



SCCR

STANFORD CENTER FOR CHICANO RESEARCH
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The Hispano Homeland Debate

Working Paper Series No. 17

Sylvia Rodríguez
Assistant Professor
Department of Anthropology
University of California, Los Angeles

October, 1986

The purpose of the SCCR Working Paper Series is to publish works that significantly advance our knowledge about Chicanos and other Latinos. We invite your comments and critique. Please address your remarks directly to the author.

ABSTRACT : This paper discusses the substantive, theoretical, and methodological issues raised by the 'Hispano homeland debate,' which centers around the alleged ethnic distinctiveness of Hispanos in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado. It argues for the application of a reactive model of ethnicity to the case of Hispanos-Chicanos, and for a world systems framework for understanding an ethographic example of their contemporary ethnopolitical mobilization.

Introduction

Recently a somewhat bitter debate has raged around geographer Richard Nostrand's attempt to substantiate the longstanding, widely accepted claim that the Hispanos or Spanish Americans of northern New Mexico and southern Colorado are ethnically (that is historically, culturally, and even genetically) distinct from Mexicans and other Mexican Americans. The controversy unfolded on the pages of the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* between 1981-84, in response to the last in a series of articles in which Nostrand (1970, 1975, 1980) developed his Hispano homeland thesis based on an examination of U.S. census data. The debate simmered on the sidelines after the AAAG considered the matter closed, and soon found another forum when Clark Knowlton organized a panel session on it at the 1985 annual meeting of the Western Social Science Association. An earlier draft of this paper was prepared for the WSSA panel. Its revision is presented here with the hope of stimulating further discussion of the several significant theoretical and methodological issues raised by the controversy.

This discussion builds in part upon an unpublished paper by Thomas Hall (1985) which was circulated in advance of the WSSA panel. Hall's paper attempts to untangle several sources of confusion in the debate, which had indeed become a turgid knot of real but limited truths, genuine difference, misconceptualization of the problem, mixed levels of analysis, and potential schizmogogenesis or runaway disagreement. He contributes by distinguishing several conflated though interrelated issues, which pertain to ethnic theory, ideology and scientific practice, and sociopolitical

process. Most importantly, Hall places the debate within a conceptual framework of reactive ethnicity. This represents a necessary step toward resolving at least part of the controversy, and it makes embarking on my own task easier. The comments offered here therefore incorporate Hall's, and use them as a point of departure.

I will begin with a few thoughts about the appropriateness and utility of a reactive model of ethnicity for looking at the historical genesis and evolution of Mexicano-Hispano-Chicano identity in New Mexico and elsewhere in the Southwest. Rather than debate the accuracy or insideousness of the claim that New Mexico Hispanos constitute an etically and/or emically distinct subcategory of Mexican American, I wish to focus upon the historical, interactive process by which the notion of Hispano distinctiveness has come about. I am particularly concerned with the development of this idea, as well as with the larger issue of ethnic persistence and symbolization in general, as it occurs in northern New Mexico in the late 20th century. The question of Hispano ethnicity and its relation to contemporary Mexicano-Chicano ethnopolitical identity and mobilization requires a consideration not only of ethnic theory but also of how the social science and popular literature on Hispanos and New Mexico has been shaped by, and in turn contributes to, the history and sociology of the region. Needless to say one cannot hope to resolve or even adequately cover all of these issues in so short a space. At best I will identify and conduct a whirlwind tour of them, with the hope that this will lay groundwork for further discussion.

The materials drawn upon and the perspective brought to bear upon the matter are ethnographic. They are based upon field research on interethnic relations and social change in contemporary Taos. ¹ My research focuses

particularly upon the social, economic, and political situation of Hispanos within what Bodine (1968) aptly named the "tri-ethnic trap." ² While the case of Taos is perhaps idiosyncratic and therefore like Santa Fe atypical of the Rio Arriba as a whole, it nevertheless exhibits, as an extreme, exaggerated, or accelerated example, what I take to be the major features of the regional system of ethnic-race relations. Most importantly for the present discussion Taos has become, by virtue of its combination of tourism-welfare economy, one of the principal focal points for the development of the self-conscious, constructed and reconstructed (following MacCannell's 1984 usage) sense of Hispano or Spanish American cultural uniqueness that stands at the center of the controversy. Within the past fifteen years or so a new Hispano-Chicano ethno-political mobilization has emerged in Taos, which bears the mark of several local, regional, and national influences. It is with reference to this phenomenon and the problem of accounting for it theoretically that I will conclude my remarks. Now first a few words about why a reactive model of ethnicity is useful here.

The Reactive Approach to Ethnicity

Briefly, the reactive approach to ethnicity emphasizes the interactional or 'secondary' rather than 'original', isolation-bred, or primordial nature of ethnic identity. Following Barth (1969), the approach tends to focus upon the maintenance of ethnic boundaries rather than the preservation of specific cultural content. This frees the investigator from the archaic task of trying to measure or even explain ethnic persistence or assimilation by means of trait inventories. It also better fits the widely

observed yet (to a primordialist view) seemingly paradoxical facts of ethnic persistence and even resurgence in the face of ongoing social and cultural change, including acculturation. Without going into its limitations in explaining, for example, the complex interaction between ethnicity and class in contemporary urban industrial settings, let me simply propose that a reactive approach constitutes a necessary though not in itself sufficient component for a working model of ethnic relations in northern New Mexico. That even some of the recent anthropological literature on Hispanos has not explicitly or systematically incorporated this otherwise now commonplace perspective seems to bear out Renato Rosaldo's (1983) observation that the anthropology of Mexican Americans has shown a temporal lag behind more mainstream theoretical and methodological developments, in a manner reminiscent of how periphery lags behind core in the world system. This lag seems particularly pronounced with reference to Hispanos in New Mexico.

Part of the confusion about whether Hispanos or Mexicanos in northern New Mexico ever really constituted a culturally distinct and presumably self-conscious subgroup might begin to dissipate if we agree at the outset on the following points: 1. ethnic boundaries serve to structure group relations and to organize differential access to and control over critical resources, particularly in situations of competition; 2. ethnic difference and identity are historical products of ongoing interaction between groups; 3. at the level of individual behavior, ethnic boundaries are maintained and crossed by people who use them, more or less consciously (this is contingent upon various sorts of factors), as adaptive strategies in their everyday lives, but who are nevertheless subject to their primary ascriptive dictates. They are, in other words, both situational *and*

structural or structurally sustained.

Probably the most obvious—though certainly not unique—feature of the ethnic boundary system in the Rio Arriba is that while the cultural repertoires (not to mention genetic makeup) of Indian, Hispano, and Anglo populations have undergone radical and continuous transformation during the past 150-400 years, the boundaries between them persist and today seem to be maintained and protected with increasing self-consciousness if not intensity. From the start these boundaries defined, among other things, differential patterns of use of and control over land, water, and other key resources. Indeed, the history and probably prehistory of intergroup—and intragroup—relations in the region has been cast largely in the idiom of competition for and conflict over land and water, and this is still true today.

The Controversy

Now to get to the issue at hand. If I understand the crux of the debate correctly and am not oversimplifying it, it seems Nostrand and his supporters claim that historically, Hispanos constitute both an etically and emically distinct subcategory of Mexican/Mexican American. The extremist version of this thesis would even deny that Hispanos are Mexicano at all, but I don't think Nostrand himself has argued for this. Rios-Bustamante and Blaut (1984) deny any of it is true, and moreover detect in Nostrand's claim the insidious workings of a divide-and-conquer, essentially imperialist paradigm. At the same time however, none of the principals seem seriously to be denying that Hispanos are indeed Mexican Americans, or that real regional and other subcultural variations exist

among the sociologically rather heterogeneous population of Mexican-descent peoples in the U.S. Instead, as Hall notes, the argument seems to be over the social, political, and anthropological significance of these facts. I agree with Hall that Nostrand's basic homeland thesis does not *necessarily* entail an imperialist interpretation of Southwestern history. Nevertheless the terms of his argument, for example when he speaks of Mexican influx as "diluting" Hispano culture, betray assumptions inherent in an outmoded primordialist notion of ethnicity. His commentary, and certainly those of his supporters Marc Simmons (1984) and Fray Angélico Chavez (1984), seem to partake of a certain pervasive naivete about the current economic and political underpinnings of the "uniqueness" interpretation or image of New Mexican inter-racial history.

My own observations as an anthropologist and northern New Mexico native do corroborate the claim that a significant proportion of Hispanos of all classes in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado see and speak of themselves as related to but distinct from other Mexicanos and Spanish-speaking people. It seems to be fairly widely acknowledged today, and has been shown for example by Adrian Bustamante (1982) and John Chavez (1984), that the 'Spanish' or 'Spanish American' myth was originally perpetuated by the Mexican (and *mestizo*) or recently Mexican American elite and middle classes as a self-protective measure against the progressive institutionalization of Anglo American racism. That this measure simultaneously served their own class interests and reflected Spanish racism against Indians is also apparent, and reminiscent of a similar pattern observable in other parts of Latin America, such as the southern highlands of Mexico and in Guatemala. As John Chavez notes, Anglos as well took an active role in promoting the romantic fiction of a

genteel Spanish heritage, for example in California. In New Mexico particularly, the Spanish myth has been fostered and shaped in this century by the needs and dictates of the tourism industry, which has also had considerable impact upon the character and symbolic expression of Indian ethnicity. The dynamics of this particular aspect of the New Mexican Spanish American phenomenon have yet to be adequately described and analyzed.

But the point to be made here is not that Hispanos' post-American sense of themselves as geographically, historically, culturally, or even genetically distinct is a manifestation of false consciousness, nor even that out-group encouragement, commercialization, or scholarly reification of this identity is imperialistically motivated. The basic point is that it happened. It means that like the (by definition) self-conscious identity of any other ethnic population, Hispano ethnicity has been historically constructed. This makes it no less real, authentic, or anthropologically significant than any other ethnic identity. A related point is that just as it emerged and evolved in the past, Hispano identity like Chicano identity in general is being constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed right now. The process consists of ongoing everyday interaction between regular people which occurs, for example, in Mora, East LA, Laredo, or Chicago. It happens on university campuses and at academic conferences, as well as in living rooms, parish and union halls, courthouses, art galleries, political rallies, and so on. Indeed, our own views and the controversy at hand are themselves creatures of this process: they express, reflect, and contribute to it in turn.

I will now turn to a consideration of two specific aspects of the debate. The first concerns the *idea* of a homeland, while the other

concerns the nature of the process which underlies the widely observed phenomenon of ethnic resurgence in developing and modern states. I will link these two via an ethnographic consideration of Taos.

The Homeland Idea

The first point to be made about the Hispano or Chicano homeland is that the very idea is a creature of history. This is the basic import of John Chavez's book *The Lost Land*, which attempts to trace the theme of an ancient homeland, known as *Aztlan*, from the aboriginal Mexica to contemporary Chicanos in the U.S. Southwest. The term 'lost homeland' is probably redundant since the very homeland idea would seem to imply territorial absence or loss. A brief comparison with Chavez's homeland idea will be pursued here in order to analyze Nostrand's. Their differences are instructive.

Chavez's implicitly reactive argument shows how the specificity and articulation of the homeland idea has increased gradually but also fluctuated through time, and grown explicit more or less concurrently with Chicano ethnopolitical mobilization. Chavez's lost land concept differs from Nostrand's also in that its scope is pan-Chicano rather than just New Mexican. Even though he may not actually prove his thesis, Chavez seems correct in suggesting that a homeland *mythos* has emerged among Chicanos in response to their collective historical experience of foreign occupation and territorial expropriation, as well as of immigrant isolation within Anglo America. The full heterogenous range of Mexican Americans encompasses both these poles of minority experience, which contributes to a mixed sense of place and dispossession.

Nostrand's homeland on the other hand is by definition exclusively Hispano or northern New Mexican. He sees the homeland as a pre-American phenomenon progressively diminished by Mexican infiltration as well as Anglo encroachment and assimilation. Nostrand's approach is essentially primordialist. This is evident in his attribution of Hispano distinctiveness to the preservation of archaic Iberian elements through geographical isolation. In his view, contact with Mexicans from the south, or with Anglos later on, "diluted" and continues to erode Hispano cultural 'purity.'

In response to Hansen's (1981) commentary, Nostrand (1981, 1984) nevertheless retreats from the implication that this process began prior to 1900, and he explicitly places the Spanish American phenomenon in the 20th century. Yet the very concept of Hispano difference, which its proponents are well prepared to document with trait inventories, implies pre-American origin. Part of the problem is that Nostrand infers cultural content from geographic distribution. By drawing a line between Hispanos and other *norteños*, he assumes what in fact he needs to prove. But the complex nuances of culture and ethnic membership cannot be demonstrated one way or the other on the basis of census data alone, as Meinig (1984) notes. Back past the twentieth century, the Hispano uniqueness thesis which otherwise is presentist, needs to be tested rather than presumed. Among other things, this would require intensive ethnohistorical including archival research for the purpose of ethnosemantic reconstruction. One would expect the most salient boundaries and distinctions in pre-American times to be Mexicano/Indian. Spanish/casta or hispano/mexicano distinctions would be along class rather than geographical lines. Undoubtedly the ethnic boundary system in New Mexico changed through time, perhaps in the manner Gutiérrez (1981) has

proposed for the late colonial period, with transition from a caste to class-based society accompanied by cultural change in marriage practice and ideology.

The reader may feel some unease due to confused levels of abstraction with respect to the term "homeland." It is therefore useful to call attention to Bateson's distinction between *map* and *territory*, and to differentiate between the homeland as map and as territory (1972).³ Territory refers to the actual land base lost and reduced to Mexicanos as a result of Americanization. I have argued elsewhere that this loss has been the historical stimulant for the homeland as map or symbol (Rodríguez 1987). And it is the 'map' or its significance that the whole Hispano homeland controversy is about. Both Chavez's and Nostrand's treatments are themselves expressions of the map or homeland idea, although they seem differentially aware of the map/territory distinction. Nostrand's discussion is problematic partly because he confuses them, even though his thesis ostensibly concerns territory pure and simple. The census data alone cannot prove his claims about intra-ethnic cultural variation, and we have yet to see any clearcut evidence for pre-American Mexicano/ Nuevo Mexicano difference or sense of difference not essentially reducible to the metropolis/frontier, urban/rural, or civilization/'dogpatch' contrast. This suggests that any such distinction in pre-American times would have been invidious to New Mexicans and anything but cultivated.

The Homeland Idea in the Rio Arriba Today

The most dramatic manifestation of the homeland idea in New Mexico

has been the *La Alianza Federal de los Pueblos Libres*, an organization of dispossessed *mercedes* heirs in Rio Arriba and other northern counties which led by its charismatic founder Reies López Tijerina, came to international attention in the late 1960's with the famous Tierra Amarilla courthouse raid and its military aftermath. The symbolic import of that episode still reverberates throughout the Rio Arriba today, even though Tijerina's actual political effectiveness has long faded. The *Alianza* represents one of the key American minority ethnopolitical mobilizations of the 1960's and early 1970's. Its failed purpose was to bring to an international court of law the alleged violation of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo which resulted in illegal and unjust dispossession of Hispano land grant heirs, and to restore the "lost" lands. Tijerina and the *Alianza* themselves became symbols of the stolen homeland as well as of resistance to further dispossession. The *Alianza* movement placed the ongoing everyday struggle of individual Hispanos to keep their lands and surface waters within a historical, collective, symbolically charged context.

The meaning of that context is very much alive today in Taos and Rio Arriba counties. In Taos, collective Hispano resistance to further dispossession has emerged since 1970 in the form of community-based grassroots protest against large-scale tourism developments. Among those which stand out for the 1970's were protests against Indian Camp Dam above Talpa and Ranchos southeast of Don Fernando de Taos, and against ski resort pollution of the Rio Hondo some twelve miles north of the town. The Dam involved a conservancy district that would have flooded lands to create a lake, ostensibly for irrigation but gradually understood and opposed by farmers as a government-sponsored

recreational enterprise for which they would be taxed. After five years of resistance, the conservancy district was dissolved on a technicality. What is significant about this and the ski valley case is that together they inaugurated ethnically mixed yet also legitimately Hispano or Chicano direct action protest activity in Taos. The ski valley and related condominium development protest movements in the Rio Hondo watershed have been described in detail elsewhere. Discussion here will focus on their constituency and organizational basis.

Hispano Mobilization and the *Acequias*

Both the Indian Camp Dam and ski valley protests in addition to a rash of others against tourism development in the early eighties were comprised of three essential elements: *acequia*, domestic water users association and in some case land grant officers, mostly older Hispanos and their families; younger Chicanos who have lived away and come home; and what can be described for the most part as ex-hippie Anglo environmentalists. The actual cleavages at work in this battle are urban-rural and class, although they are universally perceived as ethnic. This is because they are fundamentally community-based in organizations which link households through the distribution of surface water on the one hand and ground water on the other. The backbone of Hispanic village organization in the Rio Arriba, apart from family, *morada* and parish, was and still is the *acequia* system. Each village has a system of hand-dug ditches by means of which water is diverted from the nearest stream to irrigate individually owned plots of cropland. Ditch maintenance through collective labor and water allocation during the

growing season is managed by annually elected commissioners and *mayordomo*, in whom power is also vested as a legal entity. Although the mutual domestic water users associations (MDWUAs) did not come into existence around Taos until the 1950 and the 1960's, they nevertheless frequently share overlapping administrative personnel with the ditch systems, which they parallel by virtue of their function.

The ethnic significance of the *acequias* lies in the fact that they constitute the technical means by which traditional, village-based subsistence irrigation agriculture is carried out. They comprise, in other words, a key institution in the Hispano pattern or strategy of adaptation to the semi-arid, topographically rugged Rio Arriba bioregion. Physically, each ditch system delineates a bounded, self-identified resource domain coextensive with the village or community it serves. Each such individuated resource domain is linked to every other within a given watershed, and sometimes to those in adjacent watersheds. Now that the *ejidos* are gone, the *acequias* are what is left of the material base for the traditional agro-pastoral economy, and they remain the means by which Hispanos still exert majority control over arable microbasins surrounded by desert, piedmont and mountain. This control and the ownership it depends upon are now quickly eroding in the rural communities around Taos, under pressure from the real estate boom associated with luxury tourism development and the ski industry. So while the protest movements against such developments are in fact ethnically mixed and individual Anglos may even play important roles in them, they nevertheless have a strong Hispano ethnic identification because the *acequias* are involved. It is within this context that Hispano cultural survival has become symbolically identified with specific tracts

of land and water in the Taos area, in a manner somewhat similar to how Blue Lake became the symbol of Taos Pueblo cultural survival

The theoretical significance of all this consists in the fact that the organizational basis for Hispano-Chicano ethnopolitical mobilization in this case is local, small-scale, provincial and traditional. Yet it is commonly supposed that local, small-scale identity is an impediment to the formation of larger-scale identity such as class or nation. Hence the assimilationist thrust of modern efforts to nationalize ethnic minorities, or to mobilize them along class rather than ethnic lines. This assumption seems to be shared by virtually all the participants in the homeland debate, with the exception of Hall.⁴ In other words, they assume that any sense of Hispano distinctiveness, whether true or false, will impede the development of a broader, more progressive Chicano (or 'American' or working class) political consciousness, and is therefore undesirable or retrograde. Correspondingly, it is supposed that the processes of modernization and assimilation involve the supercession of traditional localized identities by larger, more widely shared extralocal ones.

Hannan's Model

Michael Hannan has proposed a theoretical resolution to the seemingly paradoxical but widespread observation that modernization seems to cause a decline in ethnic diversity, yet also under certain conditions to intensify the social and political importance of ethnic boundaries. He attempts to link these two processes within a single conceptual framework that combines world systems theory at the macrosocial level with ethnic niche theory at the microsocial level. Briefly, he argues that

When modern centers penetrate the local community, they undermine the salience of small-scale identities...Sustained mobilization in opposition to further penetration by the center must be on a scale commensurate with that of the center. Therefore, successful penetration by the center alters the condition of competition among the various bases of collective action in a direction that favors large-scale identities....The most important feature of the proposed theory is that it relates the reemergence of ethnicity to the process that typically destroys ethnicity. It implies that the center can be so successful in breaking down subsystem boundaries that it creates the conditions for successful ethnic collective action in opposition. (1979: 255-256)

In other words Hannan is arguing for a kind of dialectical process whereby opposition in the periphery, resulting from penetration by the core, necessarily becomes organizationally isomorphic with the core. Hence the widely observed emergence or increasing salience of large-scale ethnic identities, at a stage at which an earlier generation of ethnic theorists would have expected assimilation to be nearly complete.

Hannan's formulation seems to describe precisely what has been happening in the Rio Arriba. What the case of Taos demonstrates, where *acequia* officers and small farmer-ranchers join forces with urbanized Chicanos and even Anglo environmentalists, is that the stepping stone to a new kind of collective ethnopolitical mobilization is a parochial, highly localized microniche-based ethnic identity. Rather than being an impediment to the emergence of a broad-based, extralocal Chicano identity, the traditional, small-scale organization has become the medium through which a larger identity is realized. Rooted in the village community, Hispano identity has become 'Chicanoized' through modernization, outmigration, and resistance. Today this resistance is

organized in part around the *acequias*, MDWUA's and *mercedes*, against tourism-generated real estate developments which threaten to consume already over-allocated surface waters as well as other key resources within traditional village resource domains. These conflicts are articulated by their native participants as struggles for cultural survival and community self-determination—a feature which attests to a heightened degree of ethno-political self-consciousness, at least in comparison to say three decades ago. That they correspond to the process Hannan describes is further borne out by the fact that *acequia* organizations have recently begun to band together in order to better protect their common interests, not only within and between watershed systems but across the five northern Hispanic counties.

It would seem, therefore, that contrary to the fears of virtually all the principals in the Hispano homeland debate, a strong, ethno-politically mobilized northern New Mexican Hispano identity both enhances and in turn is reinforced by a broader Chicano identity. They are at odds neither theoretically nor empirically. The latter is evidenced by the fact that in Taos the personnel for both Chicano (national-regional) and Hispano (specifically local) collective cultural or symbolic expressions of ethnicity overlap, in terms of families if not individuals. For example, many of the same people or families involved in or at least supportive of anti-development protest activity are also involved in contemporaneous forms of ethnic cultural resurgence, such as ritual revivals within the parishes, or Chicano innovations such as *Danza Azteca*, lowriders, or local celebration of the *Cinco de Mayo*. Participants typically span different generations within extended families.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I want to suggest a couple of areas for further investigation. Although of general theoretical import, they must nevertheless be approached through the comparative method of empirical case studies. The first set of questions centers around the relation between ethnicity and class, and has to do with how, why, and under what circumstances ethnicity rather than class becomes an explicit or implicit basis for mobilization, or vice-versa. The interaction between the two under conditions of socio-economic and technological change and at different historical periods needs to be examined comparatively, in the Rio Arriba as well as elsewhere in the Southwest, for example in south Texas and urban California. The other area concerns the specific social, political, and cultural-symbolic ways in which local, small-scale identities articulate with larger, extralocal ones, or conversely, how different organizational foci compete for members under different conditions. Again, particular cases must be examined in depth. Only thus can we build a conceptual framework for the comparative, intra-regional analysis of Mexicano populations throughout the Southwest.

NOTES

1. This research began in 1981, and has been carried out with the assistance of grants from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, the American Philosophical Society, and the Academic Senate and ISOP-Mexico Program at UCLA. It focuses upon interethnic relations and social change in Taos from 1930 to the present.
2. Briefly, the tri-ethnic trap is a situation in which Hispanos, unable to advance beyond clearcut secondary economic status and faced with the steady and irrevocable loss of their traditional land base, must abide by a tourism-engendered Anglo glorification of Indian culture, as well as the federal protection and even restoration of Indian lands, sometimes at the expense of Hispano ownership.
3. This is essentially the distinction between the thing or *ding an sich* and the symbol that represents it in human discourse. Drawing upon the semantic map/territory distinction proposed by Korzybski ("the map is not the territory"), Bateson incorporated and elaborated upon this notion in his own discussions of epistemology.
4. Hall states that subcultural identification can but does not necessarily impede the development of a larger political unity, and "If one accepts the position that ethnicity is reactively created and that there is a general trend to larger, more wide-spread ethnic groups, then the identification and understanding of those features which impede such changes is vital to the construction of such a wider identity (1985: 10)."

REFERENCES CITED

Barth, Fredrik

- 1969 Introduction. *In* *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. F. Barth, ed.
Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Bateson, Gregory

- 1972 Form, Substance, and Difference. *In* *Steps to An Ecology of Mind*.
New York: Ballantine Books.

Blaut, J. M., and Rios-Bustamante, Antonio

- 1984 Commentary on Nostrand's "Hispanos" and their "Homeland."
Annals of the Association of American Geographers 74 (1):
157-163.

Bodine, John

- 1968 A Tri-Ethnic Trap: The Spanish Americans in Taos. *In*
Spanish-Speaking People in the United States (Proceeding of
the American Ethnological Society). June Helm, ed.

Bustamante, Adrian

- 1982 *Los Hispanos: Ethnicity and Social Change in New Mexico*. Ph.D.
dissertation, University of New Mexico.

Chavez, Fray Angélico

- 1984 Rejoinder. *Annals of the Association of American*

Geographers 74 (1): 170-171.

Chavez, John

1984 *The Lost Land*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Gutiérrez, Ramón

1981 *Marriage, Sex, and the Family: Social Change in Colonial New Mexico*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Hall, Thomas

1985 Comment on the Nostrand, Hansen, Nostrand, Blaut and Rios-Bustamante, Nostrand Debate. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Social Science Association, Fort Worth.

Hannan, Michael

1979 *The Dynamics of Ethnic Boundaries in Modern States*. In *National Development and the World System*. John Meyer and M. Hannan, eds Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hansen, Niles

1981 Commentary on the Hispano Homeland in 1900. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 71 (2): 280-282.

MacCannell, Dean

1984 *Reconstructed Ethnicity: Tourism and Cultural Identity in Third World Communities*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 11: 375-391.

Meinig, D. W.

- 1984 Rejoinder. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 74 (1): 171.

Nostrand, Richard

- 1970 The Hispanic-American Borderland: Delimitation of an American Culture Region. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 60 (4): 638-661.
- 1975 Mexican Americans Circa 1850. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 65 (3): 378-390.
- 1980 The Hispano Homeland in 1900. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70 (3): 382-396.
- 1981 Commentary in Reply (to Hansen). *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 71 (2): 282-283.
- 1984 Hispano Cultural Distinctiveness: A Reply. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 74 (1): 164-169.

Rodríguez, Sylvia

- 1987 Land, Water, and Ethnic Identity in Taos. *In* Land and Cultural Survival. Charles Briggs and John Van Ness, eds. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. (In press.)

Rosaldo, Renato

- 1983 Anthropological Perspectives on Chicanos 1970-1980. *In* Chicanos in the Social Sciences: A Decade of Research and Development. Isidro Ortiz, ed. Santa Barbara: Center for Chicano Studies, University of California.

Simmons, Marc

1984 Rejoinder. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 74
(1): 169-170.