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The social and geopolitical marginalization of intermixed individuals reveals the U.S. dominant culture’s denial that racial intermixture—an identity formation process exemplified in the borderlands of Maine and Texas—has always been part of American history. The mixed communities of Mexican Americans on the Texas-Mexico border and Franco Americans on the Maine-Canada border embody the complex issues of identity from local to national levels in the United States, and help us better understand why racial intermixing has been excluded from the nation’s historical identity. This comparative study of Texas’s Lower Rio Grande Valley and Maine’s St. John River Valley explores the interplay between intermixing, identity, and borders as these communities developed from colonial settlements to 20th-century border towns, and also recognizes the transborder relationships with their international sister cities. The stories of families like that of Sandy Leveck and Elodia McDonald, the author’s maternal grandparents, help show how the personal, local lives of borderlanders were interrelated with national and international events.

This project investigates how mixed-ancestry communities have been part of U.S. history since before its inception and how these mixed-ancestry groups’ inclusion in, or exclusion from, dominant U.S. society and identity has been accomplished using social and geopolitical borders.
The two border communities appeared so different, yet shared so much. Both were transnational communities where geopolitical borders became more clearly defined over time, but cultural borders remained in flux. A comparative study of these two frontiers reveals the nature of geopolitical borders between international neighbors, the social borders created between groups within U.S. society, and the relationships that can bridge those borders. Knowing that *mestizaje* or *métissage* (cultural and racial intermixing) has been part of North American history since earliest contact can help us better understand why the United States as a nation has struggled with incorporating mixed-heritage groups as equals and hopefully help us move toward a more honest and inclusive U.S. history and identity.
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INTRODUCTION
FAMILIES, BORDERS, INTERMIXING, & IDENTITY

How the Texas and Maine Borders Met Through Sandy Leveck and Elodia McDonald

A young man, Sandy, slowly rode down the small neighborhood street on his cavalry horse. His brain nervously fumbled with how to put the words in the right order for what he was going to say. The South Texas sun pierced his blue eyes, and warmed his ruddy complexion. It was February 10, 1920, and winter, but not the kind of winter he was used to as a child. He flashed back to his hometown in Maine that seemed so distant and so much colder. Sandy was three months shy of his 20th birthday and about to take one of the most important steps of his life. He dismounted from his horse, smoothed back his closely-cropped brown hair, straightened his five-foot-six and three-quarter frame to its fullest height, and walked toward the door of the house.

Inside, a young woman in a floral print dress, Elodia, had been expectantly watching for him. As she saw him approach the house, she quickly moved away from the window, tidied her short, dark brown hair, and tried to stay calm as she waited. Although she would not celebrate her fifteenth birthday for another two months, she was already becoming a woman and had a mind of her own. Her mother, Delfina, a strong-willed and imposing woman, also saw Sandy coming and knew his intentions. She was not pleased to see him.
Sandy knocked on the door, and Delfina politely motioned him into the house. He took a few steps into the living room and prepared himself to ask for Elodia’s hand in marriage. He did not speak Spanish and Delfina did not speak English, but he thought she would understand. Delfina knew what was coming and ordered her daughter out of the room,

“Elodia, vete pa’ el otro cuarto.”

She had no intention of letting this young man marry her daughter. Elodia knew this and responded, “No me voy.”

Her mother insisted, “Vete pa’ el otro cuarto, Elodia.”

Again Elodia refused, “No me voy.” She knew her mother planned to reject Sandy’s request and refused to accept the outcome quietly. Delfina insisted a third time,

“Elodia, vete!”

Elodia responded with equal vehemence, “No!”

Delfina realized Elodia was not going to budge and rejected Sandy’s proposal outright.

Because it was obvious that her mother would not change her mind, Elodia finally decided to leave. She eloped with Sandy and the pair rode away on his horse.

This may sound like a scene from a movie or a novel, but these people were real, and the event actually happened. Sandy and Elodia were two young people from very different worlds, and they still decided to marry. They were products of two distinct, culturally-mixed border regions that also shared many common characteristics, even if the couple was not fully aware of them. Sandy Leveck was born in Caribou, Maine, a town near the U.S.-Canadian border, was of Franco-American descent like many in the area, and had ancestral roots in Canada. Elodia McDonald was of Mexican-American descent and, like her husband, hailed from a border town,
in this case, Hidalgo, Texas, which was located on the U.S.-Mexico boundary. Growing up in these two, different, small, border towns connected them to each other and to transnational historical events.

Figure 1. One couple, two borders

This project is directly influenced by my family and personal history because Sandy and Elodia are my maternal grandparents. When I reconnected with Maine relatives and visited that border for the first time several years ago, I was struck by how much my grandfather’s northern Maine home reminded me of my grandmother’s home in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. I wondered what life was like back then for them and whether similar thoughts had crossed my grandfather’s mind when he first explored the Hidalgo border area.4
From Acknowledging Their Presence to Understanding Their Erasure

Research Focus, Thesis and Goal

When I began this research project, I intended to show how these intermixed cultural groups had existed in their home areas since before the United States formally existed. As the project progressed, I began to ask why this exercise was even necessary. Why was this intermixed heritage not already part of our national history and identity? Is not the history of *mestizaje* or *métissage* along borders important to understanding U.S. identity and North American history? I argue that the social and geopolitical marginalization of intermixed individuals reveals the U.S. dominant culture’s denial that racial intermixture—an identity formation process exemplified in the borderlands of Maine and Texas—has always been part of American history.

This study follows two borders, one in the Northeast and the other in the Southwest, to explore how these seemingly different communities shared commonalities as they developed from the colonial era to the early 20th century. Sandy and Elodia came from transnational communities, where political borders became more clearly defined, but cultural ones remained in flux. The bordertowns from which the newlyweds hailed were each affected by broader events that included national and border formation, interethnic tensions, immigration, transborder community formation, identity transformation, and racial intermixing.

We often hear the proud statement that the U.S. is a nation of immigrants. What makes Mexican Americans and Franco Americans on these borders different from that narrative? These communities, like the familiar east-coast English-centered history, were established during the colonial period when the Spanish and French arrived and intermixed with local Native Americans. Comparing Mexican American and Franco American communities on their
respective borders allows us to examine how over the centuries intermixed groups fit into American identity. This project contributes a more complex view of national identity to the historical literature by incorporating mixed-heritage groups whose presence has been pushed to the edges of the American narrative.

Central Themes

The three central themes are (1) mestizaje/métissage/intermixing, (2) identity, and (3) borders. Mestizaje and métissage are the Spanish and French terms, respectively, for physical and cultural intermixing that date to the European colonial periods in each region and continue today. Identity is explored from the local to national levels in terms of how the different levels are interrelated. Borders refer to both the geopolitical boundaries between international neighbors, as well as the social barriers between groups in U.S. society. All three of these themes are inextricably intertwined. Gender is a secondary theme that illustrates how experiences of intermixture differed for men and women in family and community formation. Language also played a crucial role in identity, perceptions, and power relations.

Studying intermixing is important because we are paradoxically all the same in that we are each a unique combination, or intermixture, of different biological ancestors and cultural identities. That quality is shared by all individuals and groups across the globe. What makes this project distinctive is the examination of intermixture, first as biological and cultural process, and second as geopolitical and social factors on borders.

The study of these borders and-communities is valuable because it illuminates the shared experiences of other subordinated cultural, racial and hybrid communities in America, who have been perceived as different and treated accordingly. As in other communities, border identities
have been repeatedly challenged, redefined, and reborn over the centuries; treated as other in relation to the dominant culture of the broader society; and survived in a world of their own making where their culture is perpetuated and celebrated. By virtue of living along a geopolitical border and being of mixed-ancestry, these communities also existed on a social border on the outer limits of dominant Anglo-American society. Borders and border communities allow us to study the complex dynamics between different groups, whether they differ in terms of power, culture, gender, country, or class. These communities’ members strove to thrive in a world that continued to change around them. They worked to define themselves and their place in that world even as the dominant culture attempted to impose its own views of their place in society.

Exploring the connection between intermixture and border communities is important because border communities are where this intermixing process is quite visible and where it has occurred for centuries. Intermixed identity in border communities is particularly complex, more so than either intermixed identity or border identity alone. These intermixed border groups live with daily geopolitical reminders of their complicated and tenuous standing along social borders within their own country—as citizens, aliens, or somewhere in between. United States citizens by birth or marriage, intermixed border citizens have constantly had to define themselves within the dominant culture of their own country, as well as within the society of their international neighbor, Mexico or Canada. The in-between status meant that they were not seen as full members of the dominant Anglo-American group and therefore were not extended equal treatment in the United States.

As a result of close proximity and long-term interaction over time, border communities intermix and learn to develop more open and cooperative relationships with varied groups seen as other by their dominant cultures. In addition, they usually do so earlier than citizens in more
homogenous communities in the nation’s interior, who have not had similar consistent exposure and intermixed familial ties to other neighbors. Intermixed border identity brings together identity factors--culture, race, country of origin, and more--in a variety of nuanced and complicated combinations that change over time and space.

The South Texas and northern Maine intermixed communities are distinctive because they have been in a broad sense geopolitical and social border areas for centuries. These specific Mexican American and Franco American communities have had to define themselves relative to the dominant culture, and to their international neighbors. Their intermixing with others on the remote edges of large empires and nations dates back to early contact between Natives and Europeans. As a result, over the centuries, these cultural groups had to compare themselves with their international neighbors with whom they often shared ancestral and cultural roots. Also, a nearby geopolitical border provided intermittent re-infusions of people and practices of that neighboring culture that sustained the other culture over time on the U.S.-side of the border. This is in contrast to Anglo-dominant communities in the country’s interior or East Coast that faced racial others, such as Indians, for limited periods, segregated blacks, and whitened European immigrants to the point of losing their otherness. This whitening or assimilation process became the “melting pot” image popularized in the United States at least since the early 20th century. However, the border areas continued to exemplify an alternative to this idea. They maintained their pride in a cultural identity that incorporated their U.S. and other heritages, even when the intermixed aspect of that heritage had been erased from the national historical identity.

To use the analogy of weaving, these three themes – intermixing, identity, and borders-- are the warp of this history. They are the threads of the narrative framework present in each chapter. The secondary themes, characters, examples, and surrounding history are the weft or
woof. They are the threads of the story that are woven over, between and around the central themes as appropriate in each period. Together they form a beautiful, colorful tapestry of our U.S. history that can be appreciated up close in detail or from a distance as a bigger picture

Research Approaches

These intermixing, identity, and border themes are explored using borderland and comparative approaches. Stories of mixed-culture people can be found in many parts of North America and the world; however, studying these people and themes in borderland and comparative contexts offers valuable, complex insight. This combination brings together a perfect storm blending race, culture, biology, language, education, economy, law, national origin, loyalty, citizenship, border security, immigration, and racism with individual and national identity.

In the broadest sense, borderlands history is the study of contact zones, the study of the people and processes in the areas we recognize today as the geopolitical borders between nations. More than the story of how a line was drawn on a map, borderlands history is about the interactions of people at these borders, the societies that developed, their relationships to the land, and how their sense of place and identity developed, created both locally and by the nation. This applies equally to social borders controlling access to power, and the dynamics between dominant and subordinate groups who define and cross those barriers. It is about how those geopolitical and social borders define the people, the region, and the nation.

Comparative study of these two border areas can test how broadly its conclusions can be applied in North America and elsewhere in the world. We can distill elements that these communities shared from what was unique about each one. Part of what makes these two
intermixed communities distinctive and worthy of study is that they developed along international geopolitical borders and involved the mixing of cultural and national groups that ultimately were shoved to the outer social borders by the dominant group that ruled the United States.

The benefits of comparing Maine Franco Americans and Texas Mexican Americans are multiple. The comparison shows how these two borders began similarly with the meeting of Europeans, Indians and Africans, and ended with many shared characteristics. The comparison also offers examples of the spectrum of otherness and the associated treatment of those considered other over centuries of intermixing. The comparison offers insight into the realities lived by locals and how they differed or followed the idealized planned ideas, policies, and practices of elite governing officials from national to local levels.

These two areas show how definitions of otherness and intermixture became more complex and changed over time to include religion, class, skin color, culture, and national origin. While skin color became the predominant form of determining difference in other regions of the United States, these border areas showed that some members of intermixed groups could never be identified as other by skin color or other physical features; however, their difference based on cultural characteristics and national origin could be associated with their darker compatriots. They could thus be racialized. The comparison demonstrates how these border communities either did not fully assimilate, or were excluded from dominant White Anglo Saxon Protestant (WASP) culture. The comparison shows how if these intermixed border communities did not fully “melt” or let go of all traces of their other culture, then they maintained various elements of their ancestral cultures and, in some instances, created new hybrid forms of cultural expression and traditions. Examining the evolution and treatment of Mexican Americans and Franco
Americans on these borders opens up an avenue to study the development of attitudes and policies towards racial intermixing in the United States. These two border areas show the fluidity and complexity of the social and geopolitical borders of the changing societies and countries in which these ethno-racial groups lived.

These themes have been examined by scholars from different approaches and perspectives over the years. Most U.S. borderlands studies examine only one of the two land borders with Mexico and Canada. The U.S. Southwest Borderlands has a long and well-known historiography dating from Herbert Eugene Bolton’s 1921 book, *The Spanish Borderlands* that valorized Spanish contributions to U.S. history, to Civil Rights era challenges to this interpretation by the children of U.S. Southwest *mestizaje* who introduced previously unheard voices, and followed later, in the 1990s to the 21st century, by nuanced very personal, grand scope, and transnational studies. In U.S.-Canada border studies, we find that both U.S. and Canadian traditional national narratives looked east to west, valorized the rugged fur trapper, and esteemed the transformation from savage to civilized, in both people and environment. Similar to their U.S. counterparts, border scholarship on women and Native Americans blossomed in the 1970s and 1980s, including the debut of *métis* studies, followed by a more transnational perspective.

Among state-level histories, there appear to be more border studies about Texas than Maine, and there are even few books about the specific counties in study. In total, these works are good for introductions to different aspects of the area’s history, but are often too brief, dated, or celebratory. Maine border histories appear to be more objective, but are also more recent. They offer detailed histories, but few focus on northern border communities. Beatrice Craig’s *Land in Between* is a notable exception in its detailed border study of the St. John River Valley.
Even more rare are studies that directly compare both the U.S.-Mexico and U.S.-Canada borders. Such studies make valuable contributions but are often either monographs that focus on the western regions of the respective countries or span a broader scope but are edited collections. Andrew Graybill’s *Policing the Great Plains* directly compares the Texas Rangers and Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Ben Johnson’s and Andrew Graybill’s *Bridging National Borders*, examines border people, environment, enforcement and identity in an edited collection.

This study bridges those approaches by presenting a direct comparison of both boundaries that is broad in scope and examines *mestizaje/metissage/intermixture*. It will add to the historiography about the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas and the St. John River Valley of northern Maine. It will contribute to the few direct comparisons of both U.S. international land borders, and will be one of very few to directly compare Maine and Texas. Where other borderlands studies have emphasized the geopolitical boundary or the social experience of living along that boundary, this study examines borders as both geopolitical boundaries and social barriers that were used to shape U.S. identity by excluding those considered *other* from elite status and restricted entry to the country. The common motivation in this exclusion was the fear of potential intermixing.

Studies on intermarriage, alone or in combination with gender, generally differ from this study in geographic or subject area focus. Considerable ground has been broken on Indian/Mexican/Spanish women and intermarriage; however, these tend to focus geographically on California and New Mexico, and thematically on spousal conflict, court cases and legislative records. Looking northward to the U.S.-Canada border, most of the research also focused on the West and on Indian-European (especially French) partnerships in connection to the fur trade.
Most general intermarriage studies, like Peggy Pascoe’s *What Comes Naturally*, tend to examine how state or federal government policies and legal cases have restricted intermarriage in the U.S, especially between perceived, clearly defined racial groups. More recent studies explore how intermarriage evolved at a community, family level, rather than an institutional policy perspective. These studies focus on intermarriage between Native Americans and Whites or Euroamericans, primarily in the nineteenth century, although some carry the narrative into the early twentieth century.¹²

This study contributes to research on *mestizaje* in multiple ways. It is broad in geographic and temporal scope – comparing the policies and practices of intermixing from earliest contact period in colonial North America to the twentieth century United States. It focuses on how U.S. policies that originated in British colonial legal and cultural practices came to impact communities descended from the Spanish, French, and Native cultures on 20th-century U.S. borders. It follows the changing meaning of race from pre-contact origins to how intermixed groups were racialized differently in the twentieth-century. This study explores the extent of the similarities and differences between two often neglected borderland areas, and between rarely compared hybrid cultures – Mexican Americans and Franco Americans. It is also the first to compare these issues on these specific Maine and Texas borders.

My research will contribute to the history of North American borderlands by helping us to better understand the process of *mestizaje/metissage* that led to the development of two ethnic groups who were central to the history of their border regions, and, even though they were overlooked, they were important to the development of United States identity. *Mestizaje* is an integral part of the long history and rich culture of North America.
Narrative Organization

The organization of this study unfolds in a chronological sequence that combines a local to broad perspective in a complex story. A broad historical context is presented with the dominant culture point of view to show how elites attempted to impose their idealized sense of social order, hierarchy, and behavior onto the rest of society through official policies and unofficial practices. Key regional events act as reference points for both national and local level events. Regional and community history offers a perspective on the realities faced by locals, realities that often differed from elite ideals.

This project explores the interconnected nature of family, intermixed ethnic and national identities, and social and geopolitical borders, and how each of these was used to define the other. The existence of mixed-culture border families in Texas and Maine, who often proudly maintained their U.S. national identity, challenged the dominant homogenous image of who was considered “American.” These same mixed-culture families faced challenges that questioned their status as U.S. citizens and treated them as *other*. The main goal of this work is to show that knowing that *mestizaje/métissage* /intermixing has been part of North American history since earliest contact can help us better understand why the United States has always struggled with justly incorporating racially-mixed groups as equals. The hope is to help us move toward a more honest and inclusive U.S. historical identity.
Endnotes Introduction

1 Translation: “Elodia, go to the other room.”

2 Translation: “I’m not leaving.”

3 Bertha Leveck Mendiola, Interview by Carla Mendiola, In person in Dallas, Texas, March 1, 2008; “Honorable Discharge from the United States Army of Sandy Leveck #6001468 from the Troop of the 4th Cavalry” (United States Army, July 20, 1921); “Marriage License for Sandy Leveck and Elodia McDonald” (Hidalgo County, State of Texas, February 10, 1921).

Bertha is the daughter of Sandy and Elodia Leveck, and the mother of the author, Carla Mendiola. Elodia told Bertha this story. Some introductory details have been added for transitional smoothness and to establish the setting. Elodia’s description was based on a photo from the time period. Sandy’s physical description was gathered from his military record.


Portions of this work were previously printed in other publications by the author, noted above.

5 Bolton’s work planted the seeds of a new field of study that promoted a reinterpretation of U.S. history that countered the traditional East Coast focus and anti-Spanish Black Legend, by centering the historical narrative farther south and west, and showing Spaniards in a positive light. However, he presented a history that had clear cut cultural groups, and largely omitted the presence of Indians. In the 1960s and 1970s, Chicanos and Chicanas began publishing histories that included the presence of Indians, Chicana/os, and women. The works included a spectrum from broad polemical histories, like Rodolfo Acuña’s Occupied America, to community studies spanning California to Texas, and crossed time from the Spanish colonial era to the twentieth century. Other scholars, like David Weber, also helped to bridge this gap by telling more nuanced stories of The Mexican Frontier and The Spanish Frontier. John Chávez’s The Lost Land and Gloria Anzaldúa’s Borderlands/La Frontera offered scholarly windows, from Chicana/o perspectives, into the physical and psychological world of living in a mestizo borderland. The 1990s and after saw renewed attempts to reinterpret the U.S. Southwest as a U.S.-Mexico transnational borderland. Examples from the 2000s included Continental Crossroads, edited by Samuel Truett and Elliott Young, and Ben Johnson’s Revolution in Texas. Some scholars looked beyond contiguous nations to better understand group identity, like Chavez’ Beyond Nations. See Herbert E. Bolton. The Spanish Borderlands. 1921. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1996. David Weber. The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846. Albuquerque:


Most of the works noted above were written by scholars in the United States. Histories written by scholars in Mexico and Canada about international North American borders do exist. However, considering only a limited number get translated into English, coupled with notorious U.S. monolingualism, few are used in the United States. I have included sources published in French in Canada and Spanish in Mexico as much as possible.


CHAPTER ONE

MESTIZAJE/METISSAGE IN EUROPEAN AND NATIVE WORLDS, 1400-1599

"[They are] [o]ld Christians without race of Jew, Moor nor heretics."

—1547, Archbishop Juan Martínez de Siliceo during a debate in Toledo, Spain. The first use of race in association with limpieza de sangre (cleanliness or purity of blood)¹

"[M]ixing of the races [classes] would be so important that the nobility of this Kingdom would be completely bastardized."

—1547, French historian François de Belleforest²

Introduction

During early contact in the Americas, Native Americans and Europeans defined mestizaje/métissage/intermixing between culturally defined us and others based on of religion, class, and language. This practice of selecting characteristics that define who belongs within a group, and the process of intermixing, existed in the Americas, Europe, and Africa long before their people came into contact in North America.³ Ideas of otherness, intermarriage and identity underwent considerable transformation as a result of intercultural contact in the Americas. On the international level, imperial powers focused on drawing lines on maps and on passing policies to create orderly imperial settlements, but had limited influence on daily life in the Americas. At the regional level, colonial administrators and local Native Americans grappled with the realities of
social interaction and intermixture occurring amidst larger imperial efforts. While ambitions to expand European imperial geopolitical borders drove change in this period, it was the intermixing and resulting redefinition of social borders that continually vexed colonial administrators.

Given that most records of the colonial period that have reached us were written by Europeans, more is known about their perspective. Nonetheless, we can try to gain a sense of the Native American and African perspectives based on their actions or words recorded by Europeans. Few records of Africans exist for what would become South Texas and even fewer for northern Maine. Despite this, Native American and African groups played an important role in the intermixing process to differing degrees in each region. Many Indigenous groups in the South Texas and northern Maine areas had seen or heard of Europeans well in advance of the French and Spanish, and later English, arrival en masse.\(^4\)

By the 16th century European nations were taking shape. Small disparate kingdoms were being consolidated under one royal family, such as Isabella and Ferdinand of Spain. As those leaders tried to forge a political unity through military force, they also attempted to create a uniform identity by requiring conformity to a specific religious faith, a common language, and shared customs. Those who differed experienced discrimination; some were forced to convert or leave the country.\(^5\)

European monarchs were engaged in wars of domination involving people seen as other close to home—the Irish in the British Isles, the Moors and Jews in Spain—just as they were shifting their attention to exploration and colonization across the Atlantic. Early European explorers and colonizers often described and treated Indians they met in North America in the same way they had treated others back in Europe. Individuals or groups were either the same as
at home and acceptable and welcomed into the community, although this was rare. Or, they were *different, other, and unacceptable* and kept outside of the community, either socially, physically, or both.

In the years following the conquest of New Spain and the early explorations of New France, administrators in Madrid and Mexico City, as well as Paris, Quebec City and Port Royale, faced the challenge of defining and controlling a diverse society that was giving birth to even more diverse children. Words evolved to reflect this process of social diversification—*mestizaje* and *métissage* (intermixing). Terms also developed to describe the individual people of diverse heritage, such as *mestizo* and *mulato*, *criollo* and *creole*. The variety of terms reflected not only change over time, but also the different cultures and languages involved. Each of the broader groups involved in intermixture had their own languages and dialects. Intermixture and identity became closely intertwined in this ever-changing colonial American world. Decisions regarding intermixing made, by European administrators and settlers and Indian leaders and communities, in the early colonial period established the roots of ideas, policies and practices that would reverberate into the 20th century.

The sharing of ideas and the interaction of people, which could result in children of mixed heritage, had been occurring for centuries across the globe, creating a diverse intermixed world from the beginning. The ideas, policies and practices related to intermixing that developed in North America were a continuation of ideas and experiences that existed before contact. Nonetheless, the intermixing of Native Americans, Africans and Europeans in the Americas is distinctive because never before had such different groups interacted in such large numbers, for so long, and over so broad a geographic area.
Contact between Natives Americans and Europeans started long before the arrival of Columbus. When early Europeans—Norse explorers and Basque fishermen—first began visiting the northern shores of the Americas, their impact was limited. They engaged in fishing, trade and made unsuccessful attempts at permanent settlements. Perhaps they engaged in relationships and unions with Native women, but records are scarce or non-existent. While coming from fishing villages across Europe, their visits were seasonal and temporary. Their visits to the Atlantic coast whisper to our imaginations across the centuries through a few remaining artifacts. A Norse coin produced between 1065 and 1080 A.D was probably traded southward from Inuit country across multiple Indian villages until reaching Maine. Basque fishermen traded frequently enough with Atlantic Coast Indian tribes that together they developed a distinctive mixed (pidgin) language that facilitated communication with later European explorers and colonists familiar with the Basque language.

European trade ambitions and imperial competition resulted in the colliding of Native, African, and European worlds in the Americas that laid the groundwork for later intermixing. While many fishermen from different lands had reached the eastern coasts of North America, the landing of Christopher Columbus and the Aztec gold acquired by Hernán Cortés were the historic events that motivated the ensuing waves of exploration and colonization of the Americas by Europeans. As Spaniards started arriving and staying in large numbers, beginning in the Caribbean and Mexico, irreversible change rippled across the continent like aftershocks of an earthquake. To the north, the Spanish established the oldest settlement in what would become the mainland United States at St. Augustine in Florida in 1565. The French followed with the second permanent European settlement north of Florida with Port-Royal in New France in 1605 (renamed Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia under the English). The English followed third with
Jamestown in Virginia in 1607. The dominance of the Spanish fleet eventually linked Europe to the Americas, and the Americas to the Philippines, effectively completing the circle of one of the earliest global trade networks. This Manila Galleon trade network was based on the silver mined in the Americas by Indian and African labor. The Americas and the rest of the world were irreversibly changed forever.⁸

European introduction of disease, guns, horses, and domesticated herd animals dramatically altered the human and environmental landscape of the Americas.⁹ Scholars disagree on estimated numbers, but agree that Natives had no immunity to European diseases and were decimated. Diseases made European conquest and colonization easier by weakening existing Native military forces or killing off existing inhabitants of lands colonists desired. In response to devastating population decreases, Natives who survived often moved away from the affected area, joined larger neighboring tribes, or merged with other small groups. This comingling of Native cultural groups united tribes of varying degrees of similarity. Larger group identities remained primarily intact while subsuming or adopting elements of the smaller group; and merged smaller groups likely created new combined identities with elements of both.

After diseases, Europeans introduced other elements that soon transformed the biological and technological frontiers of North America as Natives adapted to the changing world around them – guns from the French and English, horses from the Spanish.¹⁰ From earliest contact, Indigenous individuals and groups played active roles in the events impacting their homelands in northern New Spain. A key shift occurred in the 17th century with the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 that forced the Spanish to abandon New Mexico and flee to El Paso del Norte (Ciudad Juárez, Mexico today).¹¹ The neighboring Apache and Comanche quickly gained control of the Spanish horses left behind, dominated the southern Plains, and contributed to ensuing power struggles in
South Texas and northern Mexico as both nomadic tribes headed southward in the early 18th century.\textsuperscript{12}

**Identity, Ideas, and Practices**

**Native American: Texas Lower Rio Grande Valley**

Lower Rio Grande and South Texas Indians lived in small communities but interacted often enough with neighboring Indigenous groups to maintain sophisticated trade and communication networks with neighbors, both near and far, who shared the same or different languages and culture. Most natives in this region were semi-nomadic and ranged across different areas with the seasons following food sources.\textsuperscript{13} They viewed territory as an integrated whole made of multi-use spaces – hunting, fishing, ritual, trade, war.\textsuperscript{14} The most numerous and influential group, in what would become South Texas and northern Mexico, were the numerous sedentary and semi-nomadic Indian groups who Spaniards collectively called *Coahuiltecans*. While most groups shared similar *Coahuilteco* linguistic or cultural characteristics, more recent research suggests some groups were actually distinct cultural communities.\textsuperscript{15} Those who lived near the Lower Rio Grande River shared the practice of surviving through hunting, gathering and fishing.\textsuperscript{16} Archeological excavations show that Rio Grande Delta Indian groups lived in the area since the Late Archaic period (ca. 1000B.C. to 300B.C.) and may have developed distinctions between those who lived north and south of the river.\textsuperscript{17} As a whole, this broader Rio Grande area cultural group engaged in a far-reaching shell industry and used small triangular arrow points, Huastecan-like ceramics, and made campsites and cemeteries using coastal clay dune formations.\textsuperscript{18} Rio Grande area Natives traded with both their neighbors to the north in what would become *la provincial de Tejas*, but traded more frequently with their neighbors to the
This shows they had well-established cultural practices, knew how to make and use tools and weapons, and engaged in long-distance trade.

Marriage was important, usually monogamous, and lasted as long as both partners were satisfied. When ready to propose, the man gave his intended’s parents gifts and food. His request was accepted if they accepted his gifts and asked him to join them in sharing it. The woman would then move in with him and his group. Individuals who could support them, like group leaders and shamans, might have more than one wife. Either of the partners could leave the marriage when they wished, although this was less common when children were involved.20

Documentary evidence points to frequent intermarriage between different hunter-gatherer groups who spoke the same language, between A.D. 1528 and A.D. 1700. Both documentary ethnographic and archeological records describe how these groups lived in seasonal and residential camps, later called rancherias by the Spanish, and usually migrated across large areas in search of food - across central Texas to the east or west or south, or from the Rio Grande River area to the north or south. The practice of living in geographically specific areas, coupled with seasonal gatherings, provided ample opportunities for intermarriages between same or different language groups.21

This long history of intermixing with neighbors was prompted by a variety of factors, including, but not limited to, protection from more militarily powerful tribes, scarcity of food due to drought or famine, and population decline from disease or warfare. While large confederacies existed in today’s Central and East Texas, population expansion and contraction in South Texas resulted in smaller group sizes of family units or possibly bands. These small groups likely developed distinctive identities, yet their sharing of culture and technology with fellow semi-nomadic neighbors during seasonal migrations created shared characteristics with multiple
small groups across these long-distance networks. Groups could splinter into separate bands (small groups ranging from an extended family to a hundred people) or gather in larger tribes (a group of bands with shared culture and ideology) or even larger networks of communities that spanned vast distances. Many Indigenous groups had an accepted practice of maintaining a flexible sense of identity because over time they repeatedly incorporated individuals and groups of varied backgrounds. This would have made interacting with the Europeans appear as yet another group added to their list of previous contacts with other cultures. Considering the long-standing practice of fluid and mobile Indian social groups that merged and split to survive, both temporarily and permanently, it is highly possible that local Indigenous groups would have been open to accepting and intermarrying with Europeans.

The cultural and religious beliefs of each specific Indigenous group would have determined their openness to accepting Europeans into their Native communities as neighbors and also allowing them to marry their daughters and sons. Openness to intermarriage was true for some, however, it was not true for all. In Texas, Cabeza de Vaca described the Mariames, an Indian group who lived north of the Nueces River, who opposed intermarriage of their women and enforced this practice through infanticide. They believed this was necessary in order to keep women from joining their enemies and increasing their numbers through marriage and offspring. Cabeza de Vaca reported:

When their daughters are born they cast them to the dogs, which eat them. The reason for doing this, according to them, is that all the people of that land are their enemies with whom they are constantly at war, and if their enemies were to marry their daughters, they would multiply so much that they would conquer them and take them as slaves. For this reason they preferred to kill their daughters rather than have them bear offspring who would be their enemies. We asked them why they did not marry their daughters to their own men and they replied that they considered it an unseemly thing to marry them to their relatives and that it was better to kill them than to give them to their relatives or their enemies. This custom is observed only by these people and their neighbors, the Yguazes, and by no other people in that land. When they want to get married, they buy
wives from their enemies, each one paying the price of the best bow he has and two arrows. If a man does not have a bow, he gives a net up to one fathom wide and another fathom long. They kill their own children and buy the children of strangers. A marriage lasts only as long as they are happy, and for the slightest reason they dissolve the marriage.\textsuperscript{25}

This practice required Mariames men to intermarry women from other bands or tribes, and studies suggest monogamy was the rule. The preference for male children points to a patrilineal and patriarchal society, but male children were still susceptible to infanticide. The high value placed on dreams meant that bad omens associated with male children in dreams could result in their death. Gender clearly played a crucial role in determining which children survived to adulthood and how marriage partners were selected. Intermarriage was acceptable and necessary, but only allowed for men.\textsuperscript{26}

Time, seasonal weather, and potential land obstacles of dense vegetation, and dry or flooded rivers could limit the frequency of trade and social gatherings with neighboring tribes. Rivers in South Texas and northern Mexico were few and generally flowed to the Gulf coast. Large beasts of burden were not available for riding, so, travel overland was done primarily by walking. Papaya, Mariames, and other Indian groups were known to travel to communal areas to harvest food during the summer. Their travels to distant foraging areas could span thirty to eighty miles or more and happened at least two times a year.\textsuperscript{27} Large gatherings to the north, in central Texas were also common when bison were in the area. Although these limitations on travel and frequency of gatherings minimized opportunities for meeting spouses from other tribes, the opportunities still existed. Given the difficult subsistence lifestyle of the area, small bands probably were more prevalent, and therefore, marrying outside of the group (exogamy) was more appealing than marrying within the group (endogamy).
While there were multitudes of Indigenous people in North America during early contact, the number of Africans was considerably smaller. Their presence would be felt more strongly in later centuries as their numbers increased due to the slave trade. Nevertheless, Africans made their mark during early contact. The most famous African in early North America was Estebanico. He was one of the first to explore the northern frontier, although not by choice, with fellow shipwreck survivor Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, between 1528 and 1536. Scholarly opinion differs on whether he was free or slave; however, it is likely that he was a slave. Although their exact route is debated, it is widely accepted that they crossed along the Texas coast and through part of today’s South Texas, possibly near the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

The presence of Africans in European empires varied by location and time period. Throughout the colonial period in New Spain the majority of Africans were concentrated farther south - in Mexico City, near mines, or near ports where Africans arrived as slaves, worked as servants, or were free. Between 1521 and 1594, New Spain imported approximately 36,500 Black Africans, and 8,000 of them lived in Mexico City. By 1640, over 275,00 Africans had been brought to New Spain, before importations stopped, due to cost and a more stable supply of Indian labor. In 1646, New Spain’s total population of 1.7 million included 13,830 Europeans, 35,089 Africans (both African and American born), and 116,529 black mestizos. By 1810, 624,000 people, approximately 9 percent of New Spain’s total population was black, due no doubt to mestizaje. Most Africans who arrived in the Americas during early contact were probably slaves. Spanish legal and religious practices allowed slaves to earn money, marry partners of varied ethnicities, and achieve their freedom. By the early 18th century, Mexico’s
Black population was predominantly free, intermixed, and lived and worked in every part of the colony and economy.  

Like Estebanico, early African or African-ancestry individuals reached Spanish South Texas and northern Mexico by accompanying exploratory teams or by shipwrecks, or joined the concerted settlement efforts in the early 18th century. If shipwrecked, it is highly likely that, if accepted by their Indigenous neighbors, they would have intermarried with area Natives. Colonizers recruited settlers from New Spain communities in central Mexico and surrounding areas. After two hundred years of Spanish rule and mestizaje, these settlers carried their African-Indian-Mestizo intermixed-ancestry with them to the north.

A similar intermixing of peoples occurred even farther north and east in New France, with similar exploratory and settlement colonial phases. The predominant groups were Europeans and Natives. Like Spaniards in northern New Spain, the French were significantly outnumbered by a variety of Native groups.

Native American: Maine St. John River Valley

During early contact, northern Maine was inhabited by Indian groups that were part of the linguistic family known as Algonquian, whose social and trade connections reached as far west as the Rocky Mountains. Wabanaki encompassed four different tribes - Abenaki, plus the Maliseet, Passamaquoddy, and Mi’kmaq - and each of these had their own subgroups. The name Wabanaki comes from the Abenaki word wapánahki and means dawn land people or easterners. These tribes lived in what would later become the U.S. state of Maine and neighboring states of Vermont and New Hampshire, as well as parts of the Canadian provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec.
The Abenaki, Maliseet and Passamaquody tended to migrate within certain territories that slightly overlapped each other. The harsh winters and changing seasons prompted them to migrate in search of food.\textsuperscript{34} The Abenaki had two main Eastern and Western subgroups. The Eastern Abenaki lived a semi-nomadic life closer to the Atlantic coast and relocated their villages often.\textsuperscript{35} They spoke a different language than the Western Abenaki.\textsuperscript{36} The Maliseet and Passamaquoddy were considered to be almost identical in culture; however, the Maliseet were more inland hunters and the Passamaquoddy survived more on sea life.\textsuperscript{37} The Mikmaq lived to the east in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.\textsuperscript{38} Together, the Wabanaki numbered approximately twenty thousand upon the arrival of the Europeans.\textsuperscript{39} In 1677 a missionary at Rivière-du-Loup (along the St. Lawrence River) estimated approximately 400 or 500 Mikmaqs lived on the coast between Cape Breton and Gaspe. At the turn of the 18th century, an estimated 2000 Mikmaqs lived in Acadia (Nova Scotia).\textsuperscript{40}

Land was important in creating a sense of Wabanaki belonging to a place; however, rivers held even more significance. Home territories and distinct linguistic dialects tended to develop based on the river systems where they lived. Groups who used the same rivers tended to interact more and be more similar to each other than groups who used a neighboring river system. However, differences could still develop within one river system when those groups lived in upper or lower river areas.\textsuperscript{41} By the colonial period, the Wabanaki associated themselves and their sense of place with rivers and streams more than the land. Each Native group had a clear sense of identity and homeplace and maintained active networks that reached across the peninsula, coast, and inland.

Although these different tribes tended to migrate within specific areas, Indigenous groups did not believe in private ownership of land. However, land could be distributed and allocated
for different purposes. For example, families associated with traditional hunting grounds, but there were also communal areas where all could gather or hunt or forage. They practiced usufruct land use where the land was shared by all, as long as no one abused their privileges, and all benefited. Wabanaki viewed land as a sacred communal responsibility held in safe-keeping for future generations, as directed by the Great Spirit or grandfather or Glooskap, the Wabanaki mythical cultural hero and caretaker. This attitude differed markedly from the Euro-American attitude that saw land as a commodity. Their view of land and territory also differed from the European approach in that they had a more gradual sense of one group’s area blending off into another’s. There were no hard lines separating territories like those associated with European maps.

Northern Maine was a veritable crossroads due to the myriad of rivers and lakes that connected the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic coast. Rivers were seen more as places of gathering, or zones of contact, rather than territorial boundary markers. Given the relative ease of traveling by boat on rivers versus by foot over land, it is likely that different groups interacted on a regular basis. However, as in Texas, location and seasonal weather played a significant role. The colder winters froze existing rivers and lakes, making travel on them limited at best and potentially hazardous at worst. Locals lived in smaller groups in the winter when food was more scarce and travel more dangerous, and held larger gatherings in the summer in communal fishing, hunting, or foraging areas. Communities surely used these opportunities to find spouses for their members.

Both Lower Rio Grande Valley and northern St. John River Valley inhabitants lived in harsh environments that required a seminomadic lifestyle with a combination of foraging and hunting, and small to large group gatherings, depending on the seasons. Relations ranged from
marriage to warfare between different groups, with the idea of otherness based primarily on where one lived, or language, or tribal affiliation. While North Atlantic coast Natives were exposed to small groups of European fishermen long before Gulf Coast natives heard of such people. As Europeans arrived in larger numbers, both groups learned that their worldviews and ideas of otherness shared some commonalities and held significant differences.

Like their North American Native counterparts, pre-contact Europeans’ ideas about who they were and their relationships with their neighbors and environment underwent dramatic changes after contact. Before contemplating colonies across the Atlantic, European elites’ world views were oriented toward their nearby rivals or farther eastward toward their long-distance Arabic and Asian neighbors. European citizens’ world views and experiences focused on their immediate community and possibly the province. Ideas of us and others for elites and citizens were based more on class and religion, and as nations gradually took form, so did ideas of who “belonged.”

**European: Spain to New Spain**

In mid-15th century Spain, early definitions of other groups were based on religious differences of Christians or non-Christians - Muslims, Jews, heretics and the like. This was due in large part to centuries of religious and cultural battles that included the Crusades in the Holy Land and La Reconquista in Spain. Completed in 1492, La Reconquista signified the reconquest of Spain by Spaniards when they regained control of the peninsula after over 800 years of Moorish occupation. La Reconquista also marked the unification of Spain for the first time under centralized rule of a single queen and king and an ensuing shift to Catholicism as the dominant
religion, both which changed the treatment of peoples who were considered other. These changes would impact both the peninsula and the soon-to-be discovered Americas.\textsuperscript{44}

During Spanish unification, anxieties over religious and political stability raised concerns about internal vulnerabilities to potentially disloyal New Christians, including new convert \textit{moriscos} (Muslim converts to Christianity) and especially \textit{conversos} (Jewish converts to Christianity). As a result of these anxieties, in 1449 in Toledo, the first \textit{Sentencia-Estatuto} was passed and prohibited anyone of Jewish origin from holding public office in that municipality. In the midst of multiple individuals and groups fighting for political dominance across the different regions of Spain in the 15th century, \textit{conversos} became popular targets of animosity. They were suspected of continuing to secretly practice Judaism and, therefore, allegedly posed a threat to the political and social order.\textsuperscript{45}

The best way to avoid discrimination and access religious and political posts at that time was to prove one’s status as an “Old Christian” with “pure” religious lineage unsullied by the “contamination” of other faiths. This status was called \textit{limpieza de sangre}, or \textit{purity of blood}, but initially was seen as having to do with purity of religious beliefs of individuals and their families, rather than biological ancestry.\textsuperscript{46} This proof of purity was required for anyone wishing to hold a secular or religious office, enter a university, religious or military orders, and some guilds. This status also became more important after the 1480 establishment of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, which investigated claims of heresy and religious genealogies. While tasked to investigate “the sins of fathers only up to the second generation,” inquisitors often investigated more deeply and any evidence of Moorish or Jewish ancestry was enough to ban long-term, orthodox Catholics from office.\textsuperscript{47} These anxieties and practices contributed to Isabella and Ferdinand’s decision in the spring of 1492 to expel all Jews from their kingdom, unless they
converted to Christianity. Even then they were treated as other and subject to suspicion and discrimination.

The first use of race in association with limpieza de sangre was by Archbishop Juan Martínez de Silíceo during a 1547 debate in Toledo, in which he affirmed that the cathedral clerics and altar servers were “Old Christians without race of Jew, Moor nor heretics.”

By the 1560s, under King Philip II, blood purity policies became accepted practice throughout Spain, as did romanticized claims of Visigoths as idealized ancestors because they ruled Spain before the Moorish conquest.

By the 16th century in Spain, protecting a family’s religious lineage and associated family honor soon lead to increased concerns over proper marriages and legitimate births. This lead to increased efforts to “protect” the honor of “Old Christian” noble women by controlling their sexuality before and after marriage to avoid the introduction of “unclean” or “contaminated” lineages into the family. The negative view of this dishonor was such that it was preferred to be puros (pure of blood) and commoners over being nobles infectos (infected nobles). “Yo soy un hombre/ aunque de villa casta/ limpo de sangre/ y jamás de hebrea o mora manchada.” (I am a man/ although of a mixed or lower class village/ pure of blood/ and never by Hebrew or Moor stained.)

A mancha, or stain, on a family’s name gradually gained a sense of permanence, and lead to ideas of the inheritability of religious and ancestral purity and family honor. This sixteenth-century Spanish practice of identification based on religion was carried over to its colonies.

As more Spaniards arrived in the Americas, and either married local women or had children by them, and then brought over their wives from Spain, the growing diversity and numbers of colonists required the Spanish monarchy to institute rules of social governance.
Christian Spaniards and their African servants were considered part of the república de españoles (republic of Spaniards) that was ruled by the Spanish king. All non-Christian and Catholic Indians, from acknowledged complex city societies to smaller nomadic groups, belonged to the república de indios (republic of Indians) and initially were ruled by the Spanish Crown through elite Indian leaders.\(^{51}\)

Indians were seen as a completely new group or as descendants of a lost tribe of Israel. In either case, Spanish authorities decided Indians were separated by distance from any contamination of Islamic or Jewish influence. Therefore, Indians were sin mancha and marriages between similar economic Indian and Spanish classes were acceptable. In that way, Spanish second-sons moved up the socio-economic ladder by marrying Indian women from noble families. This was especially true in the highly stratified societies of central Mexico, where the Spanish colonial governing city was built upon the Aztec capital of Tenochtitlán. Conversion by Indians to Catholicism was nonetheless required. Only later would religious difference be replaced by physical and associated characters as determiners of marriage choices. Even though Indians were officially viewed as having free will and fully redeemable after conversion to Christianity, in practice, most Indians were treated as lower-class citizens. Protecting the family lineage and honor from contamination continued to be paramount among elite families, both Indian and Spanish.

To help preserve the “pure” nature of the American Natives and Spanish colonies, all “impure” groups and individuals were prohibited from migrating to Spanish America. In Spain, everyone was required to present proof of purity in order to obtain travel licenses from the Casa de Contratación (Royal House of Trade) in Seville. In New Spain, a complementary policy passed in 1523 that prohibited the arrival of those lacking proper “purity” paperwork.\(^{52}\) However,
enforcement of these exclusionary policies, and *limpieza de sangre* investigations and requirements, was often inconsistent and contradicted official directives. Adding to the complexity of *mestizaje* in colonial Spain, many of the Spaniards who emigrated were New Christians of questionable ancestry. The difficulty of tracing ancestry across an ocean on two different continents could make proving *pureza* claims difficult, but could also make challenging *pureza* equally so.

Initially, the legitimate and illegitimate children of Spaniards, usually Spanish men and Indian women called *mestizos*, were recognized by their fathers and could be raised as fully Spanish or Indian. However, a few decades after the conquest, the number and variety of mixed blood children created concerns for the stability of Spanish colonial society and sparked more restrictive policies towards them. *Mullatoes* (usually a Spanish father and African mother) were especially despised because their African heritage suggested both potential Muslim influences (with the associated children-of-Ham stain) and slave ancestry.53

The variety of couplings, and resulting mixed-blood children, eventually gave rise to a classification system in the second half of the 16th century that became institutionalized around the middle of the 17th century.54 This *sociedad de castas* (society of castes) or *sistema de castas* (system of castes) both reflected, and attempted to enforce, a socio-economic, racial *casta* (caste) hierarchy. Intermixed children were conceived through consensual unions or marriages, others through coercion or violence, and many outside of wedlock. Whether these children were recognized as legitimate or illegitimate offspring of one or both parents directly impacted the social standing of the child and potentially the families of the parents.55
European: France to New France

Similar to Spain, an awareness of a class hierarchy and associated attributes already existed in metropolitan France in the 16th century, and reached New France in the 17th century. In France, initial differences were based on noble and non-noble class status, as nobles sought to protect their rights and privileges under increasingly absolutist monarchs. In defining classes, three rationales were used to justify noble status - the king’s power to grant noble status, natural inheritable “racial” superiority, and a constructed history and identity based on the conquest by the Franks of the Gauls in the fifth century. In addition, the older, aristocratic noble families, “men of the sword” (noble since Medieval period), argued that their long-standing noble lineage justified their higher social ranking because of their “superiority of birth.” They argued this particularly strongly in comparison to newer noble families, or “men of the robe” (often legal or political elites), and especially in comparison to people of common origin, or roturiers. The older elite lineages allegedly possessed qualities of superior character, valor, and virtue that did not contain the “stain” of disreputable qualities of lower classes. French writers helped reinforce the belief that these qualities were hereditary and unchangeable.

Even though class traits were considered unchangeable by many, an individual’s social standing, and by association a family’s reputation, could still be tarnished or altered. A dishonorable act could “cause the ‘nobility of renowned blood’ to be reduced to ‘public infamy,’ thus losing its superior status.” A safeguard against this threat was the education of noble children in proper attitudes and behaviors. The person held responsible for the education of children, primarily sons, was the father. In French culture and language “education” referred to the upbringing of children in proper behavior and moral practices, rather than the English-language reference to an academic institution of learning.
Throughout the 16th century in France, “blood” referred to family kinship and “lineage.”65 Although the language used then sounds similar to what we understand today as difference of race based in biology, in the 16th century, difference was still viewed primarily in terms of economic and social classes based on character traits and perceived morality passed on through family lines. This idea and practice of maintaining a hierarchical social order through family lines was a common practice dating back to medieval times. While accepting that different classes existed, metropolitan French society also believed there was one human race.66

A shift began to occur by the second half of the 16th century, as race also began to be used interchangeably with “blood” when referring to ‘family’ or ‘lineage.’67 However, it still emphasized class as the marker of difference. Historian François de Belleforest wrote in 1547 that uncontrolled “mixing of the races [classes] would be so important that the nobility of this Kingdom would be completely bastardized.”68 The associated superior moral and physical attributes of nobles were considered transmittable from one generation to the next through blood. The same was understood as being true for the transmission of undesirable traits among lower class members.

Intermixing in France between families of different social classes was frowned upon by the upper classes as a threat to their social standing and the stability of society in general. In early Indian-French encounters in New France, however, class distinctions posed little hindrance to intermarriage for many French explorers. Protecting their class status may have been a consideration for noble French, but would likely not have been a concern for French sailors, fishermen, or traders. French elites, or ambitious lower class members, would have been mindful of intermarrying with high-ranking Indian women to maintain or achieve higher social standing. However, most Native communities did not have the same noble and commoner distinctions
because their social structures were more egalitarian and less hierarchical than European societies. This was due in part to their smaller-sized communities. French authorities still required conversion to Catholicism for official church-sanctioned marriages; however, many couples were known to marry à la façon du pays, according to local Native custom.

The process of this Native-European intermixing was called métissage. The term métiz was reportedly used in France as early as the thirteenth century. The earliest recorded reference to a French-Indian ancestry person, métis, in New France was in 1604-1614, when Jean de Poutrincourt, co-founder of the colony of Acadia, complained about French men intermarrying with Indian women.

**European: England to New England**

Following their European contemporaries, the English enthusiastically engaged in colonization efforts along the length of the North Atlantic seaboard. Earliest English-sponsored explorations included landings on the Maine coast by Simon Ferdinando in 1579 and John Walker in 1580, under orders from Sir Humphrey Gilbert. Sandwiched between the French to the north on the Maritime Peninsula, the Spanish to the south in Florida, and Native groups in every direction, the English gradually dominated the east coast through sheer numbers of colonists from England and neighboring European allies.

English colonists engaged in intermarriage and sexual relations with Indians and Africans, albeit to a somewhat lesser degree than their Spanish and French counterparts. There was less need to intermarry with local women because a larger number of European women and families emigrated than in the Spanish and French colonies. Over time, colonists who were open to intermarriage gradually began to hide this fact because of an increase in stricter anti-
intermarriage laws, which were directly related to the increased importation of African slaves. Intensive participation in African slavery in England and the Caribbean prejudiced English attitudes against intermixing with groups seen as dark or other by the time colonists reached the Atlantic coast. Prejudice did not stop intermixing, nor the birth of intermixed children, whether their conception was censentual and loving or not. Still, it took time for the English language to catch up with age-old coupling practices and the associated intermixing ideas and identities. For now, English colonists adopted the terms used by their Spanish and French neighbors.

**Conclusion**

Native Americans, the French, Spanish, English, and Africans all experienced intermixing with others long before the Americas appeared on the horizon of European explorers’s ships. However, the beliefs and practices these groups held before they encountered each other greatly influenced their relationships and openness to intermixing in the Americas when their different worlds collided. Native American groups lived in communities that were usually nomadic, sedentary or a combination, and were open to intermixing with neighboring groups to survive.

Native Americans for the most part appeared open to intermarrying with other groups. Their ideas of other were based more on different cultural or language groups, rather than class or religion like Europeans. While Native groups often had elected leaders, most did not have entrenched social hierarchies like Europeans. They interacted with neighboring groups, often only seasonally as they migrated to find food, or perhaps for trade. Given famine, war, disease, and environmental changes, many Native groups were accustomed to merging with neighboring Natives when necessary, sometimes temporarily or permanently. Even if it had not happened within their lifetimes, stories of similar migrations or mergings were still part of community
memories. This acceptance of past mergings made accepting new mergings more palatable. The idea of internalizing an external being, force, or energy and making it part of the village was viewed as making the group stronger in some Native spiritual belief systems.73

In Europe, series of waves of different invaders and conquerors passed through and occupied the lands that would later become Spain, France, and England—each populated by the intermixed descendants of these myriad indigenous and more recent immigrants. In Spain, early uses of race referred to a “pure” family lineages free from the supposed contamination of converso or morisco (Jewish or Moorish convert) ancestors. Any class level was open to investigation and potential social stigmatization. In France, race served to entrench existing socio-economic class stratifications, by reinforcing the idea that nobility and associated traits were inheritable through family lineage. In both cases, the dishonor was considered more of a social stigma associated with a family’s reputation, not a characteristic carried in the blood.

After early contact with Natives in the Americas, both Spanish and French ideas about what were considered acceptable unions began to change, as did the criteria used to define ideal and other identities The Spanish and French, and to a lesser extent the British, colonial monarchs and administrators shared the practice of initially encouraging intermarriage, but would eventually change to more restrictive policies when initial plans did not meet their expectations. Strategies to differentiate socio-economic classes, and classify those seen as other, was but the latest manifestation of a long tradition in European modes of thinking to create a more orderly, acceptable society. They were forced to adapt to Native American communities who exerted cultural, economic, and sometimes military influence, especially upon their border communities. Native-European relationships changed over time as colonies continued to expand and first-contact frontiers transformed into borderlands.
Endnotes Chapter One


3 European history was filled with multiple migrations and mergings of different people. While most of those migrations were motivated by reasons of survival, many of those migrations and mergings involved violence and war, contests over territory, attempts to acquire wealth, impose religious beliefs, or other reasons besides purely survival. In North America, before Europeans arrived, similar waves of migration and merging occurred. While some were due to population decline from warfare, most motivations were for reasons of survival due to urban community decline, environmental changes or lack of food. For a brief overview of this process in Spain, see Weber, Spanish Frontier, 19.


5 This persecution and expulsion lead families to practicing their faith in secret in the colonies. In some cases the traditions continued but the knowledge of the Jewish roots was forgotten until it was rediscovered much later, as with the Crypto-Jews in New Mexico. David J. Weber, The Spanish Frontier in North America, Yale Western Americana Series (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 19.

6 Europeans were also engaging in interactions with other peoples and cultures long before colonizing the Americas. Long-distance trade with China and men returning from the Crusades, beginning after the first Crusade in 1095, introduced exotic and valuable goods to European communities who had limited trade beyond their immediate vicinities. Arab and Portuguese innovators pioneered navigational technology that allowed sailing beyond sight of land, and more importantly, a consistent method to find home again. Moveable-type printing presses made it easier to spread news and stories about fascinating foreign lands and travels. These were some of the factors that contributed to the European imperial powers’ competition to be the first to find a passage to the East that circumvented the middle-men merchants of the Mediterranean. Beginning in the fifteenth century, power became concentrated in fewer noble hands across
Western Europe, so did military and financial resources, thus resulting in the coalescing of early European states.
Ibid.

7 Early contacts between European colonists and Native Americans prompted the creation of pidgin or creole languages that were a combination of elements of two or more languages. One of the oldest pidgin dialects reported was a mix of Basque and two different Indian tongues. Upon the meeting of a Basque fisherman and Montagnais client, a Basque-inspired greeting received a Native-inspired reply. James Axtell, “Babel of Tongues: Communicating with the Indians in Eastern North America,” in The Language Encounter in the Americas, 1492-1800: A Collection of Essays, ed. Edward G. Gray and Norman Fiering, European Expansion and Global Interaction, v. 1 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), 30–32; An intermixed language that combines elements of two or more different languages, first exists as a pidgin dialect spoken as a second language by all in the community, then may become a creole language spoken as a first language by all. In a typical creole language, the dominant culture language contributes most of the vocabulary, and the subordinate cultural group contributes most of the grammar. “Creole, N. and Adj.,” Oxford English Dictionary Online (Oxford University Press), definition 2b., accessed November 6, 2015, http://www.oed.com.proxy.libraries.smu.edu/view/Entry/44229.

8 The Manila Galleons traveled between Manila in the East Indies (Philippines) and Acapulco of New Spain (Mexico) between 1565 to 1815. In exchange for Spanish silver from the Americas, Ming Dynasty merchants from Fujian (China) traded goods such as spices, porcelain, ivory, and silk. The Manila Galleon trade transported an estimated one-third of the silver mined in Spanish America in this period. Gaston Fornes and Alan Butt Philip, “The China-Latin America Axis: Following the Path of the Manila Galleon,” AIB Insights 14, no. 1 (2014): 7.

9 Having lived in close quarters with domesticated animals and been exposed to a variety of diseases over centuries, Europeans developed multiple immunities. However, once in the Americas, diseases were spread by individual Europeans, their pigs or other domesticated animals that got loose, or other Natives who had been exposed to diseases and unknowingly spread them ever farther.

10 Natives acquired guns from the French and English who wanted their Native neighbors as allies against their European rival in imperial wars for territory. The Spanish reintroduced horses to North America and withheld guns to avoid armed Native revolts because Spaniards were so outnumbered. Native trading and raiding soon spread horse herds beyond Spanish settlements and lead to the rise of Apaches and Comanches as dominant forces in the region.

11 An organized Pueblo Indian effort spanning many settlements in northern New Mexico, it is sometimes refered to as the first American war for independence. For different perspectives on the causes of the revolt, Native perspectives of the leader Popay, and archealogical contributions to understanding what happened among Pueblo communities afterwards, see the following sources, respectively. David J. Weber, ed., What Caused the Pueblo Revolt of 1680?, Historians at Work (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 1999); Weber, Spanish Frontier, 133–41; Marta Weigle, Frances Levine, and Louise Stiver, eds., Telling New Mexico: A New History, 1st ed (Santa Fe, NM: Museum of New Mexico Press, 2009), 107–13, 418–21; Matthew Liebmann, Revolt: An


14 Natives in northern New Spain viewed recognized territory “as a continuous, diverse whole that was rationally utilized by its inhabitants. Territory in this sense is defined as a set of spaces – hunting, fishing, gathering, ritual, warring, exchange – in which a strategy of integrated management of the land is observed. The alteration or physical transformation of those spaces (pollution, erosion, deforestation), produces a chain reaction of discontinuities: deprivation of means of sustenance, elimination in diversity of economic activities, radical changes in social relationships, transformation of relations with the environment. These discontinuities are made evident in the reconfiguration of the social relationships between groups and individuals.”


In terms of appearance, many adorned their bodies with paint, piercings, tattoos, and a stripe from their hairline to the tip of their nose combined with a tattooed line around the mouth. These markings may have indicated band or status. Due to the climate, men often wore no clothes or a
deer hide breechcloth, perhaps a rabbit fur robe. Women wore skirts of grass or perhaps animal hides. Buffalo hides were used for shoes and blankets.


See this site for Late Archaic period dates and additional information about the prehistory to early history of Texas, plus important archeological sites.


Arnn points to studies that examined two groups – Brownsville Complex and Barril Complex, who were considered separate but whose chronology and relationship may be closer than previously thought.

Arnn also states (on the same pages) that, in fact, they traded with neighbors much farther south on a regular basis. This is evident based on the limited amount of ceramics from central Texas, and the abundance of ceramics found from Mexico, uncovered in archeological sites. Looking even more closely, Mexican ceramics are more common on the south side of the river and rare in Cameron County. Participating in a trade network that reached to central Mexico, Rio Grande Delta Indians traded extensively in ornamental shell objects of beads, tinklers, disk-shaped conch shells, gorgets, and columella pendants. In exchange, they collected Mexican-origin ceramics resembling the Huastecan style from Tamaulipan traders, and jadeite and obsidian acquired through pochteca traveling merchants from Aztec or Toltec markets.

19 Hester and Turner, “Prehistory.”


22 Ibid., Third page of Chapter Two “Framing a Model of Prehistoric Identity: Ethnographic Analogy and Archaeological Expectations”; While even sparse archeological evidence can point to shared characteristics based on common objects found across vast distances, the semi-nomadic nature of South Texas Natives still shrouds them in mystery because of the minimal durable evidence they left behind to demonstrate distinctive cultural practices or identities. Ibid., Ninth and tenth pages of the Introduction, possibly Chapter Two.

Mariames are estimated to have lived between the Nueces River on the south and the Guadalupe River to the north.

Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, *La relación y comentarios del governador Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca* (Digital Scan Online), Chapter 18, “How He Told Esquivel’s Story,” 51-52.


Distant gatherings may have occurred during the winter, however, Spanish records do not mention them. Gatherings between closer neighbors may have occurred, but records are limited on how close different tribes lived in relation to each other or how often they gathered.

Both were members of the 1528 Pánfilo de Narváez expedition, whose party of approximately 300 men dwindled to four by the time they reached Mexico in 1536. Cabeza de Vaca described their journey in a report that served as a guide for later explorers and is considered the earliest report of European exploration of the Americas. Estebanico later acted as guide and advance scout for an expedition into New Mexico that proved to be his last. An original and scanned copy of the 1555 version of La Relación is in the Southwestern Writers Collection archives of Texas State University. Johnson, “Narvaez, Panfilo de,” *Handbook of Texas Online*, June 15, 2010, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fna22; Donald E. Chipman, “Cabeza de Vaca, Alvar Nuñez.” *Handbook of Texas Online*, June 12, 2010, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fca06; Donald E. Chipman, “Estevanico,” *Handbook of Texas Online*, June 12, 2010, https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fes08; Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, *La relación y comentarios del governador Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca* (Digital Scan Online); “Cabeza de Vaca’s La Relacion (1555 Scan),” accessed June 12, 2010, http://alkek.library.txstate.edu/swwc/cdv/la_relacion/index.html.


For details on the number of Africans brought to New Spain, see Magali Marie Carrera, *Imagining Identity in New Spain: Race, Lineage, and the Colonial Body in Portraiture and Casta Paintings*, 1st ed, Joe R. and Teresa Lozano Long Series in Latin American and Latino Art and Culture (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 36; For additional information about the presence of Blacks in New Spain, not necessarily directly related to Texas, see James Brooks,


33 Handbook of Ind of Northern Mex, 1912

34 They were primarily hunters and gatherers who relied on fish, seals, porpoises, waterfowl, berries, nuts, and tubers in the spring and summer. Smaller family bands would gather together in prime fishing locations in the warmer months, then split up again during the colder seasons in search of food. They would head inland to hunt moose, deer, caribou, bears, beavers, muskrats, and otters.

35 The Passamaquoddy lived south of the Maliseet in Maine and New Brunswick, from Lake Chiputneticook in the north and along the Magaguadavic, St. Croix, and Machias rivers leading to the coast.

36 Both of these St. Lawrence River area groups were comprised of different Iroquoian and Algonquian-speaking groups. Odanak served as the new home for families from over twenty different Indian nations since its inception in the 1660s. Most of them came from Vermont, New Hampshire, and northwestern Massachusetts areas, with recent members arriving to escape Metacom’s War (King Phillip’s War). Some of the groups included Western Abenaki-speaking groups, like the Sokokis and Penacooks, and Southern New England Algonquian-speaking groups, like the Pocumtucks.

The Western Abenaki also lived in Maine and had a major village, Odanak or St. François, approximately fifty miles upriver from their Mohawks allies at Kahnawake (Kanesatake) near Montreal.


The Maliseet lived primarily along the St. John River from the coast in New Brunswick, through Northern Maine, and into Quebec to the southern bank of the St. Lawrence River.


One group, Mi’kmaq (Micmac, Mi’gmaq, Mi’gmaque or other spellings), ranged from the Gulf of St. Lawrence west along the St. Lawrence River to Kamouraska, and from Cape Breton in Nova Scotia north to the southern side of Anticosti Island. Different accounts, including a sagamaw (chief) Joseph Claude, described slightly different boundaries of where the Mikmaq lived called Gespe’gewa’gi (Gaspesie or Gaspé), but these landmarks are the general consensus.


The major river systems and Abenaki Indian groups in Maine - from east to west - were the Penobscot River and Indians, Kennebec River and Indians, Androscoggin River and Arosaguntacook Indians, and the Saco River and Pigwacket Indians. These rivers vary in length and each flowed to the Atlantic coast. The Penobscot River is the longest and the one that pertains most closely to Treat’s 1820 survey. The St. John River of the Maliseet was the other major river traveled during his trip.


This river-oriented lifestyle had not always been the preference among area Indian groups because evidence shows that their Paleo Indian ancestors had preferred flat, sandy locations away from rivers.


44 The Crusades involved several European countries that attempted to regain Jerusalem and other Christian lands from Muslims, between 1095 to 1291 and extending into the sixteenth century. La Reconquista was a similar effort, between 718 and 1491, fought entirely in Spain by Spanish nobles, kings and commoners, who were trying to regain control from Muslims rule, which started in the early eighth century.


45 While anti-Jewish sentiment in Spain reached a peak previously in 1391, that earlier movement was motivated more by religious fanaticism and still allowed elite Jewish families access to positions of social and political influence. However, the mid-fifteenth century movement aimed to block all Jews, particularly conversos, from both religious and political positions of power or influence. This belief was sparked by a protest in Toledo that resulted after allegations that converso elites were conspiring with political officials wishing to implement higher taxes. This conflict occurred during a period of general social unrest, violence, and economic and political turmoil. For 1449 statutes, see Torres, “‘Raza’: Variables Históricas,” 18; Max S. Hering Torres, “La limpieza de sangre. Problemas de interpretación: acercamientos históricos y metodológicos (Purity of Blood. Problems of Interpretation: Historical and Methodological Approaches),” Historia Crítica, no. 45, Bogotá (December 2011): 37; For a detailed analysis of the practice of the limpieza de sangre policies in Spain that were later carried to the Americas, see María Elena Martínez, Genealogical Fictions: Limpieza de Sangre, Religion, and Gender in Colonial Mexico (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2008); For an overview of the focus on Jews, see Albert A. Sicroff and Yom Tov Assis, “Limpieza de Sangre,” Encyclopaedia Judaica 13 (November 30, 2006): 25–26.


48 Torres, “‘Raza’: Variables Históricas,” 18.

The earliest written use of raza in relation to limpieza de sangre in Spain was in 1547. It was soon followed by others that increasingly associated religious affiliation, specifically Jews, with family heredity and concerns over limpieza de sangre.
Original Spanish text by Archbishop Juan Martínez de Siliceo, 1547, “... se propuso un estatuto por nos Arzobispo de Toledo en esta Santa Iglesia en el cual se contenía desde aquel día en Adelante todos los Beneficiados de aquella Santa Iglesia a Dignidades como Canonigos Razioneros Capellanes y clerizones fuesen cristianos Viejos sin raza de Judío ni de Moro ni hereges....”

English translation (author’s): “... propose a statute by us, Archbishop of Toledo, in this Holy Church in which it held from that day forward all the Benefits of that Holy Church to stipends as [cathedral clerics, officials] and altar servers they were Old Christians without race of Jew, Moor nor heretics....”


50 Torres quote cited from Lope de Vega, 1614, verso 3033. Torres, “‘Raza’: Variables Históricas,” 20.

51 Indians, Europeans, and Africans are often presented as monolithic groups, but these terms encompass many distinct groups with histories of their own, and that involved cultural and biological mestizaje long before contact in the Americas. The rich histories of these groups are beyond the scope of this paper, but I wanted to acknowledge this fact, and offer this explanation of the general terms that I use in this study. I use “Spaniard” to refer to those who were born in Spain or the children born in the Americas of two Spanish parents. Although the idea of a Spanish nation and national identity is common today, at the beginning of the exploratory period, most Spaniards held stronger loyalty to their local home areas because the concept of loyalty to a unified Spanish kingdom was new. Spaniards also had varied backgrounds because the different regions of Spain developed distinctive cultures. I use the term “African” to refer to black Africans who were brought to New Spain, often as slaves, but who belonged to different cultural groups in their homelands. “Indian” or “native” or “Indigenous” refers to the native inhabitants of the Americas, who also self-identified as members of any one of a myriad of different cultural groups.

52 Martínez, “Limpieza de Sangre.”


54 Martínez, “Limpieza de Sangre.”

55 The highest ranking social group was Spaniards, who enjoyed access to more economic opportunities, education, types of clothing, and, in large cities, to restricted parts of town. They
were subdivided into those who were born in Spain, *peninsulares*, or in New Spain, *criollos*. Indians self-identified with different cultural groups, but were classified into three main groups by the Spanish, based largely on religious standing or cooperativeness. The first were Hispanicized baptized christians, called *gente de razón* (people of reason). The second were pagans who were not baptized, *gente sin razón* (people without reason) or *gentiles* (gentiles). The third resisted Spanish rule and were called *indios bárbaros* (barbarian Indians). The numbers of mulattos – children of Spanish and African parents - grew very slowly because most Africans were men who served as slaves and servants, and their access to Spanish women was severely restricted. Although there were a myriad of *casta* (mixed blood) categories, only a handful were used frequently and consistently. The more widely-known labels were *mestizo* (*español* and *india*), *mulato* (*español* and *negro*), *castizo* (*español* and *mestizo*), and *morisco* (*español* and *mulato*). A common *casta* painting example was an image of “*de Español e de India produce mestizo*” (from Spaniard and Indian results *mestizo*).

There are numerous studies of limpieza de sangre, *casta*, race, and illegitimacy. The following titles focus primarily on New Spain. For a study of how identity criteria evolved first in Spain and later in New Spain, see Martínez, *Genealogical Fictions*; For an examination of these issues in relation to *casta* paintings, see Carrera, *Imagining Identity in New Spain*; For a study of these and a closer examination of class, see R. Douglas Cope, *The Limits of Racial Domination: Plebeian Society in Colonial Mexico City, 1660-1720* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994); For an examination of illegitimacy, honor and related issues in the broader context of colonial Latin America, see Ann Twinam, *Public Lives, Private Secrets: Gender, Honor, Sexuality, and Illegitimacy in Colonial Spanish America* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); Lyman L. Johnson and Sonya Lipsett-Rivera, eds., *The Faces of Honor: Sex, Shame, and Violence in Colonial Latin America*, 1st ed, Diálogos (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998).

56 For a discussion of the history of race ideology and comparison of Spanish and French views of race, see Torres, “‘Raza’: Variables Históricas,” 16–27.

“Metropolitan” France refers to France in Europe, often focusing on Paris, versus New France or the French colonies in the Americas or elsewhere in the world.

57 Guillaume Aubert stated that “a number of historians have argued that the construction of French absolutism led the French nobility… to argue for the defense and preservation of their privileges.” Aubert, “Blood of France,” 442.

58 Torres, “‘Raza’: Variables Históricas,” 19.

Most nobles downplayed the first rationale because it subordinated them to a more powerful king. Nobles preferred the second option to legitimize the existing social inequality as part of the universal laws of man and nature, where the qualities best suited for leadership continued to be passed down through the same, select family lineages. The third option, a common and imagined past, also helped solidify existing class stratification by arguing that nobles descended from the victorious Franks and commoners descended from the conquered Gauls. The popularity of this interpretation began in the sixteenth century and continued to gain ground through the eighteenth
thanks in large part to historians, especially after the publication of *Dissertation of the French Nobility* by influential historian Count Henri de Boulainvilliers in 1732. While the arguments eventually emphasized the biological inheritability of traits as natural and historical, the main purpose was to maintain and protect noble socioeconomic status and privileges.

59 “Men of the sword” refers to families who dated back to the days of knights when nobles were responsible for raising armies and exercised more authority before the rise of centralized royal authority. Whereas, “men of the robe” gained their status later, were often jurists, and attained their status by purchasing a royal office, and, starting in 1604, were able to pay dues so their heirs could inherit the title. Aubert, “Blood of France,” 444. For roturiers, see ibid., 446.


61 Ibid., 445.


64 Aubert, “Blood of France,” 445.
This understanding of education in French culture continued to the twenty-first century.


66 An exception that became more pronounced was attitudes toward Jews, who in a Catholic monarchy, were seen as dark in both character and complexion, but who would become whiter with conversion to Christianity. Aubert, “Blood of France,” 449–50.

67 Ibid., 443.

68 Ibid., 446. Aubert also discusess the role of gender in and promiscuity of noble women in the text and notes.


71 Judd, Churchill, and Eastman, Maine: The Pine Tree State, 39.


73 Gutiérrez describes how different Pueblo communities shared the belief that malevolent spirits could be domesticated through the power of women’s sexuality and intercourse, either ritual or physical. Once domesticated, these external spirits - animal, human, natural, other - were considered incorporated and benefited that Pueblo community. He also quoted Spanish reports as examples of how the different belief systems of the Pueblos and Spaniards caused misunderstandings that resulted in violence and warfare. Conflicting beliefs regarding gender and sexuality were among the most contentious interactions. Ramón A. Gutiérrez, When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846 (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1991), 17–20, 50–52.
CHAPTER TWO

CONSTRUCTING IDEAL IDENTITIES AND FACING COLONIAL REALITIES, 1600-1821

“[O]ur Young men will marry your daughters, and we shall be one people.”

—1603, Samuel de Champlain to the Ottawas and Hurons during his early explorations of what would later become Quebec City and Quebec province\(^1\)

“One should never mix a bad blood with a good one… for all the French men who have married savage women have been licentious, lazy and have become intolerably independent; and the children they have had are even lazier than the savages themselves. Such marriages should thus be prohibited.”

—1709, New France Governor Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil’s letter to the king\(^2\)

“[T]hey saw a very large multitude of Indians that are believed to be all mixed with the said negros...”

—1757, Description told to Captain José Tienda de Cuervo during his visit to Reynosa and Camargo (on the Lower Rio Grande River near the gulf coast)\(^3\)

“The inhabitants of the ceded territory [Louisiana] shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States … to the enjoyment of all these rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States ….”

—1803 Treaty between the United States of America and the French Republic (Louisiana Purchase)\(^4\)
Introduction

When pre-contact ideas faced North American realities, leaders redefined what it meant to be other and where intermixing fit into their changing societies—Native Americans accepted it with growing reluctance, European colonies shifted from encouraging to discouraging it, and the newly-independent United States rejected and hid it. Still, intermixing continued on the frontiers well into the period when these colonies became nations. As ideas about intermixing and identity ideas traveled from Europe to the Americas, their application rarely went as smoothly as colonial authorities had hoped or planned because the realities faced by settlers on the frontiers differed significantly from the ideals of imperial authorities in both the American and European capitals.

Living in a frontier zone made a difference in colonists’ adherence to, or rejection of, restrictive policies and practices. Groups defined as other by central-government authorities were often viewed locally as neighbors who were necessary for the survival of colonial border communities. Social hierarchies still existed in border communities, as evinced by mixed-ancestry individuals who were relegated to lower classes and treated negatively, especially in larger towns. Still, in frontier communities, enforcement, mobility, and boundaries between classes were much more fluid. For that reason, mestizaje and métissage were common.

Ideas about intermixing flowed not only from Europe to the Americas, and from urban centers to remote areas, but also vice versa. They also traveled between colonial rivals. One of the earliest English-language printed references to mestizos in 1600 indicates the proliferation of mestizo children and wide-ranging adoption of the term, “A Mestizo is one which hath a Spaniard to his father and an Indian to his mother.” As Native Americans met Europeans, both
in the Americas and on the European continent, Europeans were forced to rethink their previous ideas about how the world was ordered, where different groups fit in relation to each other, and who were considered humans, citizens, and equals. Native American survivors of European diseases, warfare and labor camps impacted intermixing policies due to their large numbers, moreso in New Spain. Africans were significant in number but powerless to shape intermixing policies because most were slaves and free Blacks were few. The very presence of Indians and Africans as partners of Europeans and Euroamericans, and the proliferation of the intermixed children of these partnerships, directly contributed to the growth of colonial societies and influenced broader intermixing policies and practices.

The ratio of different groups – Indian, African, European - in each colonial area resulted in different mestizaje or métissage combinations. The more remote, northern St. Lawrence River and north Atlantic region included predominantly French and Native intermixing. Although Louisiana introduced a significant number of African slaves into the broader French imperial picture, the north Atlantic and the upper St. John River area of northern Maine saw very few, if any. In New Spain, the Spanish dealt with a spectrum of Spanish, Indian, and African intermixing, especially in port cities and urban centers. The remote Rio Grande River area of northeastern New Spain included predominantly Indians and Spaniards, with mullatos from the Mexican interior and occasional reports of a first-generation Africans. Along the mainland East Coast, the English, and later United States, dealt with European, Indian, and African intermixing.

Social borders in the Americas were the more feasible boundaries governing authorities could hope to create and enforce, because Europeans and Euroamericans had very limited military capacity to enforce the geopolitical boundary lines that they had drawn on maps. Social borders were very much in flux throughout the Spanish, French and English colonies. Native
Americans were aware of the presence of Europeans long before seeing them, thanks to their well-established information networks, and had to decide how to deal with the others who were entering their homelands. Natives co-existed when possible, resisted when threatened, submitted when necessary, and dominated more than expected.

In the 1600s, following Native American trade and communication networks that crisscrossed North America in pre-contact times, European empires laid claims that covered vast areas of the continent. Traveling the same paths as their Indian predecessors and allies, it is no surprise that explorers, traders and settlers of different Native and European communities also crossed paths, formed relationships, chose spouses, and had children.

From the 17th to early 19th centuries, continental power struggles continued as empires solidified borders and colonies reached maturity. At the same time, colonial intermixing policies shifted from encouragement, to acceptance, to social marginalization, and some countries even completely rejected it, namely the new U.S. republic. The United States gained independence in 1776 and Mexico in 1821, while Canada remained part of the British Empire. Newly-independent nations faced many of the same intermixing issues as their imperial predecessors. As U.S. geopolitical boundaries expanded westward in the 18th and 19th centuries, attitudes and polices of New England strongly influenced Maine and the Southern states influenced Texas.

Self-conscious Americans who cared about what Europeans thought of them, felt a social pressure to prove and preserve their “pure” White status and ancestry. This prompted the passage of anti-intermixing practices, policies, and laws to prohibit marriages between Whites and “unacceptable” groups, namely Blacks and Indians. When intermixing occurred, which it always did, then additional policies and laws were passed to ensure that the mixed-heritage children would not be allowed free access to mainstream “White” society. As colonies turned into
countries, ideas and policies that defined social and geopolitical borders continued to change, but had minimal impact on local border communities.

A variety of factors influenced how each group and individual thought about, interacted with, and lived next to their new neighbors. Relationships of power between Europeans and Indians depended in part on the fighting strength of each group, their population numbers, and availability of natural resources in the area. Demographic ratios, religion, socioeconomic class, political maneuvering, settlement patterns, commercial ambition, trade needs, and, daresay, love, also all played a role when deciding how close one got to one’s neighbor, and whether one approached with respect or with violence.

**Native Frontiers Meet Expanding Colonial and Republic Borders**

The Spanish Crown claimed an American empire that stretched roughly from the present-day northern United States and Canada to the southern tip of today’s Chile and Argentina, as well as islands in the Caribbean. Within the Spanish empire, *New Spain* referred specifically to *Mexico*, which included the current United States Southwest and Florida on the north, all the way to Guatemala to the south. Considering the vast area was covered by a relatively small number of Spaniards, relationships quickly developed between the male Spanish explorers, soldiers and settlers, and their female Indian neighbors. In Texas, this process of *mestizaje* gave birth to the first mestizos in that area, who would become the first *Tejanos* and, in the 20th century, Texas *Mexican-Americans* and *Chicanos*.

While the Spanish were occupied with claiming most of the Western hemisphere, the French were busy claiming vast territory of their own - along the coast of the North Atlantic, the rivers of the St. Lawrence and Mississippi reaching to the Gulf of Mexico and Louisiana, plus
islands in the Caribbean. New France referred primarily to the St. Lawrence River area of the current Québec province, plus today’s Canadian Maritime Provinces and the U.S. state of Maine. The St. Lawrence River area was also referred to as Canada and Québec, and the Atlantic Coast region as l’Acadie (Acadia, and later Nova Scotia), with the peninsula in between called Gaspé. French settlers who lived along the St. Lawrence River and Gaspé areas became known as Québechois, while those who lived in the southeastern coastal areas were called Acadians.

Both Native and European groups could benefit from intermarriages. Native communities could increase their populations, and create or strengthen ties with European allies. Other possible advantages included access to trade goods and commercial networks, horses, weapons, and potential military reinforcements. European communities reaped similar benefits through trade networks, alliances, and additional citizens. The French and Spanish openly accepted the existence of métissage and mestizaje, respectively, because their colonial populations, especially on their imperial borders, were outnumbered by local Indians. The French in particular relied heavily on Indigenous connections to support their fur trade interests. Remote Spanish settlements, too, relied on Native trade goods and labor to survive.

There were also potential negative consequences for Indian-European intermarriages. Some New France administrators viewed Indian-French unions in more political and military terms. They argued against such unions for fear that local native conflicts could involve French citizens and escalate to the point of involving the French state. A similar argument was quite understandable on the part of Native American leaders, who wanted to avoid native communities becoming entangled in European and Euroamerican conflicts.

Each community had varying levels of acceptance of intermarried couples and their children. Marrying into an Indian family could gain a European spouse immediate entrée and
standing within the community; however, the social standing of the spouse and children could depend on whether the native community was matrilineal (where ancestry and tribal affiliation were determined by the mother’s line) or patrilineal (determined by the father’s line). Patriarchal European cultures were often surprised to find Indian communities that were matrilineal, and in some cases where women held powerful influence over community matters.  

At the same time, Spanish and French administrators welcomed Indians, as long as they were converted. They viewed Indians as potential citizens and future taxpayers who would strengthen imperial claims to territory in the Americas. They differed somewhat in their views of how much participation and protection to offer Natives. The French viewed Indians as capable of full participation in French society, moreso than the Spanish. In terms of protection, the Spanish missionaries preferred to keep *Indios* and *mestizos* at a distance from the negative influence of presidios and settlements, where missionaries feared Spaniards would treat Natives as lesser beings or introduce them to vices.

Anti-intermixing policies became more common as Native cultures were seen as having a negative effect on the social and moral order of French colonial society. In New France, French men were apparently falling prey to the immoral influences of Indian women, and in New Spain, intermixing was creating an overly complicated and inferior social mix. The Spanish began to shift to a more restrictive attitude to intermixing by the mid-17th century and the French did so by the beginning of the 18th century. The British, and later Americans, rejected intermixed individuals because these Anglo-dominated groups quickly outnumbered Natives early in the colonization process and, later, because the most prominent *other* group involved in intermixing was African slaves.
This shift in administrative attitudes reflected changes in intellectual discussions in Europe. François Bernier may have been the first to use the term *race* to classify human beings in groups based on phenotype characteristics in his 1685 work, *Nouvelle Division de la Terre par les différents espèces ou races d’homme qui l’habitent* (*New Division of the Earth by the Different Species or Human Races that Inhabitant It*). Another groundbreaking work, that influenced practices still used today, was Swedish naturalist Carlous Linneaus’s 1735 publication of *Systema Naturae* (*System of Nature*) that established a hierarchical classification system, based on the three kingdoms of nature - animal, vegetable and mineral - and additional subdivisions of classes, orders, genera, species, etc. While simply classifying humans into four groups in 1735 – Europaeus albenses, Americanus rubescens, Asiaticus fuscus, Africanus Niger – by the 1758 edition, he had also introduced evaluations of these groups that connected physical appearance to internal spiritual or moral characteristics. According to Linneaus, White Europeans embodied the most admirable qualities, followed by the Red American, then Yellow Asian, and Black African. This shift by 1758 was most probably influenced by the 1749 *Histoire naturelle* (*Natural History*) work of Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comté de Buffon, where he interwove multiple disciplines and attempted to classify and explain all of the natural world, including *Histoire naturelle del l’homme* (*Natural History of Man*). Elaboration of these classifications of humans continued among Enlightenment intellectuals, who despite espousing reason and education’s ability to free humanity’s minds and souls, still managed to rationalize hierarchical views of *race*. The ideas of some 18th-century Enlightenment thinkers reached the shores of North America and inspired independence movements from oppressive governments, while other ideas encouraged the oppression of fellow human beings.
Avoiding poor marriages, or *mésalliances*, and maintaining the appearance of purity of ancestry, or *pureza de sangre*, has deep roots in North America. The primary difference is that the Spanish understood and accepted the fact that intermixing occurred and tried to organize their society so that all groups had a place on the social ladder. Granted, elites tried to ensure that only a few were at the top and the majority were farther down the ladder. The French used a similar approach. However, the British and their colonists adopted a social organization that emphasized dichotomies of “either-or” where citizens were either White or other. There was no room for an “and” identity that reflected the mixed heritage of individuals.

**Texas Lower Rio Grande Valley - Native-European Frontier to European-U.S. Border**

(1600-1699) Texas Area Indian Realities

Names played an important role as identity labels and reflected how groups saw themselves and each other. The name of Texas is one example of Natives’ importance to this region’s development. Spaniards adopted the Caddo Indian name *Tejas* from a term that referred to their home and meant “friends” or “allies.” There were a variety of different Indian groups who lived in Texas, but the names and numbers of them are unknown because most of them either merged together to survive, were forcibly or voluntarily moved to other areas, or died from disease.

Descriptions of Native Americans reach us from European reports, which relied on Indian-European interactions that varied in length of duration and each party’s motives and military strength. The greatest number of distinct Native groups was noted between 1625 and 1715, a period that witnessed the height of both *encomiendas* and Indian hostilities towards Spanish settlements; although encomiendas were more common farther south and hostilities
more common along the frontier. Spaniards took great care to note which and how many Indians either lived on their land grants or attacked them. Detailed descriptions of Natives were also more common and peaceful when Europeans traveled in small groups and interacted in closer quarters with locals. Frenchman, Henri Joutel, explained his orders from René Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle to maintain courteous relations with local east Texas natives during the ill-fated 1685-1689 expedition. “La Salle, who did not smoke tobacco, told me to keep the natives company for it was necessary to use discretion with them so as not to offend them. In truth, small in number as we were, we had no hope of passing through their area forcibly.” Spanish missionary Fray Francisco Casañas de Jesús María spent a couple of years among East Texas Indigenous groups in August 1691 described the group names and their social and political organization. Some names are similar to groups reported about the Lower Rio Grande in this period, or who continued into the period of U.S. occupation.

The proper name of the [East Texas] province is Asinai. It is composed of the nine tribes already named. There is not one tribe of these nine called Asinai but each of the tribes combined with the remaining eight compose the Asinai Nation. The friendly tribes called the “Tejias” are: Nazonis, Nacan, Nabaydacho, Nesta, Guaseo, Cataye, Neticatzi, Nasayaya, Naviti, Caxo, Dastones, Nadan, Tadivas, Nabeyxa, Nacos, Caynigua, Caudadachos, Quizi, Natzos, Nasitox, and Bidey...[He goes on to list groups in all directions.]...The enemies of Province of the Asenay are the following .... Others are called Apaches, Ca-au-cozi, and Mani. These are all enemies. Only three or four of these tribes are located toward the southeast; the others live toward the west. They communicate with the province of the Asinai, and they know that some are friends and some enemies.

Fray Francisco Casañas de Jesús María described how their form of communal organization of shared leadership, as opposed to a centralized authority, was common among other small Indigenous groups in Texas, including South Texas.

I notice that this name Tejas includes all the friendly tribes. The name is common to all of them, even though their language may be different. And, since this name is a general term, it must be used for no other reason than to indicate the long-standing friendship which they entertain towards each other. And, therefore, among all these tribes “Tejias”
means friends. These allied tribes do not have one person to govern them (as with us a kingdom is accustomed to have a ruler whom we call a king). They have only a xinesí. He usually has a subordinate who gathers together four or five tribes who consent to live together and to form a province or kingdom as it might be called – and a very large one, too, if all these tribes had one person to rule over them. But such a head they have not, and I, therefore, infer that this province which in New Spain is called “Tejas” – which really expresses just what they are, because each tribe is a friend to all the others cannot be called a kingdom.18

Joutel later described the variety and number of native groups, alliances, communication network, and subsistence lifestyle.

They made us understand that they came to see us because of what their allies had told them, that we harmed no one…. They told us they sometimes went to war with tribes to the east but that their strongest enemies were from the southwest where they indicated there were a number of tribes against them at war. They also said they were allies of 45 tribes, that few of them were stationary, most roving, living off only hunting and fishing like those which we had encountered before. For this reason they disperse to different places in order to subsist better, and they drive the bison back and forth to each other. It seemed from this that the woods and the rivers are their boundaries for hunting. There were many Indians in this region, and that was the reason we had not had plenty to hunt.19

He observed that natural features – rivers and forests – marked hunting grounds, which could change from season to season given the fickle nature of the weather, seasons and animal behavior. Therefore, it is safe to say that small-band Native groups from east to central to south Texas area had a flexible view of land-based boundary lines. Seasonal confederations with a loose group leadership served political and military purposes, such as defense against common enemies. Considering the size of these confederations in number and geographic scope, they also served a social purpose by providing multiple groups from which to select partners. The spousal groups could be similar in that they were allies, but other in that they were not from the exact same area and cultural background.

European reports of distinct Native groups point to the social and geopolitical borders that existed before European arrival; some were hostile and others were permeable and amicable.
Marriages between different Native groups were considered intermarriages, depending on a
group’s cultural traditions. In terms of European interaction, reports like Joutel’s reveal early
frontier first contacts. Potential intermarriage, or sexual intermixing without marriage, would
occur later with the arrival of Europeans in greater numbers.

**Texas: Importance of the Spanish-Texas Border Area**

Texas offered no mineral wealth and few navigable rivers to attract Spanish settlers. However, the Texas borderlands were an important nexus for several reasons. First, the region
was part of New Spain’s northern frontier that reached westward to its established holdings in
New Mexico. Second, it presented an obstacle to encroaching French explorers, missionaries,
and traders from the east. Third, it helped form a line of defense against a number of militarily
formidable Indian groups. Fourth, it also offered access to the sea via the Gulf coast. Texas’s
primary importance to Spain lay in its role as a buffer zone against its European rivals and local
Indigenous groups as all three groups competed for control of the area.20 From its inception,
Spanish administrators conceived of the area as a geopolitical border; only later would they
realize it would become a social one as well.

Throughout the 17th century, Indians continued to dominate the area around the Lower
Rio Grande River; however, Spaniards still made their presence known. Several expeditions
passed through South Texas, including the Lower Rio Grande, and area Indians heard news
about the strangers in their midst. As rumors of settlements by European competitors reached
Spanish ears, renewed interest in east and south Tejas grew. In 1638, García de Sepúlveda
traveled from Cerralvo (Monterrey) to the south of Mier and continued along the Rio Grande
River to where Brownsville would later develop. In 1663, the elder Alonso de León investigated
near the mouth of the Rio Grande for invaders, who turned out to be only rumors. Natives also continued to play an influential role in prompting Spanish expeditions north across the Rio Grande, but instead of in search of riches or rivals, in retaliation against Indigenous raids that crossed south of the river. The Eagle Pass area saw the Juan de la Garza expedition in 1663 and Fernando de Azcue in 1665. The latter third of the 17th century, 1660 to 1690s, saw the Camino Real de los Tejas develop from a few exploratory and missionary expeditions to a more frequent trade route that connected Saltillo, Mexico to the Rio Grande River to San Antonio and beyond to Los Adaes in East Texas. This second half of the 17th century was important for the Lower Rio Grande Valley because that was when several missions were established in the area.

These centers of worship also introduced communal spaces that allowed different Native groups to interact in close quarters, and occasionally Natives and Spanish civilians or soldiers. Frontier missions were the centers of initial cultural mestizaje where Natives were indoctrinated in Spanish language, religion, food, music, and social mores and customs. This introduction then opened the door to physical mestizaje and developing intermixed kinship networks between Native and Spanish colonial communities.
Different Indian bands, from friendly to aggressive, lived relatively near the Spanish missions or villages. Those who lived in the missions tended to be peaceful. Indians and their families who lived in the villages were often referred to as *mestizos* because they may have intermarried with Spanish settlers from the interior, many of whom had intermixed ancestry by the time they arrived on the frontier. Some Spaniards treated Indians as less than, but others treated Indians with respect as fellow community members.

During the 17th and 18th centuries, it is estimated that most Indian groups in the South Texas and northern Mexico region, who the Spanish referred to as Coahuiltecs, disappeared as distinct ethnic groups. This disappearance from Spanish records could be attributed to the inconsistencies of Spanish expeditions and record keeping and tribe mobility, but it could also be due to epidemics, warfare, infant mortality, and forced migrations to Spanish missions and plantation or mining work sites. As in previous centuries, groups probably merged in order to survive. Many also formed small
communities outside Spanish or Mexican towns. This proximity opened opportunities for intermarriage, adoption of Spanish culture, and conversion to Catholicism. While this cultural-exchange process flowed both ways, as intermarriages occurred, Spanish names began to replace Indian ones. By the end of the 18th century, the missions were secularized, closed, and the land was distributed to local Indians. While owning land was beneficial for survival and helped maintain status, it did not guarantee upward mobility for lower level classes. In general across New Spain, Indians were relegated to the lower end of the socioeconomic ladder.

In 1757, Captain José Tienda de Cuervo visited Reynosa and Camargo during an inspection of the frontier Seno Mexicano coastal communities for the Excelentísimo Señor Virrey Marqués de las Amarillas. Captain Tienda de Cuervo’s report offers insight into both colonist and Indigenous attitudes and community practices. Although the harsh environment and distance from other settlements may have deterred some settlers, that same isolation from centers of authority held an appeal for others.

During a mid-18th century inspection of the lower Rio Grande settlement, one of the mission Indians explained why local Indians liked Spanish Captain Cantú and included their less-than-stellar views of the current lead missionary.

These last two castas [Indians] also explained how much they desired to have another Missionary father that would attend to them with more charity than the current [father] and how much they craved the return to the position of Captain of the settlement of Don Carlos Cantú, who had about two months before been removed from that position by Colonel Don José de Escandón, placing another [in that position] who does not look upon them with the same affection as the former, since the said Cantú speaks their language and attends and helps them with their needs.

While it was common practice in New Spain to keep Indians separated from Spaniards or mixed-bloods, this example clearly shows the value of close contact, especially on the frontier. The fact
that Captain Cantú learned a native language earned him their respect and facilitated his dealings with them. Indians usually learned Spanish as part of the Christian indoctrination process or for trade purposes. This type of cultural exchange was common across many colonial locations. Language clearly played in important role in promoting understanding and cooperative relationships.

The report by Capt. Tienda de Cuervo offers additional examples related to identity terms and cross-cultural communication. He referred to Indians as castas, which probably reflected that they were mixed ancestry and lower class. In response to one of their request, he instructed the Indians to work hard and learn their Christian doctrine so the viceroy would send them what they wanted. He described the mission Indian response as, “they understood very well because many of them speak Spanish and explained this reasoning to their companions, who made signs that they understood and were pleased.” Both Indians and Spaniards were learning the language of the other in order to negotiate for what they wanted, and in the process, whether consciously or not, were opening the doors to possible cultural mestizaje.

Intermixing between mission Indians and Spanish or mestizo settlers was difficult, if not impossible, when spousal candidates were not available. When supplies were low, Indigenous groups left the town or mission in search of food. Tienda de Cuervo reported that this happened so often that the missionary considered moving the mission to a more remote area farther south, where local Indigenous groups reported better land and more Indians,

[O]n every occasion when providence is lacking to have something to give them [Indians]; and from 15 to 20 days to this part has taken the said missionary priest the decision to move with his said mission to a side of the place called the Desert, to the southern part about three quarters of a league of this population in order to achieve some better lands in which to sow crops and there have collected the Indians that currently have congregated.
This practice exemplified a continuation of earlier indigienous traditions of migrating as needed in search of food, as well as the opportunities to meet and marry partners from distant groups.

Although intermixing between Indian and Spanish or mestizo community members seemed less likely with Indigenous groups who left, for those who stayed in the settlement area the relations between the different groups were apparently amicable, and potentially conducive to intermarriage and intermixing. Where population numbers allowed, as in rural communities in central Mexico, marriage within one’s social class was practiced, especially among Spanish-Spanish and Indian-Indian marriages. Marriage partnerships were more fluid between the middle castas. Occasionally, when the number of “Spaniards” ran low, a few mestizas/os were basically promoted to Spanish status for marriage purposes. In rural areas on the northern frontier, where the spousal pool was also very limited, the same practices could be expected.

Tiende de Cuervo’s report offered no explicit record of the frequency or acceptability of intermarriage, but he described an atmosphere conducive to it.

“[T]hat the populations situated in the circle of the colony, can be found with their haciendas and conregas [peoncomiendas] completely peaceful and the settlers in good correspondence with each other, and as for the unconquered Gentile [unbaptized] Indians there is no single new fear for now well all are staying calm, and those who enter and exist in this population do not cause any prejudice nor cause any vexations.”

Some Indian groups who lived farther away from Spanish settlements wished to avoid Spaniards and the possibility of intermixing with them. Equally clear evidence shows that Spanish-influenced intermixing occurred in the countryside beyond Spanish communities. Cantú testified:

“[A]nd of these gentiles [unbaptized Indians] there are recognized, and said declarant [Captain Cantú] has seen, that on a rise in the middle of the three arms that the Rio Grande divides into before emptying into the sea, twenty-five leagues [approximately 75 miles] from this settlement to the east, there is a caste of negros lobos [negros mixed with Indians] who have recognizably mixed with Indian women and from this may result this second caste, which have formed
encampments of orderly, formal housing; that this declarant managed to see some of said negros as close as a pistol shot away and he gave them a bunch of tobacco by leaving it within their view on some grasses, that they came later to collect, and in a short time after the declarer and his companions withdrew, they saw a very large multitude of Indians that are believed to be all mixed with the said negros, and of the latter there is no more information about their origin than what is given by some old Indians that they came from a boat that carried them and do not know by what accident they came to stop in that place.”

This rare documentation of Indian life beyond the mission walls exemplifies the process of mestizaje that occurred on the frontier of New Spain. Although the origins of the African ancestors are unknown, it is possible that a ship of enslaved or escaped Negros could have shipwrecked or landed nearby. This group may have been the reason why some Comecrudos who lived near the Rio Grande became known as Mulatos or Carrizos.

Although missionaries sometimes traveled through the countryside, it is likely that most of the marriages of these remote Indian or casta communities were not conducted, recognized, nor documented by the church. Although binding by local customs, they were not legal under Spanish law. However, they apparently survived contentedly away from Spanish settlements for generations, so clearly official Spanish recognition did not concern Native groups in more remote frontier areas.

Living in the Lower Rio Grande borderland made a difference because it was easier to create a life beyond the reach of the casta-calidad system, for Indian, Spaniard, African, and casta alike. The report of the mixed indio-mulatto community is noteworthy because it shows mestizaje in the context of an Indian community, instead of a Spanish one. Spanish settlers bent rules when necessary because, despite what Spanish authorities believed, these frontier dwellers recognized that they lived in a predominantly Indian domain where survival depended on good relations with neighboring Natives more than on appeasing Spanish administrators in Mexico City. Once again, the demands of the remote frontier lifestyle placed significant pressure on
colonists to adapt to local needs regarding *mestizaje*, rather than strictly conforming to distant
decrees regarding *casta* and *calidad*.

In Texas, the process of mestizaje in 17th and 18th century New Spain took place in the
context of power struggles both in the Americas and Europe. The Spanish kings had to contend
with European and colonial challengers, but also internal resistance from powerful Indian
groups, many of whom wanted these foreigners to leave. Enforcing territorial claims, particularly
in northern New Spain, was especially difficult for the Spanish Crown given the sparse
population inhabiting it. By 1650, approximately 440,000 Spaniards had emigrated to the New
World, although few settled in the northern provinces. Spanish emigrants had options of
destinations and most preferred the more financially promising mining areas of Mexico or farther
south, rather than the arid, resource-poor, colonial region of New Spain’s northern borderlands.
English and French colonists interested in mainland North America had little choice but the
eastern coast. Nonetheless, in the 1700s, the Spanish empire continued to explore and establish
settlements in its northern frontier. In 1790, New Spain (approximately north of Mexico to
Guatemala) estimated 3.7 million inhabitants, approximately 60% of them were Indians. By
1820, New Spain population estimates reached 6,200,000.

**Texas: Spanish Realities of Calidad, Limpieza de sangre, and Castas**

At the same time, across the Atlantic and farther south in New Spain, elite leaders
discussed intermixing policies and practices that would influence the development of the Rio
Grande area. An early 17th-century Spanish linguist wrote that “… race in lineages are made
bad, as when having some racial trace of Moor or Jew.” By the 1670s, old prejudices remained
and formerly intangible religious beliefs and practices had become even more closely associated with family lineage.\textsuperscript{36}

As the decades passed in New Spain, the different mestizaje combinations and efforts to document social status presented new challenges. Previously clear-cut identity labels and racial groups had multiplied, hybridized, and became so complicated and ambiguous, that even the blood purity of a “Spaniard” was questionable. The physical appearance of the body was no longer a reliable determinant of one’s standing in the social hierarchy, and administrators adopted a system that included \textit{calidad}, which emphasized an individual’s intangible characteristics and reputation, as well as their \textit{casta} heritage. The \textit{calidad} of a person - ancestry, character, economic status, occupation, and associated behaviors - became central to how one was perceived in society. An individual’s behavior, dress, social skills, associates, speech, deportment, and overall acceptance by neighbors as a certain \textit{casta} became increasingly important. This acceptance or rejection could uphold or undermine claims to specific social status, even at times overriding one’s physical appearance, like skin color or hair. Discriminatory attitudes developed not only between Spaniards and \textit{others}, but also between Spaniards. Spaniards born in Spain (\textit{peninsulares}) claimed higher status than, and used derogatory terms for, Spaniards born in the Americas (\textit{criollos}).

To complicate matters further, claims of racial purity were made by more than those claiming to be Spaniards, but also by non-Spaniards who wished access to the same privileges as Spaniards. Indigenous elites also claimed \textit{limpieza de sangre} in an effort to solidify their top-tier status within both Indigenous and Spanish spheres of social, political and economic power. \textit{Indios} were considered by some Spanish intellectuals as pure of blood, without stain, because they were not exposed to Jewish or Moorish “contamination,” even though they were new
converts and not descendants of the idealized Visigoths. Also, some contended that they may have been descendants of a lost tribe of Israel that left before the arrival of Jesus Christ, and, therefore could still be considered untainted. At the same time, some Spaniards considered *Indios* irreparably contaminated by long-term pagan religious practices, and, therefore, like other heretics, did not qualify for “Old Christian” privileges. One theologian argued that pagan practices had “spread such deep roots in the Indians that … although they [are] born with free will, they carry this vice in their blood, and drink it in their [mothers’] milk.”

Debates over purity requirements concerned more than just Natives in the Americas. King Philip IV’s (reigned 1621-1665) *tres actos positivos* statute required Spanish nobles to submit to expensive requirements to prove their purity of lineage. Nobles resisted these mandates and faced a strong backlash from Inquisition authorities and social pressures to maintain existing policies. Nonetheless, beginning in the 1680s the crown began overtly accepting children of *caciques* (Native chiefs) as “noble” descendants and required their admittance (based on quotas) into seminaries and other restricted institutions as long as they could prove their *limpieza de sangre*.

Marriage choice remained central to maintaining, attaining, or losing social standing. Families could lose status if a member married someone of questionable ancestry – based initially on religion and later on character or skin color. If that happened, individuals could officially gain, or regain, Spanish standing for their children and families through strategic matches. Marriages with individuals that introduced more Spanish blood supposedly purified the lineage, and descendants could regain official Spanish status.

Identity records were a key element in maintaining the *casta* hierarchy and determining *calidad* status, and were required to document one’s qualifications in order to receive the
associated privileges. An individual’s ancestry was recorded on baptismal and marriage records, where mistakes were sometimes made. Individuals could request corrections or legitimization of their social standing by submitting a petition and undergoing an investigation to verify their qualifications to receive official status as a Spaniard. Other times, donations or favors could alter a family member’s status up the socio-economic ladder when the life event was originally recorded.

In the 18th century, Bourbon reforms (1720s-1790s) made it more difficult for Spanish colonists to change their standing as administrators tried to create order amidst the *mestizaje* chaos. Special councils acted as gatekeepers against individuals with questionable ancestry who wished to claim the rights and privileges of Spaniards. The practice of accepting Indians of noble and pure heritage continued into the 18th century, as evinced by a 1766 decree by King Charles III that left elite status open to anyone of proven “pure” ancestry “without hindering those from the Americas who have descended from pagan times.” This applied more to densely populated central Mexico where the pre-existing Aztec empire, and their predecessors, had created highly stratified societies.

Attempts to depict this diverse socio-economic hierarchy were portrayed in a series of *casta* paintings. There is some debate as to their exact purpose and audience; however, they clearly show the potential variety of intermixing couples and children. As one scholar succinctly explained, “Colonial images are not showing life as it was but, rather, life as it was imagined.”

By the end of the 18th century, although casta classifications were so complex that some labels could identify an individual’s ancestry back three or four generations, in reality, only six or seven terms were used by religious or secular officials. More common terms included *indio, mestizo, mulatto, criollo*, and *peninsular*. Just as intermixing continued in central Mexico, to the point
where entire new classes were created, intermixing was especially true on the northern border areas where the spousal options were even more limited.

(1600-1821) Texas: Lower Rio Grande Valley - Networks and Settlements

Initial Indian-European extended contact usually occurred between traders or missionaries. While traders were often willing participants in conceiving intermixed children with Native women, missionaries were concerned with Native spiritual conversion, which initiated cultural intermixing. Establishing missions was also one of the first steps Spaniards took to solidify territorial claims through occupation. The few missionaries assigned to these remote areas focused on converting the different surrounding Indian groups and introducing them to the “civilized” ways of the Spanish. Their goals benefited the Spanish Crown by creating tax-paying citizens. The missions along the Lower Rio Grande were established in the later 17th and 18th centuries, centered primarily along the southern bank of the Rio Grande (Río Grande or Río Bravo) and the San Fernando rivers (Río San Fernando or Río Conchas).

The missions of northeastern Mexico were some of the last missions to be established in New Spain, not including Alta California missions established 1769-1820. The ones along the Rio Grande River were fairly evenly distributed approximately 20 to 30 miles apart, starting at the apex of the delta near Reynosa. In 1646 and 1675, two missions were established approximately twenty-five miles south of the Rio Grande River (southwest of border towns Ciudad Mier, Tamaulipas and Roma, Texas near present-day Agualeguas, Nuevo León). These were Santa Teresa de Alamillo in 1646 (near Agualeguas) and San Nicolás de Agualeguas in 1675 (in Agualeguas). Shortly after 1748, six more missions were established during the colonization efforts of José de Escandón. In 1749, Mission Nuestra Señora del Rosario de
Cabezón de la Sal was established on the lower Río San Fernando (near present day San Fernando). The remaining five were established along the Río Grande River. Two more missions were established in 1749, this time at Camargo, Divina Pastora de Santillana and San Agustín de Laredo. The following year, 1750, two more missions were established - Mission San Joaquín del Monte at Reynosa, and San Francisco Solano de Ampuero at Revilla. Over fifteen years later, in 1767, Mission Purísima Concepción was established at Mier. Franciscan missionaries from Zacatecas administered all of these missions, which were built after the peak of the Spanish mission period. Only Mission San Agustín de Laredo at Camargo was built with stone and mortar, leaving the rest with simpler architectural designs and materials.46

Despite the best efforts of Indians and Spaniards, all of these missions closed even before the Spanish viceregal government ordered all missions secularized after 1790. This was due to several factors – building too close to rivers left irrigated fields vulnerable to destruction of crops by flooding and required relocating missions, inability of irrigation agriculture to provide enough food for all mission inhabitants who left to find food, a decline in displaced Indian groups from which to recruit more mission Indians, and occasional competition with older northern missions of Coahuila y Tejas for coastal Indian recruits.

Each of these missions reflected the diversity of experiences lived by Indian groups and Indian-Spanish relations found in the Rio Grande Delta area. Mission San Joaquín del Monte at Reynosa included local Natives plus refugees from eastern Nuevo León moving away from Spanish colonists, captives from the Sierra Gorda, and immigrants from both upstream and downstream on the Río Grande River. Some Indians agreed to stay in the mission, but others preferred to leave the mission rather than have Spaniards live among them, as in Mission Divina Pastora de Santillana, which lasted one year before relocating to where the Indians had moved.
Other missions, like Mission San Agustín de Laredo at Camargo, were quite prosperous thanks to the efforts of area Natives, who decades earlier had filled Spanish reports with their attacks on Spanish villages fifty miles to the south (near Cerralvo). Some sites were missions in name only, like Purísima Concepción at Mier and San Francisco Solano de Ampuero at Revilla, which never developed due to lack of a missionary, Spanish financial support, limited natural resources, or sporadic Indian participation.\(^47\) While some Indian refugees were reported to have moved in from other areas, most Indians were from the Río Grande area. The sparseness of the land around the Río Grande meant that the closest neighbors tended to be from less densely populated areas - Corpus Christi and Baffin Bay to the northeast, and the Río San Fernando to the south.

The Indians in the Río Grande delta missions tended to be from the area and, of those, most went to Mission San Joaquín del Monte at Reynosa. Mission San Agustín de Laredo at Camargo, located at the confluence of the San Juan and Río Grande rivers attracted Indians from the north and south sides of the Río Grande, as well as those from farther south near the Spanish settlement of Cerralvo. The missions at Camargo, Mier, and Revilla hosted the most Indians from Nuevo León, who immigrated in response to encroaching Spanish settlements. This was especially true in the Camargo and Reynosa areas.\(^48\) Indian populations at the missions ranged from short-term gatherings to committed inhabitants in adobe homes. Estimated Indian populations at several of the missions ranged between two hundred to three hundred or more.

One of the most successful missions was San Agustín de Laredo at Camargo. In reports between 1752 to 1770, examples of its success included the election of a Tareguano leader, Juan Antonio Viruela, as governor of the *congrega* (Indian community near the mission and Spanish settlement). The mission Indian population ranged between 243 to 359, who tended “10 yoke of oxen, 100 cows, 270 sheep, 6 goats, 32 horses, and 12 mules” and “at least four hundred
horses.” The mission also housed Indians who cultivated fields of corn, beans, squash, watermelons, and cantaloupes and worked as skilled stonecutters, masons, and carpenters. Even when Spaniards abandoned the missions, several Indian groups continued to live there at least until 1818.

Missionaries, and the few soldiers or civilians who settled nearby, continued the pre-contact, predominantly southern-oriented trading practices of their Indigenous neighbors. This practice would begin to shift after more Spaniards arrived and established colonial frontier settlements and illegal trading with rival European communities to the north and east became more convenient than trying to conduct commerce with businesses in the distant colonial capital to the south. Indian groups in the north, namely Apaches and Comanches, mastered Spanish horses and made trade and travel treacherous for other Natives and Spaniards, alike.

For Spanish colonists, trade with Indians was common and necessary in order to acquire food and supplies. Goods exchanged included Spanish cotton or wool cloth and other European goods for Indian deer or buffalo hides and salt, and later U.S. goods. These trade networks followed pre-existing long-distance trading practices between different Native groups, such as the trading partnerships with Huastecans and Aztecs of central Mexico for salt from a salt mine near today’s Harlingen, called La Sal del Rey (salt of the king) during the colonial period. They also interacted with northern Tejas or Toyah neighbors who migrated south with the seasons. Although foraging for food was the main motivation, an exchange of goods and information likely occurred as well.

Although a variety of different Indian groups lived in and migrated across the area, the rare descriptions we have of a few of them were recorded in official reports sent back to military or government headquarters. During his 1757 visit to a mission near Reynosa, Captain José
Tienda de Cuervo reported four main naciones o castas (nations or castes) by the names of Nazas, Narices, Comecrudos, and Tejones. He noted that the first two groups were all baptized or Christians, except for a few older or younger individuals, and that most of them had come from a different mission where they had already been converted. The missionary there consciously contributed to the mixing of Indian groups when he recruited them from a different mission, near the village of Pilón. Unfortunately, these new arrivals were disappointed not to find the better living conditions, treatment, or larger Indian community they had been promised.

The Comecrudos, according to Tienda de Cuervo, “son de los gentiles de esta Colonia” (are from the unconverted of the community, gente sin razón) and they complained that the head missionary only baptized their young and not the adults. In response, the missionary explained that he required the adults to learn the doctrine before baptism, but he did not want to instruct them because he expected they would leave the mission and return to their home in the surrounding hills. Despite missionaries’ best efforts to convert them, Natives demonstrated their free will regarding how much of Spanish culture and authority they would accept. They followed their own priorities for survival that the missionaries did not always, and sometimes did not try to, understand.

The Tejones’ more limited description noted that “son naturales de este terreno en que está situada la población” (they are natural or native of this area where the settlement is located). This would be in contrast to other frontier New Spain settlements, where many of the Indians associated with the community had accompanied the settlers from elsewhere, “…que desde el principio que se fomentó esta población, mantuvo el declarante [Capt. Cantú] a los indios que lleva referido trajo consigo y a los que aquí se le agregaron…” [...]
brought with him and added [them] to those who were here...\textsuperscript{56} Once a settlement was established most Indians lived in the nearby mission, especially all those who were recent converts, but many regularly left in search of food whenever food supplies became scarce.\textsuperscript{57} This report describes Indigenous groups in 1757, after a number of missions and settlements had already been established. These examples offer glimpses of Native relationships with Spanish missionaries, civilians and soldiers.

Civilian settlement efforts in the northern Seno Mexicano took root with the colonization plans along the Rio Grande River led by José de Escandón. In June 1748, he received official royal approval to mount settlement expeditions. In addition, he was given the titles and authority of governor, captain general, and viceroy representative. The Marquis of Altimira and the viceregal authorities named the province Nuevo Santander (New Santander) in honor of Escandón’s home region of Santander in Spain.\textsuperscript{58}

By that fall, he had gathered the necessary supplies – seed, farming and building equipment, weapons and munitions - and the 100-200 pesos to pay settlers for moving expenses. He had also contacted neighboring provincial governors to recruit settlers, preferably experienced farmers, ranchers, and fishermen. After establishing settlements in the southern and central areas of the province, the expedition headed north.\textsuperscript{59} The travelers passed fewer and fewer missions, military outposts and small towns the farther north they traveled.

Escandón used a different approach than the traditional colonization plan used elsewhere in northern New Spain. Instead of the usual combination of mission, presidio and civilian settlement, he decided to establish only civilian settlements and missions. Instead of permanent forces of professional soldiers, he recruited settlers who could defend themselves, and who preferably had military experience.
Along the Rio Grande River, Escandón founded four settlements on the south bank and two on the north bank. He either started the villages himself or officially recognized settlements recently established by other Spaniards. On the south side of the river, the settlements and their year of establishment were Nuestra Señora de Santa Ana de Camargo (March 1749), Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Reynosa (March 1749), San Ignacio de Loyola de Revilla (October 1750), and Lugar de Mier (1753). On the north side of the Rio Grande the final two settlements began as large ranching hacienda - Nuestra Señora de Dolores (1750s) and Villa de San Agustín de Laredo (1754). This completed the initial wave of northern settlements along the Rio Grande, known as the villas del norte (towns of the north). Escandón encouraged settlement farther north to the Nueces River, but the rancher, Tomás Sánchez de la Barrera y Gallardo, sent to find a site reported that the Apache were too resistant to Spanish settlement. Many of these Spanish pioneers were descendants of families who had lived in New Spain for several generations. They most-likely claimed Spanish status, as criollos, although in fact some of them may have had mestizo ancestry. In addition, many of them probably had servants of Indian, Mestizo, or African ancestry. Just as in the early contact period, identity and social status were complex.

After inspecting most of the settlements in the province, Escandón wrote a 1755 report in which he claimed that, between 1748 and 1755, he had established 23 settlements (1 city, 17 villas/towns, 2 poblaciones/settlements, 1 lugar/place, 2 reales de minas/mining camps) with a population of 6,383 people (1,481 total families, including 144 families of officials and soldiers), plus 2,837 Indians in Franciscan missions with attendant missionaries. In his report he also described the hardships faced by the settlers that included a three-year drought that impacted all of New Spain, 1749-1751, followed by flooding rains. To survive during the drought, settlers received corn that Escandón purchased at high prices from crown suppliers. During the floods,
they suffered malaria and destruction of their homes and farms, forcing them to trade with older frontier communities for supplies. They traded salt, livestock, tallow, meat, and hides for food, corn, farm equipment and other necessary supplies. These hardships plagued Spaniard and Native alike. In the ensuing decades, additional towns were established. Matamoros was established in 1770 and would develop into one of the more important cities of this area by the 1820s. By the end of the 18th century, much of the land north and south of the Rio Grande had been portioned out to settlers.

Spanish colonial elites tried a variety of policies in their attempt to create a system that could identify people by their moral and physical traits, and help maintain an orderly society. However, creating social classifications and enforcing that system were two different issues. In colonial New Spain, the number of Indigenous people consistently outnumbered the Spanish. That difference was even greater when including the many mestizos, who Spaniards tended to consider more like Indians than Europeans, especially in the strict social hierarchy of the capital in central Mexico. However, as the decades passed and land became concentrated in the hands of elites, class and racial tensions began to simmer and finally boiled over with the successful completion of Mexican Independence in 1821.

Maine St. John River Valley - Native-European Frontier to European-U.S. Border

(1600-1699) Maine Area Indian Realities

By the mid to late 17th century, the Wabanaki way of life changed dramatically due to several factors. Their population numbers decreased by approximately half due to the introduction of European diseases. Their hunting practices and purposes changed due to the increasing demands of the fur trade. And, their subsistence patterns altered due to the availability
of more stable food supplies and European goods through trade with the European colonists to the south. The Wabenaki shifted from a nomadic to more sedentary lifestyle as they engaged in more trade with Europeans.

Boundaries between Native groups varied because areas of habitation and domination changed over time. The Malecite dominated the Rivière-du-Loup area along the St. Lawrence River in the 17th century, but by the 18th century they shared it with the Mikmaq, who became the most numerous and important Indigenous group along the St. Lawrence River up to Quebec. The St. John River location offered Indigenous groups the options to trade with the French either along the St. Lawrence River or southward in Acadia, or with the English farther south along the Atlantic seaboard.

In spite of adapting to changing subsistence patterns and including European trade goods, hunger could still be a problem for Native groups. They began to live in larger, sedentary villages and shifted from limited to more constant agricultural practices. They no longer broke into smaller groups over the winter where the entire group migrated to hunt. Some members stayed in the village while the hunters searched for furs to trade. Some even built permanent shelters similar to log cabins, but they did not live in them year round, as became more common later. The introduction of the fur trade also led to a stricter sense of European-style territorial hunting grounds. Also, a stronger sense of private land ownership developed among the Maliseet and Passamaquoddy in connection with hunting and trapping territory.

The most unfortunate aspect of contact with fishermen, missionaries and trappers was the devastating effect foreign pathogens had on native communities. Mortality rates in the Maritime Peninsula due to disease before (1600-1610) and after (circa 1650) epidemic waves were devastating. The mortality rate for the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy was 67% (population dropped
from 7,600 to 2, 500), for the Eastern Abenakis it was 78% (dropping from 13,800 to 3,000) and for the Western Abenakis it was 98% (dropping from 12,000 to 250). Given such dramatic decreases in their populations, it is understandable why Indigenous groups would turn, yet again, to the incorporation of outsiders as a means to perpetuate their tribes. Intermixing was more than simply accepted within their culture; it was essential for their survival.

Drought, famine and war were other reasons why intermixing among Indian groups occurred to a greater degree in order to survive. In the summer of 1676, King Philip’s War, or Metacom’s War, reached Maine and spread to New Hampshire as Abenakis attacked towns in retaliation against traders who had cheated them. It also spread farther inland and continued for the next year. Maine was the only area where Natives successfully drove out the British, at least temporarily, instead of suffering massive population decline due to war and being pushed out of New England. Still, several Indian groups migrated and intermingled with their neighbors. Abenakis headed east and joined the Etchemins (Maliseets), while some Etchemin moved north and joined the Montagnais north of the St. Lawrence.

The 1680s were a busy period along the length of the St. John River. Five French seigneuries (land grants to lords) were approved, including the Madawaska seigneury to Aubert de la Chesnay. Maliseets were known to be in the Upper St. John River Valley area in 1696, where they hunted, trapped, and traded along the river. Gaspé Mi’kmaqs also likely hunted there. Some groups – Abenakis who had headed to Quebec, and Penobscots (Canibas) – sought refuge from encroaching Europeans or more aggressive Indian neighbors. By 1696, an estimated 1,119 Natives lived in Acadia, and approximately 294 lived in the St. John River Valley.
(1600s) Maine: Importance of the French-Maine Border Areas

French presence in the North Atlantic focused on three general areas – the coast region of *l’Acadie*, the St. Lawrence River region of *le Québec*, and the peninsula of *la Gaspésie*. Although documentation about the early human history of the upper St. John River Valley is sparse, what is certain about this, and the neighboring Madawaska-Témiscouata area, before 1675 is that it served as a crucial link that connected the St. Lawrence River area to the north with the Bay of Fundy Atlantic coast region to the south. The network of rivers and portage areas (where canoes were carried overland to the next waterway) that the Natives used to travel overland was a favorite highway used by Natives and colonists alike. News and events that occurred on either end were transmitted and felt along this information-transportation corridor. This consistent crossing of paths by different groups of Indians and Europeans accustomed them to interacting with people considered other.

Like Texas, Maine offered no mineral wealth but, nonetheless, was hotly contested by rival groups of Indigenous First Nations and European rivals, in this case, the French and English. Unlike Texas, Maine possessed abundant natural resources that would be highly prized in later centuries – tall trees for ship masts, lumber, and paper. It also offered direct access to a major coast of the Atlantic off Acadia and the St. Lawrence River superhighway that passed by Québec City and indirectly connected to the Great Lakes, then the Mississippi River and all points south. New France differed from New Spain in that there was no large central capital nor nearby densely populated countryside like Mexico City and Central Mexico. Québec City was the capital for New France and the largest concentration of settlers, although it was surrounded by sparsely-populated farmland. Along the frontier area of northern Maine, there were varied groups of natives, but they tended to live in smaller groups and migrated with the seasons. The
European settlement centers in Québec and l’Acadie were rather small. They acted as trade hubs, but did not exert the same kind of political, economic, and social influence as Mexico City. Still, the location of what would become Maine’s northern border was an important link in the social, economic, informational, cultural and other networks that connected people from the many regions that used those waterways.

(1600-1699) Maine: Métissage in New France’s Maine Area Frontier

Early explorers who mapped New France territory included Jacques Cartier in 1534. The first French settlement attempt north of Spanish Florida was St. Croix Island (Maine) in 1604. After a rough year with poor housing, limited food, an extremely cold winter, and disease, nearly half of the population died from scurvy. For their next attempt in 1605, lead organizer and merchant, Pierre Du Gua, Sieur de Monts, and geographer and cartographer, Samuel de Champlain, chose to establish Port-Royal (later Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia under the English). Samuel de Champlain explored south all the way to Massachusetts Bay and was the first to draw a detailed map of the coast. Following a common practice among French and Spanish explorers, he arrived at the mouth of a sizeable river on June 24\(^{th}\), the feast day of St. John the Baptist, so he named the river in honor of the saint—the St. John River.\(^{74}\) The local Maliseet called the river Wolastoq, “the beautiful river,” and themselves the Wolastiquiyik, meaning “the people of the beautiful river.”\(^{75}\) These efforts soon brought Champlain’s party into personal contact with les Premières Nation (First Nations) when he traveled north to the St. Lawrence River in 1603, where he encountered Maliseets near Tadoussac and established a small settlement in 1608 that would grow into Quebec City.\(^{76}\) Jesuits and other missionaries followed
as they tried to break new spiritual ground to plant the seeds of Catholicism. They were soon followed by traders, soldiers, colonizers and settlers.  

European colonial administrators attempted to recruit settler families with varied success. The Spanish succeeded in sending many families to settle their North American frontier, while the French had more difficulty but did their best to match them. The British exceeded both of their European rivals in sending large groups of families to settle their colonies, especially in the New England region. While French administrators discussed options for populating the colonies with proper French families, the single French men on the frontier considered available options and proceeded to marry native women. Intermarriage fulfilled church, state and local needs.

Relations between Indians and the French tended to be consistently stable and peaceful in the early colonial period and in the more remote areas. This was due to the small numbers of French trappers and traders who were highly dependent on good relations with the Indians to achieve their goals. Although customs varied among different Native groups, in general, marriage was seen as a consensual agreement that would last as long as both parties wished. The partnership could be ended by either party at any time. Eastern Algonkian couples could divorce easily, but gift exchanges and community pressure could influence couples to stay together. Some Indian groups also believed in polygyny, the custom of one husband having more than one wife. These practices contrasted markedly with Christian beliefs of monogamy and no divorce.

Missionaries were some of the earliest French arrivals and introduced new standards of behavior that sometimes conflicted with Indian gender role expectations and matrimonial traditions. Missionary attempts to impose, and Native attempts to adopt, new norms reflected the struggles inherent in the cultural métissage process, especially in the early stages. Eastern woodlands Indian nations accepted premarital sexual experimentation and couples married.
young, approximately early to mid-teens for girls and late teens to early twenties for boys. Missionaries proudly reported about successful conversions and influences of proper Christian behavior, such as young female Indian converts who resisted advances by admirers. For some converts, both men and women, local traditions presented unexpected challenges or proved difficult to let go, such as polygyny and divorce. One 17th-century Indian husband explained how church teachings were contradictory because of a problem that he faced. He gave up all but one wife, but the other wives kept coming back. He saw the only way they would stop was in death, but he did not want to kill them. Some Indian wives married by the church, but felt strongly enough about ending their relationships that they wanted to divorce their husbands, no matter the consequences. These women were often threatened with imprisonment if they left their husbands. One was imprisoned for twenty-four hours with no fire, no blanket and little food. Other converts fashioned a combination of traditional Indian customs and Christian teachings. Marrying first according to Indian custom before marrying by the church was common among nomadic groups who visited the missions annually in the summer.

Unfortunately, as in the English and Spanish colonies, partnerships and sexual relations between French men and Indian women were not always consensual, which contributed to the birth of more intermixed children, ancestors of future Franco Americans. Alcohol played a role in many cases of abuse, both in and near missions. Some French men raped Indian women, wives and otherwise, when drunk and claimed they were not responsible because of the drink. Jesuit missions in Gaspé were abandoned because of such excessive drunkenness. French fishermen were known to offer Mi’kmaq girls alcohol to make them drunk, pliable, indebted and dependent. If a girl tried to leave she would be threatened with violence. Jesuit missionaries
visiting in 1676 decided “to meddle not in this business.” How often abuses occurred is
difficult to estimate because they were not always reported nor recorded.

Where missionaries prized Indian converts for religious reasons, royal administrators
were eager to convert Indians to advance imperial claims to land power. A 1627 charter granted
by Armand-Jean du Plessis, Cardinal Richelieu, stated that “the Savages who will be led to the
faith and to profess it will be considered natural Frenchmen, and like them, will be able to come
and live in France when they wish to, and there acquire property, with rights of inheritance and
bequest, just as if they had been born Frenchmen, without being required to make any
declaration or to become naturalized.” Cardinal Richelieu made quite clear how religious,
political, and economic aims could be intertwined. When Indians became Christian through
baptism, they were automatically considered French subjects, and as such, the Indians and all of
their land could be claimed by the king. Thus, the Indians lost claim to the land and so did any
other colonial competitors.

While conversion was pleasing to the church and state, intermarriage occurred primarily
due to the gender ratio imbalance. French men consistently outnumbered French women for the
first half of the 17th century, both in the more densely populated St. Lawrence River region of
Quebec City and coastal Acadia. Between 1608 and 1699, approximately 12,621 French men and
1,772 French women (not including nuns) immigrated to Canada. In Canada, single French
men outnumbered single French women six to one. Prompted by limited attention and support
from Versailles, New France settlements grew slowly and remained relatively small. The 1653
arrival of a shipload of French women the St. Lawrence area alleviated the imbalance slightly.
By 1660, after approximately sixty years, New France’s population reached three thousand.

Not until the 1665 arrival of the filles du roi (Maidens of the King) did the gender ratio in the St.
Lawrence area approach a balance. In contrast, the 1685 census in Acadia reported significantly higher numbers of French men and women than Indians, with French men still being the most numerous.\textsuperscript{88}

Compared to French civilian settlements, the number of French trappers and traders living in the interior frontier remained relatively small, approximately a few hundred by the mid-18th century.\textsuperscript{89} Similar to the larger number of French men to French women, there were more Indian women than Indian men in many cases. This was especially true during times of inter-tribal war. To remedy this gender ratio, French colonial administrators attempted two strategies to find brides for their male settlers. They looked first to potential local Indian brides, and then to imported French brides. Administrators held idyllic egalitarian visions of the future and spoke of hopes that by living near each other, Indians and French, “after some time, having one law and one master, they may form one people and one blood.”\textsuperscript{90}

It was next to impossible to accurately document the number of Indian-French intermarriages because many unions were celebrated \textit{à la façon du pays}. Recorded approximations vary. Demographers estimate six official intermarriages occurred in the 17th century (1.6 marriages in one thousand) and approximately 95 during the French regime period. Additionally, different historians found 16 intermarriages in the 17th century, while others found 145 marriages between French men and Indian women and 35 between French women and Indian men.\textsuperscript{91} The limited number of recorded intermarriages is one of the reasons why support for state-funded conversion and intermarriage programs started to wane at the end of the 17th century. During the French colonial period, approximately 27,000 marriages occurred, including approximately 65 church-sanctioned French-Indian marriages. The Indian-French marriages made up approximately .2 percent of all marriages in New France between 1608 and 1765.\textsuperscript{92} This
does not include the French-Indian and Indian-Indian unions that occurred in Indian communities outside officially counted areas. Records for intermixture for this period are sparse, but DNA studies point to a shared ancestry of Québécois and Acadiens. This strongly suggests extensive intermixture among early settlers across both regions. In addition, colonial population numbers remained low due to harsh living conditions and disease, which was particularly devastating for native populations, especially among infants.

(1600-1699) Maine: French Acadia (French Quebec?)

L’Acadie was an early area of contact and intermarriage. The earliest recorded reference to métis in New France appears when Jean de Poutrincourt, founder of Port-Royal and co-founder of the colony of Acadia, administrator of Port-Royal 1604-1614, complained about the potential negative consequences of French men intermarrying with Indian women, “[I]t will mean that those married here [in the Americas in New France] will move their wives and children [to France], and that their sons will go searching for French wives (wives in France).” This was clearly in contrast to the more optimistic words of his contemporary, Samuel de Champlain, “Our sons will marry your daughters and we will form one people.”

Intermarriage between French and Indians reflected initial administrative approval. After 1610, in the Port-Royal area, a small group of French administrators and fur traders decided to live among the Mi’gmaq, chose spouses, and had the earliest known mixed children in New France. Charles de St-Étienne de La Tour, one of the first governors of Acadia, was born in 1593 and started out as an Acadian colonial assistant, but he had to change careers when Port-Royal was destroyed in 1613 by English rivals. He established and ran a lucrative fur trade for
the next fifteen years. It is in this period that he probably married his first wife, a Mi’gmaq woman whose name is unknown, and they had three daughters.²⁸

Between 1632 and 1654, a renewed colonization effort by Isaac de Razilly established La Hève (on the coast of today’s Nova Scotia) in 1632. Nicolas Denys’ recruitment and colonization efforts with Isaac de Razilly in 1632 resulted in immediate intermarriages with Indian women. Denys’s own son, Richard Denys married an Indian woman.²⁹ By 1636 the settlement welcomed the ship Saint Jehan carrying some of the first migrant families to Acadia – 78 passengers and 18 crew members. Their arrival marked a shift from a predominantly single-male French population to groups of families. This decreased the need to intermarry with Indian women, at least with this first generation of arrivals.³⁰ By 1650, through additional French immigrants and continued intermarriage, Acadia reached a small but determined 300 French inhabitants.³¹

While a few written records of intermarriages do exist, many more occurred that were not recorded. At Pentagouet, Jean-Vincent D’Abbadie de Saint-Castin, Baron de Saint-Castin, married Penobscot Chief Madokawando’s daughter, first by native custom and then by the church in 1684. He exercised great influence among, and loyalty for, the Penobscots. His wife’s name was Pidianske or Pidiwamiska, or alternately Marie-Mathilde. They had at least seven children, one of whom became an Abenaki chief and French baron.³² On the Acadian coast, Jean Serreau de Saint-Aubin, seigneur of the seigneury at the mouth of the St. Croix River, had sons who married Native women and joined their wives’ communities.³³ Intermarrying continued among elites and commoners alike, then decreased among elites as central administrative approval waned.

Differing gender roles within Indian and European societies was another important factor in decisions to intermarry and where the couples chose to live. French men living in the interior
frontier tended to marry Indian women and raise their families within the Native communities. This practice is understandable given the economic benefits for the husband and the more flexible and egalitarian social organization of Native communities where Indian women enjoyed higher status and more respect than in European villages. French men and women could also enjoy a more equal social status than they might find in the stricter social hierarchy of French villages and forts. Importantly, in matrilineal Native societies, it was easier for Indian women to marry outside of the community and still maintain their status, in comparison to their European counterparts.  

European men were usually the most eager to intermarry because of more benefits and fewer negative consequences. Men could marry “equal and inferior women,” because it was believed that she was simply a physical vessel that bore the children and passed on her husband’s traits, and none of her own. On the other hand, a woman marrying a man of lesser social standing was frowned upon, especially a noble woman, because this could allow her partner to pass as upper class. A European woman was held to a different standard that would have dropped her down the social ladder considerably farther than a man.  

Interruption was implemented in a number of ways, and gender played a clear role in several of these policies. First, schools for Indian women were created to convert them into proper Christian wives for their soon-to-be French husbands. The assumed superiority of French culture was expected to dominate and civilize the Native women and eventually create a French population because of the common French belief that the father’s, not the mother’s, qualities passed on to the children. Second, converted Indian women were encouraged to marry Indian men with the expectation that the introduction of French culture and moral practices would civilize the Indian communities. Third, where the couples lived was also intended to help
strengthen French colonial and territorial claims. Intermarried couples who lived in French settlements would increase town populations, and those who lived in Indian communities would strengthen French alliances and influence there. Administrators expected that daily exposure to French culture in its many forms – religious beliefs, language, food, household goods, government, communities, and more – would solidify imperial claims to the people and territory in the Americas. Colonial administrators consistently pursued different avenues to reach that goal.

(1600-1699) Maine: French Realities of *Mésalliance, Francization, Filles du roi, and à la façon du pays*

In France, *mésalliance* described “an unsuitable, unhappy, or unworkable alliance or marriage.” A 1690 French dictionary explained it meant “To take a wife, or an unworthy husband, or of low status, who causes the loss of some advantages of Nobility, honor, or dignity.” Marriages were closely scrutinized and planned to avoid unions with a family of lower social status that could threaten a noble family’s standing. Noble families knew love, but often prioritized protecting their socio-economic status, especially as they felt threatened by upcoming *bourgeoisie* (middle class) families who were becoming more capable of buying their way into upper classes. Economic and practical matters took precedence and love was expected to develop later, not before marriage. Concerns over unacceptable marriages, especially partnerships of women, and the desire to protect the status of noble classes prompted the French government to pass stricter marriage laws.

Previously, marriages were overseen solely by the church under canon law and were viewed as a private agreement needing only consent of the couple. By the early 17th century,
marriage became a private and public matter as couples now needed to satisfy court and state regulations that required clerics to acquire parental consent, witnesses, and to publish banns (public announcements) before performing a marriage. If the intended bride or groom were from different parishes, then additional requirements and permissions were needed. By the mid-17th century, if couples married without fulfilling all requirements or married secretly, then the marriages were considered clandestine, invalid, and “‘polluted conjunctions’ that disturbed the public good.” The unions were not recognized by law and were subject to laws of illegitimacy.

The children of mésalliance were considered the worst consequence of such misguided unions. They were called métis, and were considered the “mixing of two different species” in the 16th century. In the 17th century, they were described as having “a father and a mother of different quality, country [pays], color or Religion” and the term carried a negative connotation. One contemporary source described these métis children as easily recognizable by their “presumptuous attitude or their sheer stupidity,” as “of no use to the Republic,” and “as far removed from the generosity of their ancestors as their faces often are.”

In contrast to metropolitan France, where mésalliance was frowned upon, in the colonies, intermarriage was viewed favorably because of the belief that French culture and Christianity would civilize the non-French groups. Initial French colonial policies supported and encouraged marriages between the predominantly male European explorers, soldiers, traders and colonists and the local Indian women. New France administrators expected that the Indian women and their communities would adopt French culture and assimilate into a French dominant society. Imagine their surprise when they realized by the end of the 17th century that this plan was not
working. In fact, it was often the opposite, where Natives refused to assimilate and French men were the ones adopting Native ways of life and joining the native communities.

In the 17th century, a new attitude began to creep into French public consciousness - the idea of the transmissibility of traits through blood as unchangeable and part of the innate nature of people.\textsuperscript{115} A 17th-century source who cautioned that “A generous blood must not be mixed with that of a vile and abject person, and its splendor blackened by the obscurity of a low condition…The dignified rank of nobility must not be prostituted by an illicit conjunction.”\textsuperscript{116} This change in attitude was due in large part to colonial authorities' frustration with the failure of Native Americans to accept assimilation as expected. Colonial authorities in the Americas conveyed their frustrations to the Crown through their intermediaries in France, the premiers commis (chief clerks). These high-ranking clerks wrote colonial reports and offered recommendations that influenced the King and ministers, who often followed the clerks' advice without question.\textsuperscript{117} Thus, as colonial attitudes to intermarriage changed, so did metropolitan attitudes and policies.

Consistent with 17th-century French views of gender and morals, administrators believed that the detrimental moral influence of women was responsible for the moral degeneration of men. The customs of some Indian groups, in this case Huron and Ottawa, also fed this view because, as one French official reported, “married Indian women sleep with whomever they wish, without their husbands being embarrassed the least about it, saying that they are the mistresses of their bodies, and can dispose of them as they please.”\textsuperscript{118} Seeing that French men accepted Indian brides \textit{à la façon du pays} (according to local custom), the government also tried to curtail the exposure of French men to Indian women by prohibiting fur-trading expeditions from 1676 to 1679, and later instituting a permit system with mixed results.\textsuperscript{119}
Throughout the 17th century, French colonial policy-makers attempted different strategies to create their ideal of a French colony. Early efforts focused on *francisation* (Frenchification), intending to *franciser* (to make French), or assimilate, Native Americans. The first *francisation* attempts, during the first half of the 17th century, were lead by Jesuits, as well as Recollects and Sulpicians, who attempted to convert adults, families, and communities through religious instruction. When it was possible to establish them, schools taught religion and other subjects to the young to inculcate French culture and norms. Schools for young Indian women were especially popular institutions for a time.

In 1667, the crown was so eager to increase the colonial population to solidify territorial claims that chief administrator, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, wrote New France *intendant* [administrative official] Jean Talon that the crown would establish a dowry fund for prospective Indian brides for French bachelors. Following the same gender assumptions of the time, marriages between French men and Indian women were not viewed as *mésalliances* because the male qualities were considered dominant and would override the Indian woman’s supposedly inferior, *sauvage* (savage) qualities. The difference here was less about class and more about religious and cultural difference, although it was assumed the bride would soon convert and assimilate.

Although apparently supporting French-Indian unions, the crown was also supporting French-French unions through the *filles du roi* (daughters of the king) program that recruited and sent nearly 800 French women to New France, between 1663 and 1673. If budgets reflected wholehearted, as well as monetary support, then the French-French program was clearly favored over the French-Indian program. The French bride program received between 12,750 to 33,000 livres while the Indian bride program received 3,000 livres maximum. Perhaps the Crown
preferred French brides for social or “racial” reasons, or perhaps he considered French brides a more cost-effective investment, even considering the supplies and transportation costs.\textsuperscript{121} In 1670, to support the \textit{filles du roi} program, the \textit{Conseil souverain} (highest court and legislative body) of New France ordered all single French men to marry within fifteen days of the women’s arrival or face denial of permission to fish, hunt or trade with Indians.\textsuperscript{122}

Ursuline nuns in Quebec and Montreal spearheaded efforts to convert Indian girls into suitable French brides. After hearing of Colbert’s plan, however, the mother superior, Marie de l’Incarnation, wrote about their previous lack of success, “It [was] a very difficult thing, not to say impossible to Frenchify or civilize [Indian girls]. We have more experience in this than anyone else, and we have observed that out of a hundred who have passed through our hands we have scarcely civilized one.”\textsuperscript{123}

In 1682, Intendant de Meulles (in office 1682-1686) marked an early shift toward opposing the existing intermarriage policy when he argued against funding converted young Indian women, “there is hardly one or two who marry each year.”\textsuperscript{124} Considering the low return on the financial investment, he recommended continuing the program by replacing the monetary payments with in-kind support, “give them a pig, wheat, and a few hemp seeds,” so that daily reinforcement of French culture would eventually convert the native husbands. As for the effectiveness of converting native women and communities, Jesuit missionary support was less than enthusiastic because they had tried similar approaches over fifty years earlier with little success, as reported by Father Paul Le Jeune, S.J.\textsuperscript{125} The French government insisted in pursuing their policies in the belief that the execution of the earlier Jesuit program had been faulty and the state’s attempt would be more effective.
By 1683, the governor wrote Versaille to recommend discontinuing the program to convert Indian girls because the money had been used more to help French girls marry because there were so few Indian candidates. In 1685, governor Jacques-René de Brisay de Denonville reported that “the very opposite has taken place because instead of familiarizing themselves with our laws, I assure you that they communicate very much all that they have that is the worst, and take likewise all that is bad and vicious in us.”126 He was also concerned about the number of les coureurs de bois, who were undergoing a process of ensauvagement, or basically “going native.” He complained that “the coureurs adopt a savage way of life which consists of doing nothing, in being restrained in nothing, in pursuing all one’s urges, and placing oneself beyond the possibility of correction.”127

(1700-1821) Maine: Métissage in New France’s Northern Frontier

By the early 18th century, some French officials still supported intermarriage, but most no longer did. They did not deny its existence; they discussed it in a negative light. In 1709, New France governor Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil wrote that

One should never mix a bad blood with a good one… Our experience of [intermarriage] in this country ought to prevent us from permitting marriages of this kind, for all the French men who have married savage women have been licentious, lazy and have become intolerably independent; and the children they have had are even lazier than the savages themselves. Such marriages should thus be prohibited.128

This language is reminiscent of the earlier ideas circulated regarding protecting noble status and associated ideal characteristics by limiting marriages between classes.

In the East, assimilation appeared successful among many Abenaki and Huron, who apparently converted. However, similar attempts failed among other Native American groups. In 1709, Intendant Antoine-Denis Raudot (Intendant of New France 1705-1710) complained,129
It is surprising that, considering that there are so many nations, there is still none who takes our manners; and even by being among us and every day with the French, they still govern themselves the same way they did in the past ... The woods and forests are their palaces for them ... We would need infinite work and time to free those peoples and to be able to reduce them to take our ways and our customs ... I assure you that this work will last several centuries.\textsuperscript{130}

The noticeable shift from 17th century supportive policies of intermixing in New France to 18th century negative ones is clearly visible in the changing attitudes towards \textit{métissage}. The peak of the debate regarding mixing is exemplified by the contest of ideas surrounding the establishment of the colony of Detroit. The founder of Detroit, Antoine Lamothe Cadillac, insisted on pursuing 17th-century policies of integration, assimilation, and francization in order to establish his new-found sparsely-populated colony. The governor general of New France, Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil (1703-1725), reflected 18th-century skepticism of these policies based on limited success in the past, his own negative views of intermarriage between Natives and French, and his wariness that marital unions with Natives would lead to political or military entanglements later.\textsuperscript{131}

Vaudreuil’s reluctance to mix bloods also points to a changing view of blood as more than lineage or kinship, but with an added meaning of the blood of a social group or people. The word still did not signify the biological meaning we think of today, but it was another step closer to blurring the line between biological and social defining lines. The mixed-blood children of New France were the embodiment of the blurring of those lines and by the 18th century, they were no longer seen as the welcomed and potential citizens of the 17th century.

New laws were passed discouraging intermarriage throughout French colonies in North America – Indian widows could not inherit their French husband’s property in the West, Canada prohibited adoption of mixed French-Indian children by Indian families (even Catholic ones), officials discouraged \textit{les coureurs de bois} from intermarrying (missionaries encouraged it), and
intermarriage was prohibited in Louisiana. In 1735, the new secretary of the colonies, Jean–Frédéric Phélypeaux de Maurepas stated that French-Indian intermarriages “are dishonorable for the nation, they can have very dangerous consequences for the colony’s tranquility… [and] the children born from these unions are more libertine than the savages.”

This change in attitude resulted from changes in colonial social, economic, and political relationships with Native Americans. As the economy and colonial settlement patterns shifted from the fur trade and single settlers to farming, industry and permanent towns with families, French motivation to maintain strong relations with Native Americans waned. As French dependence on Native Americans as spouses decreased, French impatience with their reluctance to assimilate to French society increased. Indigenous communities were described in terms of their “independent nature” and savagery. This blurred the line even more between characteristics that were considered inherent and unchangeable as part of nature, and those that were learned as part of social practices. Native Americans were no longer seen as potential subjects, but instead as simply allies to exploit economically and militarily. As a result, métissage shifted from a state-supported policy in the 17th century to, by the beginning of the 18th century, being officially discouraged.

As imperial contests for power intensified on the north Atlantic coast, colonial authorities view of the children of métissage, whether they lived in Indian or European colonial communities, shifted from acceptance to suspicion. This was especially true when control of the north Atlantic region permanently changed from French to British hands with the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht. Overall, the population of New France increased from about 3,000 in the mid-1660s, to approximately 10,000 in the early 1680s thanks to an immigration influx, to about 75,000 in the 1750s when the British took over control of the region.
Between 1755 and 1778, British authorities forcibly deported many Acadian settlers from their homes in Nova Scotia (formerly Acadia) to sites across North and South America and even back to France. Even though many Acadian families were torn apart, they clung tenaciously to their cultural roots. An example is Louisiana, where many Acadians migrated on their own after deportation. The culture of the French-speaking colony felt familiar even though it changed hands between the French and Spanish empires, and eventually the United States. The Acadian immigrants intermixed with the existing French, Indian, African, and other European groups, and gave rise to the later Cajun (adaptation of Acadian) culture. Other Acadians avoided deportation and ongoing tensions with the British by migrating to northern Maine.

Continuing the age-old process of human migrations across different areas, either by choice or by force, French-descent settlers crossed between the Acadian coast and the St. Lawrence River over the ensuing decades and settled in what would become northern Maine. While there, they met, interacted with, and intermarried with each other and local Indians. The process of métissage, the mixing of Indian and French, and other groups, gave rise to the first métis children in that area.

(1636-1786) Maine: French Quebec – Gaspé, St. Lawrence River Valley

Intermixing occurred throughout this broad region and Gaspe shows three stages during the 18th century that lead to a distinct métis group. During the first half of the century, the initial intermarriages occurred for approximately three generations. Then, some of these early intermixed families are recorded in the 1750 and 1761 censuses, registers, and primary sources. In the final stage at the end of the 18th century, the community split off from the sea-centered Mikmaq community and further developed their own distinct community and identity.
Turning to the Quebec St. Lawrence area, we find one couple, Nicolas Pelletier and Jeanne de Vousy (or Voisy) who arrived in 1636 and settled in Sillery, a small village just outside Quebec. It was the first attempt at concentrating Natives in a permanent French-established village where French colonists also lived. Nicolas engaged in the fur trade with Indians and his wife oversaw the sale of alcohol, “l’eau-de-vie” (water of life). Due to the negative effects, the sale of alcohol to Indians was prohibited by colonial secular and religious authorities. Nevertheless, illicit sales continued. Growing up in a family of traders and interacting with diverse groups of people, Nicolas and Jeanne’s children learned French and other languages spoken by area Indians. Nicolas and their descendants acted as interpreters for their neighbors - Abenaki in Gaspe and elsewhere, and Algonkian speakers in Trois-Rivières and Quebec. After multiple intermarriages into area families they eventually were also translating on behalf of their kin. Several of Jeanne and Nicolas’s children intermarried with local Indians and called different locations their home.

Their second son, François Pelletier, was also known as Antaya, and married an Indian wife, Dorothée, at Tadoussac in 1660. Their granddaughter, Françoise Goupil, was captured by the Iroquois. Her daughter, Marie-Agathe Vallée, married Alexis-Jean Vallée in 1786 at Sainte-Anne-des-Monts in Gaspe and together developed that settlement. Other children of Nicolas and Jeanne married into Gaspe families with land grants and Indian in-laws.

Another son, Nicolas Pelletier, and a brother-in-law, Noël Jérémie dit Lamontagne, were the first les coureurs de bois to travel into the interior to set up trading posts. Nicolas went to Chicoutimi where he married three Native women in succession – Madeleine Tegoussi in 1674, Franoise Ouechipichinokoue in 1677, and Marie Outchiouanich (or Nanabesa) in 1715. He is considered the father of the metis community of Boréalie du Québec (Domaine du roi et
seigneurie de Mingan, or present-day Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean et Côte-Nord) north of the St. Lawrence River. They were but one of many families who intermarried. Studies of the Mikmaq Gaspe-St.Lawrence-Acadian area before the 1714 Treaty of Utrecht find that approximately 10% of the non-Mikmaq population were of métis heritage. And this number is estimated to have held constant up to when deportations began in Acadia. 141

Metis families and individuals played important roles in the history and development of New France along the north Atlantic coast, and certainly elsewhere in the colonial world. They served as translators and intermediaries of culture and trade, developed European settlements, established specifically métis communities, and contributed many other valuable accomplishments. At the same time, however, some preferred to blend into French society, and perhaps deny their Indian heritage. Reasons included security during wartime, professional ambition, personal preference to avoid discrimination, or other motivations.142 Just as Indian-European unions had advantages and disadvantages, so did being of mixed heritage.

(1702-1745) Maine: French Acadia –Île Royale, Port Royal, Nova Scotia

Still, not everyone approved of Indian-French marriages. Local administrative disapproval reflected royal policy and was directed not only at Indian-French marriages, but also later Acadian-French marriages. Class and character distinctions, reminiscent of the mesalliance concerns in Europe, were apparent in New France at the end of the 18th century. As French military forces and merchants arrived in Acadia to assist with administration of the colony, some of them married Acadian women.

After the English defeated the French at Port Royal in 1710, many of the defeated French administrative and military elites returned to France, and then returned again to the Americas to
establish the colony of Ile Royale (later Cape Breton Island). Upon the new colony’s founding, at least 12 Acadian women were listed among the elite wives of the settlement. Although these women joined the elite class of the colony, their lives were different from elite wives in France. Where a bourgeois wife in France might have two or three servants, a colonial elite home on the fringes of New France was fortunate to have one.\textsuperscript{143}

While French-Acadian marriages continued, records of disparaging remarks continued sporadically. In 1702, Captain Louis-Simon le Poupet de Saint Aubin married Madeleine Melanson with no comment. However, the 1705 marriage of Lieutenant François Du Pont Duviver to Marie Mius D’Entremont was not as welcomed. His commandant, at the request of the Lieutenant’s family, opposed the marriage saying that the girl, cousin of Madeleine and daughter of two noble families, was from too humble origins. The chaplain married them secretly, resulting in a social scandal and official reprimands of the chaplain.\textsuperscript{144}

Not surprisingly, as time passed, intermixing continued between French, Indians, and Acadians throughout L’Acadie (Acadia), whether authorities wished it to or not. Colonial authorities for their part also changed their minds regarding intermarriage policies. The transition from French authority of l’Acadie to British authority of Nova Scotia provides examples where policies towards people of mixed heritage clearly changed over time. In the English colonies, intermarriage had been formally restricted starting in the 17th century. However, after taking control of Acadia, British authorities offered incentives to English men to encourage them to intermarry with Indian women. In the early years of trying to establish control of Annapolis Royal (former French settlement Port-Royal) British authorities viewed intermarriage favorably. In 1719, they encouraged male and female British colonists to intermarry by providing a dowry of ten pounds and approximately 42 acres of land on behalf of the Indian spouse.\textsuperscript{145} These
policies continued in 1729 as British authorities hoped to create strong kinship bonds and military alliances with Native groups to counter the existing French-Abenaki alliance.

After the English took control of Acadia, they were initially open to intermixing, but eventually their distrust of Acadians could not be quieted, no matter how sincerely the Acadians expressed their neutrality.\(^{146}\) Acadian origins in France was one reason for mistrust. Their pre-existing ties to local Native groups - through political, trade or intermarried family kinship - was another reason. These newly-acquired “English colonists” of recently-annexed territory were occasionally pressed into service or requested to assist with duties along the frontier - military expeditions for defense or offense, negotiating for trade goods, locating travel routes. To support these missions, Indian and Metis colonists were often asked to act as guides or canoe pilots because of their expertise and skill. Perhaps proposed as a test of loyalty by English leaders or simply considered standard procedure, potential family ties did not stop English authorities from requiring Acadians to fight against local Indian groups, who were potentially kin.

In contrast, by 1744 and 1745, British authorities found takers when they offered to pay instead for Indian scalps during the War of Austrian Succession. In Nova Scotia (formerly Acadia), colonists petitioned to be excused from acting as guides in attacks upon neighboring Indians who were potentially kin, and to receive protection from armed New England Rangers seeking to kill anyone with Indian blood, which might include the petitioners.\(^{147}\) This is a telling example of the complexity of colonial life as the threatening party of Rangers included men described as Mulattoes, who probably had English and either African or Indian ancestry, or all three.

Approximately 1744 or 1745, Acadian colonists heard disturbing news that a group of Rangers were heading northward to kill Indians and require the locals to act as pilots. Colonists
feared being murdered or asked to assist the English against neighboring Indians.

Representatives from Grand Pre, River Canard and Pizziguid carried a petition to British authorities describing what they heard and what aid they requested.

“[S]everal armed vessels were arrived from New England, and that they had pressed by violence several inhabitants of Annapolis Royal to go against the Indians and serve them as pilots, and hearing they were coming up the Bay to do the same, and to destroy all the inhabitants that had any Indian blood in them, and scalp them, that as there was a great number of Mulattoes amongst them, who had taken the Oath, and who were allied to the greatest families, it had caused a terrible alarm, which made many put themselves on their guard, being very much frightened, for which reason all the inhabitants being assembled of each district, had sent to him to submit themselves to his mercy, and to represent that in case they were obliged to make any Sorties or go against the Indians, that barbarous & inhuman nation would assassinate them every day, while they were at their work and separated from one another without being able to have any succour from the Government as it was so remote…”

Fear of Indian reprisals was a reason listed to be excused from required service. Given common intermarriage practices, it may also have been fear of being forced to attack their Indian kin. The mention of Mulattoes referred to intermixed colonists in New England and is a reminder of the presence of Blacks in this region, even if they were in small numbers. That term was used originally by the Spanish to refer to children whose parents were Spanish and African. As Europeans and Africans spread across North America and intermixed with Indians, the term could also be used to refer to individuals of any mixed ancestry.

(1600-1821) Maine: St. John River Valley- Networks and Settlements

Early European settlers along the Upper St. John River were settlers and traders. Acadians began moving to the area to escape the 1755 British efforts to expel them from their coastal homes. Traders established a trading post in 1783 at the mouth of the Madawaksa River along the St. John River. The traders estimated approximately 250 Native families lived nearby.
British authorities created New Brunswick in 1784; separating it from Nova Scotia. European and Euroamerican families starting arriving in greater numbers in 1785 from the Fredericton area and settled in what we know today as St. Basile and St. David. Families from the St. Lawrence River Valley also began arriving about the same time. British authorities estimated the population of Madawaska at around 15 families or 105 people in 1786. This estimate included settlers on both sides of the upper St. John River. A year later, 1786, this number grew slightly to approximately 20 families or 140 people. By 1812, or 26 years later, the population ballooned to an estimated 110 families or 800 people. In 1820, the year the United States created Maine as a separate state from Massachusetts, the first U.S. census of the area estimated 1100 people lived along both sides of the upper St. John River.

Education was important for government officials and settlers alike, although for different reasons. Government administrators saw schools as avenues for indoctrinating and preparing productive, cooperative, tax-paying citizens. Locals valued schools as a way for their children to hopefully have a better life than their parents. In the early 19th century, the Legislative Assembly allotted funds for school operations, but placed the Lieutenant Governor and Executive Council in charge of implementation and licensing. For the first half of the 19th century, educational administrators organized schools and allocated funds in two basic branches—academy and grammar schools for upper classes and parish, Indian, church schools for poorer classes. Given the remoteness and basic subsistence level of existence along the upper St. John River, area schools likely received little to no money. Settlers continued to migrate and create communities along or near the St. John River Valley – Madawaska, Violette Brooke (Van Buren), Chataqua (Frenchville) and others.
In such an isolated location with rugged terrain and harsh winters, supportive neighbors were critical to survival. Being related to those neighbors often made cooperation and support all the more reliable. The story of Tante (Aunt) Blanche in the starving winter of 1797 is a favorite example of how that network functioned. It also showed the important role that women played in the success and survival of their families and communities.\textsuperscript{155}

Frontier families had a reputation for couples who married young and had ten to twenty children. That was more of a myth than reality. Between 1792 to 1842, if born in the St. John River Valley, the average marriage age for women was 21 and 25 for men. If born outside the Valley, those numbers rose slightly with women married at 26 and men at 31 years of age. If a spouse died and left young children, widowers tended to marry sooner and more easily than widows. If older, both widows and widowers tended to remain single.\textsuperscript{156}

As for children, it was common for families to have thirteen to fourteen, with older ones moved out of the house by the time the youngest ones arrived. Childbirth was potentially dangerous for mother and child, as were childhood illness, but the St. John Valley enjoyed a low infant mortality rate. The first child would be born approximately a year after marriage, followed by siblings every year and a half, eventually slowing down to every three years, until the mother reached around forty-three years of age.\textsuperscript{157}

Marriage and children were clearly important to St. John River Valley residents. This was due, no doubt, to their Catholic beliefs in accepting as many children as they conceived and to the difficult environment that required many hands to run a family farm. The remote location and few economic attractions kept the marriage pool rather small. Records and letters by priests indicated that marriage of distant and close cousins occurred with church permission.
As small as the pool may have been, marriage to fellow Euroamericans was more attractive than marriage to Native Americans. The same may have been true from the Indian perspective as well. They may have preferred to marry fellow Indians rather than their White neighbors. Children of métissage still existed, but were not as visible in the records at this point. They were being pushed out of social spaces and social consciousness. Intermarriage continued, but likely in smaller numbers in towns as the practice was discouraged under the French by the 17th century, and even more so under the British starting in the 18th century. It occurred more commonly in the frontier regions where social pressure and policy enforcement was less strict.

After the conclusion of the American Revolution, Maine shifted from territory controlled by France or England to territory controlled by the United States. Maine existed as part of Massachusetts. New England policies and attitudes were expected to prevail over all aspects of life, including interactions with Indians. However, given the distance between Boston and Maine, then the distance and isolation of the St. John River to the Maine coast, New England policies were like a ripple that lost strength as it traveled.

**New England**

(1600-1699) New England: English Realities of Half-Breeds, Mulattos, and *Partus sequitur patrem*

Like France and Spain, England unified under one monarch was a recent development, and what it meant to be English (or French or Spanish) was not clearly defined nor universally accepted. Most individuals identified more closely with their local communities rather than the larger empire. What it meant to be English in the first half of the 17th century was based largely on subjecthood or what it meant to be a subject of the Crown. Key markers of identity and
membership within dominant society were being English and Christian. English attitudes toward intermarriage were more dichotomous than the Spanish and French. Colonial societies in New England focused on Indian-White relations, but were soon strongly influenced by the African chattel slavery system that focused on Blacks as other. Attention on Black-White relations increased as the importation of slaves grew and with the passage of new laws codifying slavery beginning in the mid to late 1600s.

The earliest term commonly used was amalgamation and, beginning in the early 17th century, initially described the combining of metals. As British colonists and Africans intermarried with Native Americans, the term half-breed came into use. The earliest published reference to this term was in the 1760 Newport Mercury (Rhode Island), “On the 18th a Half-Breed, who is a Leader and Head Warrior..came..to Fort Augusta.” The earliest reference to “the action of combining distinct elements, races, associations, into one uniform whole” was in 1775 in reference to the Saxons and Normans.

Like Spanish and French colonies, early settlers included many single men, although this was more true in the Chesapeake. As a result, as seen elsewhere, they looked to Indian women for companionship. When African women eventually arrived, either as Free Blacks or involuntarily on slave ships, they also became sought after companions. Soon, children of these unions, usually illegitimate in colonial eyes, were running around the countryside and settlements, creating quandaries for local officials. Colonial authorities had to decide where these children of mixed English, Indian, and African ancestry fit into colonial society. Terms used to describe them included half-breeds (Indian and White or Black parents) and mullatoes (Black and White parents).
Similar to its French and Spanish European neighbors, England was a patriarchal and patrilineal society, where men dominated leadership positions, and inheritance and family name passed down the male line. They followed the practice of *partus sequitur patrem*, where the status of the offspring followed the father. Patriarchal English law and practice required fathers to provide enough support for their children, particularly illegitimate ones, to be able to support themselves. The goal being to avoid the children from becoming burdens to society. When carried over to the colonies, this practice continued unabated. However, the law became problematic in areas where illegitimate children involved a slave parent, especially in the southern mainland colonies where slaves were more numerous.  

Considering most mixed-heritage children had a White father and slave mother, the patriarchal traditions required the child be taught a trade, given some form of education, or perhaps inheritance later in life. In some cases, they might even have been freed.  

Native Americans intermarried or intermixed with English colonists relatively frequently, including free English Negroes as well as escaped slaves. Intermixing of the three groups occurred much like in the other European colonies, especially in the early decades of the 17th century when social classes were still nebulous. However, intermixing decreased as larger numbers of English colonists and family groups immigrated. The higher numbers of colonists offered a wider pool of potential English or other European spouses and lessened motivation to intermarry with Indians. Harsher laws restricting social and physical freedoms of non-Whites made intermarrying with non-English partners less appealing, at least in colonial villages or towns. Many Native Americans communities remained open to intermarriage with English and non-English partners for a longer period of time.
This may sound surprising considering that tensions between Native Americans and northern English colonists began to rise as competition for land and resources increased. King Philip’s War, 1675-1678, was an example of violent conflicts between Indians and the English over control of territory and resources. This war marked the end of decades of peaceful cohabitation as colonial population pressures and discriminatory practices could no longer be ignored nor tolerated by Native Americans. While both sides were devastated, approximately ten percent of the New England population had died and nearly two-thirds of the Native population had died and many others were sold into slavery. English community populations were replenished through immigration, but Native American communities did not have that same option, plus their homelands were being overrun and their resources depleted by European colonists. Survival required them to marry, capture, or adopt spouses and children from outside of their communities.

Ships arriving at English colonial ports brought immigrants from England and other primarily northern European countries, plus slaves from Africa and the Caribbean. Intermixing with Negros, both slave and free, had begun in European colonies since the arrival of the first slave ships from Africa. As English Caribbean colonies reached population capacity, White families migrated to the southeast mainland coast and, in bringing their slaves, contributed many already intermixed and partially assimilated African-ancestry families and potential partners to those colonies. The high concentration of African and intermixed African-descent individuals, as well as intermixed Native individuals, forced English colonial leaders to wrestle with the question of what characteristics defined a person as White or as intermixed other. By extension, the status of White could grant a person access to all attendant rights and privileges, such as the basic right of freedom.
Elizabeth Keys was one of the earliest cases in Virginia where a mixed-heritage woman sued for the freedom of herself and her child. She was the twenty-five-year-old daughter of a free White man and a Negro woman, possibly a slave or of non-English background. Upon her father’s death, Elizabeth and her infant son were classified as *Negroes* by the overseers of her father’s estate. In the 1655 case, her three key arguments were that she was a practicing Christian, her father was a free White Englishman, and her period of indentured servitude, contracted by her father, had expired. At this time, the number of African slaves in Virginia was relatively low and the classification of mixed Anglo-slave children was not consistent. While it was common for indentured servants to seek their freedom through the courts when held after their contracts had ended, the additional two arguments point to the complicated and still-forming social policies of English colonial society. Elizabeth and her legal supporters wanted to ensure that she was seen as *English* in order to be treated as other English indentured servants. Fortunately, their strategy succeeded and Elizabeth and her child gained their freedom.\(^\text{165}\)

Religion clearly played a role in Elizabeth Key’s case and English colonial social status; however, it was no guarantee of freedom. England had several levels of servitude including *villeinage*, which was a status between indentured servant and slave, similar to serfdom. In the 17th century, whether Christians could hold fellow Christians indentured or enslaved was a heated debate in England, and continued as Christian Blacks became more numerous. In practice, Black Christians were usually exempted from lifetime servitude, but were still pledged for significantly longer contracts than White English servants.\(^\text{166}\) Maryland and Virginia colonial courts and legislatures passed laws in 1664-1667 that eliminated Christian status as a reason for slave liberation, at least for those slaves born in the colonies.\(^\text{167}\) This was another step in the incremental chipping away of Blacks’ rights to freedom, and, in turn, their children’s rights.
Partus Sequitur Ventrum

One of the most important slave laws regarding the status of mixed-ancestry children in the English colonies effectively turned centuries of patriarchal traditions (partus sequitur patrem) upside down, while still simultaneously benefiting White male property owners. In 1662, the Virginia legislature passed a statute that supported partus sequitur ventrem, where the offspring followed the status of the mother. This statute determined that future children born to slave women and free white men would remain slaves, like their mothers.¹⁶⁸

WHEREAS some doubts have arrisen whether children got by any Englishman upon a negro woman should be slave or free, Be it therefore enacted and declared by this present grand assembly, that all children borne in this country shalbe held bond or free only according to the condition of the mother, And that if any christian shall committ fornication with a negro man or women, hee or shee soe offending shall pay double the ffines imposed by the former act.¹⁶⁹

This decision made it legal for White male slave owners to have as many children as they wished by their female slaves and keep those children enslaved, with no possibility of freedom and no obligation to train them to be independently self-supporting. While some slave owners cared for, and even loved, their female slaves and children, they were in the minority. It was far more common for slave owners to rape any slave they wished and thereby satisfy any sexual, power, or other desires, and legally increase their property holdings through any resulting children. This law made it more difficult for mixed-ancestry children to gain their freedom as slave laws became stricter over time. Massachusetts, of which Maine was a part, legalized the same partus sequitur ventrem decision in 1670 and Connecticut followed in 1704.¹⁷⁰
During the many wars that raged across New England and New France, tension, conflict, fear, and ignorance were all part of the colonial experience. Of course, not all English colonists wished to kill every Indian and Frenchman, and vice versa. There were numerous instances of peaceful coexistence, even in times of conflict. Taking captives and adopting individuals from other groups continued as a fairly common practice among Indian groups in order to repopulate their communities after the repeated losses of lives during successive wars. Stories about, or by, white captives who returned to English society, called captivity narratives, were popular reading in the English colonies. The veracity and accuracy of the stories varied, and were often written with a religious or moral agenda. Still, they held some truth and could provide a window, however biased, onto Indian-English relations.

One such narrative published in 1768 described how a young English officer was captured during a skirmish with Indians. An elder “Abanakee” man was poised to kill him with an arrow, then changed his mind and saved him from two younger Indian men preparing to kill him with their hatchets. The older Native took him back to the Indian village, treated him kindly, and taught him their Indigenous language and hunting and fighting skills. The following spring a small group of villagers, including the Indian elder and young Englishman, headed in search of British camps. When they found one, the Abenaki man explained that he spared the young man’s life because he reminded him of his own son, who died beside him in battle. He expressed great anguish recalling the son he missed so much, then calmed himself. He then asked the young man, after everything that he had done for him, if the young officer would still attack the Abenaki. The young man replied that, although he could never raise arms against his British
countrymen, “he would never turn them against the Abenakees, whom, so long as he should live, he would consider as his brothers.”

Upon hearing these words the man told him to go to the camp and from there to return to his father in England who surely missed him very much and would love to see him. This story promoted understanding and peaceful relations between Indians and the English. It also described a short-term example of Abenaki adoption practices. Intermarriage was not involved, but intermixed cultural family bonds were formed just the same.


The 1803 Louisiana Purchase was the United States’s first mainland introduction to the French version of intermixing that involved a significant population of African slaves and some Spanish influence thrown in for good measure. Often celebrated as an excellent opportunity that more than doubled the size of the U.S., and at a significant bargain to boot, it is less often discussed in terms of the intermixed population that it introduced into the newly-forming U.S. nation. Dealing with intermixing populations and policies in La Louisiane caused many a headache for their French administrative predecessors and promised to continue to do so for its new administrators. With the acceptance of the Louisiana Purchase, the U.S. government agreed,

The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted as soon as possible according to the principles of the federal Constitution to the enjoyment of all these rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States, and in the mean time they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and the Religion which they profess.

This implied that all inhabitants, no matter their intermixed ancestry, would have the same rights and protections of U.S. citizens. This was in direct conflict with existing laws pertaining to Blacks and intermixed individuals, such as partus sequitur ventrum. Reconciling French,
Spanish, and English laws would entangle courts for decades. Regarding Indians, the agreement stated that, “The United States promise to execute Such treaties and articles as may have been agreed between Spain and the tribes and nations of Indians until by mutual consent of the United States and the said tribes or nations other Suitable articles Shall have been agreed upon.”

While these promises looked good on paper, the likelihood of their fulfillment proved doubtful. While similar to the English colonies in the intermixing of Whites, Blacks and Indians, the fact that there were a large number of Blacks and Mulatoes in Louisiana, especially those who were free, was cause for concern among many U.S. administrators, elites, and locals alike.

Throughout the 17th to early 19th centuries, intermixed citizens were excluded from the treaty negotiating tables and ignored in the midst of treaty agreements. As decades passed, the boundary line of the U.S. continued to move, and mestizaje/métissage continued, especially on the edges of that moving border line. As intermixing continued, U.S. attitudes towards intermixing became more negative. Just as the U.S. was experiencing growing pains and redefining itself as a country, U.S. leaders were redefining where intermixed individuals fit in U.S. society. Mixed-ancestry individuals were also forced to do the same.

Conclusion

European monarchs attempted to create orderly colonies based on pre-existing ideals and policies practiced in Europe, just as Native groups attempted to continue to practice their customs. Indigenous and European pre-contact concepts and practices of intermixing gave birth to a more diversely mixed society that forced both groups, especially Europeans, to redefine their ideas about identity and intermixing. From the 17th through the early 19th century, the processes of mestizaje and métissage continued with each successive wave of colonial expansion, albeit
more often among the Spanish and French than the British. The intermixing practices of European, Euroamerican and Native populations, especially at the colonial frontiers, influenced ideas about race and identity that were created in the governing centers of Europe and their American colonies. These revisions of pre-contact concepts and practices influenced post-contact attitudes toward intermixing and mixed-heritage individuals for centuries to come.

One fact common to all four areas—Spanish, French, British, and later United States—was the attitude that Indians were never considered equals by administrators nor by many colonists. Yet, intermixing still occurred across North America, no matter the political entity that claimed the territory. Both European and Native leaders acknowledged that rates of intermixing were rather high. As the European empires lost control of their colonies, and Indians lost control of their homelands, views on intermixing and intermixed individuals also began to change. By the early 1800s, Europeans, Euroamericans, and most Native American groups had either heard about or had direct exposure to each other. Colonial societies had developed entrenched hierarchies that left room for Indians, Blacks, and Mixed blood individuals at the lower rungs of the socioeconomic ladder. Once the U.S. gained its independence and incorporated Maine and Texas as individual states, anyone of mixed blood was either grouped with their other heritage (Indian, Black) or expected to assimilate and fully adopt White culture.

The early 19th century was an important time in the history of both border communities, both regions, and all three countries. To the north, Canada was adjusting to the relatively recent 1818 settlement of the 49th parallel as the western border with the United States. Maine’s northern border with Canada was also finalized after a “bloodless” war. To the south, Mexico’s effort to free itself from imperial reign, begun on September 16, 1810 with Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla’s “Grito” in the town of Dolores, culminated in 1821 when Mexico
successfully gained its independence from Spain. This directly impacted Texas when Mexico opened its northern borders to immigrants from the United States. In between, the United States was undergoing heated, internal political struggles, especially regarding slavery. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 marked a temporary truce in those struggles and the year Maine became a separate, independent state from Massachusetts. The borders areas we know today as northern Maine and South Texas were so remote that these communities felt these changes neither directly nor very strongly, at least not at first.
1 Quoted in Jean, “Ethnogenese,” 60.
2 Quoted in Aubert, “Blood of France,” 457.

For additional report notes on Africans, see Tienda de Cuervo, Estado General, vol. 1, p. 443-444.


6 This is not including their colonial claims in the Pacific and elsewhere. The Portuguese were also one of the first exploratory and colonial powers, names in Brazil in the Americas.

7 There is great debate over definitions of identity terms, however, I define these terms in this way: The terms Tejano and Mexican American or Chicano refer specifically to groups of Mexican descent and were used more commonly in the nineteenth (Tejano) and early twentieth (Tejano, Mexican American) to later twentieth centuries (all three). Chicano is also associated with more twentieth-century militant activity starting with the Civil Rights Movements of the 1960s. The early- and later-twentieth-century terms Latinos and Hispanics, can also describe Mexican-descent individuals, but also includes groups from other countries. Latinos refers more to all groups from the Americas who descended from Spanish colonial regions, while Hispanic encompasses the same plus Spaniards. There is also a spectrum of variation within ethnic Mexican (born in the U.S. or Mexico) communities across the U.S. Southwest – Tejanos (emphasizing Mexican and Indian ancestry, more conservative), New Mexico Hispanos (emphasizing their Spanish ancestry), Californios (emphasizing Mexican and Indian ancestry, more liberal). These are generalizations and variations occur within each group.

8 This does not include French claims elsewhere. At one point, French Louisiana encompassed land from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border, from the Mississippi river and west to the Rocky Mountains. This became the later 1803 Louisiana Purchase.

9 The modern-day Canadian Maritime Provinces refer to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island. Grouping these three provinces with Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador provinces, the region is called Atlantic Canada. During the French colonial period,
much of the Maritime Provinces were part of French Acadia, until it was ceded to the British by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713.


ISBN 0521808235


12 An example is German intellectual Immanuel Kant’s *Von den Verschiedenen Rassen der Menschen (On the Difference of Human Beings)*.

13 The term “Tejas” was reportedly used by the Hasinai of the Caddo Confederacy and interpreted to mean “Kingdom of Tejas” by some Spaniards, see Weber, *Spanish Frontier*, 153; It has also been interpreted to refer to a province or a collection of different, loosely-allied native groups. Arnn III, *Land of the Tejas*, 134–39; Europeans used different terms, including Caddo - a shortened form of Kadohadocho – or Hasinai and Nachitoches. These names reflected different groups with shared cultural characteristics who lived in neighboring areas, see Timothy K. Perttula, “Caddo Indians,” *Handbook of Texas Online* (Texas State Historical Association, June 12, 2010), https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/bmcaj.

Although Texas was home to a myriad number of Indian groups, the Caddo of east Texas were one of the first groups to be consistently exposed to a Spanish presence. The reason for a Spanish site at this location, so distant from New Spain’s capital in Mexico City (former Aztec capital of Tenochtitlán), was due to the Spanish missionary desire to convert Indians and a military desire to keep the encroaching French at bay.
Encomiendas were basically land grants that gave elite Spaniards the authority to require tribute from Native inhabitants in a specific area, in exchange for providing the Indios protection and religious instruction. In practice, numerous Spaniards abused the system by claiming rights to the land, tribute and labor of the Indians, but did not fulfill their obligations. In response, Indians rebelled against the unfair treatment or simply moved when possible.

Henri Joutel joined René Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle, on his ill-fated 1685-1689 expedition. La Salle hoped to establish a French foothold from Fort St. Louis on the East Texas coast, northward to the Illinois River and back to New France.

Salinas, *Indians of the Rio Grande Delta*, 164 According to Salinas, no Spanish record has been found that correlates native names with Spanish names of area groups. Nonetheless, at least forty-nine Indian groups native to the area have been recorded. Names of the Indians ranged from native names to descriptive names the Spaniards invented. The variety of names can be attributed to a number of factors. The crossing of paths of both Indians and Spaniards as they moved through different regions could lead to the observation of different Indian groups, as well as the same Indian group being given different names. Also different names could have been recorded depending on if Spaniards asked for a group’s names from a group member or from a neighboring Indian group.


Herbert Eugene Bolton, “Map of Texas and Adjacent Regions in the Eighteenth Century,” Map (Central University Libraries, Southern Methodist University, 1915), Texas - Photographs,
The map depicts communities, borders, and expeditions the full map and close up.


25 Ibid., vols. 1, 372.

Original Spanish text: “Estas dos últimas castas explicaron también cuánto deseaban tener otro padre Misionero que los atendiese con más caridad que el actual y cuánto apetecían el que se les volviese a poner de Capitán de la población a Don Carlos Cantú, a quien habrá como dos meses que lo quitó de este empleo el Coronel Don José de Escandón, poniendo otro que no los mira con el cariño que aquél, pues el dicho Cantú habla su lengua y los atiende y socorre en sus necesidades.”


Original Spanish text: “lo cual entendieron muy bien porque muchos de ellos hablan el castellano y explicaron este razonamiento a sus compañeros, los que hicieron demostraciones de haberlo entendido y quedar gustosos.”

28 Ibid., vols. 1, 381.

Original Spanish text, “[E]n todas las ocasiones que falta esta providencia de tener que darles; y que de quince a veinte días a esta parte ha tomado el dicho padre Misionero la deliberación de mudarse con su dicha Misión a un lado del paraje que llaman el Desierto, hacia la parte del Sur como a tres cuartos de legua de esta población a fin de lograr algunas mejores tierras en qué poder exponer sus siembras y ahí tiene recogidos los indios que actualmente se hallan congregados”


Original Spanish text: “[Q]ue las poblaciones que se sitúan en el círculo de la Colonia, se hallan con sus haciendas y congregas enteramente pacíficas y sus pobladores en buena correspondencia unos con otros, y que por lo que toca a los indios gentiles de lo no conquistado no se teme por ahora novedad ninguna pues todos se mantienen en quietud, y los que entran y salen en esta población no dan perjuicio ni causan vejaciones.”

31 Ibid., vols. 1, 384–385; For additional report notes on Africans, see ibid., vols. 1, 443–444.

Original Spanish text: “[Y] de estos gentiles tienen reconocido, y el declarante [Captain Cantú] lo ha visto, que en una lista que está en el medio de los tres brazos en que se divide el Río Grande antes de desembocar en el mar, veinticinco leguas de esta población a la parte del Oriente, hay una casta de negros lobos que se reconoce se han mezclado con las indias y que de esto puede resultar esta segunda casta, los cuales tienen formadas sus rancherias de viviendas formales puestas en orden; que este declarante alcanzó a ver algunos de dichos negros tan inmediantos como a un tiro de pistola y les dió un manojo de tabaco dejándoselo puesto a su vista sobre unos zacates, lo que vinieron luego a recoger, y a poco rato de venir retirándose el declarante con sus compañeros, vieron una multitud muy grande de indios que cree estén todos revueltos con los dichos negros, y de estos últimos no se tiene más noticia de su origen que es la que dan algunos indios viejos de que proceden de una embarcación que los conducía y no se sabe con qué accidente vinieron a parar en aquel paraje.”


The Spanish crown laid claim to a vast expanse of territory, however, they were not alone. Spanish kings jealously guarded their claims from the encroaching presence of France, England, Russia, and eventually the United States. By the end of the colonial period, a series of wars and treaties dramatically altered North American imperial boundaries. However, these boundary shifts were not always felt by inhabitants in distant colonies. Important treaties included the secret 1762 Treaty of Fontainbleau, which shifted a significant area of French land claims to Spanish control, and the 1763 Treaty of Paris subsequently ceded remaining French territory to the English, as well as Spanish Florida. This left Spain and England as the dominant European empires vying for control of this mainland northern frontier. Ibid., 198.

This situation changed when the newly-formed United States entered the contest after the 1783 Treaty of Paris marked its successful fight for independence, and England ceded all lands west of the Mississippi river to its former colony. This new challenger posed a formidable threat through both the expansionist attitudes of its leaders and its expanding population. Comparing the population estimates for New Spain and the United States offers some perspective. In 1790, the U.S. estimated 3.7 million also, but excluded Indians and counted black slaves. By 1820, the United States population had boomed to 9,600,000. Ibid., 274.

In addition to challenges in the Americas, power struggles on European soil directly impacted imperial territorial claims in North America. Colonial struggles were interwoven with the changes in succession of Spanish kings. After enjoying great wealth and political influence throughout much of the colonial period, Spain’s status reached record lows by the late seventeenth century. Carrera, *Imagining Identity in New Spain*, 32–33.


35 Ibid., 274.

36 Torres, “‘Raza’: Variables Históricas,” 18.

Linguist Sebastián de Cobarrubias defined race in the 1611 “*Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*” (*Treasury of the Castillian or Spanish language*) as “... raza en los linages se toman en mala parte, como tener alguna raza de Moro, o Judío.”

English translation (author’s): “... race in lineages are made bad, as when having some racial trace of Moor or Jew.”

See also the Jewish blood quote of Fraile Torrenjoncillo in his 1674 “Centinela contra los Judíos”, “[Para] ser enemigos de Christianos [...] no import que no lo sea el padre, basta la madre, y esta aun no entera, basta la mitad, y ni aun tanto, basta un quarto, y aun octavo, y la Inquisicion Santa ha descubierto en nuestros tiempos que hasta distantes veinte un grados se han conocido judaicar.”

English translation (author’s): “To be enemies of Christians, ... it does not matter that it is not the father, it is enough with just the mother, and even this not whole, just half, and even so, just a quarter, and even an eight, and the Holy Inquisition has discovered in our times that up to a distant twenty-first degree has been found to be Jewish.”
For the theologian’s quote by Alonso de Peña Montenegro, Spanish Jesuit bishop of Quito, see Villella, “Pure and Noble Indians,” 641.

The tres actos positivos statute allowed noble families, who had proven positively three times that they were pure Old Christians, could be exempted from future limpieza de sangre investigations. The above summary of limpieza de sangre was collected from an overview by Martínez, “Limpieza de Sangre”; An earlier work - considered a classic on the subject by M.E. Martinez - is Albert A. Sicroff, Les controverses des statuts de “pureté de sang” en espagne: du XVVe au XVIIe siècle (Paris: Didier, 1960); For an overview of this work, see the 1962 book review by Edward Glaser, “Les Controverses Des Statuts De ‘pureté de Sang’ en Espagne Du XVVe Au XVIIe Siècle by Albert A. Sicroff,” Hispanic Review 30, no. 2 (April 1962): 156–60, doi:10.2307/472093; For a more in-depth discussion of the topic and the manifestations in Spain and the Americas, see Martínez, Genealogical Fictions.

Limpieza de sangre policies still impacted military academy applicants until 1860, when the practice was finally legally abolished. From Martínez, “Limpieza de Sangre.”

Such was true for the children of Spaniards who married castizos (mestizo and español parents) and moriscos (mulato and español parents). By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, those identified as Spaniard were associated with purity of blood, however, many often had mixed blood heritage.

An example of the loosening of social boundaries was the use of the title of “don” and “doña.” Under eighteenth-century law, the titles “don” and “doña” could only be used by pureblooded Spaniards, criollos, and Indian nobles. According to the 1791 dictionary of the Real Academia, “don” was a “title of honor and dignity that formerly was given to very few, even among the highest nobility, but which has now become distinctive of all nobles, although it is commonly granted to those who are not [noble] merely out of tolerance or abuse.” Regarding gender, this 1791 definition of “don” applied only to men. The feminine “doña” was a separate entry that listed nuns, jewels, gifts, but no titles nor associated respect. This latter meaning appeared to apply to women in the combined entry for “señor-ra” and women associated to men as wives. [Original Spanish of “don”: “Título honorifico y de dignidad que se daba antiguamente á muy pocos, aun de la primera nobleza, y que se ha hecho ya distintivo de todos los nobles, aunque tambien se suele dar á los que no lo son por mera tolerancia, ó abuso. Dominus.”] “don,” Diccionario de la lengua castellana (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1791), 345, https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.libraries.smu.edu/2027/mdp.39015058453575?urlappend=%3Bseq=353; “doña,” Diccionario de la lengua castellana (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1791), https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.libraries.smu.edu/2027/mdp.39015058453575?urlappend=%3Bseq=353; “señor,” Diccionario de la lengua castellana (Madrid: Real Academia Española, 1791), https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.libraries.smu.edu/2027/mdp.39015058453575?urlappend=%3Bseq=768; For a discussion of “don” and “dona,” see also Jesús F. de la Teja, “Why Urbano and María Trinidad Can’t Get Married: Social Relations in Late Colonial San Antonio,” The Southwestern Historical Quarterly 112, no. 2 (October 2008): 134–35.
In South Texas it was later often used like “sir” as a sign of respect. By the early nineteenth century, a “don” title could be purchased for fourteen hundred pesos, and did not necessarily exclude those who could not prove pure Spanish blood. Carrera, *Imagining Identity in New Spain*, 4, 155 endnote #9.

40 Considering the complex nature of mestizaje, it is no surprise that mistakes were made in church or civil records. Or, considering the need for official recognition to apply for coveted positions, individuals attempted to correct “mistakes” in order to qualify. When this occurred, an individual could submit a request for official legitimacy (cédula de gracias al sacar) to the Council of the Indies, and its subcouncil the Cámara. Formed in the seventeenth century, these administrative bodies regularly granted these requests. That changed during the eighteenth century, especially between 1776 and 1793, when Bourbon social reforms imposed stricter social policies that made it more difficult to receive Spanish standing. See Carrera, *Imagining Identity in New Spain*, 33–34; By the late eighteenth century, elite privileges included “admission” to universities, professions, certain guilds, and noble orders; to avoid paying tribute (required from Indians and mulattos, those of mixed Spanish and Black African blood) or imprisonment for debt; and, of course, to prove a right as legal heir.” See ibid., 4; Twinam, *Public Lives, Private Secrets*, 41–55.


42 The quote regarding elite access regardless of pagan ancestry is from Villella, “Pure and Noble Indians,” 642; For examples of central Mexico limpieza de sangre claims by Indigenous elites and the complexity of the issue, see ibid., 633–63; More general information was found in Martínez, “Limpieza de Sangre.”

43 For the “life as imagined” quote, see Diana DiPaolo Loren, “Corporeal Concerns: Eighteenth-Century Casta Paintings and Colonial Bodies in Spanish Texas,” *Historical Archaeology* 41, no. 1, Between Art & Artifact (2007): 28; Casta paintings are the best-known visual representations of the socio-racial hierarchy classifications, and reflected deep-seated, Spanish-elite social concerns regarding limpieza de sangre (purity of blood). The paintings were generally produced in sets of images that depicted a spectrum of various mixes of español (Spanish), indio (Indian), and negro (African) blood. They usually portrayed two parents with their child, and often depicted the family’s socio-economic standing through their material culture, lifestyle, and their work in relation to an outdoor setting. Details about the paintings and artists can be found in Loren, “Corporeal Concerns”; Ilona Katzew, *Casta Painting: Images of Race in Eighteenth-Century Mexico* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004); Martínez, *Genealogical Fictions*.

44 Frederick, “Without Impediment,” 508.

45 The Lower Rio Grande Valley would be made up of the later Hidalgo, Starr, Cameron, and Willacy Counties.


48 Ibid., 164.

49 The quoted list can be found on page 155 and the horses on 156. Ibid., 155–56.

50 Details about Mission San Agustín de Laredo at Camargo can be found on 155-157, with the list on 156. Ibid., 155–57.


52 The Sal del Rey lake was located near present-day Harlingen and attracted traders from north and south of the River, including Huastecans and Aztecs, to trade or mine the salt. For details about area cultural groups and a painter’s rendition of a possible scene circa A.D. 1400, see “Peoples of the Lower Coast and Rio Grande Delta,” *Native Peoples of the Coastal Prairies and Marshes in Early Historic Times, Texas Beyond History, University of Texas at Austin*, March 2009, http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/coast/peoples/ (accessed December 4, 2015); “La Sal Del Rey,” *Native Peoples of the Coastal Prairies and Marshes in Early Historic Times, Texas Beyond History, University of Texas at Austin*, March 2009, http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/st-plains/images/he5.html (accessed December 4, 2015).

53 Arnn analyzes Cabeza de Vaca’s references to different Indian groups and describes their habitat and lifestyles in central, eastern and south Texas, including how central Texas groups would migrate farther south in search of food as the seasons changed. Arnn III, *Land of the Tejas*, 118–19.


55 Ibid., 372 vol. 1.

56 Ibid., 380 vol. 1.


For a brief biography of Escandon, including his appointment as colonizer, and details about the settlements and settlers, see ibid., 27–36.

Ibid., 3.


Craig and Dagenais, *The Land in Between*, 37–38.

An epidemic reported by missionary Father Briard in 1612 decimated Mi’kmaq villages and was blamed by locals on visiting European fishermen. A 1617 epidemic spread through the Maliseet as far as Massachusetts, effectively depopulating the area of the first Pilgrim settlers. This was followed soon after by a 1634 Plymouth small pox epidemic. Puritans viewed these waves of diseases as the will of God clearing the land they were destined to settle.


Craig and Dagenais, *The Land in Between*, 35.

Ibid., 37.

Ibid., 14.

Ibid., 37.
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Jean-Vincent was born the second son to a noble family in 1652 and soon traveled to Acadia to seek his fortune at thirteen-years-of-age. By 1674, he had made both French and Indian allies and was entrusted with the mission to build up pro-French support among local Natives. Although married by Indian custom earlier (possibly pre-1678), he was married by the Catholic church in 1684 to the daughter of Penobscot Chief Madokawando. Although there is some debate, her name is reportedly Pidianske or Pidiwamiska, and her Christian name Marie-Mathilde.
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CHAPTER THREE
DEFINING BORDERS AND REDEFINING IDENTITIES, 1822-1879

“[T]he United States will forever secure and guaranty to them, and their heirs or successors, the country so exchanged with them … Provided always, That such lands shall revert to the United States, if the Indians become extinct, or abandon the same.”  

—1830 Indian Removal Act

“Mexicans … shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted, at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the mean time shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.”


“They [North Americans] are a very mixed assortment…. Absolutely nothing productive will result from it….”

—1853, Arthur de Gobineau, French aristocrat’s Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races that is credited with originating the idea of Aryans as the ideal race

Introduction

As North American nations took shape the expanding geopolitical border of the U.S. led to more aggressive anti-intermixing policies against Indians and Blacks, but had limited impact on marriage practices and cross-border relationships in Maine and Texas border communities. Policies restricting intermixing were influenced by ongoing research in scientific fields and debates regarding human racial development, different capabilities of men and women, and
biological and social evolution. For example, the mid 19th-century writings of aristocrat Arthur
de Gobineau described intermixed U.S. “human flotsam” as inferior to purer Europeans,
especially in U.S. intermixtures with darker “racial elements” of Indians, Negros, and Spaniards.

They [North Americans] are a very mixed assortment of the most degenerate races of
olden-day Europe. They are the human flotsam of all ages: Irish, cross-bred Germans and
French, and Italians of even more doubtful stock. The intermixture of all these decadent
ethnic varieties will inevitably give birth to further ethnic chaos. This chaos is no way
unexpected or new: it will produce no further ethnic mixture which has not already been,
or cannot be realized on our own continent. Absolutely nothing productive will result
from it, and even when ethnic combinations resulting from infinite unions between
Germans, Irish, Italians, French and Anglo-Saxons join in the south with racial elements
composed of Indian, Negro, Spanish and Portuguese essence, it is quite unimaginable that
anything could result from such horrible confusion but an incoherent juxtaposition of the
most decadent kinds of people.4

Known to his aristocratic contemporaries as a diplomat and writer, Gobineau’s ideas contributed
to the development of scientific racism, a field of study that proposed that biological heredity
determined one’s capabilities and character.5 This was coupled with the theory of Social
Darwinism that argued the “fittest,” best specimens of a society were those who were the most
successful individuals. These theories would continue from the 1850s to the 1920s and supported
a biology-based view of race that ultimately favored Whites and the wealthy.

In the U.S., President Andrew Jackson would play an integral role in the early shift
toward a more negative view of intermixing, with his “Indian fighter” reputation and pro-slavery
Southern beliefs, and specifically the 1830 Indian Removal Act. The U.S. Supreme Court would
also play an instrumental role in race relations with the 1857 Dred Scott v. Sanford case. Chief
Justice Roger Taney wrote the majority opinion that formally denied Free Blacks and Negro
slaves U.S. citizenship, as well as associated protections and rights, and sparked controversy
over where slavery was legal in the country.6
In the 1860s, all three North American countries would once again be rocked to their cores by changes that impacted how they would define themselves and how they sought to interact with their international neighbors. In the United States, 1861 marked the beginning of the Civil War that would last for five years and determine whether the country stayed unified or split apart. In Mexico, the 1860s marked President Benito Juarez’s term as Mexico’s first Indigenous president, embodying the hopes of those who wished to usher in a more egalitarian democracy, and who would later defended Mexico from attempted conquest by France. The year 1867 was important for Canada because that marked the passage of the British North America Act, or Confederation Act, that unified and organized Britain’s far northern American colonies into Canada, as one Dominion, within the British empire.

Regionally, both Maine and Texas were far away from major battle sites of the U.S. Civil War, although both states contributed soldiers and resources. Some skirmishes took place in Texas before it was cut off by Union forces from the rest of the Confederacy, and Maine shipyards fell under attack by Confederate ships. The events in Canada and Mexico had minimal impact on these two states, although Benito Juarez did live and work in El Paso del Norte, across from today’s U.S. El Paso, during a turbulent period in his presidency.

Social borders and definitions of intermixed continued to shift. Popularization of a new term, miscegenation, reflected a more concentrated focus on Black-White intermixing and away from Native Americans. The first published use was David Goodman Croly’s 1864 political pamphlet “Miscegenation: The Theory of the Blending of the Races, Applied to the American White Man and Negro.” Opponents of intermixing circulated the pamphlet during the 1864 presidential campaign and proposed using this term to describe the blending of races, instead of the then common word of amalgamation, which pertained more to mixing metals. The pamphlet
appeared to support miscegenation, but the intent was the opposite, “We must accept the facts of nature. We must become a yellow-skinned, black-haired people – in fine, we must become Miscegens, if we would attain the fullest results of civilization.”

Even though it referred to symbols of government-protected liberties, the pamphlet’s message painted a social and political picture that clearly would have agitated many a White Southerner and supporter of limiting Negro rights.

Although geopolitical borders felt little initial impact in terms of restricting crossing, over time, the redrawing of conceptual border lines on maps would have very real repercussions for the identities of individuals who lived along those borders. The northern Maine and South Texas border areas continued to be contested spaces, both geopolitically and socially. Communities that had once been unified were split apart, like the Madawaska area. Sister cities developed on either side of the border that often had more in common with each other than with their compatriots in their own nation. Yet, the international border’s existence symbolized that the communities on either side of the river were supposed to be different. These U.S. mixed, border communities juggled being seen as geopolitically different from their international neighbors, while simultaneously being seen as ethnically the same and different from those neighbors. Yet, U.S. mixed-ancestry border communities needed to assert their difference from their international neighbors in order to claim the rights and privileges of U.S. citizens. This sense of difference was not as noticeable when the geopolitical borders were first imposed, but became more pronounced over time.
Valley Border *Mestizaje*/Métissage

**Texas Lower Rio Grande Valley Border *Mestizaje***

Under Spain and Mexico in the 19th century, mestizaje continued and elites attempted to maintain the casta hierarchy, even though many of the intermediate castas were already well-intermixed. Authorities and locals were well aware that in the neighboring U.S., most laws regulating intermarriage focused on relations between Blacks and Whites. Intermarriage with Indians and Blacks was allowed in Tejas, although still socially frowned-upon by some.

Slavery was also legal in Tejas under Spain and the early years of Mexico. However, importation of African slaves became illegal in the U.S. in 1808. Smugglers brought slaves from Africa to the eastern Spanish-U.S. border and sold them in U.S. Louisiana, where importation was illegal but demand was high. Slave owners wishing to avoid paying higher prices for U.S.-born slaves turned to lower-priced, illegally-smuggled African slaves.

The newly-independent Mexican Republic welcomed immigrants in hopes of populating the northern border region with Mexican citizens and thereby solidifying claims to the territory against the encroaching United States. Mexican government officials accepted formal agreements with *empresarios*, such as Moses and Stephen Austin, who were responsible for settling groups of legal immigrant families. Mexican officials were surprised by the influx of illegal immigrants that entered from the United States. The majority settled in eastern and central Tejas. Some of the European, Euroamerican, and U.S. newcomers adapted to their new home and adopted local customs, traditions, and languages. Others remained within their self-contained communities, maintained their own language, religion, and cultural practices.

The people and lifestyle of the Lower Rio Grande stayed the same even though the name of the geopolitical body where they lived changed from New Spain to Mexico. The communities
were remote from both Mexico and the U.S., but a few hardy souls traveled there to explore the area. The harshness of frontier living conditions was described by naturalist Jean Louis Berlandier on his July 1829 trip when his party departed Béxar (San Antonio) for Laredo and Matamoros:

Held back for a long time by continual rains uncommon to Texas, we left at last on the fourteenth of July [1829] for our new destination. The extraordinary swelling of the rivers [due to continuous rain] and even of the streams often detained couriers for several days. Apart from these great obstacles, we had to conquer another, perhaps just as difficult. Foodstuffs were so scarce and so expensive that, as a favor, private citizens sold us an almud of corn for a piaster, and we were fortunate to obtain even that. Not being very well provided with funds, we had a great deal of difficulty ensuring our existence in the wilderness, as well as that of some fifteen soldiers who formed part of our escort.¹²

On that same trip, as they traversed the area south of the Nueces River, he added that

The traveler who lacks provisions in this wilderness and who is not a hunter would inevitably die of hunger. But supplied with powder and firearms he can find deer, turkeys, hares, and rabbits. Wild horses sometimes serve as food for the Lipans when hunting has not sufficiently supplied their needs…. Numerous herds of wild cattle live on the hills of the Frio River….roaming wild because of Indian raids on the presidios and, especially on the outlying dwellings, whose inhabitants were forced to abandon their animals and their homes. To the number of foods which a traveler who has consumed his provisions can still procure, I shall add [cat]fish….which attains a remarkable size and is found in all the rivers and streams. Among the fruit capable of feeding man I can scarcely mention but the fruit of the nopal of Texas…; the chapote negro…. which is sweetish; as well as the semifleshy capsules of a species of Yucca….¹³

His observations revealed ongoing ethnic divisions in this borderland. Horse-mounted Lipan Apaches raided area homes, and even military presidios, for horses, stock animals, and other supplies. These communities were home to individuals from more sedentary Indian groups, those who still self-identified as Spaniards, and those considered mestizo. These groups had lived in close proximity together long enough for mestizaje to be well established.

Although food sources appeared plentiful for a skillful hunter, Berlandier concluded that “Agricultural industry will never be able to flourish between the Nueces and the Río Bravo del Norte. The countryside does not lend itself to the irrigation which is absolutely necessary in that
For several centuries it will remain nothing but an immense prairie where herds can be bred. His prediction held true until the early 20th century, when developments in irrigation technology made it possible for residents to engage in commercial agriculture. Ranching continued to dominate the local economy until then.

On his 1829 journey through South Texas along the Rio Grande River, Jean Louis Berlandier described what he observed and learned from his conversations with locals. He started near Laredo and headed southeast past Mier, Camargo, Reynosa, ending in Matamoros. Berlandier’s descriptions point to local awareness of differences between different Indian groups, between Indians and Mexicans, and between those who lived inside and outside of town.

When visiting Mier, Berlandier described the nearby Native community and their perspective on local relations and lifestyles.

The huts which form the outskirts of Mier are inhabited by a small tribe of indigenes known as the Garzas, who resemble the Carrizos[sic] in every way. All speak Spanish perfectly, and besides have preserved their own particular tongue, which differs essentially from that of the Carissos [sic]. The chief and his subjects are natives of the municipality of Mier, and have not retained anything of a savage life other than nudity and a taste for travels in the forests. They go hunt in the forest to provide for their subsistence, for, although they are town-lovers and although some of them work, there are still some lazy ones to be found. That same chief of the Garzas told me that his tribe is composed of no more than eighty-nine warriors, and that all have their cabins in Mier itself. Speaking to me of the Carrissos on the banks of the Rio Bravo, he informed me that there are two nations or tribes which resemble each other, but which can be totally differentiated by their language. The Garzas, who have recognized these differences, call the Carissos in the environs of Camargo Yué and those in the environs of Laredo Yemé. All these distinct nations – formerly savage and today reduced to living in society – preserve an implacable hatred of the Comanches, against whom they have sometimes waged war in favor of Mexican towns. Among themselves they live at peace, and I have seen the Garzas visit the Yué Carissos (with whom they seem to be intimately linked) to celebrate their fetes. Some words of the Garzas’ tongue, which I have gathered, prove their difference from those with whom they could be confused.

The “intimately linked” communities suggests intermarriages where shared festivities might have celebrated weddings or other important life or religious events. He also stated that
they “resemble each other,” most likely meaning in appearance. However, Garzas leaders expressed a definitive sense of distinct identities based on Native language differences, even though they may have spoken some Spanish as a common language. This definition of Native identity based on language dialects is a clear continuation of a tradition from previous centuries.

At neighboring Camargo, Berlandier described how the San Juan River/Río de San Juan branched off from the Río Bravo/Río Grande River and played an important role in the give and take of life on this fringe of the newly-independent nation of Mexico. The Río de San Juan “is wide and very deep, but the sudden, fearful rises to which it is subject raise the level of its waters to more than thirty or forty feet, to the point of inundating the streets of the town. A pirogue and a chalana (scow) which facilitate the crossing are found there.” The small boat connected communities on both sides of the river and the river connected them to others farther downstream.  

The Río de San Juan – which is crossed on entering Camargo and which precipitates itself into the Río Bravo on the left bank about two miles from there – is that same river which in Nuevo León passes Salinas Victoria and which comes from the environs of Parras close to the wilderness called Bolsón de Mapimi.

Berlandier summarized Camargo’s history and community,

Villa de Camargo, one of the towns which owe their existence to the protection of the Count de Sierra Gorda, was founded on the fifth of March 1749, four years before the founding of Mier. Captain Blas María de la Garza was one of the first new colonists. Since that period up to the moment when I passed through that town, there had been two floods produced by rises of the Río Bravo and the Río de San Juan. The population in 1829 rose to 2,587 inhabitants. The same industry is found as at Mier and Revilla, with the difference that there are perhaps a few more muleteers. The streets are not very regular, and fewer constructions of stone are to be observed than in other towns on the banks of the Río Bravo. Several are built of earth called adobe. Of all the towns of the north, Camargo is the one which has declined the most since eight or ten years ago.

Berlandier pointed out the dangers and advantages of frontier life that required constant adaptation – flooding, hostile neighbors, community migration.
Its population has diminished considerably, perhaps because of the hostile invasions of the indigenes or else because the founders of Matamoros were inhabitants who emigrated voluntarily from Camargo and Reynosa, seeking the advantages which accrue to a port newly opened to maritime commerce, and which provide them with enjoyments that they had not known.\textsuperscript{19}

Franciscan friars continued to pursue their missionary goals in their relationship with local Indian groups.

The mission of Camargo, although in the greatest of decline, still resists the revolutionary inclemencies of a country which has just proclaimed its emancipation. Three Franciscan friars there still look after indigenes whom they direct in agricultural tasks. On the right bank of the Río de San Juan are houses which form a part of Camargo.\textsuperscript{20}

Missions and local communities continued the Spanish-introduced tradition of raising domesticated animals, although in fewer numbers.

In other times there were several hundred thousand animals of all kinds in the jurisdiction of Camargo. They furnished the clergy with more than four thousand piasters of tithes every year, whereas now all the herds together number scarcely twenty-five thousand head.\textsuperscript{21}

Upon reaching Camargo, Berlandier noted a larger population reflected in a higher number of “ranchos dwelt in by herdsmen” that were newly built since Indian wars had subsided.\textsuperscript{22} Regarding the land, “According to the reports of old folk, all that region formerly consisted of immense prairies, whereas today it is being covered with forests.”

The principal landholdings are situated on the right bank of the Río Bravo, where the municipality extends as far as the borders of some lakes, for in our times the ranchos named Las Animas and Santa Gertrudis on the road to Goliad belong to Camargo. Before the cruel and lengthy war of the Comanches and the Lipans towards the last years of Spanish dominion in these regions, numerous huts, surrounded by fields and herds, dotted the now deserted lands which separate the banks of the Río Bravo from the Nueces.\textsuperscript{23}

The majority of the population engaged in limited farming and ranching of different scales, with the larger ranches belonging to those of previously higher rank in the Spanish military or administration, but landholders also included those of mestizo background, and
possibly even some Indians as well. Until the end of the 19th century, ethnic Mexicans (individuals of Mexican ancestry or Mexican nationality) made up a majority of the population of South Texas, with a large portion being mestizos—a combination of Indian, Spanish, and probably some mixed African ancestry.

The Lower Rio Grande was insulated by distance and frontier conditions, but it would soon feel the changes brought on by immigration waves flooding into eastern and central Texas. Mexican authorities were concerned with the number of U.S. immigrants to Tejas, and their illegal practices, however, power struggles in the capital preoccupied administrative attention and resources. When White U.S. Southerners immigrated to Tejas, they often brought slaves with them. Slavery became illegal in Mexico in 1829, and in Tejas in 1830, so slave-owners created documents that defined their captives as indentured servants. Although technically not slaves, the length of their servitude was for life, so they remained *de facto* slaves. Illegal smuggling through the Caribbean continued, and dramatically increased in the 1830s to meet the booming demand for cotton and the many plantation laborers needed to grow it. Mexico also became a destination for fugitive slaves seeking freedom. In 1832, Mary Austin Holley wrote her cousin, Stephen F. Austin, and urged, “Pray be firm against slavery,” probably unknowing that his settlement plan encouraged slavery. Traveling south into Mexico appealed to fugitive slaves or Free Blacks because it improved their chances of protecting their freedom from being captured and returned to, or illegally sold into, slavery. It also increased their chances of meeting local Indians or Tejanos and intermarrying.

By the mid-1830s, centralizing policies passed by the Mexican government prompted many Mexicans and Texicans in the northern border area to push for rebellion. While not all wanted to secede, the final outcome by 1836 was the declaration of an independent Republic of
Texas, which Mexico did not recognize. Nonetheless, the Anglo immigrants from the U.S. soon dominated the new republic’s government, and promptly forgot the contributions of their Tejano neighbors and the promises they made to Tejano supporters. As a result, many of U.S. Anglo customs became institutionalized as laws, including the the first law prohibiting intermarriage passed in 1837.

It shall not be lawful for any person of European blood or their descendants, to intermarry with Africans, or the descendants of Africans; and should any person as aforesaid violate the provisions of this section such marriage shall be null and void, and the parties … shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor and punished as such.28

A clear distinction is noted between Europeans and Africans, and their respective descendants. However, in reality, the degree of mestizaje in frontier communities, even since the more recent immigration waves of the 1820s, made the distinction rather complicated. Previous immigrants to South Texas were few in number and interacted with Tejanos as neighbors and family, and adapted to local culture. As immigrants arrived in larger numbers, especially from the U.S., they formed self-contained communities that interacted less frequently with Tejano community members and no longer adopted local culture, even though Anglo-Mexican intermarriages had occurred. Over the ensuing decades, Anglo-American views of Blacks, Indians, and Half breeds colored their views of Mexicans as inferior, mixed blood people.

In 1845, Texas was finally admitted as a U.S. state, after years of delay because of heated U.S. debates over the expansion of slavery. Antebellum Texas had one of, if not the largest, population of African-born slaves of any other Southern state.29 In keeping with pro-slavery discriminatory attitudes, before the Civil War, Texas was among five states that penalized interracial fornication and adultery. Four of those states also forbade interracial marriage.30
In a novel set in 1840s New Mexico, a young Englishman, George Ruxton, became infatuated with a young local woman, Dolores Salazar. George was a novelized version of the author, whose male companion in the story discouraged him from marrying Dolores, “[H]old on till you take the trail to old Missoura, whar white and Christian gals are to be had for the axing …. [for] Red blood won’t ‘shine’ any ways you fix it.”31 This is a fictionalized story of the author’s actual travels, but it reflects attitudes prevalent in the decades following Mexican independence.32 In Eastern U.S. minds, Spaniards were White Europeans, but Mexicans were mixed bloods. Their ancestry was viewed as a combination of Indian, and possibly Negro, blood that overpowered any Spanish blood that existed in the family line. According to that logic, that mixture made them inferior to White Americans.

Texas’s addition as a U.S. state in 1845 stoked the flames of Manifest Destiny beliefs of U.S. citizens and leaders, and lead to the beginning of the U.S.-Mexican War in 1846. The idea behind Manifest Destiny had roots dating back to the early colonial period, but the idea took form and became popularized through this term when John O’Sullivan wrote his 1845 article about the “Annexation” of Texas in the United States Magazine and Democratic Review. He argued against allowing any external governments, or internal critics, to “[check] the fulfillment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions.”33 This idea gained much attention, in part, because the annexation of Texas was a decisive issue in the 1844 U.S. presidential campaign between James Polk (in favor) and Henry Clay (opposed).34

O’Sullivan argued that annexing Texas would help eliminate the presence of slave labor from other parts of the country, because it would be drawn to Texas, much like “water descend[s] the slope that invites it. Every new Slave State in Texas will make at least one Free
State from among those in which that institution now exists.”^35 To support this idea of annexed territories not becoming slave states, he showed an awareness of the nation’s expansion and who was populating it by pointing to “those portions of Texas on which slavery cannot spring and grow – to say nothing of the far more rapid growth of new States in the free West and North-west, as these fine regions are overspread by the emigration fast flowing over them from Europe, as well as from the Northern and Easter States of the Union as it exists.”^36

Regarding the issues of slavery, Negros and emancipation, O’Sullivan touched on a point that concerned both pro-slavery and abolitionist supporters – what to do with slaves if or when they were freed. He considered the potential threat of amalgamation as the most serious issue of all. He argued that annexation of Texas presented a solution because it would

furnish much probability of the ultimate disappearance of the negro race from our borders. The Spanish-Indian-American populations of Mexico, Central America and South America, afford the only receptacle capable of absorbing that race whenever we shall be prepared to slough it off – to emancipate it from slavery, and (simultaneously necessary) to remove it from the midst of our own. Themselves already of mixed and confused blood, and free from the “prejudices” which among us so insuperably forbid the social amalgamation which can alone elevate the Negro race …. And as soon as the destined hour of emancipation shall arrive, will relieve the question of one of its worst difficulties, if not absolutely the greatest.^37

The idea of family was important on both the national political level and personal family level. O’Sullivan unequivocally stated, “Texas is now ours.” and encouraged current statesmen to welcome the inclusion of Texas representatives from “the new young State” in the next U.S. Congressional session. “Let their reception into ‘the family’ be frank, kindly, and cheerful…”^38

The state of Texas would be joining the family of previously admitted U.S. states. However, like existing U.S. states, people of free Negro or “mixed and confused blood” noted above, were not welcome in the national nor personal families of dominant culture White communities. He hinted at the “Spanish-Indian-American” populations of Mexico as potentially White enough to
“elevate the Negro race” or at the very least mixed enough to attract and “absorb” them. While O’Sullivan used these arguments in his article, the idea of Manifest Destiny resonated most strongly with the broader public and gave a name to the argument used to justify U.S. geographic expansion and domination of other people on those lands.39

The Lower Rio Grande Valley played a pivotal role in the U.S.-Mexican War because the spark that set off the war was a disagreement over the southern and western borders of Texas. Mexico claimed the international border was the Nueces River and the U.S. claimed it was the Rio Grande River. Intentional positioning of U.S. troops south of the Nueces River by President Polk provoked a reaction from Mexican forces that gave him the excuse he wanted to appeal to Congress to go to war. Important early battles included Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, both in the Valley.40 U.S. troops were stationed all along the US-Mexico border, including the newly-constructed 1846 Fort Brown along the lower Rio Grande.41 After battles raged from the Lower Rio Grande Valley to California and deep into Mexico, the war finally ended in 1848. The formal Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo redefined the international boundary line and forever changed the relationship between the two nations.

Daily interactions and marriages with Mexicans was a familiar practice in Texas, however, intermarriage laws still focused more explicitly on Blacks. An early example of the importance placed on maintaining a separate social space from a group seen as other is the 1859 Texas Penal Code, Article 808. It motivated Whites to avoid socializing with Blacks, otherwise they would be treated the same as Blacks in court.

If it shall appear on trial of any slave or free person of color, for the killing of, or personal injury to a white person, that the person killed or injured was in the habit of association with slaves or free negroes, and by his general conduct placed himself upon an equality with these classes of persons, the right of the slave or person of color are to be governed by the same rules which would apply if the offence had been committed upon the person of a slave or free person of color….
Exceptions were made for minors under eighteen years of age and for slave owners. That same year in Article 906, Texas officially defined “[a] person of color is one who has at least one-eighth African blood.”

The Texas legislature revised the 1837 Penal Code intermarriage prohibition by adding more details in 1858, “If any white person shall, within this State, knowingly marry a negro, or a person of mixed blood, descended from negro ancestry, to the third generation inclusive, though one ancestor of each generation may have been a white person” or if they married that person out of state and returned to live with them in Texas, then they subject to confinement in a penitentiary for two to five years.

Identity terms had shifted from Europeans to Whites, reflecting the increase in native-born White Texans who identified more as Texans rather than with their Euroamerican ancestry. Whiteness was an ambiguous category of identity. Much like during the Spanish colonial period, appearances could allow passing as White as a way around discrimination and up the social ladder. The specification of White ancestors in three generations, estimating twenty years per generation, would date back to 1800, when there were fewer Africans in Texas, but intermixing was more accepted. This could have favored or hurt Tejanos, depending on their appearance and their ability to document their ancestry, much as in the Spanish colonial period.

In spite of prohibitions, intermarriages did occur and resulted in questions regarding the status of mixed-ancestry people in courts across the country. In a Texas Supreme Court case in 1856 and 1862, Gaines v. Ann, a woman attempted to use expert witnesses to claim that she did not appear Black as evidence that she was not Black, and therefore should be freed from bondage.
[The] two medical gentlemen, who testified that they had examined her and could not detect any of the indicia of the existence of African blood in her, but that a person who was only one-eighth of the African blood might not show any signs of the existence of that blood, though in general that degree of the blood would show itself; and that the appearance of the child, in cases of mixed blood, were much more likely to be in conformity with the father than the mother.\textsuperscript{45}

The opposition countered with evidence based on \textit{partus sequitir ventrem}, that the status of the child would follow that of the mother.

The evidence in this case was clear and unequivocal, that the mother and grandmother of Ann were both slaves and of the African race; that the grandmother was a mullato, or half breed; that the mother of Ann was a quarteroon, and slave at the birth of Ann; that the reputed father of Ann was a white man, and she consequently was one-eighth of the African blood … but following the status of [her] mother, she would be a slave, and it would descend, ad infinitum, so long as the descent from a slave mother could be traced, though the [African] blood be of the smallest possible amount.\textsuperscript{46}

While Ann appeared White, physical appearance alone was not enough to win her freedom. The intersection of race and gender continued to play a central role in how intermixed individuals were treated. The legal precedent of \textit{partus sequitir ventrem} reached from the 17th century to Ann’s 19th-century case and condemned her to continued bondage. This decision reinforced the mentality that refused to recognize intermixture, where Ann was \textit{either} Black \textit{or} White, but could not be both. It perpetuated the national denial of intermixture in an attempt to maintain the fiction of the “purity” of the White race and of America as a White nation.

During the Civil War period, attitudes from the U.S. South directly influenced views of Tejanos by associating their mixed ancestry and often darker complections with comparisons to Negroes. In 1864, a wealthy Texan from the Austin area, George Lee Robertson, served with the 4\textsuperscript{th} Texas Volunteer Infantry for the Confederate States of America and described his impressions of Mexicans with his sister.

There is a report in camp that our company has been ordered to Corpus Christi which I hope is so. I am getting rather tired of the Rio Grande and the \textit{greasers}, of all the contemptable, despicable people on Earth the greasers in my estimation are the lowest,
meaner even than the Cummanche. The are ugly, thieving, rascally in every way and to be educated only makes a greaser the grander rascal. I think the whole nation ought to be peoned rich and poor, they would make the best plantation hands in the world. They fear and respect authority and are a great deal moore [sic] humble and less inteligent[sic] than our negroes.  

Clearly not even class distinctions among Mexicans made any difference in the minds of racist Whites. Those who arrived after Texas’s secession from Mexico had minimal to no contact with them and most viewed them negatively. For these later arrivals, every Mexican was simply Mexican, with no distinctions and few redeeming qualities. The quoted comparison between Mexicans, Indians and Negroes demonstrates a common perspective of seeing all three groups at the bottom of the social hierarchy.

After the Civil War, in the latter third of the 19th century, the majority of Southern states passed laws banning racial intermarriage, while most Northern and some Midwestern states were dismantling theirs. These anti-intermarriage laws carried severe punishments, which were often harsher than previous versions. At the same time, policies were laxer regarding illicit sex and illegitimate children.

Evidence that intermixing continued is clear in the ongoing cases that involved mixed-ancestry individuals, and the challenges of defining their identities. In 1868, the Texas Supreme Court recognized the complexity of trying to define colored in the Pauska v. Daus case.

There are various shades of color among the human race in this country, and there is no legal technique signification to the phrase ‘colored men’ which the courts are bound judicially to know. A man of pure Caucasian blood, in the freaks of nature and the idiosyncrasies of families, is sometimes impressed with a dye much deeper than falls to the common lot of his race.

The judge is clearly wrestling with the reality of U.S. intermixture in a society that denied its existence, where even “a man of pure Caucasian blood” could, through “the freaks of nature and the idiosyncrasies of families,” have a distant ancestor of “a dye much deeper” than White.
Whereas, before the Civil War, the court decision determined the slave or free status of a person, after the Civil War, it determined the Black or colored or White status of a person. Considering the limited rights and opportunities, and potentially violent discrimination suffered by Black and colored people, this was an important question with very serious consequences.

**St. John River Valley Border Métissage**

Natives of the Upper St. John River area watched the arrival of newcomers who included fur trappers, Acadians, St. Lawrence River region families, and other European and Euroamerican immigrants. While the Acadian influx ended around 1789, the immigrants from Lower Canada continued steadily. These immigration and later intermarriage processes reflected similar events occurring elsewhere along the eastern seaboard. Early, constant, and increasing exposure to European colonists, lead to an increase in the number of intermarriages with Native Americans according to reports by both Indians and Euroamericans.

Farther south in Cherokee country, in 1810, approximately 10 percent of Cherokee were believed to be of mixed heritage. Cherokee John Ridge estimated in 1826 that 25 percent of his people were mixed. This increase probably included mixed-ancestry individuals who married other mixed-ancestry individuals. Cherokee elders were so concerned about losing their land to White spouses that they passed laws restricting intermarriage.\(^{51}\)

John Norton’s Cherokee family is an example of the myriad ways that intermixing occurred across the country. Similar métissage of crossing national and social borders likely happened in northern Maine. Norton may have even passed near or through Maine in the course of his travels and duties. His story shows the complexity of political, ethnic and familial
relationships, and how intermixed-ancestry individuals could fluidly pass from one group to another. This access did not guarantee they were welcomed, but the opportunity was there.

John Norton was the son of a Georgia Cherokee father, with the same name, and a Scottish woman, Susan Anderson. The name originated with his father’s British benefactor, who along with other soldiers and Chickasaw allies, destroyed the boy’s village in the Great Cherokee War of 1760. He then took the orphan boy with him to Scotland, where John and Susan met and John was born in approximately 1770. John Norton, the son, spent time in Scotland, then went to Canada where he served as a British soldier and joined the expatriate American Mohawk community. He was tutored by Mohawk Chief Joseph Brant before he became a teacher in Ontario, then a trader based in Detroit, interpreter in the British Indian Department, and later a principal chief among the Mohawk in 1807, after the death of Brant. Norton believed, like Thomas Jefferson, that agriculture, monogamy, and Christianity would help Indians survive and succeed. During his life, he served as a trans-Atlantic intermediary between Canada and England in his efforts to preserve and advance the rights of the Mohawk.

Norton married a mixed-blood Mohawk woman, Catherine, but their home life was turbulent and ended in 1823 when he shot and killed a suspected rival. He then sold his farm and traveled to the United States in search of his father’s burial place, believed to be in Cherokee country. He wrote about the people he met, both Indian and mixed bloods, in positive terms. He stayed and lived his last days among the Cherokee. Norton was well aware of the advantages and disadvantages of his mixed-heritage and lived them to the best benefit that he could. He was one of a multitude of individuals who crisscrossed the geopolitical borders between nations, as well as walked the social border between white and Indian worlds.\textsuperscript{52}
After 1820, when Maine achieved statehood and independence from Massachusetts, St. John River Valley residents saw the arrival of New Englanders and Irish Catholics. More accurate counts of local populations reflected the changing demographics of the river valley – larger numbers of Europeans and immigrants from the United States. The exclusion of Indians from population counts and town origin stories reflected how Natives remained outside of these communities, either by choice or not, both socially and physically. It also showed the gradual shift toward the erasure of mixed-heritage individuals from social memory. In this sense, New England influence was very clear.

By the 1820s, anti-interracial marriage laws were becoming more common. Laws restricting intermarriage existed even in states where few Indians and Blacks lived. Massachusetts leaders stirred up controversy with such a law. Opponents of the law did not necessarily favor amalgamation, but, instead argued that the law supported pro-slavery policies and practices. Race was very much a factor, although like elsewhere in the country, anti-miscegenation laws were aimed primarily at Negroes.

The Maine legislature promptly passed a revised version of the Massachusetts ban on intermarriage. The 1821 Maine law stated that “all marriages between any white person and any Negro, Indian or Mulatto … shall be absolutely void.” The language reflects the reality that Maine had more Indians than Blacks. The state legislature perpetuated discriminatory attitudes towards Negros that it inherited from the New England colonial period. However, their view of others focused more on Indians, or at least broadened to incorporate them as well.

Family ties and economics played an important role in changing demographic patterns. Families established in the St. John River Valley before 1800 were considered charter families. Newcomer relatives of Valley residents usually married into charter families. When lumber
camps opened in the region in 1825, an influx of workers followed. Immigrant workers with family ties in Madawaska tended to stay permanently, versus only one in three of those without family ties.\textsuperscript{54}

In 1831, Maine’s governor sent John Deane and Edward Kavanagh to survey the communities along the banks of the northern St. John River. At the confluence of the St. John and Madawaska rivers, the team reported that only a handful of Indian families continued to live in the area.\textsuperscript{55} There was little evidence of the bustling village of hundreds of Indian families reported earlier by French traders. The possible reasons for this decline in numbers are many – disease, migration to follow food sources, migration away from encroaching White settlers, and intermarriage with European or U.S. neighbors. Given the amount of time that had passed and the amount of potential métissage, some of the Indians probably appeared more fair complected and may have been able to pass in colonial society and experienced minimal discrimination.\textsuperscript{56} In addition, shortly after Maine became a state, several Scottish, Irish, and English families traveling via New Brunswick moved into the area where the Aroostook and Little Madawaska rivers joined. Their mutual presence could have contributed to ongoing intermarriage and a whitening of Native descendants or browning of European newcomers.

Along with concern for maintaining social barriers, authorities of the nascent U.S. nation and state of Maine turned their attention to geopolitical borders. As the North American nations took shape and began to more clearly define their geopolitical borders, they also began to try to impose limits on what could cross those borders. The exchange and selling or buying of goods across the border was commonplace. In most instances this was called trade or commerce. However, when the goods were restricted or banned by state or federal governments, it became smuggling. Since the colonial period and before, regional river systems had connected people
from the Atlantic coast in the south to the St. Lawrence River in the north, and everyone in between. An imaginary political line imposed on a river, or the river’s representation on a paper map, was not going to easily change that tradition. Smuggling and illegal trade plagued all European imperial powers in North America. The same was true for the countries that followed in their geopolitical footsteps.

One of the more popular examples was the smuggling of alcohol, made famous in later decades during the 1920s Prohibition era. What may be less known is that the root of the practice of institutionally banning alcohol in the United States started in Maine in the early 19th century. Starting in the 1820s, a number of reform movements developed in response to the dramatic changes occurring in U.S. society as a result of industrialization, immigration, urbanization, and accompanying changes to work and family life. One of these moral reform movements encouraged individuals to practice temperance, or moderation, regarding alcohol. Often spearheaded by evangelical Christian middle class members, these movements eventually reached working-class members as well. The American Society for the Promotion of Temperance began in Boston in 1826 and appealed to “respectable” classes. Maine’s state legislature passed its first prohibition law, albeit a weak one, in 1837, part of a decade old movement. By the 1840s, working-class men also formed Washingtonian Societies. As the years passed, more support began to shift from temperate or moderate consumption of alcohol to its outright prohibition.

As more settlers moved in and the Maine government matured, towns and counties began to take more formal shape. The northern area of Maine would eventually be organized and named a part of Aroostook County – eventually the largest county in the state and simply called “The County.” The name is said to mean “‘Beautiful or shining river”, from w’alustuk, the
Maliseet name for the St. John River. There are a few sister city pairings across the international border of northern Maine. However, the pairings -- such as Fort Fairfield and Perth-Andover, Hamlin and Grand Falls, Van Buren and St. Leonard, Madawaska and Edmundston, or Fort Kent and Clair -- are fairly widely dispersed, especially along the western edge of the county where there are fewer settlements on the Maine side.

The town of Madawaska is located approximately midway along the northern state’s river border, where the St. John and Madawaska rivers meet. There is some controversy over the origin of the name “Madawaska.” The most common explanation is the Maliseet word “matuwehs” for “porcupine” or “Matuwehskak” for “Place of the Porcupine.” These are similar to the words used by the Algonquin-speaking Mi’kmaq neighbors. However, another explanation is the Maliseet word “Matawaskiyak” meaning “where one river runs into another with watergrass.” This is similar to the usage found among a more distant Algonquin group in Madawaska, Ontario. English-speakers’ adoption of Indian words and place names are a linguistic form of intermixing, which reflects the intermixture of the place and people.

To the west of the town of Madawaska, Maine, authorities erected Fort Kent military blockhouse at the junction where the mouth of the Fish River meets the St. John River. It was built in response to the increasing tensions with England during the Aroostook War in 1838 and 1839. The building structure is an older style than the period when it was completed in 1840. It was named for Maine Governor Edward Kent and remained in use until 1845. The town of Fort Kent currently surrounds the fort itself. The town developed as the soldiers and their families moved there, joining the handful of French descent settlers who were already there, and attracted new settlers with the growing lumber industry.
This northern border area in many ways is not a border area because the communities on both sides of the river were closely interwoven long before the border was established. The use of the word “Madawaska” reflects this complexity because it can refer to many different places and people. One reference is the town of Madawaska, on the U.S. side of the border in Aroostook County, Maine. Across the river in New Brunswick there was Madawaska Parish, established in 1833.

In 1834, the estimated population of Madawaska, on both sides of the river was 2276 people in 347 households. This number remained fairly constant through 1850. Along the St. John River, between 1792-1842, according to parish registers, the average age for first marriages between men and women born in Madawaska was 25 years for men and 21 years for women. The average age for those born outside Madawaska, those who immigrated to the border, was 31 years for men and 26 years for women. Couples married to gain independence from their parents, to afford to start a new life on a farm, and, yes, for love. On occasion, the limited spousal pool prompted local priests to petition for permission to marry first, second, or third cousins under special circumstances – when a widower needed help and a female cousin in economic need agreed, when a nephew could assist a family by marrying a daughter, when a young man repeatedly claimed she was the love of his life. In the case of the death of a spouse, widowers tended to remarry more quickly if they were young and had young children who needed tending, but they preferred single women with no children of their own to support. Widows remarried more quickly when younger, but, had a roughly fifty percent chance of remarrying, in comparison to a nearly seventy percent chance for widowers.

Madawaska families averaged ten to fourteen children with one couple, sometimes as many as twenty if multiple spouses were involved, due to death of a previous spouse.
Fortunately, these communities had a low infant mortality rate, but still not all of the children survived. These families differed from New Englanders in their rejection of the colonial custom of hiring children out to work at an early age. The 1850 and 1851 censuses showed that 85% of Madawaska children stayed home with their families or relatives to at least fifteen years of age or more.

Gender played a role in this facet of community life. As children grew older and lived outside the home, they would be listed as servants in those households, usually a median age of 18 for women or 20 for men. Most servants were young men apparently helping with manly duties or perhaps learning new skills from male heads of other households. Young women apparently stayed in their own homes, probably helping their mothers with their siblings and domestic chores. Any additional help that women needed may have been provided less by servants and more through kin networks. Servants, orphans, or lodgers often substituted for children in the family with whom they lived, especially if those children were young, sometimes as young as ten. This interchange of children for training and assistance with household, farm, or trade duties worked to strengthen existing bonds between community families. Sending young people to spend significant time in others’ homes, albeit some of them kin, offered the opportunity to cross paths with potential future spouses, such as lodgers or laborers from across the border, which could then lead to intermarriages.

Across the river, Madawaska’s sister settlement received a new name. The French named it Petit-Sault, or Little Falls, for the waterfall at the mouth of the Madawaska River. In 1850, it was renamed Edmundston, in honor of Sir Edmund Walker Head, a Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick (1848-1854). This represented in exceedingly clear terms the political and social hegemonic dominance of English governance in the Canadian province. Still, border locals
continued many of their predominantly French-heritage cultural traditions of language, food, and religion. The education system in New Brunswick took steps towards centralization after an overall review in 1844-1845, and the 1847 formation of a Board of Education, which consisted of the Lietuenant Governor-in-Council whose duties involved more than educational administration. In 1852, a Chief Superintendent dedicated solely to education was added to the board; and the University of New Brunswick President was added in 1871. This evolution of the educational system in New Brunswick was important to the St. John River Valley because, although all Valley border communities valued education, administrators’ approaches to school management was one difference between the two sides. New Brunswick educational administrators used a top-down centrally organized approach to schools, whereas, the state of Maine was more locally-based. Awareness of French and English cultural differences and language needs was a priority for local parents, often establishing schools in the predominant language of the community.

Controversies regarding cultural difference and the proximity of the geopolitical border arose again in 1851, when a stronger temperance law, known as the “Maine Law” passed in Maine’s state legislature. By 1855, almost half of U.S. states and territories had passed alcohol prohibition laws, often called “Maine Laws,” with approximately four more supporting the practice without a law on the books. Most of the areas with prohibition laws were northern states and territories, but also included Texas. Maine was the first dry state in the United States and remained so almost continuously until 1933. Differences between French and Mexican Catholic and Anglo Protestant attitudes towards alcohol formed cultural boundaries in both Maine and Texas. The demand for alcohol for Catholic religious and ethnic cultural traditions soon lead to smuggling across both borders. Locals subverted dominant U.S. authority both by
using geopolitical borders to their advantage for smuggling and by ignoring imposed cultural
boundaries by preserving local cultural practices.

French-descent Mainers often opposed these laws, even when they were members of
church temperance groups, because they supported drinking in moderation and abstinence by
choice. For the predominantly Catholic residents along the St. John River, drinking alcohol was
not seen as a sin because it was an accepted part of daily life. Wine was used in religious mass
services and alcohol for medicinal purposes. Smuggling, therefore, became common and
eventually very lucrative, especially as prohibition spread across the country and demand for
illegal alcohol increased.

Along with passing stricter laws regarding alcohol consumption, the Maine legislature
passed new laws regarding intermarriage. In 1857, the Maine 1821 prohibition of intermarriage
was revised for the first time.

Section 3. No white person shall intermarry with a negro, indian, or mulatto; and no
insane person or idiot shall be capable of contracting marriage.

Section 9. When residents of this state, with intent to evade the preceding provisions, and
to return and reside here, go into another state or country, and there have their marriage
solemnized, and afterwards return and reside here, such marriage shall be void in this
state.

Section 13. If any person commissions as aforesaid, knowingly and willfully joins
persons in marriage contrary to the provisions of this chapter, he shall forfeit the sum of
one hundred dollars…. and is forbidden from joining any persons in marriage after such
recovery.

Section three specified groups that were prohibited from intermarrying, including insane
people and idiots in the same group as Negroes, Indians, and Mulattoes. Section nine prohibited
couples from getting legally married in another state then returning to Maine to live as a married
couple. Section thirteen outlined that a person who wed an interracial couple would be fined and
forbidden from conducting any future marriages.
While state authorities attempted to impose social barriers and ideas of difference by imposing intermarriage prohibitions, local tradition and culture continued basically unchanged. The residents of the upper St. John River Valley still remembered being one area, before the geopolitical border was redefined. The people there had been called Madawaskan or Madawaskayan, although this term is probably more commonly used on the Canadian side. Evidence of this reached to the 20th century, when asked to identify himself, one elder resident of Madawaska, Maine responded, “"C'est Madawaskayan!””. There is a recognition by residents on both sides of the river of a common cultural heritage. This shared cultural and geographic past is expressed on the U.S. side through the term Greater Madawaska area.

Some Maine government authorities, primarily White Anglos men, viewed this cultural pride as a threat from an other group against the preferred dominant culture. Many state political leaders, in addition to being anti-alcohol, were also anti-Catholic. This did not bode well for the predominantly-Catholic, far-northern border inhabitants. While, like their colonial ancestors, being out of sight and often out of mind meant they could escape surveillance more easily, their very distance also made them a mystery and heightened distrust among those unfamiliar with them.

Redefining U.S. Social and Geopolitical Borders

U.S. Growth in Size and Population

Supporters of Manifest Destiny and the expansion of the United States – whether for access to natural resources, more territory, expansion of slavery, divine destiny, or other reasons – achieved their goal of acquiring land from coast to coast on which Americans could spread and
dominate. Census records reveal that in 1840, the continental United States consisted of approximately 1,792,223 sq miles area. By 1850, this increased to 2,997,119 sq miles. The approximately 1,204,896 square miles were due to the addition of Texas’s approximately 318,000 square miles, Oregon Treaty’s approximately 308,000 square miles, and the post U.S.-Mexico War accession of approximately 523,000 square miles. In John O’Sullivan’s article about Texas annexation that introduced the phrase “Manifest Destiny,” he exaggerated some aspects for dramatic effect. However, his reference to the millions of people in the U.S. was accurate. A similarly dramatic shift was seen in population statistics. The continental U.S. population numbered approximately 17,069,453 in 1840, with an estimated 9.73 population per square mile. In 1850, population figures increased to 23,191,876, but with a decrease to 7.88 population per square mile.

In 1850, the majority were born in the U.S. and approximately 2,245,000, or almost 10%, were foreign-born. According to U.S. immigration figures, an estimated 599,000 people immigrated to the U.S. between 1831 and 1840. This number increased dramatically in the following decade, 1841-1850, to 1.7 million people. This increase was reflected in annual immigration estimates of 52,000 in 1843 and 235,000 in 1847, with numbers consistently above 200,000 through 1857.

Though notable as these numbers were, they were still a relatively small percentage of the total U.S. population. Plus, with the annexation of additional territory, the prevailing attitude was that there was plenty of space for everyone. This conveniently assumed the absence of Native Americans. Unlike immigrants from abroad, which were of minimal concern, Indians were already within U.S. borders from the days of the inception of the country. The U.S. chose to
isolate Indian peoples and incorporate their land, continuing the English practice of maintaining separate social and physical spaces from groups considered other.

1830 Indian Removal

Throughout most of the 19th century, the U.S. government was preoccupied with Native American relations. Unfortunately, those relations were often violent because U.S. settlers, land speculators and politicians wanted the land that Natives had called home for centuries. The expanding U.S. population intensified the greed for land and prompted some Congressional leaders to pursue a policy of Indian removal. Strongly supported and eagerly signed by President Andrew Jackson, the 1830 Indian Removal Act promised that “the United States will forever secure and guaranty to them, and their heirs or successors, the country so exchanged with them … Provided always, That such lands shall revert to the United States, if the Indians become extinct, or abandon the same.” The language states “their heirs and successors” as if identifying “Indians” was a simple matter, when in fact there were many different Indian groups who had been intermixing with their non-Indian neighbors, both Black and White for generations. The possible loss of land due to extinction would prompt government-backed policies and wars toward that end. Possible extinction and loss of land would also create identity issues for later generations who had to prove their Indianness after years of intermarriage.

This 1830 forced migration policy was a concerted effort to remove the full-blood and mixed-blood Indians to western lands. Some mixed-blood Indians raised in close contact with their White parents and culture gained access to spheres of influence on the East Coast, where they worked to preserve the rights of their fellow Indians. However, their mixed ancestry and adoption of dominant White culture made many mixed-blood Native leaders unwelcome among
both Whites and Indians. Many Whites considered them too Indian to be White; and Native
traditionalists considered them too White to be fully Indian. They experienced the common
circumstance of being caught between two worlds and accepted fully in neither. Specific tracts of
land were set aside for them in the designated Indian territory for “Half Breeds of the Owahas,
Ioways, and Otoes” and “the Sacs and Foxes.”85

The South Texas and northern Maine border communities were not directly impacted by
the 1830 Indian Removal Act, or similar discriminatory policies directed at African Americans,
but these distant lands felt the ripple effects when they were treated as other due to their
intermixed ancestry or difference from the dominant culture. Communities on both borders had
lived in those areas for generations, had intermixed with Indians and Africans, or their
descendants, and had been incorporated into the country along with the land. Indians were
already on the land when foreign leaders designated it as a European colony or later as a U.S.
state. A few Africans arrived as free individual, or perhaps gained their freedom, but most
arrived as and remained slaves. In both areas, a European or U.S. governing entity chose to bring
them into the body of the colony or country.

This acceptance within the geopolitical borders on the one hand, did not mean automatic
social acceptance. African Americans were too numerous and integrated into the economy to
physically remove them from society, even though the Liberia movement tried. However, they
and their mixed-ancestry children were moved to the edges of acceptable society through
policies like partus sequitur ventrum. With Indians, a massive number of them were physically
moved to the geopolitical edges of society in the West. By the same 1830 Indian Removal Act,
they and their mixed-ancestry children were also moved to the edges of U.S. society because
they could no longer be present to lobby for their rights, and because of their darker skin and
associated negative character attributes. These discriminatory attitudes and treatment of Indians and Blacks would carry over to other groups seen as darker or different, especially when they were living on coveted land or possessed valuable resources, including potential as manual laborers. These attitudes and practices would definitely come into play in U.S. relations with Mexico and with U.S. settlers moving to areas dominated by Mexican-descent communities.

1842 Webster-Ashburton Treaty

Tensions along the northern Maine border were based less on race and more on economics and nationality, and escalated into an international conflict known as the 1838 Aroostook War, or the Bloodless Aroostook War. The lumber industry was the economic lifeblood of the border economy and the St. John River played an important role in those economic endeavors. Competition was intense and pressure was high to clear and deliver the timber downstream within the small window of time before the St. John River froze for the winter. As often happened, conflict over land claims and access to lucrative resources sparked conflict. Competing timber-harvesting parties disagreed over where the international boundary line was, so tensions flared when Maine groups complained to the Maine governor that Canadians were illegally cutting trees in the area and Canadian officials expressed local claims that U.S. lumber groups were trespassing on British Canadian territory. Both the British and U.S. governments sent troops to the vaguely defined border area to quell the tensions, when the U.S. established Fort Kent. Both nations hoped to avoid a war.

International negotiations resulted in the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842 that averted further escalation of the hostilities, and finalized the international boundary. Far from being the first inhabitants of this land, U.S. settlers soon came to control it through dominating political
and economic positions of power. This conflict made no significant changes to social boundaries, but had a lasting impact on the U.S.-Canada geopolitical boundary. The fires of this “war” were stoked more by economic motives rather than racial ones, and the government powers on both sides of the border were Anglo-dominant, Protestant, English-speakers. Many of those instigating the conflict probably saw themselves as more similar than different, unlike the people and war that the U.S. waged with Mexico.

1848 Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo

Commonly known in the U.S. as the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the official name of the treaty is the Tratado de Paz, Amistad, Limites y Arreglo definitivo entre la República Mexicana y los Estados Unidos de América (Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits and Final Settlement between the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America). The title is the same in the U.S. except for the small detail that “United States” is listed before Mexico. Like the sentiment embodied by the name, the agreement marked a final end to the war and clarified geopolitical borderline details. Unlike the name, a spirit of peace and friendship, unfortunately, would be largely absent from the relations between many of the descendants of both countries for generations to come. The geographic area that was known as the Spanish northern frontier and later as northern Mexico, became known as the U.S. Southwest and included the entire states that would become Texas, California, Utah, and Nevada, almost all of Arizona and New Mexico, and part of Colorado and Wyoming. This new border line redefined homelands for future generations, plus a final change by the 1854 Gadsden Purchase that added territory to southern Arizona and New Mexico for a proposed U.S railroad.
The geopolitical boundary line was defined by natural landmarks, usually rivers, and previously published maps, some dating to the 1700s. The southern Texas boundary was a Gulf Coast and river called the Rio Grande in the U.S. and the Rio Bravo in Mexico. Regarding navigation of the Rio Grande river, both countries agreed that

the part of the Rio Bravo del Norte lying below the southern boundary of New Mexico… shall be free and common to the vessels and citizens of both countries; and neither shall, without the consent of the other, construct any work that may impede or interrupt, in whole or in part, the exercise of this right; not even for the purpose of favoring new methods of navigation.

Collecting fees was also restricted and both governments had to agree if changes were going to be made to the river to make it more navigable.

Notably, no agreements were specified regarding use of the river water itself. This would lead to tensions in the future, as arid areas on both sides of the border were eyed for agricultural development. Agribusiness eventually boomed in the early 20th century in the Texas Lower Rio Grande Valley, and transformed the region’s economy forever. In the mid 19th-century when the treaty was signed, however, the border was sparsely populated and still relied primarily on a ranching economy.

Mexican diplomats wished to ensure equal rights and protections of Mexican citizens who lived on the ceded territory, similar to those citizens who had lived on the ceded territory of the 1803 Louisiana Purchase. The original language of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo provided much broader rights for Mexicans who remained in the newly-acquired U.S. territory, however, the U.S. Congress changed the language to much more limited rights and protections. Contrary to initial Mexican wishes, the final treaty stipulated that the U.S. Congress would determine when these “new” inhabitants would “be admitted at the proper time,” namely through
statehood. Nonetheless, Article VIII included protections for Mexican citizens whose homes
were located on land that was now considered inside the United States borders.

In the said [U.S.] territories, property of every kind, now belonging to Mexicans not
established there, shall be inviolably respected. The present owners, the heirs of these,
and all Mexicans who may hereafter acquire said property by contract, shall enjoy with
respect to it guarantees equally ample as if the same belonged to citizens of the United
States.

Article IX described the status of Mexicans who stayed in their homes on land now ceded to the
U.S., and the rights they would have in their new country.

“Mexicans … shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted,
at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment
of all rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the
Constitution; and in the mean time shall be maintained and protected in the free
enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion
without restriction.”96

This vague acceptance as future U.S. citizens reflected U.S.-elite uncertainty of where Mexicans
fit into U.S. society because of their mixed ancestry. These protections were the ideal, but often
not the reality. Technically, they were to be treated as citizens but their assimilability and
trustworthiness were considered questionable, especially if international conflicts erupted with
Mexico again. As a result, national leaders delayed transitioning predominantly Mexican areas
from territories to states.

U.S. politicians were conflicted over this new acquisition. It added more land for
expansion and exploitation, but it escalated tensions regarding expansion of slavery. It also
introduced a new population that U.S. dominant culture considered undesirable mixed bloods.
Concerns began to rise over other descent communities continuing their cultural practices within
U.S. borders.

Like the Indians, Mexicans had already been living on the land long before the U.S.
acquired it, and, like Indians and Blacks, were brought within its boundaries by U.S. citizens or
through government action. However, Mexicans did not neatly fit into existing *other* categories of Indian or Black. All three groups spanned a spectrum of very light to very dark complexion that resulted in complex identities. Mexicans were particularly puzzling because of their long and acknowledged history of intermarriage. Mexicans were dark skinned, with possible African heritage, and definite Indian ancestry, but also had White European blood of Spaniards.

South Texas Mexicans, unlike Blacks and Indians, already lived in an area at the geopolitical edges of the nation. Due to deep-rooted colonial antagonisms, their Spanish ancestry was considered less favorable than the “American” pre-dominantly English heritage, but was still White compared to Indians and Blacks. Their Indian ancestry was viewed negatively, but was still “better” than being Black, but some Mexicans were almost as dark as Blacks. The closest parallel from U.S. history was Native Americans, who were also born on land the U.S. acquired and were considered a foreign culture, with a foreign language and religion. Some Mexican and Indian groups in the now U.S. Southwest looked similar, many shared Spanish last names. Yet, Mexicans were still seen and identified differently from Indians in Indian territory or on reservations. After the controversy over Indian Removal with Half breeds and ongoing conflicts with Indians, Mexicans were considered yet another problematic group of mixed bloods.

Along with this racial or ethnic identity confusion, Mexicans introduced a new aspect to views of *others* within the U.S. - the sense of *other* as a foreigner based on nationality. Awareness of foreign nationals on U.S. soil had existed since the earliest days of the Republic and the earlier colonial period. These were European immigrants born abroad and the majority arrived of their own choice. The incorporation of Mexicans introduced a new element into the puzzle of U.S. identity. The newly-formed U.S. Southwest hosted a population from an independent, internationally-recognized nation who were born on the land that was now part of
the United States. While they had the choice to remain on the land or move south of the revised northern border of Mexico, many felt compelled to stay on the land of the birth, outside the country of their birth. They were foreigners, but they were not immigrants in the traditional sense. Nationality had now become a new category of identity of others brought into or born within U.S. borders.

**Conclusion**

Living in a borderland made a difference for both Indians and Europeans in that it encouraged, and often required, frequent cultural and biological mestizaje, in order for communities to survive on the frontier. In the preceding colonial period under Spain, trying to create an orderly society in colonial capitals was difficult, but enforcing a casta or hierarchical social system was even more of a challenge on a frontier hundreds of miles away with limited governmental supervision and different priorities - namely daily survival, in a sometimes harsh environment, with often hostile neighbors. Nonetheless, in colonial South Texas and northern Maine, friendly relationships did develop between some of the sedentary or nomadic Indian groups, and Europeans or mixed-blood individuals in presidios or missions or settlements, as well as a few Africans. Both regions shared common colonial frontier experiences and intermixing roots.

An important difference is how each area became a U.S. state. Maine’s addition was a rather smooth transition from being part of Massachusetts to gaining separate status in 1820. Its border line was finalized with a “war” in the St. John River Valley that ended with a peaceful international resolution. The border line change involved a relatively small amount of territory. Texas was just the opposite; with military battles at several stages of its political evolution from
Spanish province to Mexican state to independent republic to U.S. state. The U.S.-Mexico geopolitical border was finalized after a skirmish in the Lower Rio Grande Valley escalated to massive military engagements across the U.S. and Mexico that ended with a cession of territory that dramatically altered the face of two countries, tarnishing relations of neighboring nations. Some U.S. leaders self-indulgently interpreted the defeat and devastating loss of territory as evidence of the superiority of White Americans a part of Manifest Destiny where the reality was much more complex than that.

All three themes of identity, *mestizaje*, and borders came together like never before as social and geographic borders were sharpened and more strictly enforced. The U.S. mainland reached its geographic limits, including the 1867 purchase of Alaska. U.S. leaders began to worry about what to do with undesirable groups of people within its borders, some of whom were no longer simply out in the distant, mythical West, but were becoming neighbors as more Anglo Americans migrated in that direction.

It was a period of redefining neighbors, *others*, and acceptable U.S. citizens. In a continuation of the existing socio-economic power structure dating from the “founding fathers,” those considered acceptable citizens of pure, respectable character and best qualified to be social leaders were White, Anglo Saxon, Protestant men, with wealth. *Others* were seen as of a different race, ethnicity, gender or intermixed combination. Earlier experience with slaves and Indians established the legal precedent of categorizing mixed-heritage individuals as either/or, not both or more.

Previous experience also showed the complicated yet influential role that mixed bloods could play in fighting for rights of their *other* ancestral group. Accepting mixed heritage individuals as equals opened the door to potentially accepting full bloods as equals, which was
absolutely unacceptable, especially in the case of Blacks. Even if a mixed-heritage individual could pass as White, the knowledge of their mixed heritage usually precluded full acceptance in U.S. society. The only possible exception was if they were from a high economic class. Institutionalizing the practice of categorizing all mixed-heritage individuals according to their other heritage was added to the list of multiple identity factors by which people could be labeled other – physical appearance, national origin, religion, gender, and economic class.

The Indian Removal Act of 1830, earlier African slave statutes, treatment of Mexicans after the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, and distrust of mixed-blood Indians made it very clear that official U.S. policy was to keep non-White others outside the social borders of White society, literally and figuratively. Tensions over slavery and what to do with Blacks continued to escalate in the 1850s, culminating in the Civil War. Blacks were now free and had to be fit in U.S. society somewhere.

Border communities experienced being treated as other, but anti-miscegenation (anti-intermixture) sentiments focused more on Negroes and Indians. The 1830 Indian Removal Act coupled with the policy of partus effectively and legally erased any gray area regarding the status of mixed bloods in U.S. society. Native Americans and many of their prominent “half breed” leaders were moved physically outside of U.S. borders to western Indian country and kept symbolically outside U.S. social borders. The same was true for children born to Black, slave, and Indian mothers. The children’s status became that of their mothers. As North American empires transformed into nation-states and imperial frontiers into national borders, U.S. identity was also changing and elite leaders were unwilling to accept intermixture as part of it. As in previous centuries, many settlers and citizens on the borders were still more open to intermixture.
Intermixing in formerly French or Spanish colonial societies opened the door for mixed-blood Indians to be incorporated into the dominant society, particularly if they were light-completed and wealthy. However, in English and U.S. societies, intermixing with Indians led to expulsion in 1830. Full-blood and mixed-blood Indians were moved outside the social borders of “acceptable” U.S. society by physically removing them beyond the geopolitical borders of the U.S. heartland. Accepting intermixed Indians into dominant White society carried the perceived threat of the potential acceptance of groups intermixed with Blacks, which was utterly unacceptable. Incorporation of Blacks, even mixed-blood, and therefore incorporation of intermixed groups of any kind, became unacceptable in U.S. dominant society.

The French-descent communities of northern Maine and the Mexican-descent communities of South Texas were considered foreign and other by dominant U.S. cultural groups even though they had lived on these home lands for generations. Most of the residents on those borders were mixed heritage combinations of European and Indians, and possibly some African. The earlier and longer exposure to English- and U.S.-dominated societies in Maine hastened the practice of downplaying mixed heritage to avoid discrimination. In addition, the prevalence of European diseases and warfare killed many Natives and thereby may have minimized the amount of Indigenous ancestry in those communities, either through ongoing intermixing or through self segregation to avoid more disease and warfare. In Texas, disease definitely killed Natives, but the number of Europeans was much smaller by comparison, so Indians continued to be the primary other group in those intermixed communities.

Although government authorities in both states preferred to maintain a strict social hierarchy and separation of groups, intermixing continued. As both areas transitioned into U.S. states, dominant cultural ideas of race as based in ancestry and blood began to reach these
communities. These ideas were continuations of views of others carried over from Europe (difference based on religion and class and character), that then became closely-associated more to skin color and the body with the introduction of the African slave trade, and ongoing interactions with Indians and mixed-heritage individuals. The French of Maine were other because of their religion, language, and culture. They could also have been seen as different because of intermixing with Indians, but this was probably not brought up because Indian-ancestry was denied to avoid discrimination and association with Indians and mixed bloods who had been moved West. The Mexicans of Texas were also seen as other because of their religion, language, and culture. While some were light complected and could pass as White, others showed the darker skin and physical features of intermixed heritage. Both Mainers of French descent and Texans of Mexican descent tried to adapt to the changing political identities of their homeplaces. Still, no matter how much they tried or how long they had lived on the land, dominant U.S. society and their fellow U.S. neighbors saw them as other.

Over time, each border area coalesced into a chain of biologically and culturally intermixed border communities. Maine border communities took on a “whiter” identity earlier than Texas due to the largely absent presence of Africans and the earlier encounters with the British and Americans, who soon outnumbered the Native populations. Physical appearance of light skin made “passing” feasible, but they remained other due to maintenance of their French identity through cultural practices – language, food, religion, traditions. Maine border towns exemplified communities where biological intermixing had reached a point where most members physically appeared predominantly “white,” yet a hybrid cultural group continued to exist, in this case predominantly French, plus U.S. White (WASP: white, Anglo Saxon, protestant) and perhaps some Indian.
Texas border communities took on a more complex White-to-Indian spectrum of appearance due to longer exposure to dominant numbers of Natives under Spanish and Mexican rule, smaller but notable presence of Africans, and the later encounter with large numbers of Americans and non-Spanish Europeans. Physical appearance of light skin for some made “passing” feasible, but they remained *other* due to their continued maintenance of their Spanish or Mexican identity through cultural practices – language, food, religion, traditions. Darker skin for some marked them as *other* immediately, both biologically and culturally. Texas border towns exemplified communities where biological intermixing reached a point where members could appear on a physical spectrum from light to dark skinned, and culturally could be any combination of cultures - U.S., Spanish, Mexican, and Native. While revised treaty borderlines on a map gave the appearance of clear-cut boundaries, the reality was much more complex for mixed-heritage individuals in U.S. border communities who attempted to navigate the geopolitical and social borders at the local level.
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The twenty to twenty-six week logging cycle began in early Fall when “swampers” cleared paths for the choppers, who would cut and haul the trees to the river, then wrapped up in Spring when the frozen river melted and drivers guided the logs down river. However, there was only a relatively short window of time for the key stage of sending the logs down river to market, in order to catch the seasonal flooding of the river that made it possible to try to avoid yearly obstacles of boulders, sandbars, and the Grand Falls that often blocked passage or diverted logs. If that window of opportunity was missed, then they would have to wait months until the Fall for the next seasonal flood, but by then winter was around the corner and the lumber market was subsiding.
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According to the terms of the treaty, both countries agreed to “appoint a commissioner and a surveyor” who would meet within a year of treaty ratification “at the port of San Diego, and proceed to run and mark the said boundary in its whole course to the mouth of the Rio Bravo del Norte.” They were expected to keep journals and any agreements they made would hold the same force as if written in the treaty itself. The purpose of this effort was “to designate the boundary line with due precision, upon authoritative maps, and to establish upon the ground landmarks which shall show the limits of both republics.” In addition, “[t]he boundary line established by this article shall be religiously respected by each of the two republics, and no change shall ever be made therein, except by the express and free consent of both nations, lawfully given by the general government of each, in conformity with its own constitution.”

“Nor shall any tax or contribution, under any denomination or title, be levied upon vessels, or persons navigating the same, or upon merchandise or effects transported thereon, except in the case of landing upon one of their shores. If, for the purpose of making the said rivers navigable, or for maintaining them in such state, it should be necessary or advantageous to establish any tax or contribution, this shall not be done without the consent of both governments.”
CHAPTER FOUR
STRENGTHENING BORDERS AND ERASING MESTIZAJE, 1880-1913

“[T]he applicant, Ricardo Rodriguez, is ineligible to citizenship, for this, to wit: that he is not a white person, nor an African, nor of African descent.”

—1897, In Re Rodriguez, claim against Mexican citizen living in Texas who applied for citizenship to vote

“Ten percent of this [Canadian] immigration every year remains, fascinated by the good looks of our Yankee girls, or vice versa, the Yankee boys being fascinated by the Canadian girls, and they become a permanent part of the population. But that migratory immigration continues, and what is true of New England is true, I presume … [in] other places”

—1902, Charles Litchman, a pro-labor speaker, testimony for 1902 U.S. Senate Committee on Immigration Report

Introduction

The end of mainland expansion led to stricter, more racialized social and geopolitical policies and to the comparison of intermixed groups within the United States with unacceptable foreigners from abroad. U.S. practices shifted from defining social boundaries against groups who the U.S. had brought into the country—Indians, Africans, Mexicans— to defending social and geopolitical borders against those seen as unacceptable outsiders, ultimately equating intermixed domestic groups with immigrants as foreigners. National anti-miscegenation policies and attitudes minimally influenced marriage practices of Franco Americans and Mexican Americans on the Texas and Maine borders. Still, the ripple effects of such attitudes and
restrictionist immigration policies passed in government centers were felt in these distant border communities.

As long as settlers continued to have land to expand across, U.S. dominant culture could ignore intermixing as it pushed intermixed communities, such as Blacks and Indians and Mexicans, to the extreme social or geographical borders of the country and the idea that U.S. society was “purely” White could continue. The 1890 census declaration that all land had been claimed undercut that perception, of both the past and the possibility for its continuation into the future. It became more difficult to ignore the fact that intermixing had occurred within the U.S. for generations and would continue to occur.

Incorporation of others into the U.S. involved groups who had been aggressively brought within its geographic boundaries – Native Americans for their land, knowledge, networks, labor and fighting skills; Africans for their labor; French métis for their land in New England and Louisiana; and Mexicans initially for their land and later for their labor. Geographically, these groups had been either pushed to remote lands on the outer limits of U.S. territory or already lived there. Socially, they were pushed to the lowest levels of the socioeconomic hierarchy through multiple avenues, including race-based policies limiting their free access to work, education, political voice, legal recourse, and any marriage partner they chose.

As the 20th century turned and the U.S. frontier reached its geographic limit, the reality dawned that racially intermixed groups could become physical neighbors as the U.S. population expanded. This disconcerting idea was eliminated by the fact that intermixed groups were still considerably outnumbered, especially given massive European immigration that masked their presence and gave the impression that they were vanishing. Franco Americans could be whitened like European immigrants; Indians were placed on reservations; and Mexicans and
Africans could be segregated in confined barrios or neighborhoods. Intermixed groups continued to be moved out of sight and mind by keeping them at the outer limits of social borders through hypodescent and erasing them from U.S. history. \(^3\)

Just as attention focused on how to keep *internal others* from accessing levels of power within U.S. society, attention simultaneously turned to how to limit *external others*, immigrants, from accessing U.S. society at geopolitical borders. In terms of groups, attention focused first on Chinese immigrants on the western coast, then would later shift to Southern and Eastern European immigrants on the eastern coast. In terms of geopolitical boundaries, initially, coastal borders were of more concern than land borders.

Considering the broader North American borders picture, both Canadian and Mexican borders were viewed as friendly neighbors. Still, there were important distinctions in the treatment of the two borders. U.S. political leaders were quite concerned over the loosely-controlled Canadian border, with its perceived openness contributing to the flood of illegal Southern Europeans immigrating to the northeastern coast. To the south, the Mexican border raised very little concern in this regard, except for minimal staff assigned to investigate potential illegal immigration by Chinese to the west coast.

Regarding North American neighbors, United States turn-of-the-century border policies initially exempted Canadian and Mexican international neighbors from any restrictions. U.S. leaders welcomed both French Canadians and Mexicans alike as valuable workers. Canadians were seen as white and Mexicans were seen as a spectrum from White (Spanish) to a darker, inferior race (more Indian). However, French Canadians and Mexicans both were seen as other because of their Catholic religion and mixed heritage. As the new century progressed, national sentiment would favor stricter U.S. borders with both North American neighbors.
These stricter geopolitical policies reflected shifts in social attitudes and practices. Escalating U.S. border enforcement and immigration policies occurred in the context of changing attitudes toward race and intermixing. Racial, national, religious, health, and economic concerns centered on protecting “pure” Americanness (White, Anglo-Saxon, protestant, wealthier interests) from perceived others and potential subsequent intermixing. This is reminiscent of the “pureza” (purity) standards at the core of the Spanish colonial idea of status and identity, or mésalliance in French colonial society. U.S. local and national policies and practices aimed to restrict physical access to spaces of influence and intermarriage opportunities with elite Whites, as well as access to associated social privileges. As the United States mainland boundaries hardened, concerns over enforcing those social and geopolitical boundaries, and policing who was allowed in, became greater at the turn of the 20th century.

This feeling was particularly true as the idea that the U.S. had reached her geographic limits became more commonly accepted. The 1890 U.S. Census Bureau announcement to this effect and later Frederick Jackson Turner “frontier thesis” speech at the 1893 World Columbian Exposition in Chicago both had profound repurcussions on the national psyche. Although there were still vast areas of sparsely-populated land, the idea of limited expansion created a sense of limited resources and enclosed space. By the early 20th century, Turner’s essay on the importance of the frontier in shaping what was “American” was well known. It bolstered belief in U.S. exceptionalism and emphasized the role of individual accomplishment. It characterized U.S. identity as a one-way, positive, assimilationist, civilizing process that culminated in individuals becoming truly American - White, Anglo, Protestant.

Scholars have since debated the merits and misrepresentations of Turner’s portrayal of U.S. history. Most importantly, he ignored the presence of Native American groups already
living throughout the western territories, as well as other groups whose experience contradicted his narrative, most notably, Mexicans, African Americans, later Asians, and women. Turner’s essay is important because it reflected attitudes of the time, popularized a dominant White Americanization process idea, and influenced U.S. leaders for generations afterward.

With each passing decade, new groups were being introduced to U.S. society. In response, political, social, and community leaders attempted to enforce social and geographic borders more strictly. Teams of government representatives were assigned to patrol the geographic borders of the U.S. in order to regulate who entered the country. In the late 19th and early 20th century United States, immigrants were primarily from China, and Southern and Eastern European countries, respectively. The U.S. federal government targeted Chinese immigrants in the first concerted effort to officially restrict a specific immigrant group. Anglos perceived them as extremely other due to their physical appearance, dress, language, religion, and geographical origin. Chinese immigrant numbers dwindled considerably after the 1882 Exclusion Act, but they continued to be a concern for decades to come. The physical appearance of Southern and Eastern Europeans was often of a darker complexion than earlier immigrants from northern Europe.

Turn-of-the-century imperialist and economic ambitions stirred dormant memories from a recent war with a former Spanish colony - the U.S.-Mexican War of 1846 - and heightened old antagonisms to the point of declaring war again in 1898, the six-month Spanish-American War. Racist, anti-Spanish, anti-Cuban propaganda in yellow journalism newspapers created dehumanizing, exaggerated depictions of Spaniards to drum up support for the war, and portrayals of Cubans as child-like primitives were used to justify a U.S. occupation after the war. This presence was supposedly to protect locals, but actually protected and extended U.S.
business and political interests. The inhabitants of the former Spanish colonies - Cuba, Puerto Rico, Philippines, Guam - were portrayed stereotypically as darker, primitive, often childlike, or lazy and degenerate. This was attributed to their intermixing with Indians. As 19th century Englishman, Lewis Henry Morgan, commented, “It is true they have a little Spanish blood which gives them a beard, but they have Indian black hair, high cheek bones and eyes.” As a result, they, like Mexicans, were seen as enemies by Spanish association, and generally stereotyped as darker by complexion, and thereby as racial inferiors, due to intermixing with Indians and possibly Africans. Hawaii was another island dominated by and annexed in 1898. Immigrants from these islands were often considered undesirable.

Economic motivations were a significant motivation in these restrictive immigration policies, however, changing ideas about race played an even more important role. National origin of “undesirable groups” carried associated personal and group characteristics, which carried negative expectations of troublesome social and political behavior, a lack of personal morality, and little appreciation or familiarity with democracy, freedom and sacrifice.

The general theory regarding races at the time was that the more inferior the race, the more prone they were to fall susceptible to or carry disease, or other undesirable characteristics. Health and preferred genetic qualities, including resistance to diseases, was an important characteristic associated with race and national origin that added to anti-immigrant and racist anxieties. Death from infectious diseases was a serious health concern, and the growing popularity of scientific racism complicated perceptions of how diseases were spread and treated. The construction of more factories due to industrialization, the shift of residents from rural areas to cities, plus an influx of immigrants primarily to urban areas, lead to unhealthy overcrowding in cities with inadequate water and sewage systems. As a result, “outbreaks of cholera,
dysentery, TB, typhoid fever, influenza, yellow fever, and malaria” spread more quickly and more often. In 1900, most TB deaths occurred in urban areas, with 194 of every 100,000 U.S. residents dying from the disease.\(^8\) The spread of infectious diseases was dangerous for adults, but could be fatal for children. In 1900, approximately 30 percent of all deaths were children under 5-years of age.\(^9\)

Fortunately, thanks to 19th-century discoveries of the microorganism origins of many diseases, the use of vaccines, and eventual discovery of penicillin antibiotics in 1928, significant progress in prevention and treatment dramatically decreased the number of fatal cases.\(^10\) In the United States, women led efforts in health and hygiene and community improvements as part of the Progressive Movement. Efforts by local, state and federal authorities in the early 1900s helped improve sanitation, hygiene, water quality and waste disposal, established initial state and county health boards, improved disease-bearing animal and pest control, and promoted hygiene education and universal childhood vaccinations to minimize the spread of these diseases. The desire people felt to protect themselves and their families from the threat of communicable diseases is understandable. Advances in medicine and sanitation helped quell fears about communicable diseases. However, misconceptions associating innate negative characteristics and the national origin of immigrants persisted.

Despite their contributions to the nation’s welfare, women faced gender-specific restrictions on who they could choose as spouses. Due to the Expatriation Act of 1907, women potentially, and unknowingly, lost their citizenship depending on the national origin of their husbands. Women living outside of the United States became aware of this more quickly when they tried to cross the border into the country and were refused entry. This effort attempted to limit intermarriage based on national origin by prohibiting men from undesirable nations from
becoming citizens and entering the country, and also to minimize the number of intermixed children. One of the many problems with this law was that it endured in different forms for decades and most women did not know it existed.\textsuperscript{11}

Anxieties about immigrants heightened due to not only where they were from, but also how many were arriving. The number of foreign-born inhabitants in the U.S. in 1900 was 10,341,276 and increased to 13,515,886 by 1910.\textsuperscript{12} Federal officials were keenly aware of the increasing variety of backgrounds of the nation’s inhabitants because of increased concerns that these newer arrivals were from Southern and Eastern Europe, instead of the more familiar northern European countries of previous decades. The number of northern and western European immigrants remained nearly the same, 7,204,649 in 1900 and 7,306,325 in 1910, while southern and eastern immigrants increased dramatically from 1,674,648 in 1900 to 4,500,932 in 1910.\textsuperscript{13} These figures were most significant for port cities where most of these immigrants arrived, particularly on the east coast and to the northeast. The increase in Asian immigrants from 120,248 in 1900 to 191,484 in 1910 was more important for the west coast port cities. Land border neighbors also sent immigrants to the United States. Canada showed an increase from 1,179,922 in 1900 to 1,209,717 in 1910. Mexico showed a dramatic increase that more than doubled from 103,393 in 1900 to 221,915 in 1910.\textsuperscript{14} When World War I broke out, issues of loyalty became a concern. National and community leaders had to determine who could be trusted among the multitude of foreign-born and foreign-ancestry inhabitants in their midst.

Amid this focus on immigrants, concerns regarding maintaining social and geographic separation from less desirable groups already within the United States continued as well. Given the English colonial origins of the dominant U.S. culture, African Americans were a priority concern. Much like the \textit{partus sequitur ventrem} practice of having the child’s status follow the
mother’s managed to clarify the boundaries of where someone belonged socially, segregation accomplished a similar goal by clarifying where someone belonged physically in daily activities of life. The 1896 U.S. Supreme Court case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* institutionalized this “separate but equal” approach for generations to come.\(^\text{15}\)

Many Native American groups had been moved to reservations the latter 19th century. Some still fought for their independence and resisted U.S. government efforts to place them on reservations. However, their efforts were often stereotypically portrayed as blood-thirsty “savage” Indians attacking for no other reason in dramatic tales of the “Wild West” for eastern audiences, who had little understanding for such “foreign” cultures in such distant lands. Some mixed-blood individuals used the court system to demand what they felt was rightfully theirs’. In separate 1890s cases, two individuals – Jane Waldron and Barney Traversee – requested 1887 Dawes Act land allotments based on different, and changing legal arguments of their status as either Indian or White. Jane Waldron was a mixed-blood who successfully sued to purchase allotment lands in South Dakota based on her maternal Sioux blood and cultural ancestry, over the claims of a full-blood Sioux neighbor. Barney Traversee, on the other hand, tried to sell his allotment land, first claiming his status as Indian then as White. He ultimately succeeded, but had to sever all ties to the Sioux to do so.\(^\text{16}\) Their examples illustrate the complexity, flexibility, and vagaries of the legal identities of mixed-ancestry individuals. Their cases also pointed to the threat to dominant Anglo culture of how mixed-bloods could pass as White.

In the decades after the U.S.-Mexican War, Anglo-Americans viewed Mexicans as domestic foreigners and equated them with more recent immigrants and the associated national-origin undesirable traits. This conflation ignored the fact that they had lived on their homelands, now within the U.S., for centuries. An additional level of complexity occurred when official
policies or court cases pertaining to Mexican nationals, was applied, or threatened to apply, to U.S. citizens of Mexican descent. The case of In Re Rodriguez was one example. Mexicans or Mexican Americans who could pass were also perceived as a threat. This served as an additional motivation to label all of them as other.

Of equally serious concern was the idea that these perceived undesirable traits would be passed on to children. Coupled with the idea that people with darker physical traits – skin, hair, eyes – were inferior, these misconceptions helped justify efforts to discourage intermixing among different groups. This idea applied to both those already in the United States and those incoming from abroad.

Ideas - such as Turner’s Americanizing frontier and the sense of limited space or characteristics associated with specific groups - are central to the process of forming how a nation and people perceive ourselves, the formation of our identites. Ideas of how others perceive us are also important. As shown by Turner’s example, the omission of recognition of the existence of groups, especially in a nation’s historical narrative, is equally important and potentially even more devastating. It would take over half a century before these overlooked groups would be able to mobilize, be recognized, and have their stories included in U.S. history books. At the beginning of the 20th century, many national or cultural or racial groups were still either discriminated against or their presence and contributions were ignored in historical narratives. Nonetheless, these groups continued to practice their cultural traditions and strived to make their voices heard and presence felt.
Marriage Practices (National origin, 1880-1910)

How did historical exclusion translate for the border groups in Maine and Texas? How did these anti-immigrant and anti-intermixing attitudes impact border communities? Immigration, regular border crossing, and intermarriage between national-origin couples continued, but not without contention. Cultural maintenance efforts included transmitting French or Spanish language, food traditions, local history, religion, and cultural pride. The continued use of the Spanish language by Mexican Americans in South Texas, and French by Franco Americans in northern Maine, was a defining characteristic of these families, communities, and regions. This was especially notable considering government and school efforts to stamp out these linguistic and cultural practices. Cultural maintenance was a common familial and social practice in Mexican- and French-descent communities, and represented a form of resistance, especially among those communities that felt threatened by Anglo domination.

As seen in earlier time periods and multiple locations, realities at the local level did not always match the ideal envisioned at the national level, especially in the borderlands. Border locals did not always reflect broader attitudes nor follow the policies dictated by the distant central government. When they did follow those policies, they often did so in their own way adjusting for the necessities of practicality for their location and other neighbors.

Texas

An important distinction in Texas was the influence of the Spanish legal system on marriage laws and practices. The Spanish had developed a system of laws regarding marriage that allowed women to have more legal rights than under the English and French systems. This practice began as an effort to attract women to settle on the Spanish-peninsular frontier during La
Reconquista. Similar to their English and French counterparts, the Spanish believed women brought a civilizing influence to frontiers and were necessary to permanently settle and occupy territory. In La Reconquista of Spain, this meant settling land retaken by the Spanish from the Moors. Marriage and property laws were adapted to attract more women settlers.

As Spaniards settled New Spain, these laws transferred as well. Married women could own property in their own names, manage both their own and their husband’s property, and seek legal redress if their rights were infringed upon. Homestead exemption and adoption were other Spanish legal traditions introduced to the Americas. The Spanish common law system survived through the colonial period into the Mexican period. This Spanish legal influence continued into the Texas Republic and U.S. state periods, when the English legal system was the rule elsewhere in the nation. These legal practices were extraordinarily well-suited to the frontier setting.\(^\text{17}\)

This is not to say that women enjoyed equality with men. In the Spanish and Mexican periods, women were restricted from exercising power over men by forbidding them from holding elected office, voting, being judges and lawyers and similar positions of power. Their status as a “weaker sex” prompted the passage of laws also meant to protect them from economic and social ruin. Inheritance laws ensured widows received part of their husband’s estate, that their property was safe from their husband’s debt collectors, and children of both sexes received equal shares of the inheritance. To protect their social wellbeing, women could prosecute in cases of broken marriage promises and sexual assault. This protected a woman’s prized assets, her virtue and reputation, which were necessary for her to remarry and provide for her children.\(^\text{18}\)

This Spanish legal system continued during the Texas period because Anglo newcomers recognized its practicality in a frontier setting. Many of the early newcomers to Texas were single men who, thanks to this system of marriage and property laws, were able to marry into
elite classes, often above any standing they could have achieved in their former U.S. home. For the land-hungry with no scruples, the death of a husband, by natural or intentional causes, left the property rights to the widow. She could then be wooed into sharing or coerced into signing over that property. Considering many of the men who moved to Texas were leaving debts behind in the United States, as well as families in some cases, it was appealing to keep property in their new wife’s name in order to avoid debt collectors. It was also easier to divide property in case of divorce. Of course, attracting more women to the frontier was still an important reason to keep the laws in place, which lawmakers did into the 20th century.¹⁹

From the mid-19th-century Mexican period to the early 20th-century U.S. period, the independent legal status of women remained, but laws regarding acceptable spouses have changed. A lawyer attempted to compile Texas laws regarding married women in 1901 and explained that

[r]adically different from the common law, we regard marriage as a state of coequality between husband and wife, when property rights are involved. They are not one under our law, but the wife’s separate existence and identity are recognized, and are not merged in that of her husband.²⁰

Regarding acceptable marriages, qualified candidates included “Every person who is capable of contracting, and who is not forbidden by statute, may enter into the marriage relation.” as long as they were also competent.²¹ On the other hand, forbidden classes of marriage included

males under sixteen and females under fourteen years of age…, as are also persons of European blood or their descendants to intermarry with Africans or the descendants of Africans, and such a marriage would, in either instance, be void, and the latter, where the intermarriage is within certain defined degrees, punished as a criminal act.²²

This overt legal restriction of intermarriage with African-descent individuals is an example of anti-miscegenation laws introduced from existing U.S. prejudices institutionalized through the
legal system. At the same time, the existinence of this law clearly acknowledged that this practice occurred, and it reflected the predominant attitude across the country.

Marriages with Mexicans were more complicated because Mexicans’ status as White and their level of acceptability as spouses was also more complicated. In the now U.S. Southwest, throughout the centuries of Spanish colonization and mestizaje, a socioeconomic pigmentocracy persisted. Darker skin usually relegated a person to lower economic social levels, yet money could still “whiten.” Darker skin was often associated with Indian ancestry, and possibly African, although that was less frequent or at least less recognized. While color and class still mattered, in the eyes of the dominant U.S. culture, everyone in the newly acquired territories was simply Mexican. Their national origin was clear, but their ethnic standing sometimes was not.

Marriages between Mexican-descent Texans and Mexican citizens offers a window into the level of acceptance of Mexican culture and the permeability of the border. The demographic makeup of the Lower Rio Grande Valley was predominantly Anglo (generic term used for White U.S. or European citizen), Tejano (Texas U.S. citizen of Mexican descent) and Mexican (Mexican citizen). The increasingly popular view of seeing nationality and race combined into one broadened the view of intermarriage to include couples from different nations.

While U.S. and Mexican citizens of Mexican ancestry shared a similar ethnic background, the difference of national citizenship was still important. This identity distinction became especially significant as negative attitudes towards Mexican nationals increased. In South Texas, Tejanos would emphasize their difference from Mexican immigrants in order to claim their rights as U.S. citizens and to minimize suffering discriminatory treatment. Politically active groups would later work to try to protect the rights and privileges of all ethnic Mexicans, citizens and non-citizens alike.
The 1887 observations of Fanny Chambers Gooch Inglehart, who lived in Mexico for seven years, poignantly described how her U.S. countrymen had misplaced negative views of Mexicans.

The longer I mingled with the Mexican people the more forcibly was I impressed with the fact that they are not properly understood by their Anglo-Saxon neighbors. As this thought grew in my mind day by day, there grew with it a desire to acquaint my own countrymen more intimately with them, and, if possible, secure a fairer appreciation of a people whom it has been too long the custom to decry, but who deserve the highest commendation for their works and institutions, projected and carried out under many difficulties.23

She went on to express a sincere wish that both countries would develop closer, more respectful, and peaceful relations.

In submitting this volume to the people of both Republics, it is with the sincere wish that it may, in a measure, lead to a better acquaintance the one with the other, and that this acquaintance may induce both to realize that they have differences and peculiarities naturally adapted to their governments, races and religions. Each can respect and cooperate with the other in peace and harmony, independent and separate as they ever should remain, fixed by nature; but sisters as Republics.24

Considering the book is dedicated to Carmen Romero Rubio de Diaz, the second wife of Porfirio Diaz, she clearly had an elite perspective in her travels. Nonetheless, her fervent wish points to the fact that many in the U.S. had negative views of Mexico based on ignorance because, as she explained, “In all that I read on the subject, in books or transient sketches, I found that no one had endeavored to minutely describe certain phases of Mexican life and character, necessary to be understood in order to fully appreciate the people.”25

Gauging the dominant attitude towards Mexican nationals is important because it influenced attitudes towards those associated with Mexican nationals within U.S. borders, in this case Tejanos. This conflation is expressed by the fact that Texans of Mexican ancestry were commonly referred to as “Mexicans” even though they were U.S. citizens. Anglo society equated their ethnicity and national-origin ancestry.
Maine

Intermarriage practices in Maine were less restrictive. While Texas entrenched anti-intermarriage laws regarding African Americans, Maine repealed its anti-intermarriage laws between 1877-1896. Based on physical characteristics, this leniency was probably due to the scarcity of African Americans at the time, and to intermixture having lightened the complexions of those with darker Indian or African ancestors. Culturally, French-descent Mainers could still be considered different enough to be unappealing marriage partners. However, in keeping with the federal open-neighbor attitude towards citizens of North American neighbors, one speaker before a U.S. congressional committee viewed marriage between U.S. citizens and Canadian neighbors, specifically French-Canadian migrants, as quite acceptable. In the 1902 immigration Senate Committee, Mr. Charles Litchman, a pro-labor speaker who had previously worked with the Department of Treasury enforcing the alien contract labor law, reported:

Ten percent of this [French Canadian] immigration every year remains, fascinated by the good looks of our Yankee girls, or vice versa, the Yankee boys being fascinated by the Canadian girls, and they become a permanent part of the population. But that migratory immigration continues, and what is true of New England is true, I presume ...[in] other places.

Mr. Litchman estimated an average of 70,000 French Canadians seasonally immigrated to Maine, some of whom probably traveled on to other parts of the northeastern United States. Therefore, he estimated approximately ten percent, or 7,000, stayed and married U.S. citizens. These newcomers were a welcomed addition to the U.S. population in Mr. Litchman’s eyes, but not in everyone’s. For others, they represented competition for jobs and spouses, and potential harbingers of disease and social, ethnic, religious and political disruption.
**Border Place & People**

As border states with both land and sea ports of entry, Maine and Texas shared this immigration experience. While a few of the expected immigrants from distant lands stayed, many traveled to larger cities in the interior of the state or country. At the same time, a few domestic migrants traveled vast distances from other parts of the United States to settle in these border communities. These immigrants from other parts of the state or U.S., usually Anglo-Americans, often had an equally strong or stronger impact on these border communities than immigrants from other countries. As the 20th century progressed, these newcomers dominated the socioeconomic power structure within these border communities.

In both Maine and Texas, the majority of immigrants to these Valley communities were from the neighboring country, often just a few miles away. Some individuals moved permanently, others lived for years on one side before moving to the other side of the border, some owned property on both sides, and others simply traveled regularly back and forth for work, shopping or entertainment. Some of these new arrivals traveled with their families, but a number of them were single, which offered opportunities for intermarriage. Their initial motivations for moving to the area were usually more economic than romantic - opportunities for land and work in farming or other sectors.

These Maine and Texas border communities relied on flowing rivers and economies for their survival. Both areas underwent transportation, agricultural and natural resource developments that simultaneously transformed their economies and ensured that the two border areas would remain rural for decades to come. Cash-crop agriculture was a characteristic shared by both northern Maine and South Texas. In addition to agriculture, Maine’s forest industries and Texas’s cattle ranching continued to flourish, although both would eventually decline. The
introduction of the railroad was one of the factors that most dramatically transformed local
development. These different industries attracted workers from both near and far.

One constant was the presence and continuing importance of the rivers for these
communities. Notably, both Valleys had rivers that also marked an international border. Thus,
workers would come from both sides of the U.S.-Canada border that was the St. John River or
the U.S.-Mexico border that was the Lower Rio Grande River.

![Figure 3. St. John River Valley towns, plus Caribou, home of Sandy Leveck](image)

**Displacing the Socioeconomic Power of Intermixed Others**

Both border areas were primarily rural with a series of small towns. In early 1880s
Texas, most of the towns were located along the Rio Grande River, surrounded by ranches and
family farms. A similar pattern of small towns along the St. John River could be found in
northern Maine. This area differed in that the towns were surrounded by family farms and mills,
instead of ranches. In fact, small farms predominated throughout much of the United States in
the late 19th century. In both borderlands, many towns dated back several decades or more, and
some family land claims dated back to the Spanish and French colonial periods. At the turn of
the 20th century, both borderlands underwent dramatic demographic, technological, social, and economic transformations.

Texas-Mexico Border & Sister Cities

In 1881, as in centuries past, small communities dotted the length of the Rio Grande river. Although the river changed with the seasons or surrounding environment – altering course, rising and subsiding water levels – it still remained the beautiful and life sustaining river vital to local life since the days when only Native Americans lived in the area. Little could anyone suspect how events in the beginning of the 20th century would transform not only the human landscape, but the river’s natural environment as well.

The Texas-Mexico border measures approximately 1240 miles (1995 km) with the Lower Rio Grande Valley border comprising approximately 165 miles (265 km) of that. As the border took shape and stricter enforcement caused officials to close entryways on or near the coast, additional routes eventually developed farther inland. These included a railroad route that prompted the assignment of a group of Mounted Guards, or Chinese Immigration Agents, to El Paso in 1904. These agents were focused on restricting entry by barred groups from Asia and Europe, with minimal attention focused on Mexicans, who were viewed as non-threatening international neighbors, potential laborers and tourists.

Changing Texas demographics clearly showed a dramatic population shift that overturned the previous Mexican-dominated South Texas power structure. Anglos moved in took control of land from Tejano landowners, especially after Texas claimed independence from Mexico in 1836 and later became a U.S. state in 1845. Questionable transactions ranged from intentionally using confusing legal documents in a language that Tejano landowners couldn’t understand, to more
overt violent threats such as, “If you won’t sell, maybe your widow will.” The unjust land-grabbing practices and dramatic demographic shift significantly increased interethnic tensions as the Valley continued to undergo change.  

On the Texas border, Elodia’s home town of Hidalgo appeared to be a sleepy rural community that had changed little over time. Yet, it had been a part of lands contested by different Indian groups and Spain for centuries, then claimed by Mexico for twenty-seven years (1821-1848), including the Texas Republic for nine of those years (1836-1845), and most recently had become part of the United States for sixty-eight years (1845-1913). These changes were each achieved through violent wars for independence, land, and power. Like northern Maine, Hidalgo and the surrounding area was about to undergo a rapid transformation. However, the experience would be significantly more violent in South Texas than in northern Maine.

From 1880 to 1910, the total Texas population more than doubled, from 1,591,749 to 3,896,542 people. Births in Texas accounted for the majority of this growth, from 1,477,133 in 1880 to 3,654,604 in 1910. Immigration of foreigners remained a small, but relatively consistent percentage of the population – fluctuating slightly over the years from 114,616 in 1880 to 241,938 in 1910. Traditional historical narratives would encourage us to visualize these native-born Texans as the stereotypical Anglo-descent families. It is important to remember that many of these native-born families were also Tejanos, especially in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Many were of Mexican descent whose ancestors had lived on the land for generations.

The Lower Rio Grande Valley counties reflected and, in some cases, surpassed the state-level growth. Hidalgo County reflected a dramatic over-three-fold increase, from 4,347 in 1880 to 13,728 in 1910. Cameron County nearly doubled, from 14,959 in 1880 to 27,158 in 1910. Starr County also increased significantly, from 8,304 in 1880 to 13,151 in 1910. The total
population of the Lower Rio Grande Valley remained a small but relatively consistent percentage of the broader state population. While Indian-, Spanish-, and Mexican-descent families dominated the area for generations, the dramatic population increases were due less to natural increase of locals and more to immigration from abroad or emigration from other parts of the United States. Still, international neighbors also contributed to local “foreign-born” populations.

The connections between communities along the Lower Rio Grande had roots dating to the colonial period and these continued to grow along and across the international border as both the boundary and more communities developed. Transborder connections took many forms, including respectful professional ones of newspaper editors, “Matamoros Locals. The editor of this paper [The Daily Cosmopolitan of Brownsville, TX] returns thanks to the Press Association of this [Matamoros] city for a kind invitation to join that society. He takes this opportunity to express his appreciation of the courtesy this shown him by the founders of this valueable association.”

The same Brownsville newspaper listed the eleven papers that were published on both sides of the border—five in Brownsville with one in Spanish, six in Matamoros, all in Spanish. These communities were clearly aware of what was going on in the other town and exchanging ideas, in multiple languages, through print media.

Transborder connections also existed through social networks between suitors and potential spouses. The Daily Cosmopolitan of Brownsville referred to a humorous story about the bumpy road a crossborder courtship could take that was originally published in one of its Matamoros periodical counterparts, El Barbero, an illustrated weekly. Two “gilded youths” from Brownsville tried their luck playing the popular Faro card game in Matamoros, but were unable “to buck the tiger which haunts the plaza de Capilla” and fell into debt. They decided to cheer themselves up by visiting their girlfriends in Matamoros. The young men noticed an attractive
diamond ring on each girl’s hand; proceeded to convince the girls to lend them for the suitors to wear “as a pledge of love;” then they promptly left to try to gamble their way out of debt. Their plan failed and when the young ladies discovered their ruse “fun amid those embriotic [sic] families” ensued.\textsuperscript{36}

Another example demonstrated how some of the cross-border romances could lead to violence. Santiago Soto, described as “a deserter from the other side of the river,” attended a Saturday night dance in Brownsville, also attended by Atilano Mendosa and his wife. When Santiago asked the wife, his former flame, to dance and she refused, a fight ensued between the men. Santiago was fined one dollar and costs by Judge Hune for assaulting the couple.\textsuperscript{37}

Brownsville and Matamoros dominated the Lower Rio Grande social and commercial scene due in large part to their location near the Gulf coast. Other towns would soon challenge that standing as the railroad arrived and spurred additional growth upriver.

In 1900, five years before Elodia’s birth, Hidalgo county’s population numbered 6,837. By the time she reached her fifth birthday in 1910, the county’s population would more than double to 13,728.\textsuperscript{38} The city and county of Hidalgo were centrally located in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. Hidalgo city’s long-term interaction with its Mexican sister city, Reynosa, Tamaulipas and the arrival of the railroad in 1905 ensured that Hidalgo’s prominence would continue for several years to come. Other cities, like McAllen, would eventually grow larger, but Hidalgo remained the county seat until 1908, after which the seat was moved to Edinburg.\textsuperscript{39}

Other Lower Rio Grande Valley border sister cities of Brownsville, Texas and Matamoros, Tamaulipas continued to play leading roles in the area’s development.
Halfway across the country from Texas, in Maine, the Saint John River served as a vital conduit connecting towns along its banks. Its life-giving waters helped sustain the beautiful, verdant landscape. Unlike the Lower Rio Grande River, the St. John River would freeze in winter, offering a different kind of beauty and requiring different modes of transportation and means of moving across or into the state.

The Maine-Canada border totals approximately 610 miles (980 km) and the St. John River Valley makes up approximately 70 miles of that. Maine’s pioneering adoption of alcohol prohibition in the early 19th century also meant an earlier introduction to smuggling. Cultural differences towards alcohol prompted challenges to dominant U.S. cultural and geopolitical boundaries by Franco American border locals, who encouraged smuggling to meet religious and cultural needs. This, not surprisingly, lead to authorities more closely monitoring the flow of goods and people across the border. Federal efforts to ban the passage of illegal goods resulted in more resources being assigned to this northern border earlier than the southern border.

Between 1880 and 1910, the state of Maine experienced a population increase of nearly 100,000 people, growing from 648,936 in 1880 to 742,371 in 1910. A relatively consistent and notable number of foreign-born immigrants were of “Canada-French” origin. The number of “Canada-French” 35,013 nearly equaled the primarily Anglo-descent “Canada-Other” of 41,210 people. While some may have lived in the Saint John River Valley, many moved to find work in mill towns in the southern areas of the state or along the coast. The immigrants (non-natives) to the St. John River Valley nearly doubled in this period, from 18,500 in 1880 to 26,000 in 1900, to 35,000 in 1910. This was significant considering the rural nature of the area.
In the year of Sandy’s birth, 1900, his home town of Caribou was a small rural community near the northeastern border of Maine that, like most northern Maine border communities, had seen little warfare, loss of life, or need for a military presence in the many decades since the 1839 “bloodless” Aroostook War. That trend appeared likely to remain true as the first decade of the new century unfolded peacefully. In 1900, Aroostook County’s population totaled 60,744. By Sandy’s tenth birthday in 1910, “the County” population had increased slightly to 74,664, nearly 14,000 people or a 5% increase. Keep in mind that Aroostook County was considerably larger than Hidalgo County in square miles, Aroostook County had vast areas of uninhabited forest. The most northern and central community, Madawaska, had a population of 1,391 in 1880 and grew to 1831 in 1910.

Northern Maine’s sister city connections historically had been and continued to be important to the survival of the communities on both sides of the border. The pairings between Madawaska, Maine and Edmundston, New Brunswick, and Van Buren, Maine with Saint Leonard, New Brunswick became especially important for local economies. Madawaska, Maine’s sister city of Edmundston, New Brunswick was part of Madawaska Parish in Madawaska County. The sharing of place names on both sides of the border acts as a reminder of the previously unified nature of this now transborder area. By 1898, Edmundston was a port of entry and an important connection in the Canadian railroad system. It was a terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and a junction for the Temiscouta Railway. This contributed to the town’s growth and led to its official incorporation in 1905.
Railroads and Changing Identity Connections

Both South Texas and northern Maine experienced events that were occurring across the state and country, particularly the spread of the technological marvel of the railroads. These rail lines connected many of the small, agricultural towns along the border as they provided a cost effective way to ship cash crops to near and distant markets, and to transport people for work, commerce, and leisure. Railroads affected the lives of local families on many levels and effectively connected business centers in all three countries, but the growth of the railroads on both sides of these international borders had mixed results for the transborder nature of these local communities. They linked communities across each border, but could also serve to erase the need for transborder business interaction as the transportation network shifted from across the international border to within the same country’s state or province.

Although disadvantaged in some respects by their remoteness from their U.S.-state capitals and more populous cities, these South Texas and northern Maine communities also had an advantage in their location near an international border. Rail lines on the Canadian and Mexican sides of the borders reached these communities before lines from the interior of their own states, thus strengthening ties between these U.S. border communities and their international neighbors. The arrival of U.S. state-side rail lines weakened those international ties as U.S. merchants could now shift from using Mexican or Canadian rail companies to using U.S. railroad lines that ran directly from these U.S. border towns to other U.S. markets. This was especially true on the Maine border.

Railroads and other businesses that relied on commerce or tourism between countries supported a permeable border to allow for people, goods, and transport vehicles to cross the border freely. The 1902 U.S. Senate report pointed to bills specifying “That the Secretary of the
Treasury shall prescribe rules for the inspection of aliens along the borders of Canada and Mexico, so as not to obstruct or unnecessarily delay, impede, or annoy passengers in ordinary travel between the United States and said countries. This and similar provisions aimed to create free-flowing cross-border travel.

A permeable border with more open immigration policies also promoted the free flow of tourists and laborers. This benefited local business owners and employers, as well as workers. At the time, supporters of restrictive immigration policies preferred to downplay these benefits. They preferred to believe the simplified, derogatory, often racist view of foreigners and immigrants as simply ignorant and unacceptable. In some instances, laborers and their leaders feared job competition. Some employers did not understand the intelligence of their new employees because they did not understand the employees’ language and did not have, or did not use, an interpreter. Local mixed-ancestry community members often acted as bilingual intermediaries. Most proponents of restrictive immigration and border policies did not live near a border and did not understand the complexity of the lived reality in those communities.

**Mestizaje/Métissage Attempted Erasure Through Policy and Law**

The geopolitical borders in both Valleys marked a separation between countries, yet still served more to unite than divide international border neighbors. A more dangerous threat was the potential creation of borders of the mind, epitomized by ideas about race and otherness that were gaining popularity. Scientific Racism and eugenics popularized the idea that race was biologically-based, and by extension, so were associated character traits of morality, intelligence, values, and attitudes. This was also the period when universities emerged across the country and academic disciplines took shape. Early academic leaders characterized all things Anglo as *us* that
became part of history, and those considered other fell under anthropology. If Manifest Destiny meant dominating the land by spreading across it, then once all the land had been claimed, it meant becoming the dominant people on that land, in terms of power and ideology.

**Chinese Exclusion**

Although 20th-century immigration rhetoric centered primarily around Mexicans and immigration from the southern border, the first group restricted from crossing U.S. geopolitical borders were Asian immigrants in the latter 19th century. This process began in earnest with the 1875 Page Act that targeted Chinese women, the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act that limited entry for most Chinese immigrants, and the 1907 Gentleman’s Agreement that targeted Japanese immigrants.\(^48\) Although these laws focused on the West coast, ripple effects of these enforcement efforts were felt on both Mexican and Canadian borders as officials realized these prospective immigrants were trying to enter through alternate routes.\(^49\) Also regarding women, in addition to the 1875 Page Act, the later 1907 Expatriation Act caused U.S. women to lose their citizenship when they married nationals from other countries, especially Chinese men.\(^50\)

While there were relatively few Chinese in Maine or Texas, U.S. efforts to restrict their entry through U.S. sea ports and across U.S.-Canada and U.S.-Mexico land borders, directly impacted northern Maine and and South Texas geopolitical and social borders. The Chinese Exclusion Acts added fuel to the fire of conflating race and nationality, which impacted perceptions of mixed-heritage Mexican American and Franco American groups. Thus, these border communities were feeling the influence of both geopolitical and social borders being imposed by the U.S. government and their respective state neighbors.
In Re Ricardo Rodriguez

The identity status of Mexicans was far from clear cut, as shown by the 1897 case of In re Ricardo Rodriguez, which involved Ricardo Rodriguez, a Mexican national who had lived in San Antonio for approximately ten years. Mr. Rodriguez was described as approximately 37-years old, illiterate in both Spanish and English, and spoke Spanish “as it is spoken by others of his class and humble condition in life.” His appearance was described “[a]s to color, he may be classed with the copper-colored red man. He has dark eyes, straight black hair, and high cheek bones.” When questioned, he claimed to be a “pure-blooded Mexican.”

Politicians wanting to deny Mexican voting rights in Texas claimed they had no right to vote because the promise of future citizenship in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo remained unfulfilled by the U.S. Congress. They also claimed that the Indian ancestry of Mexicans disqualified them from voting in the United States. Claimants argued that Mr. Rodriguez fit none of the accepted citizenship and voting classifications because, as a Mexican, he was “not a white person, nor an African, nor of African descent.” According to a newspaper report, they attempted to bolster their argument by citing other cases where individuals of questionable mixed ancestry were denied citizenship - a Hawaiian man in Utah and a man of English-Indian parentage in British Columbia. The article noted that they also brought up the eighth and ninth articles of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and pointed out that “Congress… has not yet taken action in the matter” of giving U.S. citizenship to Mexicans in the ceded territory.

If upheld, this decision would have effectively denied the right to vote of all Mexican nationals, no matter how long they had lived on their annexed home land or had immigrated to the United States. In addition, the decision threatened the voting eligibility of “all resident Mexicans, even those who were born here, and even extend[s] to those residents one of whose
parents are Americans.” As a newspaper reporter stated, “The general opinion is that the loss [of Mexican voting rights] would be a serious blow to democracy and would result in changing the political complexion of the whole southwestern country.” Republican and Populist political party ambitions were the primary motivation in wanting to disenfranchise a potentially large block of supporters for the Democratic party.

In his decision to allow Rodriguez’s application for citizenship and access to voting rights, District Judge Thomas S. Maxey stated that, “While this [Fourteenth] amendment … was intended primarily for the benefit of the negro race, it also confers the right of citizenship upon persons of all other races, white, yellow or red, born or naturalized in the United States …. Mexicans, therefore, born in the United States … are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside.” He explained that Mexicans had special permission covered not by a Naturalization Act, but instead determined by U.S. treaties - the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the 1854 Gadsden Treaty, and an 1868 United States – Mexico Treaty.

While confirming the rights of Mexican-descent citizens and Mexican nationals, the court record noted the vague nature of Mexican identity, “If the strict scientific classification of the anthropologist should be adopted, he would probably not be classed as white. It is certain he is not an African, nor a person of African descent.” This ambiguity of Mexican identity status would continue and varied greatly depending on skin color, potential bias of observers, and the self-identification labels of Mexican-descent individuals that ranged from Spanish to Mexican to Indian, and a variety of similar terms used in the Spanish language.
**Mestizaje/Métissage Attempted Erasure Through Education**

**Texas**

As in many cultures around the world, education took place at home, in school, and in the broader community. Often lessons and community history were passed on through songs. In South Texas these songs were called *corridos*. One of the most famous was the *Ballad of Gregorio Cortez*. It relates the story of how a translation misunderstanding by a deputy lead to an escalation of tensions that resulted in a failed arrest attempt at gunpoint by the sheriff. Cortez shot the sheriff and fled from the law to avoid capture, and possible lynching or imprisonment. There are many versions of the ballad, but a common element was that Cortez shot in self defense.

Decía Gregorio Cortez con su alma muy encendida: "No siento haberlo matado, la defensa es permitida."\(^{62}\)

Gregorio Cortez said, with his soul ablaze: "I'm not sorry for killing him, self-defense is justifiable."

After the original incident in 1901 in Karnes County outside San Antonio, Cortez fled to the Rio Grande as he evaded search parties of up to 300 men, before he was captured ten days later. The anticipated biased trial resulted in a sentence of life in prison. Cortez’s early release sealed his popularity as a folk hero as a man who managed to repeatedly fight and defeat overwhelming odds.\(^{63}\) Cortez and his story embodied the tensions, discrimination, and subjugated status felt by many Tejanos and Mexicanos along the border. The story also offered hope that ethnic Mexicans living in South Texas, descendants of centuries of intermixing, could resist and overcome the obstacles and prejudices that they faced.

That subjugated status was felt inside school classrooms as well, where instructional material was published primarily in English in a Spanish-language dominant community. Racial and discriminatory attitudes of the time were frequently part of the message. A quote from
1912 Texas history book for children described the population of Texas in clearly hierarchical terms:

About four-fifths of the people are white, and most of these are made up of native Texans or immigrants from other states of the Union. There are, however, a good many foreign immigrants, and of these the Mexicans, scattered through the Rio Grande region from El Paso to San Antonio and Brownsville, are the most numerous. Less numerous, but far more important than the Mexicans, are the Germans. These are found in many parts of the state. Still other foreign nations represented in our population are Bohemia, England, Austria, Ireland, Italy, Sweden, and France, in about the order named.  

All Mexicans are unequivocally portrayed as “foreign immigrants,” completely ignoring the fact that many, if not most, of these families had lived on the land longer than many of the “native Texans” or other groups listed. It also reinforced the idea of Mexicans, of recognized intermixed ancestry, as subordinate to the “far more important” Germans, who were a more favorable shade of White. These racial stereotypes were no doubt underscored by the socioeconomic standing of most Mexicans in the South Texas Valley who worked as laborers and German immigrants who often started small businesses. Regarding the English-dominant school curriculum, one benefit was the fact that children were taught in English in school and spoke Spanish everywhere else in the community contributed to them becoming bilingual. Sadly, ripple effects of this policy would contribute to later generations being punished for speaking Spanish and even later generations not learning Spanish at all.

Maine  

Franco Americans in the St. John Valley shared a similar experience. They were a predominantly French-speaking population who faced state officials who wanted to impose an English-only curriculum on their children. Fortunately, they had an ally in the state legislature who successfully opposed this move in the 1890s. Unfortunately, the law eventually passed and
children were punished for speaking French in school. Adults today still recall their older siblings being made to kneel on glass, or face other punishments, after being caught speaking French.

In addition, in both Maine and Texas, the French or Spanish spoken was considered an inferior version of the “proper” European tongue. This 20th-century folk song recalls these experiences in Maine.

“I will not speak French in school”

At the little school (elementary) we were punished for speaking the French we had learned

The nuns caught us speaking French and we in Grand Isle had to copy

"I will not speak French in school ...."

The nuns didn't want us to speak French because no one understood the French that we spoke

Forget about speaking Grand Isle French, the nuns wanted us to learn Parisian French

It's not a tchulotte it's a pantalon ... etc.66

Nonetheless, adults continued to speak French and promote it through the written word.

The promotion of a more authentic, pure national language reflected belief in an idealized racially pure nation.

The circulation of French-language newspapers, usually published in Canada, attests to the transborder economic and cultural connections of this region. It also testifies to the persistence of Francophone culture in Anglo-dominant nations. The Edmundston, New Brunswick. Le Madawaska newspaper is one French-lanauge example that was distributed on both sides of the border.
Politics was another arena in which energetic discussion occurred in French. An 1888 political pamphlet urged the “[c]itoyens français du Madawaska” (French [descent] citizens of Madawaska) to seriously consider the difference between Democrats and Republicans and “ce qu’ont fait les partis politicques dans le Comté d’Aroostook” (what political parties have done in Aroostook County). It gives examples of how each party did, or did not, serve the community and urged them to be courageous in being politically active, going out to vote, and participating in the larger nation.

Conclusion

At the turn of the 20th century, intermixed groups problematized the social and geopolitical borders of U.S. society. Mexicans were difficult to classify because their appearance spanned a spectrum from Spanish, considered White by some, to Indian and dark-skinned, and everything in between. Franco Americans had intermixed to the point where the majority appeared as light complected Whites even though many had Indian, and possibly far distant African ancestry. Geopolitical borders also took on new importance in defining national identity because of groups who were trying to cross them. Wave upon wave of immigrants arrived on both coasts, as well as across the land borders of Canada and Mexico. Policing geographic borders reinforced social boundaries, with the common purpose of keeping out those considered unacceptable to be citizens. Their “undesirable” presence portended future intermixing and sullying of U.S. White society.

As the century progressed, attitudes shifted from tolerance to increased discrimination against mixed-heritage groups, including Mexican Americans and Franco Americans. These mixed-heritage U.S. citizens were identified and treated as foreigners, or simply overlooked,
because of changing ideas of race, anxieties about miscegenation, and questionable loyalties due to proximity to their respective borders. The conflation of foreign and other lead to U.S. citizens of mixed ancestry being treated not just as other but now also as foreigners.

Attempts to institutionalize anti-immigrant and anit-miscegenation attitudes through policies adapted as each new intermixed group presented new challenges. Strategies included political and legal attempts to tighten borders and restrict immigration from abroad; or laws that penalized mixing and marriages with others from outside and within U.S. borders. And, they created educational practices that promoted whiteness as the superior ideal and denigrated anything seen as other.69

At the same time, local communities and individuals decided for themselves how much of the dominant identity they would accept. Local Texas and Maine border communities maintained much of their mixed-heritage identities and traditions. Their transnational border lifestyle survived amid attempts to tighten the national land borders. In spite of external pressures to conform and “melt” away, they refused to completely assimilate into dominant U.S. Anglo culture. While maintaining pride in their U.S. heritage, they still created communities where the multiple cultural heritages of individuals could be accepted and celebrated.
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CHAPTER FIVE
ENFORCING BORDERS AND DENYING MESTIZAJE REALITIES, 1914-1940

The … block…was cleared for dancing, music being furnished by two orchestras, one Mexican, and the other negro…. The festivities were interrupted about 9:30 when …purported… members of the K.K.K. paraded through the city…. after which the festivities were resumed.

– 1921, *Mercedes Tribune* (TX) report of American Legion dance and boxing festivities

**Introduction**

Increasingly racist attitudes and restrictive social and geopolitical border policies – anti-miscegenation, anti-immigrant, border enforcement – minimally influenced marriage practices in communities along the borders of Texas and Maine, but discrimination flared up in communities that were seen as ethnically other, even if they looked White, and more violently impacted communities of members with visibly darker skin. Racism, and more biology-based ideas about race, became more prevalent at the turn of the century across the United States. There was also increasing pressure to assimilate to predominantly Anglo U.S. culture. These ideas spread to both borders as more Anglos moved in and dominated positions of social and economic leadership. Both Valleys had centuries-old communities established by mixed-heritage groups that were considered other by incoming members of dominant White U.S. culture. Franco Americans and Mexican Americans of all social levels had to adjust quickly to either maintain or
find new positions within the rapidly changing socioeconomic hierarchy of their changing homelands.

**North American Border Family: Sandy and Elodia**

January 1921, Sandy and Elodia, two teenagers, rode away on his horse under a South Texas winter sun. Sandy reached this point by joining the military, traveling from Maine to the distant land of Texas, and falling in love. Elodia had finally paid heed to this young foreigner’s advances, defied her mother, and agreed to be his wife. What happened after they eloped, as described earlier? They launched themselves on horseback into an unknown future, married in a civil ceremony on February 10, 1921, and eventually moved a few miles away to the recently established border town of McAllen, Texas. There, Sandy built their home and they started their family. They came from distant and seemingly very different lands and cultures, yet found common ground.

We return to the question posed at the beginning of this story. Who were these young people and what could possibly have brought them together? Perhaps intermixed ethno-racial heritages and similar border homes formed a common identity. In the broader picture, changes in national or regional level policies - in terms of marriage, border, language, or immigration - may have given them pause before their decision. As Mexican Americans and Franco Americans, perhaps they saw the intermixture in each other as something in common rather than as a difference. Taking a closer look at their individual backgrounds and home border areas, in the years before and during their marriage, may provide some answers.
Sandy and Elodia – Family Histories

Elodia McDonald, Sandy’s new wife, was born on May 5, 1905, in Hidalgo, Texas, to Delfina Pérez and Severo McDonald, both of whom were born in Texas. Elodia was the fifth of six children in the McDonald family. Elodia’s maternal grandmother was Dolores Pérez, and her maternal grandfather was Rafael Pérez. Her paternal grandmother was “Mama” Dolia, a Mexican national, and her paternal grandfather was an Irishman named John McDonald, who moved to Texas from Tennessee, yet another example of mestizaje. Although there is no known record of a marriage, John and Dolia had a son, Severo, born circa 1873. Severo married Delfina, who reportedly had Indian ancestry and was very sensitive about it; she preferred to emphasize her McDonald blood.

Figure 4. Family Tree of Elodia McDonald

Elodia was the fifth of six children, all of whom were born in the Hidalgo, Texas. Her siblings included Edelmira, born 1894; Adolfo, born 1897; Altagracia “Grace,” born 1901; Guillermo “Willie,” born 1904; and younger brother Pedro “Pete,” born in 1909.
Elodia’s cultural background was predominantly Mexican American, her religious background was Catholic, and her father was a farmer. She was born and raised in Hidalgo, approximately one mile from the U.S.-Mexico border. Given her hometown, it is understandable that she was bilingual because Spanish was the dominant language of daily life in the Valley and English was learned primarily in school. Elodia’s extended family exemplified the potential for mestizaje. Her father, Severo McDonald had an Irish-descent father, and a German-descent half-brother, Adrian Franz, and a Mexican-descent half-brother, Jose Uresti. All three brothers shared the same mother, Dolia. Elodia grew up knowing these branches of the family, and visited her Franz relatives most often, all of which would have laid a foundation for seeing mestizaje as commonplace and intermarriage as acceptable.

On the northern border, Sandy Leveck was born on May 20, 1900, in Caribou, Maine to two Canadians, Coleman Levesque and Hannah Maskell. Coleman was born in New Brunswick and Hannah probably was as well, although her exact birthplace is unclear. Sandy’s maternal grandparents – William Maskell and Sally Lord – were both born in New Brunswick. Sandy’s paternal grandparents – John Peter (Jean Pierre) Levesque and Susan Little – were born in Riviere-du-Loup, Quebec, and New Brunswick, respectively.
Jean Pierre Levesque moved from Quebec province to New Brunswick, where he married Susan Little in 1853. Sandy’s father, Coleman “Colby,” was born in 1871 in New Brunswick, the sixth of seven children. His siblings were also all born in New Brunswick and included John, born ca. 1854; Rose Ellen, born in 1857 in Moose Mountain, Carleton County; Isaac, born ca. 1864 in Florenceville; Francis “Frank” born in 1866; Marinda born ca. 1870; and younger brother Charles, born 1873. While living in Anglo-dominant New Brunswick, Jean Pierre became known as John Peter. While this might signal assimilation and acceptance of Anglo culture, it is also a common technique used by members of minority cultures to avoid discrimination by the dominant culture. Overt cultural displays—Anglicizing names, learning English, attending religious service—sometimes signify superficial adaptation rather than complete adoption and internalization of the dominant culture.

In 1889, John Peter and Susan moved their family to Maine, where they quickly made themselves at home and known to their neighbors, as described by the October 4, 1900, edition of the Aroostook Republican. “Peter Levitt [Leveck], of Limestone, is a regular visitor to town,
and when it is considered he is 93 years old and walks both ways from his home to Caribou, in his bare feet, with his wife, Susan, 90, by his side, the distance being 10 miles, making 20 all told, it is easily seen he is a smart old man.”

It appears they moved first to Fort Fairfield, then Limestone, and later to Caribou. Both John Peter and Susan died in Maine and were buried in Grimes Mill Cemetery near Caribou.

Sandy’s parents, Colby and Hannah married in 1887, then immigrated to Caribou in 1888, where they started a family and a farm. In terms of siblings, Sandy was outnumbered by three older sisters – Bertha, born 1888; Susan, born 1893; and Ethel, born 1894. Everyone in the family could read and write and speak English. This English proficiency is understandable considering they had lived in Anglo-dominated New Brunswick. Given Sandy’s grandfather’s Quebecois heritage, it is likely that Colby knew French, and may have passed this on to his children. According to his daughter, Sandy reportedly spoke both French and English, so it is likely that he learned it from his father.

Sandy’s cultural background was clearly a mix of predominantly Quebecois and English ancestry. Church records show his baptized in a Methodist church. Given his mother’s English background and the time the family spent in New Brunswick, this is quite possible. He probably also was exposed to some Catholic traditions, due to his father’s Quebecois heritage. This knowledge and exposure laid a foundation of awareness of métissage and an openness to it.

Sandy and Elodia – How They Met

Both Sandy and Elodia grew up in border areas in which mixed-heritage individuals felt the sting of being treated as other in an Anglo-dominated society and state. Both communities developed hybrid cultures that held proudly to their distinctive cultural practices and identities.
As Franco-American descent, Sandy was identified as *other* within Maine, in comparison to the dominant White Anglo culture in the rest of the state. In the South Texas context, Sandy could have identified with the local *other* hybrid culture, Mexican Americans. Yet, he was probably perceived as being a *gringo*, meaning Anglo or White. Being considered White, and therefore *other* to South Texas ethnic Mexicans, was a potential obstacle to his courtship of Elodia. However, his Franco American background, ability to speak French (a Latin-based language like Spanish), and familiarity with the Catholic religion, may have softened that barrier. Even though Sandy no longer lived in Maine, there was a history of intermarriage in his family and border area that may have made him more open to doing the same.

Elodia and Sandy lived during a very dramatic and turbulent period in U.S. history. As racial border tensions escalated in the early 1900s, federal troops were assigned to South Texas, including Sandy’s future cavalry unit. The central location of Elodia’s hometown, Hidalgo, made it an attractive point to station U.S. troops along the border in the early 20th century. The Fourth Cavalry unit was assigned to the Texas border to help quell conflicts during the Plan de San Diego crisis, and conducted military drills before being reassigned during World War I. The unit was sent back in 1919 to help patrol the border.

Sandy Levesque is a bit of a mystery and was apparently a rather quiet person. He was likely going to continue in the family farming tradition, until he joined the military as Sandy “Leveck” in 1919. It appears one of his ancestors changed the spelling of the family name, perhaps to fit in better with the Anglo-dominant culture of New Brunswick. As a teenager, Sandy embarked on an adventure that would take him to South Texas and do more than alter his name; it would dramatically change his life.
Sandy joined the Fourth Cavalry, Troop I, on April 25, 1919, as a private when he was “18 11/12 years of age and by occupation a farmer.” He had enlisted to serve from May 18, 1919, until July 20, 1921. His unit passed through Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio in 1920 for medical exams. He was described as having a “very good” character. He must have impressed the higher-ranking officers because he was temporarily promoted to the rank of corporal from November 4, 1920, to January 30, 1921, to assist with the unit’s trip to Fort Sam Houston.

Sandy was designated a “2nd class rifleman on April 6, 1921,” and his horsemanship was “good.” He “completed 2 years, 2 months, 15 days service for longevity pay.” He was discharged in McAllen and paid $138.25 to pay for travel expenses to “Caribau.” By all family accounts, he stayed in Texas and briefly returned to Maine only once shortly after his discharge.

Interestingly, Sandy’s identity even during his military career caused some confusion. During a visit to Fort Sam Houston on January 7, 1920 for training, his birthplace was listed as Maine. However, the next day, at Camp McAllen, his nativity had been listed as “U.S.” then crossed out. His parents’ nativity was listed and crossed out the same way. Perhaps the note taker was a bit overzealous and accidentally crossed out Sandy’s information, but no correction nor alternate location was noted either.

On a personal level, he reportedly kept a low profile both during and after his service in the military. Sandy completed his service and was a hard worker. Not drawing attention to himself appeared to be his personal preference. Yet, he made the effort to try to catch the attention of a young woman he saw from the neighboring town.

Elodia was fourteen when Sandy’s Fourth Cavalry unit was stationed in Hidalgo in 1919. She would pass by the camp of horses and men on her way to school or to run errands. She caught Sandy’s eye, and he tried to catch hers, but she initially ignored him. There were several
personal and external factors that contributed to her distance and later change of heart. Elodia did not respond to Sandy at first because her heart was set on a local boy, Anselmo (nicknamed “Chemo”), even though her mother preferred a Mexican dignitary’s son who had given her his ring – a clear opportunity for upward class mobility and security. Elodia used to keep notes to or from Chemo in her shoe, so her mother would not find them. To her painful surprise, Elodia discovered that she was not the only one exchanging notes with Chemo. She found a note between Chemo and her own sister, Altagracia. Elodia broke off relations with both Chemo and the Mexican suitor. And, as described earlier, she eloped with Sandy – a young man she hardly knew, from a distant land, and seemingly foreign culture.

Family Mestizaje/Métissage Factors

These were some of the personal factors that influenced Sandy’s and Elodia’s decisions to interact and later marry. Sandy and Elodia were individuals who made their choice to marry based on personal factors. Still, they grew up in specific places and time periods where external factors undoubtedly played a role. Was Sandy’s and Elodia’s marriage unusual or part of a larger trend in that period and in their communities? What may have been some of the factors that influenced their decision to marry?

Sandy’s decision to marry outside of his ethnic group is understandable. The chances of him meeting a Franco American woman, or even a woman from Maine, were highly unlikely in this South Texas community. He had a better chance of meeting an Anglo or Euroamerican woman, but their numbers were also small. He apparently preferred to stay in Texas and court Elodia, instead of returning to Maine to find a wife.
Elodia’s decision to marry Sandy is undoubtedly due to more than gender and ethnicity factors. Hispanic women tended to marry outside their ethnic group more than their male counterparts did. Ethnic Mexicans, Mexican-descent individuals of either U.S. or Mexican citizenship, still comprised a large portion of her South Texas border community. There were undoubtedly several eligible men from her own ethnic group who she could have married. Also, considering heightening tensions between Anglos and Mexicans in this period, one could imagine that social interaction between them would have been limited and discouraged. If pressure to avoid marriage with non-Mexicans had been strong enough within that community, then fewer Mexicans would have married Anglos, and vice versa.²⁰

Turning to class as a factor, intermarriage between different classes and ethnic groups was a common practice in South Texas dating back to when Texas was still part of Mexico. This practice was typified by marriages between upper-class Hispanic women and early male Anglo newcomers. This allowed both parties access to the power structure of the marital partner’s ethnic group.²¹ Sandy and Elodia were from different ethnic groups and different border regions, but both were also from similar classes in terms of their farming backgrounds. His status as a soldier and veteran offered the possibility of upward social mobility.

So, although there were tensions between Anglos and Mexicans in the larger community, personal and external factors worked in favor of Sandy’s and Elodia’s courtship and eventual marriage. Their personal and border community backgrounds were not as different as they might have first appeared. The process of métissage or mestizaje was common to both areas and families, although the variety of intermixing was more visible in Texas. Her recent romantic breakup, plus the tendency for women to out-marry, coincided with his status as a soldier and military assignment that made regular exposure to each other possible as she passed by his camp.
These multiple factors helped explain their potential openness to a relationship, even when social pressure opposed it.

Clearly, Sandy and Elodia were open to intermarriage. They married, even though Sandy was undoubtedly categorized as Anglo, in a time period and place where tensions ran high between Anglos and Mexicans. The question remains whether a similar combination of factors existed for other intermixed couples in those border areas. Did Sandy and Elodia’s marriage reflect or break tradition with community and national practices of the time? How deeply did national identity anxieties and concerns over social and geopolitical border control penetrate into deep South Texas and far northern Maine?

**Border Valley Marriages**

Whether a person is open to marrying someone from a different background than their own depends on a variety of factors. Social and economic factors can include group size, gender balance, the amount of interaction between members of different groups, the potential for upward socioeconomic mobility, and a group’s openness to those considered different. On a cultural level, if a community has a dominant language, and also uses a second or third language of neighboring groups, then that practice suggests that the community is open to the people of the other cultural groups. On the other hand, this multilingual practice may be due more to necessity, such as to conduct business or qualify for a job, than to an openness of minds and hearts to intermarriage. Still, it leaves the door open for individuals to decide for themselves on a personal level, even if their larger social group argues against it.

In the broader context, U.S. attitudes and policies toward both intermixed group, and their respective borders, continued to gradually shift from friendly to tolerant to intolerant.
National views of the Canadian border were amicable but anxious over the turn of the century because this northern land border was seen as a major entryway for illegal Chinese and Southern European immigration from the west and east coasts, respectively. The Mexican border also shifted from friendly to tolerant to intolerant as immigrants rejected from seaport entryways attempted to enter via this southern land border, and then later when Mexican immigration increased due to the Mexican Revolution. Border concerns heightened even more with the smuggling of illicit alcohol across both borders during Prohibition.

As changing attitudes equated Franco Americans and Mexican Americans with French Canadians and Mexicans, respectively, they were perceived as other even though they were citizens. Nonetheless, their labor was welcomed. Communities on Maine and Texas borders lived in locations that were both remote from their respective state capitals and in closer proximity to their ethnically-similar international neighbors, who offered constant cultural reinforcement. Fellow Mainers and Americans from more densely populated areas in the interior of the state and in the capitals equated them with their nearby international counterparts. These Franco American Mainers and Mexican American Tejanos had to fight against discriminatory attitudes directed at them for their non-Anglo ancestry, non-English language, and Catholic religion. This was true even when the ethnically other group outnumbered the dominant group in their border communities, and were forced into a socio-economically subordinate position in their own homeland, which was true on both borders.

Texas Border Marriages – Hidalgo City and County, 1880-1930

Given the distant and isolated nature of the Lower Rio Grande Valley, and its location near water and land points of entry, regular interaction between different groups would be
expected and the interdependence of neighbors accepted. Still, conflicts arose over long-standing ethnic and racial tensions, or sometimes political or economic differences, that erupted in varying degrees of violence over the decades. In addition to armed conflict, South Texas underwent a dramatic economic, political, and social shift from ranching to agriculture. This shift relegated many Tejanos to manual field labor for Anglo landowners, and reinforced discriminatory attitudes and practices. These events changed the interactions and relationships between Anglos and Tejanos from the mid-19th to early 20th centuries.

Interrmarriage laws in Texas, both criminal and civil, referred primarily to partnerships with individuals of Negro ancestry. Almost anyone not considered Negro was considered white, except Indians and dark-skinned Mexicans.23 This attitude was due in large part to the many immigrants from the U.S. South, and other parts of the U.S. and Europe, starting in the Mexican period, whose primary experience with *others* was with Negroes and Indians. By this period, most of the Negroes in the state had been brought in illegally as slaves by those earlier, immigrants or had moved here after the Civil War in search of freedom. Indians were also a concern based on previous experience in other parts of the U.S., however, they were fewer in number and primarily nomadic in South Texas. Plus, many had either died, were moved out by the government, or intermarried and intermixed with earlier settlers to the point that the federal government did not recognize them as individual tribes. For the Lower Rio Grande Valley, this meant that the federal and state governments had few to no Negroes nor Indians to identify as other. Instead, identity became a complicated combination of *otherness* based on national origin and physical appearance, similar to the Spanish *casta* hierarchy.

For a broader demographic perspective of the Lower Rio Grande Valley, government records provide valuable data on community language and marriage practices. Community
marriage patterns of both Valleys are examined using decennial federal census data for Maine, and a combination of federal city census and local county court records for Texas. Decennial federal census data provides a partial picture of national-origin marriage patterns for the city of Hidalgo for 1880 and 1930. The years in between were filled by examining civil marriage records for Hidalgo County, using Spanish and English last names as a guide, knowing the limitations of this approach. The civil court records offer a glimpse of the larger county area and the level of acceptance of Mexicans in the broader ethnic sense, regardless of national origin.

The demographic makeup of the Lower Rio Grande Valley changed over time, yet it appears that Hidalgo County maintained an overall upward trajectory in its rate of intermarriage of Mexicans or Tejanos with Anglos, from 1880 to 1930.

Table 1. Hidalgo city, 1880 & 1930: Married Couples by National Origin

However, given the expectation is that Hidalgo couples were marginally influenced by stricter U.S. or Mexican border and immigrations laws or intermarriage laws. Looking first at the number of married couples in the city of Hidalgo, intermarried couples were defined as those...
who married individuals with different national origin characteristics. The total number of married couples more than tripled from 28 in 1880 to 106 in 1930. Intermarried couples who married a partner from a different country more than quadrupled from 7 in 1880 to 31 in 1930. The general upward trajectory is clear. The number of total marriages increased, as did the number of intermarriages.

Looking at Hidalgo County civil court records reveals a similar upward trend when determining intermarriage based on last names that appeared to be of either Mexican or Anglo origin.

Table 2. Hidalgo County, 1900-1930: Married Couples by Last Name²⁷

Considering both sets of data, we see that the county and city marriage patterns are fairly similar and consistent. The pattern suggests that as the population increased, intermarriage with Mexicans and Tejanos continued at a steady rate, with a gradual increase over time. Due to shifting demographics, with more Anglos moving to the border region, intermarriage became a
smaller part of the overall number of marriages. Recalling the dramatic over-three-fold increase of Hidalgo County’s population in these decades – 4,347 in 1880 to 13,728 in 1910 – begs the question, why didn’t the intermarriage rate increase dramatically also? What could account for the rate to remain steady, but still rather low?

**Texas Border Marriages – National-Origin, 1880-1940**

Examining census data and adjusting marriage subgroups as percentages of total number of marriages, reveals important variations and changes over time that suggest some answers.

![Subgroup % of Total Marriages - Hidalgo city based on national origin - federal census records](image)

Table 3. Hidalgo City, 1880 & 1930: National Origin Percentages of Total Marriages

Two groups had dramatic shifts from 1880 to 1930, while two others experienced minimal change. The couples where both partners were from Mexico (Mx-Mx), decreased by half from 64% in 1880 to 32% in 1930. The couples where both partners were born in the U.S. (U.S.-U.S.), more than tripled from 11% in 1880 to 39% in 1930. This shift could be explained
by the influx of inhabitants from other parts of the U.S., and the natural increase of Tejanos. As a result, there was an increase in the numbers of U.S. born partners who were available to marry each other. While this possibility opens the door to potential cultural intermixing among U.S.-born partners – Anglo and Tejano mixed couples - it also could represent more isolation of cultural groups – where Tejanos married Tejanos, and Anglos or other Euro-Americans married each other. The decrease in Mexican-Mexican couples could reflect the impact of stricter immigration and border enforcement on the number of available partners, or that newly-arrived immigrants were not staying in Hidalgo. Instead, they may have moved on to other communities in the Valley, state, or country.

Combining U.S.-U.S. and Mexican-Mexican couples reveals that 75% in 1880 and 71% in 1930 engaged in endogamous marriage practices by marrying partners born in the same country as themselves. This implies that endogamy was a common practice both in terms of national origin and culture. Given the predominance of Spanish surnames in the area, the upward shift in U.S.-U.S. and downward shift of Mexican-Mexican marriage percentages suggests a combination of factors – the decrease in Mexican immigrants in the area, an increase in availability of Tejano partners, and increased endogamous marriages within cultural groups. It is also plausible that the Mexican border and immigration policies may have had an impact on the number of available Mexican marriage partners, and very likely that national and local racial sentiments impacted local marriage practices.

The other two groups had partners born in a different country. The U.S.-Mexico couples increased slightly from 25% in 1880 to 28% in 1930. The U.S.-Other Nations couple, in this case Germany, increased from 0% in 1880 to 1% in 1930. The mixed nationality couples maintained a steady rate and still remained an important percentage of the married population. This U.S.-
Mexico data shows a consistent openness to Mexican nationals as marriage partners and to Mexican culture more broadly. Nonetheless, that openness was becoming an apparently smaller percentage of the booming local population. The fact that U.S.-Mexico intermarriage rates appeared steady over time also suggests that national-origin intermarriage rates were not influenced by national immigration or border policies, fluctuating immigration rates, nor racial attitudes.

Texas Border Marriages –Cultural Data Analysis

Looking at border and marriage practices in Hidalgo County, it appears that despite stricter national immigration and border policies, border enforcement often varied, transborder migrations occurred, and *mestizaje* continued. Local border community members lived with a daily awareness of their status on geographical and social borders, and at least a quarter of them maintained an openness to engage intimately with their international neighbors through marriage. Using names for ethnic identification, most Tejanos appeared to have married Anglo-, Italian-, perhaps African American, and a rare few Asian- (Japanese, Indian) or Russian-descent spouses. Apparently, Sandy and Elodia were one of several interethnic couples in Hidalgo County.

Texas Demographic Changes – State, Valley, Sister Cities

In terms of broader state demographic changes, the native born population of Texas experienced a steady increase over the entire period. The foreign-born population also increased steadily, with a couple of noticeable spikes in numbers between 1890 and 1900, and again up to 1910. It is unclear how many of the first group were Tejanos or the second group were recent
Mexican immigrants. Unfortunately, the federal census did not track Mexicans or Tejanos as a distinct group at the state level until the latter 20th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas total</strong></td>
<td>1,591,749</td>
<td>2,235,527</td>
<td>3,048,710</td>
<td>3,896,542</td>
<td>4,663,228</td>
<td>5,824,715</td>
<td>6,415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TX born</strong></td>
<td>1,477,133</td>
<td>2,082,567</td>
<td>2,869,353</td>
<td>3,654,604</td>
<td>4,299,396</td>
<td>5,462,428</td>
<td>6,179,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign born</strong></td>
<td>114,616 (7.2%)</td>
<td>152,956 (6.8%)</td>
<td>179,357 (5.9%)</td>
<td>241,938 (6.2%)</td>
<td>363,832 (7.8%)</td>
<td>362,287 (6.2%)</td>
<td>235,528 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexico Born</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TX bound</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1910: 77.8%</td>
<td>1919: 65.6%</td>
<td>1920: 67.1%</td>
<td>1929: 63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native TX white persons of foreign parentage</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2734</td>
<td>5931</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Texas Population and Immigration 1880-1940

Expecting that Mexicans were the largest foreign group in the state, “native Texan white persons of foreign parentage” on the federal census could be read as a rough estimate for Tejanos, with perhaps a few immigrants from other parts of the world. If so, then approximately 2734 Tejanos in 1910, jumped to 5931 in 1920, and then decreased to 2685 in 1930. This increase could reflect the influx of Mexicans during the 1910 Revolution, while the decrease could be due to repatriation to Mexico or other destinations in the U.S., or the increase in the number of Tejano parents, or probably a combination of both.
As for Mexican immigrants, between 1900 to 1920, approximately 250,000 to 350,000 registered Mexican citizens entered the United States, with an estimated 190,000 additional unregistered Mexican citizen immigrants.\textsuperscript{30} Between 1910 and 1929, it appears the majority were heading to Texas, based on approximations of intended state of residence of Mexican immigrants. After an initial dip from 77.8% to 65.6% between 1910 and 1919, the percentage continued to decline from 67.1% to 63.3% between 1920 and 1929.\textsuperscript{31} The steady influx of immigrants from other parts of the U.S. and from Mexico points to an explanation of how the population managed to boom and still maintain a steady rate of intermarriage.

Focusing more specifically on the four counties of the Lower Rio Grande Valley, county-level population estimates also reveal an overall growth trend with occasional dips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TX Counties</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>8,304</td>
<td>10,749</td>
<td>11,469</td>
<td>13,151</td>
<td>11,089</td>
<td>11,409</td>
<td>13,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>6,534</td>
<td>6,837</td>
<td>13,728</td>
<td>38,110</td>
<td>77,004</td>
<td>106,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,499</td>
<td>13,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>14,959</td>
<td>14,424</td>
<td>16,095</td>
<td>27,158</td>
<td>36,662</td>
<td>77,540</td>
<td>83,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total\textsuperscript{32}</td>
<td>29,490</td>
<td>33,597</td>
<td>36,301</td>
<td>55,947</td>
<td>87,781</td>
<td>178,382</td>
<td>217,743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| County % of Texas Total | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.4 |

Table 5. Population of Lower Rio Grande Valley Counties 1880-1940\textsuperscript{33}

Starr County had the most noticeable drop, of almost 1700 people, between 1910 and 1920. Willacy had a late start in 1911, when it was split off from parts of Cameron and Hidalgo counties, but showed steady growth. Hidalgo and Cameron counties showed consistent growth and the most dramatic population booms, especially when they more than doubled in number between 1920 and 1930.
The dramatic increase in the overall number of marriages in Hidalgo County and City fits with the population boom that occurred in the Lower Rio Grande Valley at the time. The connection to broader events is evident in the Lower Rio Grande Valley’s population growth and the notable increase in the number of towns, a testament to the success of railroad and agribusiness promotion efforts, as well as political events in Mexico.

The growth of border sister cities is a reminder of the transborder connections that spanned the river on a daily basis. Cities on both sides of the border clearly experienced dramatic growth spurts. The estimates on the Texas side reflect the dramatic influx of newcomers to the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville, Texas</td>
<td>6,305</td>
<td>10,517</td>
<td>11,791</td>
<td>22,021</td>
<td>22,083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamoros, Tamaulipas</td>
<td>8,347</td>
<td>7,390</td>
<td>9,215</td>
<td>9,733</td>
<td>15,699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,331</td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>11,877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynosa, Tamaulipas</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>9,412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Texas-Mexico Twin city Populations 1880-1940

Maine Border Marriages – Madawaska, Maine

Turning from the Texas Lower Rio Grande Valley to northern Maine’s St. John River Valley, analyzing intermarriage and language practices recorded in the U.S. Census investigates the formation of a Franco American border community in Madawaska, Maine. The study also explores the potential influence of gender, family history, and parental nativity on those practices. While focusing on Madawaska, Maine, the investigation recognizes the important relationship with its sister city, Edmundston, across the St. John River. This river marks part of the international U.S.-Canada boundary line and has served to both unite and separate these two towns and their inhabitants for centuries.
Originally, plans to define intermarriage based on ethnicity or race changed because all individuals were listed as “White” in the census. Intermarried couples were then identified based on national origin. National origin was recorded in all censuses, and, in most cases, individuals from Canada were also noted as being from “Canada-French.” The social reality was undoubtedly more complicated, but for the purposes of this study census terms are used.35

In moving from a broader to narrower focus of analysis, intermarriage and language practices among all married individuals are examined first, followed by only intermarried native Mainers. Multiple factors can help explain what the analysis results reflect and reveal about the relationship between the local community and broader events.

Like South Texas, the expectation is that local migration, marriage, and language patterns in Madawaska, Maine were marginally influenced by stricter U.S. or Canadian border and immigrations laws and intermarriage laws. The expectation is that the number of intermarriages based on national-origin would be high given the proximity to Canada. The first question is, how many individuals in Madawaska intermarried in relation to the overall number of marriages?

Table 7. Madawaska city, 1880-1930: Intermarriages as Percentage of Total Marriages36
From 1880 to 1930, there is a decrease, with a noticeable dip in 1910. Keeping in mind that each date represents the preceding decade, we find that the overall number of intermarried individuals were a minority in the community, ranging from 32% in 1880, down to 11% in 1910, then rising again to 24% in 1930. Possible factors that could explain these fluctuations include the availability of Canadian spouses, negative attitudes within the Madawaska community, or larger external factors.

Maine Border Marriages – National-Origin, 1880-1940

Knowing this number of marriages leads to the questions of who was doing the intermarrying, based on national origin and gender?

Table 8. Madawaska city, 1880-1930: National Origin of Married Individuals (percentages)
Canadian spouses who immigrated to the city of Madawaska and married either Mainers or fellow Canadians were in the minority. These numbered 21% of the population or less. The majority of Madawaska’s married individuals were clearly born in Maine, ranging from the low 70 to low 90 percentiles. Notably and understandably, the dip-and-rise pattern of 1910 here follows the same pattern as the earlier intermarried table.

Apparently, the majority of Canadian immigrants were moving to other communities in Maine, but those who stayed in Madawaska tended to marry native Mainers. These individuals often had relatives in the community. Possibly, more Canadians were in Madawaska but moved on because they did not feel welcome in the community or as spouses. Clearly, marriages between partners of different nationalities were occurring on both borders.

Maine Border Marriages – Cultural Data Analysis

An examination of the number of French speakers may provide a gauge of how open the community was to the French language, francophone culture, and, therefore, French-speaking potential spouses from Canada.
Madawaska city was clearly a French-language-dominant community between 1880 and 1930. This points to the very strong likelihood of openness to French culture and francophone spouses.

Considering the high number of native-born Mainers from the previous table and the high number of French speakers shown here, this evidence clearly demonstrates the development of a Franco American culture. English-speakers are consistently in the minority, but show a general increasing trend, until a noticeable drop from 16% in 1920 to 3% in 1930. This could mean the number of French-only speakers increased and English-only speakers decreased. A more plausible possibility is that this shift actually reflects a growth in the number of bilingual speakers. This conclusion is based on the number of individuals who were listed as able to speak English and inferences regarding additional languages spoken.

Table 9. Madawaska city, 1880-1930: Dominant Language of All Married Individuals

![Bar chart showing the dominant language of all married individuals in Madawaska city from 1880 to 1930, with the percentage of French speakers and English speakers for each year.](chart.png)
Table 10. Madawaska city, 1880-1930: Bilingual Speakers Among All Married Individuals\textsuperscript{39}

This increase in English language skills is probably also due in part to compulsory education laws passed in 1887 and 1909. Attendance became mandatory for five to fifteen year olds after 1887, and for illiterate fifteen to seventeen year olds after 1909. Valley schools reached the sixth grade, only a few beyond that, and most used French on school grounds. Nativist-backed state legislation in 1895 attempted to cut funding to schools that taught in any language other than English, but early efforts were defeated.\textsuperscript{40} New job requirements also introduced the need to communicate with English-language dominant supervisors. Therefore, it appears that potential French Canadian spouses were passing through town and that the Madawaska community was open to them.

Narrowing the focus from all married couples to only intermarried Mainers, the expectation is that Maine women outmarried more than Maine men, and that French-speakers prefer French-speaking spouses.

At first glance, it appears that, surprisingly, more Maine men intermarried than Maine women.
Table 11. Madawaska city, 1880-1930: Maine Native Intermarriages by Gender

However, this could also reflect that more of the intermarried male inhabitants stayed in Madawaska, while some of the intermarried Maine women moved back to Canada with their husbands. Also, the low number among women could have been due in part to the 1907 Expatriation Act, although this is unlikely because most women were not aware of this law. Plus, like Texas, in the long history of the river, locals frequently crossed for work, socializing, and education. Enforcement was minimal even after federal crossing points and agents were assigned to enforce the international border in the first half of the twentieth century.

Turning next to language, from 1880 to 1930, we see a reversal of language practices from predominantly French-only speakers to English speakers.
Initially, French-only speakers probably married French-only speakers; however by 1930 French speakers were also marrying English speakers.

Looking at gender, we see that the female French speakers decreased and English speakers generally increased. While the male French speakers rose then fall, and English speakers gradually rose. However, as noted earlier, I believe these figures do not show an increase in English-only speakers, but instead reflects an increase in bilingualism within the community.

Family history is another potential influence on a couple’s decision to intermarry. The expectation is for a higher probability of intermarriage with a family history of intermarriage,

Table 12. Madawaska city, 1880-1930: Language of Intermarried Maine Men and Women

Initially, French-only speakers probably married French-only speakers; however by 1930 French speakers were also marrying English speakers.

Looking at gender, we see that the female French speakers decreased and English speakers generally increased. While the male French speakers rose then fall, and English speakers gradually rose. However, as noted earlier, I believe these figures do not show an increase in English-only speakers, but instead reflects an increase in bilingualism within the community.

Family history is another potential influence on a couple’s decision to intermarry. The expectation is for a higher probability of intermarriage with a family history of intermarriage,
Of couples who intermarried, as expected, when parents did not intermarry, a very small percentage of their children intermarried, between 20% in 1880, down to 6% in 1910, then increasing slightly to 10% in 1930. Surprisingly, when parents did intermarry, again, the numbers remained rather low, fluctuating from 16% in 1880, up to 24% in 1890, dropping to a low of 5% in 1910, then increasing again to 25% by 1930. Ultimately, parental intermarriage practices had minimal influence on the marriage practices of their children.

Looking at a combination of these factors, what patterns are revealed among French-speaking intermarried Mainers regarding parental gender, nativity, and language skills? The expectation was that most French-speaking Mainers would have French speaking parents, with a predominance of both parents, or just the mother, being from French Canada.
Table 14. Madawaska city, 1880-1930: Parental Nativity and Gender Influence on French-speaking (Non-English-speaking) Intermarried Mainer Children

The analysis revealed that the highest percentage of French-speakers in every period were those with both parents from Maine (58% blue). Over time, we see this number remained consistently high and increases fairly steadily. This supports the earlier data showing a steady increase in the number of native Mainers who were French speakers.

The next largest group had both parents from French Canada (18% red). This number remained steady in 1880 and 1890, when it nearly equaled the number of Mainer-Mainer couples. After that, these marriages decreased steadily to zero by 1930. This suggests a gradual decline in the number of French Canadian immigrants, or at least their tendencies to marry each other; and that they passed their French skills to their children.

The third largest group had a mother from Maine and father from French Canada (13% purple). This group fluctuated considerably. Apparently, among French Canadian immigrants, the influx of men varied, or Maine women returned to Canada with their husbands, or Maine
women chose not to marry foreigners. Nonetheless, this group points to either (1) if the mother’s language dominated, then many Maine women spoke French, or (2) the father’s language dominated, or (3) both.

This next group consisted of a mother from French Canada and a father from Maine (10% green). This group rose and fell rather steadily. At the same time, the influx of French Canadian women showed a steady rise then fall over time. This supports the idea that the mother’s language dominated, and that Maine men may have been bilingual.

The smallest number had a mother from Maine and a Father from English Canada (1% light blue), which had a brief appearance in the decade preceding 1900. Of course the English or French language skills of the father would have depended on where he lived in New Brunswick or English Canada. Still, here too, it appears that, even if the father was an English speaker, Maine women spoke French and taught it to their children.

Overall, we see that although the number of French Canadian immigrants appeared to decrease over time, French language was still practiced by native Mainers. And, accepting that a mother’s language had the stronger influence, then the data shows that many native Maine mothers were speaking French and teaching it to their children. This supports the importance of women’s roles as primary caregivers and cultural preservation and perpetuation.

Looking at the overall conclusions in this period, it appears that the number of Maine-Canada intermarriages comprised one-third or less of the Madawaska population. Gender influences were reflected in male Madawaskans apparently intermarrying more than women, and French-speaking mothers had the strongest influence on the language acquisition of their children. Parental marriage practices did not influence their children’s marriage practices. However, their language skills did influence the language acquisition of their children. And even
though the number of Canadian immigrants decreased and native Mainers increased, the number of French speakers remained high or increased. These practices boded well for the development and growth of a Franco American border culture from the late 19th to early 20th century.

Maine Demographic Changes – State, Valley, Sister Cities

Turning to the broader demographic changes in the state of Maine, the overall population increased, however, cultural demographic changes due to fluctuations in Canadian immigration appeared minimal. Immigration numbers remained steady for several decades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maine total population</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>648,936</td>
<td>661,086</td>
<td>694,466</td>
<td>742,371</td>
<td>768,014</td>
<td>797,423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maine, Foreign-born Whites from Canada-Other</th>
<th>36,169 “Can-English”</th>
<th>41,210</th>
<th>38,570</th>
<th>36,796</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine, Foreign-born Whites from Canada-French</td>
<td>same as above</td>
<td>same as above</td>
<td>30,908</td>
<td>35,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Maine Population and Immigration 1880-1940

Looking at the availability of potential spouses, between 1880 and 1930, census abstracts report that Maine’s overall population increased by approximately 130,000 people in this period. And, while potential foreign-born spouses from « Canada-other » decreased, (by about 600 people), the number of « Canada-French » continued to increase, by approximately 6,000 people. The term « Can-other or Can-Engl » is taken to refer to New Brunswick and « Can-Fr » to refer to the Quebec province. Most « Can-Fr » immigrants are expected to have spoken French. Looking at Madawaska specifically, its overall population also showed a steady increase, (by
approximately 450). So, it appears that these Canadians immigrants added to the number of potential spouses in Maine over all and Madawaska more specifically.

In northern Aroostook County and the St. John River Valley, many of the larger towns dotted the far northern border. The town of Madawaska, at 1,698, was a mid-sized example of these communities. While most immigrants headed for job opportunities in urban industrial centers in southern Maine, northern Aroostook County still managed a dramatic aggregate population increase from 29,609 in 1870 to 87,764 in 1930. The sharpest increase in Aroostook County’s population occurred between 1890 and 1910, the period when Sandy was born, when “The County’s” population increased by fifty percent. The St. John River Valley showed noteworthy population increases of non-natives, those from outside of the Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valley non-natives</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>41,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. St. John River Valley Population 1880-1930

The majority of these individuals were likely Canadian immigrants who had family already living in the Valley. As the numbers increased, there were undoubtedly many with no previous connection to the are or its residents.

Focusing more specifically on the sister cities of the St. John River Valley, shows steady growth on both sides of the border.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madawask, Maine</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmundston, New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Buren, Maine</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Leonord, NB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The transborder connections were still important. Even when the closeness of economic ties changed, as with the arrival of the railroad from the interior of Maine, the social connections still continued.

**Constructing Identities and Borders**

As the 20th-century progressed, however, increasingly restrictive federal immigration policies attempted to limit access of some immigrant groups to U.S. society. Early policies focused on the waves of immigrants entering the U.S. from across the oceans. As a result, funding and staff were focused on ports of entry on the two coasts. North American neighbors of Mexico and Canada were exempted from most of these early laws. Accordingly, the two land borders and the Gulf Coast received less attention. Still, North American neighbors became entangled in these restrictive immigration and border issues as determined individuals, who found their entry barred along the coasts, sought entry via the land borders. As immigration restrictions and quota limits grew stricter, issues of immigration enforcement became closely integrated with border enforcement.

If undesirable immigrants or existing intermixed groups were the embodiment of the idea of human threats to U.S. society, then border agents were the embodiment of the idea of geopolitical border defense. Trying to enforce restrictive immigration laws and accurately track crossings along both U.S. land borders was a daunting, if not impossible, challenge for the understaffed early border officials. The land borders covered nearly 1935 miles (3115 km) in length in the case of Mexico and approximately 5,525 miles (8890 km) in the case of Canada. 50
Initial resources devoted to the Mexican border were tasked with uncovering and stopping illegal immigration of Chinese or other barred groups, and most of these efforts followed routes through border states closer to the west coast. In later decades, concerns regarding the number of immigrants from China and Europe would direct more attention to the Texas-Mexico Gulf Coast. The entire group of border inspectors, numbering 75 or less over the years, were responsibility for patrolling the entire U.S.-Mexican land border.

Texas Border Posts

During and after World War I, combined concerns at the national level led the assignment of more officials to the borders, including Texas. The Border Patrol presence in the Rio Grande Valley began in 1921 with four officers assigned in Hidalgo, two in Rio Grande City, and two in Brownsville, which was also the location of the headquarters office. Additional officers were assigned near the Texas border in 1923 in Alice, Harlingen, Kingsville, and Mission. In 1938, as towns shifted in size and importance, the headquarters moved to McAllen.
Given the long history of cross-border traffic for work, shopping and visiting relatives, and the fact that many border officers lived in or were from the area, border officers would have recognized Tejana/o locals and regular Mexicana/o workers and allowed them to cross the border without detaining them.

**U.S. – Mexico Border Immigration**

The combined elements of booming agribusiness and railroad construction and the resulting need for labor were key factors that attracted waves of immigrants from both the northern reaches of the U.S. and the northern states of Mexico to South Texas where they transformed the face of the Valley forever. By the mid-1910s, South Texas had undergone dramatic and violent economic, social, and political change in just over a decade.

Mexico was undergoing dramatic changes as well on a national scale. Ideas about reforming the existing power and social structures were exchanged across the border, as Mexican
intellectuals sought refuge in Texas and U.S. intellectuals offered support or sought inspiration for their own issues. Political power plays between U.S. and Mexican presidents influenced the timing of border raids. Racial and class tensions continued, and influenced the development of the Tejano community far beyond the border and well into the 20th century.\textsuperscript{56}

Although Pancho Villa’s activity centered more in northern Mexico, rumors of raids by Villa and his men spread across South Texas and made locals very anxious. However, Villa was only sighted near Texas during a skirmish in Mexico across from El Paso, and only crossed the border into Columbus, New Mexico in 1916.\textsuperscript{57} Tensions surrounding the raids, and General J.J. Pershing’s 1916-1917 expedition in response, are perfect examples of the connections between the local and the international levels of border issues.\textsuperscript{58} Local raids from Mexico into the U.S. prompted federal responses, and vice versa, from both the United States and Mexico.

Between 1900 to 1920, Mexican immigrants to the United States numbered approximately 250,000 to 350,000 registered Mexican citizen and an estimated 190,000 additional unregistered Mexican citizen immigrants.\textsuperscript{59} The figures are estimates for several reasons. First, as Spaniards and Mexicans discovered previously, it was next to impossible to accurately track crossings over immense, largely desolate land borders. In addition, in 1919, there were only 151 immigration officials and 20 border crossing posts.\textsuperscript{60} Another factor is the question of how U.S. officials identified “Mexicans” and whether natives of Texas of Mexican descent were counted as Mexican nationals.

At the turn of the century, Mexican immigration to the U.S. was apparently of so little concern that it was not counted as a separate country in earlier census decades. Mexico is first counted in 1910 when estimated immigrants to the U.S. numbered 382,002. By 1920, this number almost doubled to 725,332.\textsuperscript{61} In 1920, of this total number, 249,652 chose to reside in
Approximately 14,601 of them decided to become “foreign-born white” residents in Hidalgo County. The foreign-born whites in the county also included 81 Canadians.

Maine Border Posts

The U.S. Border Patrol officially established its presence in Maine on May 28, 1924, and was under the direction of the office in Newport, Vermont. Fourteen Patrol Inspectors covered eight points of land entry within the Houlton Sector and were responsible for patrolling the entire state. Fort Kent, Van Buren, Fort Fairfield, and Mars Hill stations were located in the northern part of the state, and Houlton, Jackman, Vanceboro and Calais stations were located in the mid and southern part of the state.

Figure 7. Map 1932 St. John River Valley and Canada border area

U.S. – Canada Border Immigration

Regarding immigration from the north, the 1920 U.S. census estimated Canadian immigrants to the U.S. numbered 848,309 Canada-French and 1,755,519 Canada-Other. This
marked a decrease from 1910 immigration estimates of 932,238 Canada-French and 1,822,377 Canada-Other.\textsuperscript{66} Maine apparently also experienced a downward shift in immigration. Foreign-born Whites in Maine decreased from 110,133 in 1910 to 107,349 in 1920. Of these, 52,307 lived in rural areas in 1910 and 48,197 lived in rural areas in 1920.\textsuperscript{67} Of these foreign-born Maine inhabitants in 1920, approximately 33\% (35,580 individuals) were identified as Canada-French and nearly 36\% (or 38,570 individuals) were Canada-Other.\textsuperscript{68} These generally decreasing numbers could be explained in part by Canada’s political and economic state, particularly its earlier involvement in World War I than the United States.

\textbf{U.S. Identity Tensions Embodied in Texas Border Tensions}

Texas Valley promoters often painted a placid scene of the area, trouble still brewed. New Anglo immigrants brought with them their worldly possessions, dreams for a better future, and attitudes towards people different from themselves. They were usually unfamiliar with Mexican citizens and U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry. Some newcomers adapted to their new home, adopted the local culture and language and religion of the area, and even married local men and women. However, most kept to themselves in segregated neighborhoods, maintained only their language and culture and religion, and interacted very little with the local community members. As a result, many of them perpetuated their stereotypical and racist views of their neighbors who they viewed as \textit{other}.

In this case, that meant they viewed locals as dark, inferior, and having negative characteristics - due to either popular scientific racism views of dark or mixed races - or carried over from their home regions - often equating the dark skin of Mexicans with the dark skin of Indians or Blacks. These misconceptions and derogatory attitudes combined with greedy
ambition for land and social status to the point that tensions between Anglos and Texas Mexicans escalated and erupted in the Plan de San Diego conflict. The indiscriminate lynching of Mexicans and Tejanos, often without provocation, was strong motivation for Mexicans to avoid crossing the border to the U.S., potential reason for Mexicans and Tejanos to cross to Mexico, and a clear reminder to choose a marriage partner carefully – whether Tejano or Anglo – to avoid persecution.

As more towns developed and grew larger, new Anglo and European arrivals created communities separate from existing Tejano communities. As a result, the opportunities for daily interaction between different ethnic groups and classes decreased. Railroad tracks often physically segregated sections of town where Anglos and Texas Mexicans developed their own religious, business, and recreational spaces. Property values, quality of home construction, and investment in infrastructure development were usually higher in the Anglo neighborhoods. Segregation spread and Americanization efforts attempted to impose the English language and idealized U.S. culture in schools, especially during the First World War. Still, although their residential areas and schools were often separate, different ethnic groups crossed paths through the necessities of work and everyday life.

Increased tensions between ethnic Mexicans and ethnic Anglos in South Texas resulted from a combination of Anglo racist attitudes, discriminatory practices, and unscrupulous land-grabbing techniques, plus an influx of Mexican and Anglo immigrants attracted by the expanding agribusiness opportunities. Local power control was shifting hands very quickly and violently from the hands of Tejanos to the hands of Anglo newcomers from other parts of the United States, and some from Europe. Tejanos resisted as best they could, but were being quickly
outnumbered. A similar process that had taken place elsewhere in Texas - San Antonio during the Texas Republic period - was happening now in the Valley.

Texas was rocked by violent racial conflict, beginning with when tensions reached a boiling point in 1915 with the Plan de San Diego. This plan referred to documents calling for an uprising in Texas and across the U.S. Southwest by Blacks, Mexicans, Indians, Asians, and all oppressed peoples. The Plan de San Diego voiced common complaints of Tejanos living in poverty and suffering violent abuse at the hands of racist Anglos. Although no large-scale uprising developed, group skirmishes occurred, and the document solidified fears of Anglos that a major assault was coming. In the ensuing weeks, Anglos mercilessly attacked Tejanos and Mexicans, shooting, lynching, and killing hundreds, possibly thousands, without due process of law. In fact, law enforcement officers, particularly the Texas Rangers, were known to participate in these extra-legal proceedings.

Racism clearly played a role in the brutality of the killings. Economic and political ambitions were also motivators for eliminating any potential Tejano opposition to Anglo dominance in the region. The recent attacks, coupled with the history of conflict between Tejano communities and Anglo authorities, led many South Texas Mexicans to distrust local “peace” officers and to call for federal protection against local Texas Rangers and militias. In response, in 1916, U.S. federal troops were sent to the border. The violence finally subsided in July, due in large part to the realization that there was no widespread movement, as well as the presence of federal troops.70

Troops were stationed all along the US-Mexico border, including Valley military posts of Fort Brown and Fort Ringgold, primarily in response to the Mexican Revolution of 1910.71 They arrived in Texas in response to the discord in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, as well as because
of the revolution going on across the border in Mexico. Despite the presence of U.S. troops to maintain order, tension continued to mount in South Texas. In response to these crises, the U.S. government sent 12,000 soldiers to McAllen, and they arrived on July 4, 1916.

When soldiers arrived to patrol the border and help keep the peace, they also got to know the place first, before getting to know the local people. A 1916 newspaper ad showed railroad routes from New Orleans to the Texas Lower Rio Grande Valley. The additional ad text promoted,

What an Opportunity! Uncle Sam paid your car fare 2117 miles to get here. Will you spend ten dollars to visit Corpus Christi – ten dollars for a swim in the Gulf? Or a few dollars more to visit San Antonio or Galveston, the two famous cities of the Southwest? The railroad that is colonizing the Gulf Coast – that operates an extensive freight, express, mail and passenger service without accident or undue delay.  

The use of the term colonizing in reference to the Gulf Coast, including the South Texas border, carried an attitude of Manifest Destiny that implied these remote regions were still viewed as foreign and awaiting U.S. domination.

The troops assigned to the Lower Rio Grande Valley border in this period included the First Cavalry, whose name was later changed to the Fourth Cavalry – Sandy’s future unit. This cavalry unit had fought in the Philippines, and then returned to the United States before being assigned to protect the border. In September 1916, the Rio Grande Rattler reported the campsite of the First Cavalry as looking like “the start of a new city during the gold rush of ’49.” Some of the troops would eventually leave when tensions calmed, but would return at the end of World War I. Sandy would be among those troops who arrived in the post-war period.
The presence of federal troops were not an occupying force, however, they clearly embodied federal efforts to exert federal authority and define national geopolitical borders.

**U.S. *Mestizaje*/Métissage Erasure Ideals & Local Realities**

**National Identities - Re/Defining Self, International Neighbors and Others**

The United States and its inhabitants have had a unique sense of identity and an even stronger sense of exceptionalism - pride at being the best, most powerful, most unique country in the world. The U.S. is also the only place in the world where two-word terms are so central and commonly used to describe its members in an attempt to simultaneously identify culture and nationality – Mexican American, Franco American, African American, Native American, Chinese American, and others. It is an awkward attempt to accept *otherness*, or difference, as a part of the U.S. identity that simultaneously maintains an understated separateness between groups. Examining mixed cultures at the Texas and Maine borders shows how this interrelated
sense of identities developed, and explores why there is a national compulsion to require a choice of either/or instead of acceptance of and all of one’s cultural ancestries.

This dichotomous approach might seem contradictory in a country where everyone is expected to become one common people by melting together. The root of the contradiction arises from the expectation that everyone will blend into an idealized whiteness, not an intermixed off-white blended shade of brown. Individuals are either white enough and acceptable or not, and they have more melting to do.

The national image of a U.S. “melting pot” became popular at the beginning of the 20th century. The phrase was taken from the title of a 1908 play by Israel Zangwill, a Jewish immigrant from England. Granted, ideas summarizing what it meant to become “The United State of America” and “American” had existed since the earliest days when the country was striving for independence and an identity of its own. Early ideas about these processes of becoming were described most famously by J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur in 1782 in his Letters from an American Farmer, and in Alexis de Tocqueville’s observations in Democracy and America upon his tour of the young country in 1831.

The 20th-century “melting pot” idea proposed that diverse masses – both new arrivals and long-term inhabitants - would blend into a homogenous group that adopted dominant White, Anglo-Asxon, Protestant culture. It proved unrealistic in application because members of dominant, White society had difficulty accepting “subordinate” groups as equals. And, members of other groups understandably harbored their own biases toward dominant White society as a result of discriminatory treatment. This image also assumes a process where groups assimilate to White culture and forget their other heritage, but many members of these other groups, rightly, refused to do this and wished to maintain elements of their own culture. This idea accepts
mixing, but ignores that the other groups have valuable contributions, too. It also ignores the process of intermixing where elements of both exist and can create a new mixed culture. The 1959 book by historian Carl Degler conceived of the U.S. as a salad bowl. This idea recognized distinct groups within the country, but downplayed the potential for blending and also ignored intermixing.\textsuperscript{76}

Mexico’s idea of \textit{raza cósmica}, a cosmic race, popularized by José Vasconcelos in 1925, emphasized intermixing and the movement toward a new, single mixed race that combined the best elements of its constituent groups. It celebrated intermixing, recognized distinct groups, and required forgetting only the negative characteristics of the old in the creation of the new. This romantic view promised a distant future goal that the whole world would eventually reach, but in the meantime it offered only an incomplete, not-fully-unified identity in the present.

Canada’s image of a cultural mosaic, introduced by John Murray Gibbon’s 1938 history book, visualized a national image that accepted the diversity of its population, but placed more emphasis on the separateness. It celebrated the value and contributions of distinct groups and how the cooperation of diverse peoples created a beautiful whole, but ignored the mixing that created a space and identity in between.

At the end of the 19th century, however, these national identities did not yet exist. Internationally, from the turn of the century into the 20th century, the three nations of North America, especially the U.S., began to more forcefully define and enforce their political borders and cultural ideals in an effort to define who was considered acceptable citizens. The U.S. drive to enforce national boundaries and restrict immigration prompted its North American neighbors to react, often with similar border tightening practices. Nationally, U.S. anxieties over new waves of immigrants and resulting stricter border and immigration policies, spurred
Americanization efforts in schools that simultaneously celebrated dominant white culture and taught generations of children and adults to feel uncomfortable about their other heritage. At the same time, national politicians were aware of the importance of local and international labor to U.S. labor-intensive businesses of agriculture, railroads and factories. Restrictive policies allowed exemptions for the most accessible labor pools from neighboring Canada and Mexico.

It is important to remember that Native Americans continued to exist and maintained their own distinctive identities. Although they are respectfully called Nations today, they have never been regarded as independent geopolitical entities by the United States. They maintain this sense amongst other Native groups, as demonstrated by their international Olympic competitions and conferences. Like the U.S., they, too, face intermixing identity issues. They have faced a similar identity tension when trying to define who is considered Indian and who is not. Multiple factors have contributed to this quandary, including the need to intermarry to bolster declining population numbers after wars or disease, their own varying levels of openness to intermixing since before Europeans arrived, the one-drop rule practiced by the English in relation to slaves, the U.S. Dawes Act in relation to land distribution, and more recent concerns regarding resource distribution from the federal government or casinos. Indians were far from thought by the early 20th century as most had already been sent to reservations.

U.S. popular culture also played a hand in denigrating intermixing and portraying Whites as the ideal. The 1915 premiere of “Birth of a Nation” presented a pro-South, pro-White, anti-Black, anti-miscegenation message. It was also the first U.S. feature-length film, plus it used pioneering camera work and included orchestral accompaniment that drew record crowds as it toured across the country. These factors contributed to a resurgence of Ku Klux Klan activity, anti-immigrant policies, and anti-intermixing sentiments.
Regionally, this period demonstrated strong similarities between the border areas, as well as dramatic differences. French Canadian and Mexican labor were important for Maine and Texas economies, respectively, especially as both borders were transformed - by the railroad, escalation of border enforcement, and long-brewing water controversies that reached their boiling points. Intermixing was still ongoing but this period was a crucial phase in determining how much, if at all, intermixing would be accepted as part of that national identity. Previously, the status of a mixed-heritage Indian or Black individual was determined by the status of the mother. This neatly erased intermixed racial status by forcing categorization by the mother’s standing. With the introduction of groups from abroad, either through the acquisition of territory or by their immigration from other countries, this introduced a new complexity of how to determine the status of groups that were neither clearly Black nor Indian, and definitely not pure White. Nationality served the same purpose of providing clear-cut categories by which to group people as other, especially those of questionable racial background. Once again, accepting intermixture as a category was avoided and U.S. national identity emphasized the dichotomy of dominant White culture and other.

**Americanization Efforts & Local Response**

World War I heightened sensitivities to national and cultural loyalty in the United States. Programs to instill proper culture, language, and loyalty to the U.S. became prevalent during the War, particularly in schools across the country. In northern Maine and South Texas, schools helped promote pride in local Francophone and Hispanophone culture. Given the public school nature of education, many schools also promoted assimilationist and Americanization messages, particularly after World War I when state laws required instruction in English. Anti-Catholic and
anti-foreigner sentiments were expressed overtly, such as with nativist movements and the emergence of the Ku Klux Klan in Maine in the 1920s.

A 1920 Citizenship Training pamphlet summarized the purpose of the program when discussing educational efforts in a public school on the Mexican border,

> Intelligence is the antithesis of superstition, prejudice, fear, and hatred, both of a racial as well as an individual character. An intelligent understanding of our language acquired in the public schools of this country by those who come amongst us can but result in the development of a sense of appreciation of the source of the benefits and the development of a greater sense of loyalty and devotion to those institutions. The return across the international boundary of those having acquired a knowledge of our language and customs through the public schools will mean the extension of a new element and of the foundations of the healthiest character for the removal of prejudices against this country, founded largely upon mutual lack of understanding, the result of a contract of forces rather than of intelligent, sympathetic relations.\(^77\)

This goal is clearly aimed at Mexican citizens who have immigrated to the U.S., whether temporarily or permanently. Still, descriptions refer to Mexicans living on the border as if all were immigrants, blurring the line between them and locals of Mexican-descent who are citizens.

**Texas - Education**

South Texas reflected national post World War I educational efforts. Schools were used to Americanize recent immigrants as well as citizens, to acculturate and assimilate inhabitants perceived as foreign. For example, children in McAllen were punished for speaking Spanish in school. One of Elodia’s daughters, Bertha, remembered when her elementary school classmate was made to stand with her nose to the school’s exterior wall during recess as punishment for speaking Spanish.\(^78\) The habit of speaking Spanish at home and English in school was practiced even during Elodia’s childhood; however, the legally-dictated effort to discourage the use of Spanish was a later development. Hidalgo County’s proximity to Mexico and the fact that it
remained a Mexican “stronghold” where the Mexican-descent population maintained a majority was largely responsible for the perpetuation of the Spanish language.\textsuperscript{79}

**Conclusion**

The turn of the century, from 1880 to 1914, witnessed nationality becoming a more central element of identity as waves of immigrants began reaching U.S. shores in greater numbers. Defining who was, or was not, acceptable to cross U.S. geopolitical and social borders prompted stricter immigration restrictions and border enforcement. As U.S. national identity and borders became more conflated, mixed-heritage citizens and immigrants became more conflated, and then excluded from “acceptable” U.S. identity. Ideas that linked *race* to biology and associated character qualities gained popularity across the nation. Assimilation of *others* was accepted and expected, but intermixing was still frowned upon. Restrictive marriage policies attempted to limit the crossing of forbidden social borders.

The outbreak of World War I was a critical influence on how neighbors and others were treated in the U.S. between 1915 to 1941. Racist portrayals of foreign enemies influenced attitudes towards and treatment of U.S. citizens with ancestors from that country. Loyalty, good citizenship, and adherence to dominant culture were emphasized. Americanization of *others* was implemented through schools, similar to earlier attempts in the Spanish missions and French *francisation*. Creating homogenous U.S. citizens while assimilating or excluding intermixed individuals further erased *mestizaje/métissage* from U.S. history.

The blurring of U.S. social and geopolitical identity borders lead to a tightening of U.S. borders and discriminatory institutional practices towards mixed-heritage citizens and immigrants. *Assimilation* required the adoption of dominant U.S. culture and the abandonment of
all other cultural traditions. Many individuals from different cultural groups chose *acculturation* instead, where they accepted aspects of dominant U.S. culture, but also retained most elements of their *other* culture. In this period, however, U.S. tolerance of *mestizaje/métissage* shifted to intolerance.

Like most of the nation, these two border areas experienced the transformative effect of new technologies, particularly the railroad, and also felt the pressure of the influx of immigrants. Unlike other parts of the nation, these border areas remained rural, and developed limited industry, relying primarily on agricultural or natural resources to drive its economic engine. Also, each area remained sparsely populated and the immigrant influx was comprised of familiar groups from neighboring nations, with a few immigrants from other countries crossing the same land border. In the case of South Texas, a dramatic flood of “foreigners,” or gringos, moved in from other parts of the United States. In addition, both northern Maine and South Texas residents lived in a series of small border towns and surrounding farms (plus cattle ranches in Texas), in vast geographic areas located hundreds of miles from any large cities in their respective states, or even from any large cities across the border in Canada or Mexico. That simultaneous remoteness from their respective same-state neighbors, and proximity to international neighbors, was why transborder community connections were so vital to their survival. They continued to thrive thanks to both economic and social connections. A St. John River Valley example was when Fraser Limited purchased the James Murchie & Son Company sawmill in Edmundston, N.B. in 1911, then closed it in 1917 to construct a paper pulp factory, that later partnered with a paper mill in the U.S. town of Madawaska in the 1920s. That relationship has continued to the present.

Border and immigration policy goals in the capital versus enforcement on the border, were clear examples of the difference between the centers of power and the peripheries where
border citizens lived. Yes, border communities were influenced by national policies, but the effects were not as significant as policies-makers expected in this period. Communities along the border lived according to the needs of their daily reality, not according to the imagined fantasies of national politicians. This disconnect is especially understandable because most national politicians had never lived in, nor ever visited, these border worlds or any border community.

The border communities of Mexican Americans of the Texas Lower Rio Grande Valley and Franco Americans of the Maine St. John River Valley appeared so different, yet shared much in common. Both were transnational border communities where geopolitical borders became more clearly defined over time, but cultural borders remained in flux. A comparative study of these two state borders reveals the nature of geopolitical borders between international neighbors, the social borders created between groups within U.S. society, and the relationships that bridged those borders.
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CONCLUSION

FACING MESTIZAJE/METISSAGE ON THE SOCIAL AND GEOPOLITICAL BORDERS OF AMERICAN IDENTITY

When I began this study, I showed that mixed-heritage communities in the United States had existed since before its inception. I then investigated why mixed-heritage communities were left out of U.S. national history and identity. Ultimately, the study has shown that these communities have long been a part of the nation’s history and have challenged what the national identity is and how it should be defined. The communities in Texas and Maine help us understand how mixed people have been pushed to the social and geopolitical margins of the United States, and how these communities nevertheless resisted and asserted themselves. After centuries of living in these border communities and intermixing with neighbors, Mexican American and Franco American families challenged and influenced the dominant cultural and geopolitical identity of the United States, simply by their existence. In the face of institutional policies and challenges to their ethnic identities, they survived, celebrated and perpetuated their distinctive cultures that proudly combined dominant U.S. and other ancestry.

Border residents adapted as national authorities attempted to impose stricter border laws between them and their international neighbors, and also had to negotiate cross-cultural boundaries between Anglo and non-Anglo worlds. Marriages of neighbors across the border reinforced the transborder sense of community by having family and friends on both sides.
Along with many shared characteristics, intriguing dynamics of border culture can be seen through marriage, language, and cultural perpetuation.

On a community level, border Franco Americans and Mexican Americans had to learn the language and skills necessary to maintain their own culture, and work within Anglo-dominant society. This included pursuing their rights through the Anglo dominated local, state, and national government systems, especially the courts. Local cross-border commercial exchange, social interaction, and cultural relations, continued over time, despite state or national efforts to restrict it. As in other communities, daily interaction could lead to closer individual relationships.

On a personal level, mixed marriages were sometimes frowned upon, both by Whites and ethnic and racial communities, and only gradually grew in number. Due to the forced isolation of many Indian groups, or the submersion of an individual’s indigeneity to avoid discrimination, by the twentieth century most Texas and Maine intermarriages appear to have involved mixed Euroamerican descent or mixed Indian descent individuals, as opposed to full blood Indians. Ongoing intermarriage between Anglos and Mexicans, albeit on a small scale, suggested an acceptance of this practice. The rate of intermarriage between Franco American Mainers and Canadians or French Canadians remained low, but the proliferation of the French language among U.S. born Mainers suggests the openness to this practice. African-descent individuals were few in these regions, and were usually intermixed decades earlier. Both borders pointed to the continuation of a tradition of intermarriage that dated back centuries.

In the broader picture, mestizaje was assisted by the promise of jobs and opportunity in a new land and declining economies back home, that motivated waves of Canadians to flow into Maine and New England, and waves of Mexicans into Texas and the U.S. Southwest. Changing
rates of “French Canadian” migrations into Maine, and Mexican migrations into Texas, influenced the ongoing rates of mestizaje/métissage. Intermixture occurred on both borders at a fairly steady rate, but it was racialized by influences of a colonial-era pigmentocracy that equated darker skin with inferior character. Derogatory language and attitudes became intensified on the Texas border where intermixing was more visible than in northern Maine. Wars and revolutions also played a role, as in the case of Sandy Leveck and Elodia McDonald.

Multiple factors worked in favor of Sandy and Elodia to override tensions between ethnic groups. There were strong personal factors at work. Elodia’s and Sandy’s backgrounds were not as different as they might first have appeared. Sandy and Elodia grew up on distant, culturally-mixed borders, met and married during tumultuous times, and carried on their familial tradition of mestizaje/métissage as they started their own family.

The cultural identities on these borders were complicated, with different elements contributing to each. There were subtleties within the cultural heritage of each. On the Canadian side, there were cultural variations called Quebecois, Acadian, and Brayonne. Border Mainers were very aware of the variations and how they self-identified with each. Historically, different Mexican provinces existed across the border from Texas, but the cultural distinctions between them affected Tejanos less. Language was an important part of local identity, and both border areas suffered discrimination in schools for speaking French in Maine and Spanish in Texas. French appeared to be decrease in usage in Maine more than Spanish in Texas. There were also language dialects created that mixed English with each area’s other European and Indian languages to create Tex-Mex or Spanglish and Franglais.

Gender was another important factor in border intermixture, both in terms of marriage policies and in terms of language and cultural maintenance. Children tended to adopt the
language of the mother as women tended to be the primary caregivers in the family. While women were seen as critical to the managing the household, they were more restricted than men in terms of public lives, sexual activities and marriage options. Policies at the local and national levels attempted to police women’s bodies and lives on many levels.

Looking at international land borders, we see that despite stricter national border policies, local enforcement often varied, transnational migrations regularly occurred, and intermixture continued practically unabated. Texas and Maine borderlanders continued to practice a transnational lifestyle throughout periods of tumult and peace though geopolitical borders did become harder and more effectively enforced by the 1930s. A formal federal infrastructure was created, but the U.S. Border Patrol was still in its infancy and the northern and southern borders remained permeable.⁵⁰⁶

Many communities, groups, and individuals viewed as racial, cultural, or national others shared a similar experience in this country’s history. U.S. society had a long tradition of trying to identify its people in oversimplified, often racialized, categories that ignored the process of intermixing of diverse individuals. As the nation grew, and intermixing progressed, the continued use of those oversimplified categories served to deny the reality of this ongoing process. Conflicts over race and ethnicity—often ignoring the role of class and gender—contributed to tensions that lead to key turning points in the country’s history. The civil rights efforts of the 1950s and 1960s led to many changes, including the push for a more inclusive historical narrative, and new terms that reflected the more complicated identities of U.S. social groups.

Terms of identity that reflected this mestizaje or métissage, changed over time, but still maintained connotations of otherness and the “either-or” dichotomy. After the Civil Rights
Movement and the politically correct 1980s we started to see a more consistent use of terms used today that recognized the mixed heritage of individuals - Mexican American, Chicano, Franco American, Native American, and African American, Chinese American, among others. Even these terms were problematic. Here, too, inequality cast its shadow because these group were still considered less American than the All-American, Anglo-American.

Recognizing a complex intermixed heritage with new terms of identity is not enough. Even in the twenty-first century, a United States president with a White mother and an African father was seen as Black, not White, not Mixed. We still live in a time where a Cheerios commercial set in a home with a Black father and White mother stirs a racist backlash. We are still working toward the time when mixed-heritage individuals, couples, and communities will be seen simply as American and racial intermixing will be accepted as part of our country’s history and national identity. The country’s proud image as a nation of immigrants still relies on the assumption of the assimilation process eventually turning everyone White. Dominant national consciousness continues to ignore the presence of residents who have been part of this country for centuries and have contributed to an ongoing intermixing population.

A deeper mutual understanding is needed, to achieve much-needed socioeconomic and political changes. Just as knowing broader U.S. history is necessary to better understand more specific Mexican American or Franco American history, knowing mixed-heritage history helps to more fully understand U.S. history. These histories are inextricably interconnected.

Throughout its history, the United State government and people have had a rocky relationship with those considered other, whether they arrived by choice as immigrants or were incorporated by force. Fear of the unknown based in ignorance of those considered different led to many heartaches. We are reminded of this by past acts such as Indian genocide, African
slavery, Jim Crow laws, the U.S.-Mexican War, the Civil Rights movement, Chinese exclusion. Still, our country managed to adapt and survive those trying times. To move toward an openly intermixed world, we must forget enough to let go of the pain and prejudices of the past, and remember enough not to repeat those same mistakes. We are reminded by more recent events that vigilance and action are still necessary to protect the rights of those discriminated against as other due to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion, age, or dis/ability. Seeing difference on the surface is easy. The challenge is to look deeper, accept our shared history, and see what makes us all the same as human beings.

None of us is simply one thing or the other - simply black, white, brown, red, yellow. Each of us is a combination. Each of us has a heritage that is a mix of ancestors whose variety gets more diverse the farther back we go and as the family tree branches and roots broaden. That varied mixed heritage is what connects us. As a country and as a people, we need to embrace and celebrate what we have in common. By acknowledging the fact that this mixed heritage has been erased from our history and identity, I hope that we can now accept it as a part of all of us, and in so doing, create a more unified country where we can let go of fear and hate and accept each other with love, peace, and mutual understanding.
These families proudly celebrate the U.S. 4th of July, as well as enjoy Mexican Diez y Seis celebrations and Acadian and Quebecois festivities. Many family members have proudly served in the U.S. military. They experience *mestizaje* and *métissage* as an inclusive experience, rather than either-or equation.


Talking informally with a couple of locals on the Maine and Texas borders revealed that only now are locals truly feeling the effect of the border, and primarily because of stricter border crossing document requirements.
APPENDIX A

THE LANGUAGE OF MESTIZAJE/MÉTISSE

The theory and history of the three central themes are presented in more depth in the following three appendices—mestizaje, identity, and borders. Historical context, definitions of terminology, and theoretical background of these themes are presented as a meta-analysis overview of the study. These are brief introductions to the intellectual history of these concepts that have been shaped by many historical actors, including locals, elites, and scholars who have studied and written about these ideas and people. These sections incorporate another level of awareness of who we are and how we see ourselves. They discuss our awareness both as historical actors in our own moment in time and as part of a larger historical, social picture that is connected to our predecessors and ancestors. The narrative history offers examples of how those ideas have taken shape and intertwined over time.

While *intermarriages* formalized by a church occurred regularly in North America, many couples *intermixed* in informal unions or according to local Native custom. Intermarriage has come to be strongly associated with couples of different races. However, it is important to keep in mind that the meanings of *race* and *mestizaje/métissage* have changed over time and language made a difference. The Spanish and French terms have no equivalent in English that conveys a
similar sense of a long-term cultural and biological mixing of different groups of people. English-language terms tend to be more scientific and biology-based. Languages are like windows onto the worldviews of different cultures. The terms used to describe the intermixing of people of different backgrounds, the history of how those terms came to be, and how their meaning changed over times, offer a glimpse into how people thought about the world and their neighbors at different points in time. Understanding how the words and meanings evolved over time helps us understand how the ideas behind the words also changed.¹

*Mestizaje/Métissage – Native American*

Initial investigations into Indigenous languages suggest that several native cultures—South Texas Coahuiltecan, Northern Plains, Iroquois—also had no equivalent term for *mestizaje* or *métissage*. Although it appears that Native cultures may not have had a single term to describe the concept of this mixing process and resulting mixed groups, the reasons for this could be that Natives emphasized inclusion. This is contrast to the English colonial focus on exclusion. When someone new or different joined an Indian community, they were adopted in their entirety and considered Indian from that point on. In contrast, the opportunity for inclusion of someone seen as wholly or part *other* into an English community were very slim. They would have either been physically segregated or, if allowed within the community social space, kept to a clearly separate social level. This is a very broad generalization considering the multitude of diverse, distinct native groups and nations in North America, as well as different British colonial communities. However, these were the broader tendencies.

Piecing together a picture of what different Native American groups thought about *mestizaje/métissage* in general, and about intermixing with Europeans more specifically, is a
challenge. While many Indigenous cultures passed on their culture and history through oral storytelling traditions, most existing written records were created by Europeans and rarely included a Native perspective.

Mestizaje/Métissage - African

I recognize that Africans were an important part of the mixing of blood and cultures that occurred in North America. However, I have not investigated any African language equivalents because the number of Africans were few in the areas under study – Texas and Maine. Also, it is nearly impossible to identify which African cultural groups, and their associated languages, inhabited these areas because those that did move in were probably individuals or small groups of runaway or shipwrecked slaves, possibly free Black individuals or families. In addition, their small numbers, and status as slaves and servants, in these areas offered limited opportunities to influence language practices or terminology of local communities. This would be a potentially exciting investigation, but it is beyond the scope of this study.

Mestizaje - Spanish

*Mestizaje* is a latin-root word that refers to the long-term mixing of blood and cultures that, ultimately, produced a distinctive culture. According to the Real Academia Española, the Spanish authority on the Spanish language, *mestizaje* means: (1) cruzamiento de razas diferentes (mixing of different races), (2) conjunto de individuos que resultan de este cruzamiento (collection of individuals who result from this mixing), (3) mezcla de culturas distintas, que da origen a una nueva (mixture of different cultures that gives rise to a new culture).² The Spanish created the best-known system for naming the children resulting from the varied intermixed
couples. Casta paintings depicted this casta (caste) hierarchy system or idealized versions of it. The paintings represented a multi-generational pigmentocracy in the context of anticipated stereotypical socioeconomic settings. The more intermixed an individual, the lower the expected class standing and more violent and unhappy the setting. In contrast, the whiter a person, the expectation was the happier, and usually higher economic class family setting. A variety of casta terms developed including peninsular, criollo, mestizo, mulatto, sambo, negro, indio, and others. The most commonly-used words representing intermixture that are still used today are mestizaje for the process and mestizo (male) or mestiza (female) for the individuals. The term has come to mean intermixing in general, is common in countries colonized by the Spanish, but is gaining popularity beyond those borders.

*Métissage - French*

The French, who were launching exploratory and colonizing efforts around the same time as the Spanish, also have a similar term, métissage, that describes this process of intermixing of cultures or populations. According to the Larousse dictionary, the meaning of métissage is, first, union féconde entre hommes et femmes d’origine ethnique différente (a fruitful union between men and women of different ethnicities), second, the crossbreeding of different varieties of the same species of plants, and, third, a description of the same process with animals. Like the Spanish term, it has Latin roots, mysticus with the verb miscere, and came to be used to describe the intermixing of people. I have found no evidence of a uniquely French social hierarchy equivalent to the Spanish casta system. The French apparently used the casta categories developed by the Spanish as guidelines, such as criollo (Spanish) and creole (French).
The most common words representing intermixture that are still used today are *métissage* for the process and *métis* for the people. Unlike the Spanish term *mestizo*, *métis* is not as widely used and is the subject of controversy among some Canadian Indigenous communities. While the process of intermixing occurred across Canada, just as in Mexico and the United States, in Canada, *Métis* has become associated with intermixed communities on the western Plains of First Nation and French Canadian or Scottish ancestry. First Nation communities on the East Coast and elsewhere have begun to self-identify as *métis*, but occasionally meet opposition from within their own communities or from the Plains communities. Some Plains groups wish to make *Métis* the official government identifying designation for themselves, which would preclude it from use by other First Nations. Others do not adopt it, in part, because the intermixed heritage the term represents could weaken their standing as *Native* with the government, and therefore could threaten any protections or privileges they receive. This last is a cause for concern in the United States as well.

**Amalgamation/Half-breed – English**

It is noteworthy that English colonials had no equivalent term that recognized a long-term mixing of bloods and cultures. Most English-language terms for intermixing either borrowed from other languages, originated after the colonial period, or emphasized a scientific or biological aspect and carried derogatory connotations. No English-language term—*amalgamation, miscegenation, mixed blood, half breed*—proved satisfactory nor gained broad popularity across the United States. One of the more commonly-known words, *miscegenation*, was not popularized until the 1864 publication of a political pamphlet. According to the Oxford
English Dictionary (OED), *miscigenation* means “the mixing or interbreeding of (people of) different races or ethnic groups, especially the interbreeding or sexual union of whites and non-whites; a theory which advocates this as being advantageous to society; marriage or cohabitation by members of different ethnic groups.” Early usage referred to combining metals, culture, religion, or ideas, and did not emphasize the biological basis that became popular in later centuries.

Even twenty-first century terms of *biracial* or *multiracial* are problematic because they rely on the idea of *race*, which so many still associate with the outdated meaning of biology-based, unalterable inherent characteristics. The U.S. census has grappled with this intermixed-identity issue and significantly adjusted bureau policies since the first census in 1790. Instead of being labeled by census-takers, individuals can now self-identify as they wish, including acknowledging their multiple ancestries. Unraveling why this process has been so challenging, and has become necessarily complex, is at the root of this project’s inception and goal.

**Race and Otherness – Europe to the U.S.**

At the heart of discussions about *mestizaje* are ideas about *race*, which have changed significantly over time. Reflecting on the origins of *race* and *otherness* (difference) in North America can demonstrate how people thought in the past, and how we arrived at the ideas that we hold today. Granted, a combination of Native, African, and European groups influenced the development of these ideas over the centuries. However, European ideas held the strongest sway in shaping meaning in the long-term due to the proliferation of their written records and positions of power. A common underlying motive for creating identity terms was the justification and protection of existing power relations. These oversimplified and invented categories of human
difference did not reflect the complicated reality of human existence and intermarriage. Nonetheless, they would influence attitudes for centuries to come.\(^8\) These attitudes were gradually adopted informally and institutionalized as policy.

After the U.S. gained its independence from England in the 18th century, local leaders had to decide what kind of ideal society they wanted to create and what they needed to do to achieve it. One of the earliest quandrys was deciding what to do with intermixed individuals, namely those with Indian and Black ancestry. Both groups were so interwoven into local community economic, political and military networks that physical segregation would be difficult. A continuation of social segregation, maintaining them outside of positions of influence and minimizing opportunities for intermixing, remained par for the course.

The mixed-heritage children of Whites, Blacks, and Indians were effectively exiled outside dominant social arenas through the 1662 Virginia statute of *partus sequitur ventrem*. Forcing mixed-heritage children to follow the mother’s ancestry, legally moved White-Black or White-Indian mixed-heritage individuals from the blurred line between two different social worlds into either one parental group or the other, usually to the non-White lower social status. Eastern mixed-blood Indians basically were removed from sight and mind when they were relocated along with full bloods during the 1830 Indian Removal. This neatly and quite successfully began to erase the presence of intermixing from the U.S. social consciousness. The expansion westward and 1848 acquisition of a vast portion of Mexican territory after the U.S.-Mexican War introduced a new group of intermixed *others*—Mexicans. They were out of sight and mind because of their location beyond the U.S. frontier, at least until the U.S.-Mexican War. In the 1850s and 1860s, territorial expansion stoked the flames of the slavery controversy to the
point of civil war and the legal end of slavery; however, discrimination continued against Blacks and people of intermixed ancestry.

As the 19th century progressed, U.S. policies were influenced by ongoing developments in scientific fields and discussions regarding human racial development, evolution, and different capabilities of men and women. Eugenics – a field of study proposing that biological heredity determined one’s capabilities and character - coupled with the theory of Social Darwinism - that argued the “fittest,” best specimens of a society were those who were the most successful individuals - contributed to a scientific racism that supported a biology-based view of racial difference that ultimately favored Whites as an ideal, especially the wealthy ones. Changing definitions of race influenced the meaning of intermarried and intermixed, and who were considered preferred marital partners and acceptable citizens.

The beginning of the 20th century also saw a resurgence of Ku Klux Klan activity throughout the U.S., and anti-immigrant sentiments. Concerns regarding race and nationality associated health characteristics were particularly acute in this period because deaths from infectious diseases were very common, particularly pneumonia and tuberculosis. These ideas in turn negatively influenced views of anyone considered different, including the latest waves of immigrants, as having undesirable innate characteristics associated with their race and national origins.

Most discussions, policies, or laws about these groups viewed them in monolithic terms, and focused on efforts to keep them out of the U.S., or keep them socially separate, in hopes of avoiding intermixing. And while acknowledging that intermixing happened in the past, previous examples were often used as cautionary tales of the dangers of what might happen if this intermixing recurred—decline of the nation, contamination of the elite White class, moral
degeneration, weakening of the country’s mental and physical gene pool, amongst other ills. There was minimal discussion or acknowledgement of already existing mixed heritage groups, and even less on how to view or deal with them. They were usually associated with the most prominent element of their heritage that seemed the most foreign or other, namely Indian or Black, due to policies such as *partus sequitur ventrum* and the one-drop rule.

Social pressure, court cases and marriage laws established social boundaries to limit intermarriage and interaction between Whites and undesirable groups of men and women, especially White women’s interactions. The effectiveness of these efforts varied by location, time period and how strictly they were enforced. In some cases, restrictions or permissions were defined by official laws and court decisions, *de jure* (of law), while some were enacted through informal social pressures, *de facto* (of fact). For example, while some government authorities may have forbidden intermarriages *by law*, many citizens *in fact* still practiced intermarriage. Or, if intermarriages were allowed *by law* in some communities, *in fact* intermarried couples suffered violent discrimination.

National and state government efforts to track populations usually preferred to count inhabitants in clearly defined categories. Although colonial through 19th-century records noted *mulattos*, or other identity terms, most of the mixed-race terminology used in the U.S. referred primarily to Blacks, or sometimes tracked mixing among Native Americans. In 1900, the categories used to answer the U.S. federal decennial census “color or race” question were White, Black, Chinese, Japanese, and American Indian. The 1910 U.S. census used the same question and categories, but recognized social and identity complexity existed when it added Mulatto” and “Other” categories. A possible reason for these changes may have been that the influx of immigrants continued to remain high.
This influx of immigrants at the turn of the 20th century inspired Israel Zangwill, a Jewish immigrant from England, to write a play called “The Melting Pot” that became the popular national image for the process of assimilation for generations to come. It emphasized the idea that other cultures would become more American, meaning White, and held the underlying expectation that the other culture would eventually be dropped away and forgotten. This idea would be challenged in later decades by those who argued it was possible and vital to avoid “melting” into a variation of White and, instead, to promote the value of maintaining and celebrating all cultures, including those who are mestizo/métis.
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The latin origin of mixticĭus, means mixed.


4 For a brief overview of the “Métis” term origin and examples, see “métis, Collins”; For additional details, group examples, and court cases in the twentieth century, see Jean, “Ethnogenese.” Also see Jean, “Ethnogenese” 31, for the term history quote in French, originally cited in Jean-Luc Bonniol, “L’existence sociale des métis: un problem d’identification” (Troisieme atelier international sur les identités et les cultures métisses, Université Saint-Boniface, 2010), which is: “Il est possible de dater assez précisément l’apparition du terme métis dans la pensée occidentale: elle remonte à l’époque où furent massivement mis en contact les hommes des différents continents restés jusque là largement séparés, c’est-à-dire à l’aube des rencontres coloniales. Il faut alors désigner les individus issus de ces rencontres improbables entre dissemblables: on fait appel à un mot qui existe depuis le MoyenÂge dans les langues romanes, dérivant du bas-latin mixticium, lui-même issu du verbe miscere (mélanger), le mot mestiz, présent en français dès le XIIIe siècle, qui sert désormais à nommer cette nouvelle catégorie d’être humains issue des melanges coloniaux (a l’instar de son homologue espagnol mestizo). On peut cependant remarquer qu’il a tenance a se specializer, puisqu’il finit par designer avant tout les unions des rejetons entre Indiennes et Europeans.”

5 See definitions and historic use examples for “criollo” and for “creole” in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) Online, “criollo, n. and adj.,” Oxford English Dictionary Online (Oxford
6 “Miscegenation, OED-American.”


9 Street et al., “What Census Calls Us.”
APPENDIX B

CONSTRUCTING IDENTITY

The history of mestizaje/métissage is a series of redefinitions of us and others that determined when individuals were considered from different groups and intermixed by forming couples and having children. Human beings created those concepts and terms to describe us, others, identity, intermixing, culture, race, ethnicity and gender. These cultural constructs are learned behaviors and ideas that are different from, and external to, the survival adaptations of our bodies – instincts, ability to run and climb, physical senses, and more.

Understanding this difference between culturally constructed ideas and survival adaptations is key when studying human bodies, behavior and attitudes because our ideas influence how we see the bodies, behaviors and associated characteristics of ourselves and others. How an individual or group identified itself, or was identified by others, determined how that individual or group was treated. That treatment then influenced intergroup relations. Factors used to define our identities as human beings and individuals have roots that date back to the pre-contact period – language, religion, class, home place, and others – and have changed considerably over time since then. “[P]erhaps the best example of all [cultural constructs] is articulate speech or language” as “the most characteristic and the most important form of expression of the ability to symbol [to create and apply meaning].”¹

As identity definitions changed in late 18th century Spain and France, these shifts reflected changes in European society, but more importantly they showed influences from abroad
as mainland Europe also adapted in response to an increasingly mixed society in the Americas. Initial definitions of other groups in Spain and France were based on differences of socio-economic class or religion, whether a person was Christian or non-Christian (Muslim, Jew, etc.), and the associated character traits of those categories. As time passed, and Indians, Europeans, and Africans intermixed in the Americas, each European imperial group adapted in its own way to the question of how to describe and incorporate these new mixed-heritage groups into their society. In turn, these mixed-heritage groups adapted and reacted in their own ways.

**Identity & Belonging**

Early uses of the word *identity* in the 17th century emphasized the *quality of being the same* and was applied in scientific settings related to properties of natural elements (rocks, plants, animals, metals, etc.), or to mean *existence* in religious writings. By the 18th century, the meaning had broadened to also mean *a distinct impression of a single person or thing presented to or perceived by others; a set of characteristics or a description that distinguishes a person or thing from others.* These two examples combined show that from its origin, *identity* has been a complex concept that can simultaneously mean both *sameness* and *difference*. Also, distinctiveness as *perceived by others* and *distinguished from others* reminds us that identity involves multiple simultaneous perspectives – how individuals or groups perceive themselves from the inside and how they are perceived by others from the outside.

As human beings communicated amongst themselves and interacted with neighbors near and far, they created networks – social, economic, political, familial, environmental, ideological, technological. Those networks ranged in size and complexity from one family in one campsite
to an entire nation that covered most of a continent. Access to those networks extended the reach and potential influence of smaller groups when they acted in unison. They also allowed access to a broader pool of potential spouses.

Both the individual, or smaller community, and the larger group needed to accept each other in order for both the individual and group identities to become fully acknowledged in all circumstances. This would be akin to Spanish or French colonial administrators trying to create a homogenous colonial population by requiring Natives convert and assimilate French culture in order to be accepted into French society. However, this ideal was in tension with the reality that the Native population was made up of individuals and groups who were very different on many levels and who maintained their own culture while only partially adopting European culture and governing authority.

Group characteristics can be based on appearance, common experience, economic class, cultural practices like food, religion, language, traditions, or a whole host of other possibilities. The ideas of what were un/acceptable shared characteristics were determined in the minds of dominant members and then perpetuated in the minds of the rest of the group members. These ideas were shared and reinforced through words, visual imagery, symbols, and cultural practices. It is crucial to remember to avoid oversimplifying the complexity involved in group identities. Using identifying terms of Spanish, French, Indian, and English make those groups sound monolithic, homogenous and unchanging, but history shows they are far from that.

What were considered acceptable or unacceptable characteristics to be a member of a specific group was usually determined by those who held the most social and economic power, but this was still influenced by other group members. Membership changed based on pressure from previously unaccepted groups who wanted to join. This pressure could result from increases
in immigration that caused shifts in demographics. Or, pressure may have risen to acknowledge those who had been members of the group, but who have not been recognized as equal members and had been denied equal rights. That is the case regarding mixed-heritage individuals within the United States. They had been part of U.S. history since before its formal existence as a country, but have been shut out of the national history narrative and, by extension, out of the national identity.

**Culture, Race, Ethnicity, Place, & Gender**

*Culture* refers to learned behavior and practices that human beings have developed over time as they have adapted to survive. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, *culture* is expressed as the *distinctive ideas, customs, social behavior, products or ways of life of a specific group of people or time period.* The ability to create culture is uniquely human, and this process is influenced by our bodies and environment. Manifestations of culture include language, religion, food ways, music, art, rituals, customs, institutions, clothing, identity, world view, beliefs, and more. Over time, distinctive cultural groups developed as human beings lived in more disparate settings and adapted to their specific environments. That process resulted in a human history filled with a wonderful variety of cultural groups.

As much as individuals or dominant members may try to define their group, there are always forces outsed their control that influence how the group develops, and therefore influences the development of that group’s culture. For example, no one can control where they will be born and into which cultural group. Also, all members of the group, no matter their status within the group or level of action or inaction, exert some influence on the group’s culture. A member with no leadership authority who simply continues to accept and follow cultural
guidelines exercises influence on the group culture because they are unquestioningly supporting and perpetuating existing cultural practices. When many members do the same, they exert a mass internal force on the group as a whole that is potentially equal to the influence exerted by an elite level leader. This could work to perpetuate a dominant group’s culture, or bolster a smaller group’s culture within the larger group, such as Indian or mixed-heritage cultural groups.

The place where a community lived also played an important role in identity, in terms of where one felt closest allegiance, or a strong sense of home and belonging. This sense of home or ancestral connection could apply to where one currently lived or where one’s ancestors lived. After nations formed in the early 19th century, a person’s place on either side of an imaginary, geo-politically constructed line on a map did not directly impact the daily lives of those living along it. Yet, that location did influence how governing authorities viewed those communities – whether part of their claimed territory and empire, and subject to their laws, or not. Border groups regularly traversed back and forth across that geopolitical line, which in all practicality did not exist. That very sense of freedom from oversight and freedom of mobility played an important role in the sense of identity of those groups – whether natives to the land for centuries or relative newcomers of a few decades.

Both race and ethnicity carry the meaning of groups sharing a common origin or shared characteristics. Over several centuries, the defining difference between races has changed from religion, to class, personal character and biology.\footnote{Today, race is often associated with biological characteristics while ethnicity is more closely associated with cultural characteristics. However, the use of science has, at best, confused identity definitions, and at worst, been used to justify discriminatory and inhumane treatment of others.} Today, race is often associated with biological characteristics while ethnicity is more closely associated with cultural characteristics. However,
There is no biological basis for different races, ethnicities, or nationalities because these are cultural constructs, ideas. There is no gene for ideas. *Estadounidense* (someone from the U.S.A.) or *Texan* or *Maine* are real in that they are based in the physical world and hold real meaning for the people who live there and call it home. Ethnic identities of *Tejano, Acadian, Quebecois, Mexican American, Coahuilteco* and others are real because people hold dearly to those identities and cultural traditions. Yet, none of these has a biological basis in our genes. What is real is the role the appearance of our physical bodies plays in influencing how we identify ourselves or others identify us. Whether a mestizo Spanish colonist might have been accepted as a Spanish elite or relegated to a lower class depended on a combination of different factors – the color of their skin, their features, the socioeconomic status of their parents, the time period when they were born, where they were born, whether their lifestyle was more like a Spaniard or an Indian. During the U.S. distribution of western lands to Natives under the 1887 Dawes Act, government officials arbitrarily decided who received land based on who looked like the agent’s expectation of an Indian’s physical appearance. Although identity is, at its simplest, the idea of who we are; it is far from simple.

*Gender* today is associated with the description of a person’s sexual identity, whether someone is female, male, bisexual, or someone who has a more fluid sense of their sexual identity. In its most basic, original meaning, *gender* describes classifications, categories, kinds or sorts of things with common characteristics. The term’s use to describe someone’s biological characteristics as *male* or *female* based on the human body began in the late 15th and early 16th centuries. Usage to describe characteristics separate from the body as *masculine* and *feminine* – nouns, pronouns, electronics - became more common in the latter half of the twentieth century.
Gender is also a cultural construction that describes the physical, mental and emotional characteristics of men and women, and the roles they are supposed to play in society. These ideas change over time within a society, and vary, sometimes dramatically, between different societies. Even the idea of men and women as the only two genders is a fluid concept. Some cultures accept a broader spectrum, such as some North American Native groups who respect Two-Spirits as individuals who embody both genders.9

Oral and Visual Language

Language is a fascinating window onto other cultures and ways of looking at the world. Language plays a central role in determining identity. The existence or absence of words in a community’s language, and the reasons behind that, can reveal a great deal about a people. How an individual uses those words in specific situations, and in reference to other people, can reveal much about a person. As these different groups of Europeans and Native Americans encountered each other for the first time, one of the first challenges they had to overcome was how to communicate. Over time, they either learned the other group’s language, or taught their language to the other group, or found interpreters who knew both languages. Back home within their own societies, where everyone spoke the same language, words had to be chosen to describe those outside of their society. Over time, new words had to be chosen for those seen as others who were now living within their society. In few instances, no new words were necessary when the others were simply adopted or accepted into the larger community as a full and equal member.

Surnames often reflected a family’s background, ancestry, homeland, or occupation, such as an Englishman by the name of Smith (blacksmith) or a Spaniard by the name of Herrera (blacksmith). Changing last names between languages and locales could also reflect an effort to
fit in with the dominant society and avoid discrimination, such as a Frenchman by the name of Levesque (l’évêque means bishop) changing his name to Bishop if he moved to an English-dominant area. Family names could reflect the adoption of terms and identity labels of other cultures. Someone with the French surname Sauvage, or English version of Savage, very likely had Native ancestry because that term was used to refer to Indians in French Canada.

The very term Native American is a reminder of the role that language plays in identity and how language makes a difference. As a whole today, Indigenous groups in the United States are called Native Americans or Indians. In Mexico they are called Indios, and in Canada they are referred to as First Nations or Premières Nations. In the exploratory and colonial periods, Native groups had names by which they called themselves, often meaning humans or people, but they were recorded with other names when Europeans created names or asked a neighboring nation. This resulted in different name that at times simply meant a variation of enemy or ally or were descriptive of how they looked or where they lived. The English usually used names related to the geographical locations where Indians lived. The French followed Indian naming practices of using a description based on ethnic or linguistic characteristics. Adoption and borrowing of words was common among languages, such as when English colonists adopted Spanish – negro, mulatto, sambo – and French – métis, creole – words to describe the mixed-ancestry people they encountered. I want to avoid overgeneralization, however for ease of discussion, I will use Indian, Native American, and Indigenous interchangeably.

Linguistic roots can also reveal connections between Native groups who lived a great distance apart, but who shared a common ancestry. Many different language families covered North America – Algonkian, Athabaskan, Eskimo-Aleut, Iroquoian, Mayan, Muskogean,
Salishan, Siouan, Uto-Aztecan. Each of these broader language families was then subdivided into multiple dialects among smaller communities within that broader area. The Uto-Aztecan language family, one of the oldest and largest, is shared by Indian groups from Oregon to Panama, including Paiute, Shoshone, Hopi, Nahua (central Mexico dating back to the Aztecs) and others. The *canto* (song) or rhythm of a language, and its grammatical structure, can create a distinctive feeling of that language and evoke a visceral response in listeners.

A cultural group’s world view is revealed through both their oral and visual forms of communication. Vocabulary reflected the existence or importance of something to that group. If they had many words for water but no word for war, that suggests they were a peaceful group that lived in an environment with an abundance of many forms of water. The ability to communicate in writing reflected the importance of conveying information. Northeastern Woodland cultures were adept at conveying complex messages on birch bark. A hunter could leave a one-image message for a companion showing where he had gone and planned to go, what game he encountered, and where he could be found over the next few days.

During the exploratory and colonial periods, maps were excellent examples of visual representations of cultural groups’ world views. Europeans relied heavily on Native drawings and descriptions to complete their own maps. An important difference was that size of items on Native maps reflected the landmark’s importance, not their actual scale or placement, as on European maps. Examining what is at the center of a world map - the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean or a specific continent – literally depicts a specific worldview.

Inventing identity terms is at the core of the creation of identity. One group or person will have multiple identity labels, ranging from how one self-identifies in different situations to how other people identify that person or group. This can be further complicated by terms used in
different languages. During the colonial period, language differences and the fluidity and mobility of Indian groups influenced the variety of names recorded. Native groups often migrated with the seasons or merged and split depending on need. Plus, the Spanish and French travelers were writing down names that were pronounced in a language they did not know, using one of two distinct Latin-based languages that were very different from the spoken native tongue. Henri Joutel, while traveling near present-day La Grange in the late 1680s, noted in his journal,

The Indians came to see us every day that we remained there. They told us many things but it was quite hard to understand them because their language was difficult. Besides, each tribe had its own language or dialect, as it were, or at least there was some variation, which one might expect, since in France we know that the language changes from one province to another even though we trade and speak with one another.\(^\text{14}\)

An individual’s mastery, or inability, to speak a group’s language can influence acceptance as a member of that ethnic group.\(^\text{15}\) How much a group shares of their own language, or learns another’s language, can signify their willingness to accept others into their community. Early explorers and colonists were often surprised to find that Natives already spoke quite a few words of European languages. During his 1534 exploration of the North Atlantic coast, Jacques Cartier reported meeting Natives who spoke broken Portuguese.\(^\text{16}\) Language was also a tool to facilitate communication or to maintain a sense of cultural preservation and privacy when communicating amongst themselves. In Acadia, Marc Lescarbot reported how native Mi’kmaq spoke a simpler “familiar” Basque-mixed version of their language “for convenience” with Europeans, but among themselves used the proper version “known only to themselves.” On March 16, 1620, Plymouth pilgrims described the first encounter with Samoset, a native of Monhegan Island off the coast of Maine, who spoke to them in “broken English, which they could well understand but marveled at.”\(^\text{17}\)
Just as languages can change across geographic space and evolve over time into different dialects, they can also stay very much the same. Words change meaning, drop from use, and new ones can be invented. The fact that the Maine and Texas border regions were so remote, their local dialects continued to use French and Spanish words from the colonial period and that were no longer in use, or rarely used in France and Spain. These border communities, due to the English language influence, also developed distinctive blended dialects, sometimes referred to as *Spanglish* and *Franglais*. This is due in large part to the economic influence of English-speakers and the requirements for jobs and commerce conducted locally. The Texas mixed dialect, also known as *Tex-Mex*, includes Native terms from the Nahua language family of central Mexico. This reflects the large numbers and strong influence of Native cultural groups.

The language and terms used to describe and define mixed-heritage groups is important because these words represented concepts and attitudes of the societies and people who used them. These words held meanings that varied across different geographic regions – from Europe to the Americas and across the colonies. Those words also changed over time, from pre-contact to present times. Language played an important role in identity, both in how a person was described or labeled, and also in terms of the language or languages a person spoke.

Knowing that culture is a construct, and identity and language are elements of culture, it follows that identity and language are also cultural constructs. External forces influence a person’s identity, such as the cultural group in which they are raised. However, an individual or group could exercise their own influence to conform to, or differentiate from, those external identity expectations. Undoubtedly, the meaning of identity terms will continue to change.
Homelands and Identity Terms of People and Places

As often as possible, I try to use names and terms that would have been used by the people who lived in that place and time. For example, Tejas and Nuevo Santander were used to describe the land long before the existence of the state of Texas and the Lower Rio Grande Valley. In instances where confusion may arise, the modern or more general names may be substituted – northern Maine or Maine province instead of northern Massachusetts territory. In different time period, some terms used to refer to inhabitants of Texas changed from Spanish, Tejano, Mexican, and Texan to Mexican American, Latino, Chicano and Hispanic.

Settlement and settlement area are used to refer to the location where a loosely-organized community existed. This was usually a location whose name is either unknown or non-existent, but where a well-known town would later develop.

Homeland refers to that sense of personal and ancestral belonging felt in connection to a specific land or geographic location. This sense of having roots in an ancestral homeland is often tied to a person’s or group’s identity. For Chicanos, Aztlan has ideological roots in the physical place of the U.S. Southwest. It is equally rooted in the idea of an ancestral homeland from which their forebears migrated into central Mexico. Many Franco Americans feel a strong ancestral connection either, or both, Acadian roots in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, or to Quebecois roots in the St. Lawrence River region. Migration is also involved here, and is especially central to Acadian identity with the forced deportations that began in 1755.

Homeplace is similar, but has a looser association with a specific land or identity. It can apply to multiple geographic locations and social spaces where an individual or group can feel at home and a sense of belonging – a house, neighborhood, social community, cultural association, city, state or province, or country.
Identity could also vary over geographical space, where an individual who was considered White in one place, but might not be elsewhere. For example, an Irish Catholic child would be considered non-White on the East Coast, but White in Arizona in comparison to Mexican Catholics. Identity could vary over time, which allowed whitening process to occur. For example, Italians or Irish could be considered assimilated and White after a generation. Identity also varied based on the observer, where a person might see a Mexican and, depending on their biases, might call them Indian, Mexican, Mulatto, or Spanish. Of course, how someone self-identified could be as equally varied.
Endnotes Appendix B


A number of characteristics allow humans the ability to create culture and “the most important qualification of all is the ability to symbol.” The ability to *symbol* is the act of originating, defining and applying meaning to acts, objects, ideas, etc.

For an anthropological elaboration of ideas about bodies, environments and culture, see White, *The Evolution of Culture*, 3-18.

2 For additional details on *identity* definitions 1 and 2b, with quotes from primary sources, see the Oxford English Dictionary online http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/91004?redirectedFrom=identity#eid (accessed March 5, 2016).

3 I use the term *network* in a sense similar to Leslie White’s use of *system*, but visualized my use before reading his work. E.G. Tylor’s definition can be found p4-5.


5 For additional definitions and references to historical usage, see *culture* in Oxford English Dictionary http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/45746?rskey=sdsnvI&result=1#eid (accessed March 5, 2016)

6 As anthropologist Leslie White explained in a 1959 book, *The Evolution of Culture*, culture is extrasomatic, or outside and separate from the human biological body.


The “classic” 1871 definition by E.B. Tylor explains that “culture consists of language, customs, institutions, codes, tools, techniques, concepts, beliefs, etc.”

7 These dates and definitions were taken from the Oxford English Dictionary online. For definition details, etymology, and historical excerpts, for *race* see http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/157031?rskey=KcvQHr&result=6#eid and for *ethnic* see http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/64786#eid5295519 (both accessed March 10, 2016).

8 These dates and definitions were taken from the Oxford English Dictionary online. For definition details, etymology, and historical excerpts, for *gender* see http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/77468?result=1&rskey=TKs0vB& (accessed March 10, 2016).
“Two-Spirits” is the common English-language term, but Native nations have individual terms in their own languages. For examples, see Duane Brayboy, “Two Spirits, One Heart, Five Genders,” Indian Country Media Network, January 23, 2016, https://indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/opinions/two-spirits-one-heart-five-genders/.

Native Americans have had their own ideas and terms to describe themselves and those seen as different or other. Unfortunately, a consistent cross-section of written sources by Native Americans from across the country are rare for the periods before and during the colonial era. In some cases, entire libraries were destroyed, as with the Spanish destruction of Aztec libraries. In most cases, oral traditions dominated. Best efforts to piece together those early stories incorporate evidence from Native American oral traditions, archeology, European writings, and linguistics studies.


The study and categorization of these language families has, of course, been done by Europeans and their descendants. Nonetheless, linguistic studies have proven invaluable in tracing cultural linkages between Native groups across time and geographic space. For an in-depth discussion and links to details about related language families, see “North American Indian Languages” http://www.britannica.com/topic/North-American-Indian-languages, “Mesoamerican Indian Languages” http://www.britannica.com/topic/Mesoamerican-Indian-languages, (accessed March 15, 2016).


The Basque language of Euskara is an example of a distinctive language used in determining membership.

Craig, Land In Between, 28.


APPENDIX C

DEFINING BORDERS OF MIND AND SPACE

Defining frontier or imperial borders in the colonial period was equally as much of a challenge then as today. Just as the meanings of identity terms varied and changed over space and time, so have the terms used to describe the land and define the edges of areas where those denizens of the past lived. The same is true when trying to define and describe the different groups of people who lived there.

When studying their history, it is important to recognize that many of the areas discussed in these older time periods did not exist as the geopolitical bodies we know today – Texas, Maine, Spain, France, England, Mexico, Canada, and United States. Their names changed and their geographic outlines did, too. Many terms have been used to describe the lines on the maps and the communities who lived on the land they delineated – settlement areas, frontier, border, borderland, transnational, border line.

The geopolitical frontiers where the people of these different political and cultural entities lived were gray, blurred border zones where competing territorial claims converged, but were not clearly defined. While borders had been agreed upon, much like previous centuries, their enforcement was a completely different matter. The border and river served more to join people together rather than separate them. It was a line on a map and a concept people knew about through occasional markers, but people crossed back and forth freely. It was neither enforced nor ignored because it simply did not exist as any kind of reality for most community members along
either side of the border. The most consistent reminder in South Texas and northern Maine was the river.

As the U.S. outgrew its British colonial home base over the centuries, political and social leaders attempted to mold the new territories and the people on them into that same image. From the dominant cultural perspective, that proved to be impossible and undesirable in the case of Indians and Negroes and their intermixed descendants by 1830. As immigrant groups entered the country, some were perceived as completely other and barred entry, like the Chinese in the 1880s. Other immigrants were considered not exactly White and allowed entry into the country across its geopolitical boundaries, like Italians or Irish. Then, if they assimilated appropriately over a generation, they eventually gained entrée across social borders into the U.S. White ethnic group.

Molding loyal, God-loving, law-abiding, tax-paying citizens was a goal of every foreign group who set foot on the North American continent and tried to stake a permanent claim. Most succeeded in part. Problems arose when leaders tried to impose their dominant culture in place of the existing group’s culture, instead of along with the other group’s culture. Unfortunately, ever-evolving ideas about race and other groups seen as different made that co-existence next to impossible in many minds and areas of the country.

Geopolitical border enforcement was a favorite method to help police social borders. Sometimes it made a difference, but often times it did not, as determined individuals found paths into the country. Or, for communities on the border, enforcement adjusted to the daily life of the local community. As for enforcing social borders within the country, that varied greatly and was highly situational. It could depend on location, physical appearance, local attitude and a host of
other variables. Segregation of physical space was the most common method of trying to enforce social borders.

**Context of Borders, Intermixing and Identity**

In the 17th century, both “new” colonial regions – New Spain and New France - shared similar characteristics of being Catholic, non-English-speaking, and Europeans invading territory that was inhabited by a diverse array of centuries-old Native communities. However, they also had important differences. New Spain had a colonial administrative center in the long-established capital of Mexico City, where the Spanish built upon the infrastructure of the preceding Aztec empire and capital of Tenochtitlan. New France, however, had no centralized capital based on a large Native city because most First Nations in the area consisted of smaller, more semi-nomadic networks of communities.\(^1\) Due to upheavals in Europe and distance across the Atlantic, the individual colonies were largely left alone to determine their own fates. Consequently, many different factors influenced how each empire approached colonial administration of the land and people, policies regarding the process of *mestizaje/métissage*, and the resulting mixed-heritage children and society.

Eventually, intermixing of different groups became sufficiently complicated that physical appearance, as well as character qualities and personal actions, were viewed in combination to determine a person’s status. The more clearly differentiated and multi-leveled social strata in Spanish colonial society, known as *casta*, became familiar across all three colonial societies in North America, particularly the terms *indian*, *negro*, and *mulatto*.

While *mestizaje/métissage* occurred across New Spain, New France, and New England, intermixing at the colonial frontiers is instructive because that is where we see the contest for
control of the land and people play out, from the imperial to personal levels. In the geopolitical borderlands, the dynamics of mestizaje/méttissage involved the very groups vying for control of that territory – different Indian groups, Spanish, French, and English. We can see how those settlers farthest from the center reacted to central authority’s decrees – accepting, rejecting, or adapting them to what best suited their needs. It appears that Natives accepted intermarriage more readily than Europeans.

The Spanisha and French sent missionaries and established missions, but the French of the North Atlantic were not as successful as the Spanish in Texas. Many missionaries supported intermarriage in an effort to promote Indian conversion. They welcomed all newcomers to the Catholic church, including the mixed –heritage children of those intermarriages.²

The European colonial frontiers shared some important similarities. In both cases, it appears that area Native Americans were open to intermixing with the Europeans. Clearly many Europeans were also accepting of intermarriage. Unfortunately, in many cases later in the colonial period, the intermixed children were not fully accepted in either of their parents’ social world, no matter the geo-political frontier. Indian communities tended to be easier to adapt to because there were few social classes. Although they may have had clans, those tended to be considered of equal status. On the other hand, European societies had more complex socio-economic hierarchies with clearly defined classes that limited mixed-heritage individuals to a few specific roles. Intermixed families and individuals could avoid the restrictions found in more populated communities by living on the borders or outlying areas of their European colonies.

Another shared experience was that living on a border made a difference, especially for the Europeans. The settlements, trading posts, forts or presidios were in remote locations and provided few to no European trading partners or spousal options. Both river areas— the Lower
Rio Grande Valley and St. John River Valley—had their own beauty but were also potentially dangerous. When Europeans arrived, the harsh environmental conditions and distance from urban centers of authority deterred long distance travel to visit European neighbors and allowed for lax or no enforcement of unpopular policies.

Texas was the northern edge of New Spain, however, the minimal number of soldiers, missionaries, and civilian settlers made enforcement of frontier territorial claims impractical. The same factors worked in the Spaniards’ favor, making it difficult for other European empires to challenge their claims, although the French tried. A similar situation existed in New France except that Northern Maine was in a hotly-contested area that changed imperial hands back-and-forth multiple times. Indian alliances with different European groups drew all parties into a complex and changing series of wars, either between Europeans or between Indians or between Indians and Europeans. Indigenous groups consistently made their presence known, exerted their own influence, and, when possible, challenged European claims through force.

These ongoing battles were one reason why both frontiers faced similar challenges of how to maintain a population large enough to occupy claimed land areas when the male-to-female ratio was so lopsided—often more Indian women than men and usually more European men than women. Colonial authorities initially encouraged intermixing but gradually restricted it by the mid-17th century among the Spanish and early 18th among the French. Still, they often looked the other way because they need to maintain colonial settlements to solidify territorial claims, or because they had little choice with the limited forces available to enforce restrictive policies. For the most part, the closest neighbors, customers, and spousal candidates on these frontiers were Indians. Considering the inability of administrators to control intermixing of its colonists and Indian neighbors, the likelihood of métissage was rather high.
Taking a closer look at Texas reveals a high number of military men meant more single men, and more widows due to the service-related deaths of their husbands. There was also a scarcity of España|ol or criollo women, and a higher availability of mestiza and Indian spouses. Settlers may have made claims to España|ol identities, but, similar to the Mexican capital, a mestizo (mixed) heritage was more probable. In the settlements, there was a combination of legal marriages, unofficial unions, extramarital relations, and multiple simultaneous relations. Looking at Texas, according to late 18th-century census records - primarily of San Antonio, Nacogdoches, and La Bahía – extramarital unions were rather common, often occurred between different castas, and the resulting birthrate was equally high. However, the infant mortality rate was also high and kept the population from exploding and becoming predominantly mestizo.³

Turning to northern Maine shows a similar experience for the French. Primarily single men arrived first as explorers, traders, soldiers and builders of settlement structures. The same process of intermixing, métissage, occurred with initial European-Indian intermarriages followed by later generation intermarriages involving mixed-ancestry spouses. The types of relationships undoubtedly covered the entire spectrum from church-sanctioned marriages to unions following Indian customs and more. Among several different factors, natural increase (successful births) was a central reason for this population boom. After decades of disappointing efforts, French administrators eventually gave up trying to convert Indians into good Catholic French citizens, because so many refused to convert. Instead, French administrators focused on relationships with Indians as military allies and trade partners.

As far as differences in experiences on the two frontiers, the most important to keep in mind is that the borders existed primarily in European minds. The geopolitical border lines existed in European imaginations and on European maps. For Native Americans they did not
necessarily see a border because it was in the middle of the areas they called home. They had had their own wars with rival Indian groups over the centuries, knew where neighbors and enemies lived, and felt a sense of a place being their home. However, unlike the Europeans, they viewed their position on the land as one of occupation, not as possession.

Another important difference was the social border. Europeans saw marrying Indians as intermarriage, and detrimental to their communities’ future. For the most part, Indians saw it basically as marriage and necessary for their communities’ survival. While the French had fewer permanent missions and more wars with their British European rivals, they still had missionaries and soldiers on the frontier. The Spanish also had ongoing conflicts, but with Native Americans. In both cases, even though there were few European women for the European men to marry, Indian women had their choice of Indian or European men. Similar reasons for choosing to marry a European man existed for both frontiers. Choosing a European partner could confirm direct access to a beneficial trade partnership. Or, perhaps many of the eligible Indian men died from war wounds or disease. A personal union could strengthen a military alliance as well. On the Spanish frontier, a marriage could offer access to an ally in times of conflict with horse-riding Indian groups. Even if the Spanish were not willing to sell guns to Indians, they could still provide protection of the missions and villages for sedentary or non-horse riding groups.

And, of course, there is the perennial reason, a couple could marry for love. As much as Spanish and French administrators tried to discourage or control intermarriage, the biological and cultural hybridization of colonial communities continued across the frontier. Over time, and often with painful struggles, that territory eventually became home for Indians, Europeans, Africans, and their myriad mixed-blood children alike.
As the 1700s progressed in the Americas, all colonial classes were impacted by identity concerns because they determined access to privileges. Gradually, mixed-heritage individuals were relegated to lower classes, especially in urban centers of empires with a steady influx of so-called purebloods from Europe. In the Spanish empire, elites became increasingly concerned with castas individuals passing as Spaniards because when legitimacy and higher status were not achievable through official petitions or marriages, then some castas tried to imitate elite attire and behavior to attain respectability and pass as Spaniards. A frequent visitor to Mexico, Pedro O’Crouley, observed in 1763 that, “Many pass as Spaniards who in their own hearts know that they are mulatos.” Similar practices and growing misgivings about mixed-heritage subjects developed in the French colonial empire as well. In addition to concerns over intermixing with Natives or Africans in the colonies, loyalty also came into question as the proximity of European rival settlers along shared borders could lead to intercultural mixing of Euroamerican families also. In addition, the reluctance of some Indians to convert to Christianity undermined their visions of a wholly Christian, orderly, civilized society.

Defining one’s identity and place within the colonial social hierarchy was a complicated process because it was based on so many factors that varied over time and geographic location. An individual colonist who was considered of a lower economic class in Spain or Mexico City, after accepting incentives of land and titles could be considered upper class upon arriving on the frontier to establish a border community. Or, a colonist whose skin color and appearance may have appeared acceptable in a more rural community, later may have appeared too dark or unacceptable as “Spanish” in a different, more densely populated community. Unions between individuals of different backgrounds – ethnic, physical, economic, imperial, national – continued
to occur along these early frontiers, albeit to differing degrees. As this process continued, the mixing of bloods and cultures often became harder to trace as time passed.

Although many European colonists shared similar views, goals and loyalties, those living in urban centers faced very different realities from those living in remote regions of the colonial frontiers. As the decades passed after the American Revolution and the new United States grew westward, booming population numbers understandably prompted U.S. national leaders to ponder where all of these people were going to live, how they would be productively employed, and where they would fit into society, especially the ones considered less desirable or less productive. Remote frontier realities definitely influenced the choices settlers made in whether they engaged in *mestizaje* or *métissage*, how they identified themselves and expressed their identity, and how they viewed and treated *others* in their communities. These *others* could be neighbors of a different European or Indigenous group, or the children of mixed unions within their community. Living on the borderlands, where these European and Indigenous areas of habitation overlapped, opened the door to increased possibilities of intermixing.

For both Maine and Texas colonial residents, living in a borderland made a difference on a personal level because of the unequal gender ratio, and on a daily level because the distance from authority centers allowed for lax or no enforcement of unpopular policies. In Maine, Indians consistently allied with Europeans against other Europeans and their Indian allies in ongoing battles for control of European thrones and global territory. These wars were frequent and devastating for Native American communities. In Texas, Indians and Spaniards fought each other, but also formed alliances against more militarily dominant horse-riding Indian groups more often than against the French. These tended to take the form of raids on settlements and farms for food and supplies.
During the 18th and early 19th centuries, *mestizaje/métissage* blurred the lines of the unrealistic and idealized social ladder that European elites and colonial administrators had in mind. Their United States successors faced the same challenge. There were U.S. inhabitants already living in the country, Indians, those brought within the country’s borders with authorities’ approval, as in the case of Blacks and Mexicans, and those wanting to enter the country, meaning immigrants. *Mestizaje* and *métissage* continued but it was vigorously pushed outside of the national consciousness by pushing members of other groups to the outer social and geopolitical borders. Being mixed-heritage means living in a multi-cultural, social and physical borderland in more ways than one. This includes, but is not limited to, the multiple borders that *Mestizos* cross in terms of identity, geography, culture, language, education, home, workplace, and class. Mixed-heritage individuals continue to adapt to finding and defining their place in U.S. society.

**Borders and Lines**

A *border* is usually associated with a geopolitical limit where two countries meet. In this narrow geopolitical sense, it marks where control of land is contested over time to the point where a frontier has stopped moving, lost its nebulous zone quality, and transformed into a more permanent narrow boundary. *Border* also has the connotation of being narrowly focused to the immediate physical space where the two political bodies meet and where the *border line* is marked and enforced. *Border line* and *boundary line* both refer to geopolitical *lines* on a map and clearly demarcate and enclose a specific geopolitical territory or space. After a border is established, authorities continue to try to control who and what can enter and exit by attempting to enforce specific border lines. Due to the dominance of at least one of the delineated
neighboring governing bodies, these enforcement efforts are usually more effective than on a frontier, but not always. This enforcement can take a conceptual form, like treaties that discuss the exchange of territory through the redrawing of lines on a map. It can also take a more physical down-to-earth form, like an increased number of settlers on the land, or a military body to police the borders.

In a broader social sense, however, borders can also refer to (1) the meeting spaces of different groups or cultures in a variety of contexts, and (2) the social limits that they set or cross during their interactions. Border line and boundary line would then refer to the specific limits or defining lines of those spaces or relationships. The contexts of those meeting spaces and limits could be geopolitical, social, economic, cultural, related to gender, and more. Marrying a partner from a different socioeconomic or cultural group could be considered crossing a social borderline. In the 1900s, a woman, Indian, Blck or Mexican going to college was crossing a social borderline. In the 1920s, a White person visiting a black neighborhood was crossing a social borderline.

Frontiers

Frontier is a complex term and idea that has multiple meanings and connotations. Frontier describes the edges of colonial empires and nations that existed into the 19th century, where geopolitical territory claims were made but control was tenuous. Frontier often brings to mind “unsettled” wilderness areas where central-government rule was symbolic or non-existent. While European governments attempted to protect their territorial claims and control who crossed their frontiers, these outlying areas were extremely permeable. Although they had
different methods of physically marking their claims, a similar word was shared by all three European groups - *frontera* (Spanish), *frontière* (French), frontier (English).

*Frontier* also has the underlying meaning of representing the early stage of contact between different groups, and the place where power is contested until one group dominates and the frontier moves again, usually pushing one of the groups into new territory or into a subordinate position within the dominant culture that has absorbed it. These groups could be different European empires, Native groups, or nations that developed later (United States, Mexico and Canada). From the local perspective, *frontier* refers to the overlapping edges of different groups as more than just political boundaries. It also refers to the overlapping of activities - political, economic and cultural - of those societies and the communities that developed and lived on those frontiers. Members of neighboring political entities, interacted and sometimes formed communities of their own.

*Frontier* can also describe the introduction of change that sweeps across a geographic space like a wave. Looking at the U.S. Plains as an example, the spread of disease and horses would be examples of a biological frontier, while guns would be an example of a technological frontier. When these three factors met and combined on the Great Plains, they dramatically changed the Native cultural groups who lived there and their power relations to the natural world and their neighbors.

The use of this term in the United States, especially regarding westward expansion, began to decline at the end of the 1800s. In 1890, the U.S. Census Bureau stated that all land in the continental U.S. had been claimed. As a result, in 1893, historian Frederick Jackson Turner delivered his “frontier thesis” speech at the 1893 Chicago World’s Columbian Exposition when
he claimed that the frontier was now closed. While earning limited attention at the time, his idea eventually spread and became widely accepted by scholars and popular culture alike.

Its use has been carried into the twentieth century and beyond with references from frontier towns of the Wild West, to “space, the final frontier” in the Star Trek television show opening sequence. Its use in this study focuses on the meanings of overlapping edges of different worlds and the resulting changes or adaptations that occurred.

**Frontiers to Social and Geopolitical Borders**

The 19th century was an important period in the formation of North American borders, in terms of geography, politics, and identity. Although participants of the time did not realize it, the events in this period would finalize the borders into the lines and shapes that we know them as today. Across the U.S., Anglos dominated local culture and socioeconomic and political positions of power. They pushed *other* groups to the edges of social borders and wrote them out of local histories.

In the case of the U.S.-Mexico border, the shift in the borderline inspired the Civil Rights era Chicano saying, “We didn’t cross the border, the border crossed us.” This region had been the home for Native and Spanish, and some African, settlers and their descendants for centuries. After the U.S.-Mexican War, many Mexicans continued living on the land that had been their families’ homes for generations, in some instances, since even before the Pilgrims had landed on the east coast. This did not seem to make a difference to those who arrived later from the east and north. Many of these newly-arrived immigrants from the U.S. coveted locals’ land and power, or wanted to use their labor for their own profit. As time passed, these newcomers invented histories of the U.S. West that omitted the long-standing presence of Spaniards and
Mexicans and Indians, or portrayed them in stereotypical fashion as bandits or lazy, or drunken and uncivilized.

The geopolitical boundaries that these international borderlines outlined in turn influenced how countries saw themselves, influenced their sense of identity and how they related to other countries. The U.S. had expanded its territory through treaties, wars, or payments. The minimal cost involved gave national leaders and citizens an overly-confident sense of Manifest Destiny and predestination as a world leader. This in turn influenced their views towards their neighbors. Mexico was viewed more negatively and with less respect, due in part to roots in colonial antagonisms between the England and Spain, but also racial and religious differences, and the recent outcome of the U.S.-Mexican War where nearly half of Mexican territory nearly doubled the size of the United States. As for Canada, it was perceived as a more docile British colonial cousin that preferred to stay within the British system rather than rebel, as the former thirteen colonies had. It also contested for western territory with the United States, but the outcome was arranged through negotiation rather than war, and involved the annexation of less land than the war with Mexico.

The two broad other groups on the Spanish and French borderlands, depending on your point of view, were Indians and Europeans. To keep things in perspective, while intermarrying occurred on these colonial frontiers, European colonists were not flocking to the imperial borderlands. The living conditions on the edges of European empires and Indigenous tribal networks were harsh when compared to goods and services more readily available near urban centers. Incentives were usually required to attract European settlers and adaptability was a must in order to survive.
Given the distance from authorities in imperial capitals and the harsh realities of frontier life, following restrictive rules regarding intermarriage and social norms was rarely the first priority. The social expectations of the capitals of the European homelands and colonies were well-known because settlers brought them along as part of their cultural baggage, included with their physical luggage and supplies. However, conforming to those social guidelines regarding intermarriage, at times including laws with extremely harsh punishments, could be difficult and often unrealistic. In addition, the enforcement of socio-economic hierarchies was often more lax, or non-existent, on the edges of these contesting European and Native empires. People intermixed and intermarried as they wished and saw fit. Understandably, local realities of survival took precedence over the dictates from a power center often hundreds, even thousands, of miles away.

When seeking partners to face the exciting opportunities and potentially dangerous hazards of life on the frontier, border settlers either brought their spouses with them when they migrated, or found their partners amongst their frontier neighbors of Natives or rival European, or occasionally Africans. These relationships, unions, and sexual encounters – sometimes voluntary, sometimes by force or coercion – gave birth to mixed-blood children. Like many mixed-blood children in other cultures, they were often not fully accepted into either parental group. So, while they often physically lived in the community of either their mother or father, they also psychologically lived in a gray area in between both worlds, a kind of social borderland. The vague, amorphous nature of the imperial frontier borders was reflected in the complex, fluid frontier societies that developed there.
Borderlands, Transnational connections and Sister Cities

A borderland is similar to a frontier but is not as bound to a specific time. It is also similar to a border, but it encompasses more space on both sides of a border line. Borderland describes a community and cultural zone or area with a distinctive combination of characteristics that results from the reaching across, overlapping, and interweaving of the people, cultures, and communities on both sides of a border. It is a place where people meet and interact, sometimes cooperatively or violently, and create a community that is different from their original parent groups. Borderland can refer to either just one side of the border or a zone reaching across both sides. Borderlands exist in spite of efforts to enforce border lines. Like border, it is often associated with a physical geopolitical place. It can also refer to the meeting of different groups or cultures in a variety of contexts – geopolitical, social, economic, cultural and more.\(^8\)

Transnational consistently refers to both sides of an international, geopolitical border and the interconnected relationships that link both sides together, whether economic, social, political, etc. It also describes the quality of a cross-border connection that exists as if the border was permeable and not there, or, that exists in spite of, and in resistance to, attempts to enforce the border. Transnational is similar to borderland, but transnational refers more to the cross-border connections between people or entities (business, economic, social networks) and is less associated with the land where the people live, whereas borderland refers to both the connections and the land.\(^9\)

Sister cities are excellent examples of the transnational connections that can develop along international borders and can lead to the formation of a borderland. Sister cities usually form either as parallel, separate communities that were established independently by different political entities (empires, nations, states), or they were once one community that was split by the
formation of the international border. In the first instance, the independent communities can
develop at the same time, or one side may exist decades or centuries before a sister city forms. In
the case of one community that is split in two, the border may split the community geographically,
but still barely change how the two sides interact. At the same time, the relationships of sister
cities is more complicated than that. In both instances, the day-to-day, cross-border life of work,
entertainment, commerce, visiting friends and family, may continue as usual, or change. The
existence of the border may make border crossings easier or more difficult for any number of
reasons – stricter enforcement, violence on one side or the other, new trade laws, new
immigration laws, or a myriad of other possible reasons. This is true no matter how the sister
cities came into being.

How inhabitants of border sister cities identified themselves is also important. They likely
identified with their governing political entity - Spanish, French, Mexican, United States,
Canada, Maine, Texas. However, they probably also identified with a local cultural group –
Franco American or Mexican American - that may have been different from the dominant
political entity – United States - and shared more in common with their sister-city neighbors –
French Canada, Mexico. As a result, sister city inhabitants may also feel a partial affinity for
their international neighbors, or at least more so than their compatriots – Maine and Texas - who
live farther away from the border.

The impact of the border can vary over time and along the length of the geographic
border. The impact can also vary on multiple levels of day-to-day life of those who live on the
border, in terms of transborder connections and their sense of culture and identity. The border is
both of the land and of the mind.
Mestizaje/Métissage and Identity on Social and Geographic Borders

Mestizaje and métissage were important parts of the history of all three North American countries and both Texas and Maine border communities. The ideas of mestizaje and métissage and their history are key to understanding how the U.S. redefined neighbors, others, and acceptable citizens. In the U.S., the influence of different European and Native attitudes towards others directly affected how intermixed groups were treated. Over the centuries, the U.S. incorporated groups who were either brought within the country’s geopolitical borders or who chose to immigrate across those borders. In either case, habitation within the U.S. did not guarantee access to dominant U.S. society, nor acceptance as equals and marriage partners. An early example was the removal of Indians and segregation of Negroes, that achieved the goal of minimizing opportunities for interacting and intermixing with Whites, but did not stop it completely.

The meaning of race and how it was conceptualized changed from religious and economic status to being more closely associated with biology and the human body. Physical characteristics were often the first most visible form of identification as other. However, after so many generations of intermarriage, it was even more difficult to identify heritage among intermixed individuals. Geographical origin was also a form of identification, especially as nations took shape, such as African, European, French, Spanish, English, American, Native American, Mexican, and Canadian. All of these terms identified the birthplace of an individual or their ancestors, and were associated with stereotypical character or racial traits since the colonial period, but were not associated in the U.S. as biologically inherited until the turn of the twentieth century.
Citizenship became yet another category for belonging to the U.S. national identity. Anxieties surrounding World War I heightened demands for conformity to the dominant culture, language, religion, and expressions of loyalty. This was usually accomplished through Americanization educational efforts in schools for children and lessons for adults. Still, the level of acceptance in U.S. society, even as a citizen, was tempered by one’s perceived racial and ethnic background.

Academic disciplines in their formative years institutionalized the study of people using categories of otherness and race that would influence generations. Studies related to the dominant White, Anglo Saxon, Protestant culture were seen as history. Early interpretations focused on white male leaders and the British colonies. Studies of everyone else seen as different, other, or outside the mainstream, was considered anthropology. These studies included Native Americans in the U.S. in the same category as Indigenous groups from other countries. So, even though Native Americans were the earliest inhabitants of the North American continent, their history was not studies as part of U.S. history.

Concerns regarding the introduction of, or passing on of, undesirable traits were reflected in restrictive marriage policies since before the colonial period. These ideas took incremental steps until race shifted from association with intangible qualities of character to also being deeply embedded in the physical human body. Earlier beliefs referred more to the reputation of a family based on religious practices, economic class, and personal actions and lifestyle.

Late 19th-century ideas associated hereditary qualities, success, and evolution with Social Darwinism to explain the rankings of individuals on the socio-economic hierarchy. The connection between race and biology grew closer when social group characteristics were linked with biological heredity in the 19th century with scientific racism. These ideas were advanced
further with the theories and practices of eugenics in the twentieth century. *Race* still held its previous meanings, but was now also firmly associated with biology and the human body.

Late 19th to mid-20th century anxieties about borders and their connection to the formation of U.S. national identity rose in the midst of an influx of foreigners, both those brought into the country by the U.S. and those entering the country. Ideas about difference and race based on religion, economic class, and character were broadened to include nationality, when the addition of the southwestern territory from Mexico introduced a new group that was already intermixed and of a different nationality. The intertwining of national origin and race became even stronger with the turn-of-the-twentieth-century arrival of immigrants on both coasts and across both land borders. Anxieties about the potential tainting of the “purity” of U.S. character and genes lead to a dramatic increase in racist, anti-foreign sentiment directed at groups seen as unacceptable, as definitions of *other* were broadened beyond former limits of Negroes, Indians and related mixed-bloods.

Border and immigration concerns added good health, literacy and language skills to pre-requisites for entry into the U.S. as a country and society. The perceived “purity” (similar to the colonial Spanish *pureza de sangre*) and health of a person’s body would determine their access to the larger social body of the United States. These health problems were not caused by immigrants, but these concerns did prompt stricter health screenings and quarantining at U.S. border entry points. The health concerns were understandable as some of the people immigrating to the U.S., Mexico, and Canada did carry diseases, whether they were sick before they left their homeland, or became sick on the ship voyage over. However, not all of them carried disease, nor did their nationality automatically determine their innate state of health nor their personal characteristics, as some in this period believed.
Class continued to play a factor in determining belonging and treatment, also, because it could potentially shield wealthy elite others from the most violent forms of discrimination. Class interests overruled race or ethnicity, especially when skin color was light. Yet, economic success by foreigners or supposedly-inferior races could instigate animosity if they were perceived as taking jobs or opportunities from supposedly-superior white citizens.

Gender entered the picture in policies and practices related to marriage, sexual relations, and work. These rules were applied differently to men and women. The 1907 Expatriation Act is an example of how gender distinctions and the private world of mestizaje/métissage between partners overlapped with international public policy. It penalized female U.S. citizens for marrying foreigners by nullifying their U.S. citizenship. Most women did not know the law existed until after they were married. Race also played a factor, as in cases where foreign wives of U.S. military husbands were not allowed into the U.S. upon their return from duty abroad, especially Asian wives. Immigration policies, legal penalties, and social norms were often stricter and harsher for women. Still, this period also saw dramatic, positive changes for women, such as the right to vote.

Religion continued to be a marker of identity, as well. Religious animosities between Protestants and Catholics traced back to Europe with colonial rivalries and the Reformation. John Winthrop’s 1630 “City on a Hill” sermon aboard the Arbeilla set the goal for the Puritan, would-be colonists onboard. If a fellow Christian faith, Catholicism, was considered other, then non-Christian faiths were considered even more foreign and different. Judaism and Islam had even older rivalries with Christians, dating back to Roman Catholicism. Buddhism, Hinduism, Native and other religions were considered equally unacceptable. Religion was a pillar of U.S. identity because the church’s teachings were expected to safeguard society’s moral guidelines.
Perpetuation of these beliefs and traditions usually occurred through schools, such as colonial Spanish missions, French schools for young women, and English Praying towns. In later centuries, the same religious social guidelines were passed on through both religious and secular means such as U.S. Indian schools and Americanization programs.

Religious differences also influenced U.S. attitudes to its North American neighbors and their citizens. The U.S. took pride in claiming roots supporting religious freedom, but immigrants were critically assessed at the border based on the dominant religious faith in their home countries. Canada was seen as predominantly Protestant, particularly among English-speaking Canadians, and primarily Catholic among French-speaking Canadians. Mexico was viewed as predominantly Catholic across the country. For U.S.-border communities, the Catholic heritage of French Canadians and Mexicans was yet another strike against them in the eyes of some U.S. citizens and officials.

The same challenges faced in generations past were still true when trying to determine identity and belonging in the 20th century. Skin color, dress, mannerisms, class, language, religion were all still cultural markers of identity. And they became even more complicated in the 20th century with new requirements and restrictions to “belong” in the United States. Stricter immigration and border policies played hand-in-hand with Americanization educational efforts and marriage laws to help redefine neighbors, others, and acceptable citizens.
Endnotes Appendix C

1 For a brief overview of New France history, see Allan Greer, *The People of New France*, in Themes in Canadian Social History series (1997; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).


Most Spanish missions settled permanently along the San Antonio River, the coast, east Texas, or the Rio Grande. Eventually the Spanish distributed land to mission Indians when missions were secularized. Most French missions were established along the St. Lawrence River or the Acadian coast. In the late 1680s, Indians and missionaries in the northeast were busy. Maliseet Indians established the village of Meductic and the French added a Catholic mission at that location soon afterward.


4 CARRERA, *Imagining Identity in New Spain*, p.43.

5 This boundary idea has taken on new meaning in the age of mobile phones and laptops with the use of “geofencing.” Software programs can use global positioning system (GPS) or radio frequency identification (RFID) to create a virtual boundary line around a geographic area. A common use is to send messages or texts to an administrator when someone triggers a signal by crossing the virtual boundary line. This technology has been used to track whether trucks stay on their routes, employees try to enter an unauthorized area, shoppers approach a retailer, stock is removed from a warehouse, someone under house arrest leaves their home, or an employee removes a laptop from a hospital, or a child arrives home from school. Another option could be to send messages to inhabitants within a specific neighborhood of upcoming activities – garbage pickup, meeting, community picnic. [http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/geofencing](http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/geofencing) (November 20, 2016) [https://www.techopedia.com/definition/14937/geofencing](https://www.techopedia.com/definition/14937/geofencing) (November 20, 2016)

6 The understanding of this broader social sense was true since the colonial period to the present, although they probably would not have used the words in that sense. That use is more common today.

“It is possible, therefore to infer a state of permanent tension on the northeastern frontier that takes various forms, some from the changes in native territorial organization and others from Spanish desires to incorporate territories and their native occupants. We may say with assurance that despite the various attempts by authorities and settlers to establish control over the Indians, the obstinate hunter-gatherers of the northeastern wilderness never were entirely subjugates. On the contrary, the tension between non-sedentary natives and Hispanic settlers increased in direct proportion to the advance of Spanish occupation and territorial control.”
In the strict Spanish definitions of social castas (castes), *mestizo* usually referred to people with one Spanish and one Indian parent, and *mulatto* to someone with one Spanish and one African parent.

In 1921, by Herbert Eugene Bolton introduced the term “Spanish Borderlands” and it slowly gained popularity in the intervening decades until it became more commonly used in U.S. historical circles in the 1990s.

This term is more recent, becoming popular in U.S. history writings in the later 1990s.
APPENDIX D

METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATING CENSUS MARRIAGE DATES

U.S. censuses collected different data each time and marriage dates were recorded some years, but had to be estimated for other years. In addition, the majority of U.S. census records for 1890 were destroyed in a fire. In order to create consistent estimates of marriage years for all census and 1890, the following technique was used. Keeping in mind the traditional Catholic farming culture of the area and practices of the period, marriage dates were estimated based on children’s ages. For example, most couples had their first child within the first year of marriage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Marriage Date Estimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1871-1880</td>
<td>“1880” if noted “married in census year”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oldest common child age +1yr (not stepchildren)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>if “baby” → married previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>if “0” children &amp; early 20s → married previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>if “0” children → younger spouse married at 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1881-1890</td>
<td>Oldest common child age +1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1891-1900</td>
<td>Number of years married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1901-1910</td>
<td>Number of years of present marriage (noted M1,M2,M3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1911-1920</td>
<td>oldest child age +1yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1921-1930</td>
<td>oldest child age +1yr (ref. “age at first marriage”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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