Entering each other's story *en la frontera*: the nature of narrative as identity formation in the context of conflicting narratives, and some implications for intercultural congregational life.

Author(s): Quentin P. Kinnison.

Source: *Pacific Journal* 6 (2011): 3-27.

Publisher: Fresno Pacific University.

Stable URL: http://hdl.handle.net/11418/527

Entering Each Other's Story *En La Frontera:* The Nature of Narrative as Identity Formation in the Context of Conflicting Narratives, and Some Implications for Intercultural Congregational Life

QUENTIN P. KINNISON

Introduction

For decades, Christians in the United States have lived with the reality, expressed most famously by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., that 11 o'clock Sunday morning is the most segregated hour of the week. Some lament, others are resigned, and still others work toward a life together crossing racial, ethnic, socio-economic, and other significant boundaries. In the border region shared by the United States and Mexico, known as the borderlands or *la frontera*, churches are confronted with wonderful opportunities for rich life together and with the tremendous difficulties such opportunities afford.

The borderland (*la frontera*) is a place of immense cultural diversity and of considerable change and conflict. When people of different cultures interact, there are likely to be struggles as each group attempts to navigate both known and unknown social complexities.[1] In the midst of this cultural landscape, churches attempt to navigate similar realities, all the while holding fast to the Gospel and its claims. These churches seek to engage the lives of people who live along the border between the United States and Mexico as they navigate the cultural exchanges unique to *la frontera*; people like these:

Luis: From Sinaloa, Mexico, he came to the Phoenix, Arizona, with his parents nearly twenty years ago. Several years ago, he and his wife became U.S. citizens. A custodian at a predominantly Euro-American Southern Baptist church, occasionally he is asked to translate when the office staff cannot communicate with a Spanish-speaking patron. He and his family rarely attend the church where he works, although they have participated in projects aimed at reaching the predominantly "Hispanic" community around the church.

Bob: A snowbird from Chicago, he is concerned with the influx of illegal immigrants. He joins a group of people associated with the Minutemen Project to watch the Arizona border. “I don’t have a problem with Mexicans wanting to come here and assimilate,” Bob says, “as long as they do it legally.” To cite his “lack of prejudice” he tells how he is part of his church’s ESL ministry.

Juan: His family is sixth-generation Tejanos. He is a highly educated professor at a protestant seminary in California sought after as an advisor for churches seeking to minister to “Hispanics” in his birth state. Despite his birth in the U.S., he is often complimented on his ability to speak English without an accent and treated like a foreigner. At times he feels like a man without a country.

Eric: Eric is a second-generation Chinese American in Arizona. He doesn’t understand all this talk about oppression and Chicano/a power. He understands that some people are racist, having heard racist jokes as a child in school. However, as a son of immigrant parents, he has seen how hard work and persistence can payoff. “If you are part of an immigrant society, you just have to work a little harder to fit into the culture that was here before,” he reasons.

Jaime: He and his brother (Alex) work at the upscale coffee bar in a Pasadena, California bookstore. They have been in the U.S. for two years having come from Enseñada to work. On his days off, he cares for his daughter and plays fútbol in the park with friends. He remarks that, “the white people here [in the U.S.] treat us better than the Mexicans here treat us.” He and his family are Catholic.

Sue: An African-American elementary school teacher in Glendale, Arizona, Sue is frustrated by how difficult it is to help her “Mexican” students because the parents are never home. She appreciates that the parents have to work, but wonders if they neglect their kids. What makes matters more frustrating is that when she is able to meet the parents, they often cannot speak English. The kids are forced to translate, which can be awkward when discussing a discipline problem.

Stacey: A mother of four in Los Angeles, California, who cannot imagine being away from her kids, Stacey has hired a Latina immigrant, Maria, to help with the keeping of the house. Stacey works alongside her children’s nanny and has come to think of her as part of the family. She has never met Maria’s three

children, but Stacey is glad she can help Maria provide for them–even if that means that Maria is absent from her own family for 10-12 hours a day. Maria's immigration status is never discussed.

The general failure of the Euro-American church to adequately engage these various stories in *la frontera* is problematic largely because so many people know a different history than the one traditionally held in the national narrative—stories that the dominant culture does not include in its historical mirror.[2] For Euro-Americans, failure to recognize how dominant traditional narratives affect the cultural landscape creates a distorted view of their place along the border. Moreover, for people who are neither of Mexican descent nor of European-Anglo descent the complexity as to the inter-relationship of the various narratives makes forming the alliances necessary for survival in the region difficult to navigate. I contend that for pastoral people and churches serious about working toward intercultural church life, failure to know and understand each other's cultural narratives translates to our inability to agree on such basic issues in church life as reading the Bible for common understanding, the role of the church in engaging culture, God's expectations for his people related to justice and community, and even our understanding of the nature of who Jesus is.[3]

For pastoral persons serious about ministry in this context, the issues raised above and their related concepts have to be considered. How can a traditionally Euro-American church care for its members *and* minister in communities that are increasingly Mexican and Mexican American? What awareness is necessary in order to begin this process of change? These are the issues discussed in this paper.

Before discussing these issues, I acknowledge the following biases:[4]

First, I am convinced that the Gospel of Jesus requires us to look beyond homogeneity: that Christ expects us to be church with people of different races, ethnicities, languages, and nationalities. This is the clear teaching of the New Testament, including Paul, most particularly in the Corinthian and Ephesians correspondence.[5] John's Revelation of Jesus shows us this is Christ's eschatological intent.[6] The Gospel crosses all boundaries making Christ's persons one people.[7]

Second, the Gospel is deeply concerned with those marginalized by society. Jesus' ministry among the poor and disenchanted should be a guide for ministry today. God's justice does not allow those of us seemingly unaffected[8] by social injustice (for this paper racial and ethnic prejudice that has economic and legal ramifications) to stand by and not get involved. God's people are expected to use our influence and power to equalize the imbalances created by dominant culture.[9] Domination has no place in God's Kingdom.[10]

Third, I operate from the assumption that identity is formed socially. I will discuss this further in a moment, but want to clarify that the concepts of the "self-made person" or the "rugged individualist" are fallacies. As creatures made by God to be socially connected, all people are shaped by, with, for, and against others.

Finally, I believe in the power of narratives to shape identities. Some of these narratives are good and some are bad, but all have shaping properties. Either they shape the way a person or a people view themselves, or narratives shape the way others view a people which has its own forming effects.[11]

Group Identity Formation

The identities of human beings are socially formed. Sociologists Charles H. Cooley and George Herbert Mead explain that people perceive themselves based on their perception of how others view them.[12] To this end, Cooley coined the term "looking-glass self," which means that self-worth and self-respect are found in how valued one is by those around a person.[13] Van Ausdale and Feagin argue that the social mind involves social memory of past experiences and interpretations, which shapes how a person views the larger social order.[14] Specifically they state:

> Indeed the reflections and interpretations that we make of the social order include our attempts to justify that order, including its moral norms, hierarchies, and inequalities. Such justifications take place especially when we are challenged by others . . . . Children, like adults, become *human* beings in interaction with other human beings. The view of one's

> social identity, as well as of one's group, comes from everyday interactions with others.[15]

In *The Social Animal*, Elliot Aronson writes, "One consequence of the fact that man is a social animal is that he lives in a state of tension between values associated with individuality and values associated with conformity."[16] Conformity then is "a change in a persons behavior or opinions as a result of real or imagined pressure from a person or group of people."[17] Conformity evolves in three forms: *compliance*—conforming for the purpose of receiving reward or for not receiving punishment; *identification*—conforming without careful reflections because of an affinity for the person or group; *internalization*—conforming by internalizing a belief or value based on a desire to be right as deemed so by a perceived trustworthy source (personal or group).[18] It is noteworthy to remember that those who do not conform are considered "deviant."[19] Conformity coupled with the homogeneity principle—that humans tend to be drawn toward like persons rather than toward persons who are different—explains the concepts of in-group, out-group, and their related biases.[20]

Social identity plays an important role in understanding *la frontera* because of the struggle between dominant Euro-American cultural values and norms placed over and against those of Mexican descendants. As C. Wright Mills reminds us:

> Men act with and against one another. Each takes into account what others expect. When such mutual expectations are sufficiently definite and durable, we call them standards. Each man also expects the others are going to react to what he does. We call these expected reactions sanctions. Some of them seem very gratifying, some do not. When men are guided by standards and sanctions, we may say they are playing roles together.[21]

What happens to performers when the roles they perform are subverted by a change in the set, the play, the characters, the audience, and even the language, as was the case for Mexican descendants in *la frontera* from 1848 to present?

Don Martindale contends that social performers perform with the intention of creating a favorable impression of self in order to receive the audience's approval (Cooley's "looking glass self").[22] In order to create this favorable impression, the performer looks to the audience for clues as to how his or her performance is received. This is how the performer achieves upward movement in the esteem of the audience, thus feeding self-esteem and increasing social standing.[23] Conversely, nonconformity to audience expectation, either by misreading the signs or by blatant disregard of those signs, leads to negative sanctions and downward social standing.

For persons of Mexican descent, the post-1848 change of setting, characters, audience, and expectations created an environment of negative self-identity formation that persists to this day. As Acuña notes, "identity has always been problematic among the 'other' in US society. . . ."[24] He demonstrates how Chicanos from white, affluent neighborhoods adopt a "white identity" while "barrio Chicanos" are clearly different in language, dress, and economic standing.[25] This often creates a crisis for those who have adopted a "false" white identity, leading many to reject it while others seek to ignore the crisis.

Thus, using Martindale's pattern, some adapt through compliance as a means of survival. Others adapt through identification by willingly participating as expected in the environment without full association. Still others internalize the expectations of dominant society to the extent of rejecting their ethnic heritage. Finally, some are non-conformists, remaining "deviant" by dominant cultural standards with all the sanctions implied therein.[26] However, Mexican-descendants from all degrees of conformity are evaluated by standards skewed by Euro-American in-group bias, predetermining failure at their attempts to fully participate in dominant society.

With the above in mind, a particularly helpful methodology for looking at group identity formation is Harold R. Isaacs's "basic group identity." Issacs contends that "basic group identity consist of the ready made set of endowments and identifications that every individual shares with others from the moment of birth by the chance of the family into which he is born at that given time in that given place."[27] He identifies seven traits of this identity process: physical characteristics (body), birthplace, name, language, history and ori-

gins, religion, and nationality.[28] These seven identity traits hold past, present, and future implications for groups and their individual members in relation to interactions with other groups and their subsequent membership. As Isaacs so eloquently states it:

> The new member of the group comes not only into his inheritance of the past but also into all the shaping circumstances of the present: the conditions of status that come or do not come with these legacies, his families relative wealth or poverty, its relative position in the larger group to which it belongs, and the group's position relative to other groups in its environment—all the political-social-economic circumstances that impinge on the family and the group with all the inward and outward effects these conditions have on the shaping of the individual's personality and the making of his life. . . . Such are the holdings that make up the basic group identity. How they are seen and celebrated has provided the substance of most of what we know as history, mythology, folklore, art, literature, religious beliefs and practices. How the holdings of others are seen has provided most of the unending grimness of the we-they confrontations in human experience. Raised high or held low, these are the idols of all our tribes.[29]

This leads us to discuss narrative implications for identity formation.

Narrative and Identity Formation

Ronald Takaki describes the traditional history of the United States as a history that excludes the non-white, non-European perspectives.[30] He states that the omission of the stories of those usually excluded creates an inaccurate reflection of the country in the mirror of our historical awareness, which can only be corrected by including those oft forgotten narratives.[31] Acuña argues that ignoring or erasing historical memory has devastating consequences: ". . . an ethnic group unable to define its past is unable to take pride in its accomplishments, learn from past mistakes or assess its current situation. History is more than just an esoteric search for facts; it involves a living community and its

common memory."[32] As stated in the introduction, these narratives (true and false) have tremendous power in shaping identity. Jacqueline J. Lewis states:

> As I see it, we are storied selves. Our identity development, then, can be thought of as the process of finding our own narrative voice amid the speech of and in dialogue with others, as we interpret and make meaning of identity stories told to us by family, teachers, peers, and others. We are told multiple stories, and have complex, multiple identities (for example, gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and religious traditions/belief systems). We can therefore think of identity development as how these overlapping, interweaving, multi-textured stories inform one another.[33]

Key to Lewis' statement is the idea that we hear multiple stories. Sometimes these stories are positive; sometimes they are negative. The challenge is finding ways in which to process all the implications of the stories we hear. W. E. B. Du Bois wrote that this was the challenge of the African-American community following the Civil War:

> . . . [T]he Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world—a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness,—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.[34]

In other words, this multiplicity of stories has the identity effect of creating polycentric people—a concept discussed later in this paper. The power of the narrative also has greater affect depending on who does the telling. As indicat-

ed above, our social nature determines worth on how we are perceived of and received by others. Those with power and carry greater ability to shape identity than do the powerless.[35] Daisy Machado writes:

> The telling of a national history is really about power and exclusion. This is so because history is the telling of a story told by those who had the power to impose themselves. It is not surprising then, that those who hold the power to tell their story also hold the power to name themselves and exclude others from that self-definition.[36]

However, as we shall see there is still influence in identity formation that occurs by the dialogical nature of the interaction between groups.

For this paper, I am working with two forms of narrative: labels and myths. Narrative labels are those labels given to or claimed by a group which have a formative meaning. Known in social psychology as "categorization," this process of labeling is necessary for the creation of in-group/outgoup prejudices and categorization based on ethnicity is a significant form of this process.[37] Narrative myths are stories told within a group about itself or told by a dominant group to others about the others that shapes both the perceptions of the dominant group and/or the self-perceptions of the outgroup as to the nature of societal norms and the minority's place within that society. Pablo Vila puts it this way: "At the level of people's identity, however, the power to confer identity falls into the sphere of the narrative plot, whose articulatory function consists in transforming happenings into events, that is, meaningful episodes in the story of the character that is being constructed."[38] These narrative concepts are discussed later in this paper.

Dialogical Nature of Group Dynamics

It is important to note that as we look at the borderlands (*la frontera*) the cultural influence is not a one-way exchange. While there are significant things to be said about the influences of the dominant Euro-Americans' impact on the lives of Mexican descendents, it is important to understand that by nature of the interaction between the groups, persons of Mexican descent also influence

the dominant culture. Thomas Sowell, in *Race and Culture*, demonstrates that cultural exchanges—"cultural diffusion" as he calls it—between the conquerors and the conquered have occurred throughout history. In those exchanges, sometimes the conqueror's culture dominates and sometimes the conquered culture wins out, but in either case neither is unaffected by the exchange.[39] Vélez-Ibáñez writes, "Whether divided by geography, language, or culture, human populations may often become more distinct but sometimes more similar after bumping into one another."[40] What affect does the ignoring of Mexican narratives have on those who do the ignoring? Does the partial history we tell negatively affect our ability to understand our present and future?

Polycentric Identity

Mark Lau Branson makes reference to the "polycentric" person—an unbounded, centered self who functions within his or her own narratives/histories with a fluency between the different narrative wherein he or she operates.[41] His example of the Chinese-American, female Christian shows the various worlds she navigates as she moves from her heritage as a Chinese descendant, her citizenry as an American, her gender experience as a woman, and her faith understanding of all the above. Polycentric implies a multiplicity of narratives or stories wherein a person has a particular role or part, but which does not make up the whole of their being. This is what Barry A. Harvey means when he writes, "An individual's identity is therefore never fixed, but is determined by her or his constantly changing position within the *polis*."[42] Virgilio Elizondo expresses this as a "new *mestizaje*" that was formed by his crossing from his Mexican neighborhood to the German Catholic school that would deny him his Mexican identity.[43] Martha Minow, in her book *Not Only for Myself*, discusses this concept in terms of boundaries and border crossing.[44] Nina Boyd Krebs calls the process "edgewalking." Krebs writes that "edgewalkers" are not moving from one role to another, " . . . *[E]dgewalkers* do not shed one skin when they move from their cultures of origin to the mainstream and back. An *edgewalker* maintains continuity wherever he or she goes, walking on the edge between cultures in the same persona."[45] This is the "double-consciousness" spoken of by De Bois.[46]

What becomes clear in reading these authors is that depending on the nature of the narratives, position, boundaries, or cultural shifts, the process can be considerably more difficult for persons moving from outside the dominant culture into its mainstream. What about issues of acceptance? Minow discusses the difficulties polycentric persons face when she states:

> Consider the tensions among self-identification, assignments by self-claimed group members, and assignment by self-claimed group opponents. You say you are Choctaw, but do the Choctaw say so? The Catholics claim you, but do you claim them? The Apartheid government declared you to be colored, whether you did or not. The gaps and conflicts among self-identification, internal group membership practices, and external, oppressive assignments have given rise to poignant and persistent narratives of personal and political pain and struggle.[47]

Krebs speaks of it this way:

> Role shifting does not work as a way of life when the differences are great between one environment and another. Over time this way of getting by will mean loss of connection with who you really are. . . . This process is painful, and as a psychologist I have heard from many how hard it is to stay true to oneself rather than just taking what looks like the easy way out.[48]

Krebs goes on to write of the danger of "*splitting*–amputating part of myself to lessen conflict or pain."[49] She contends that "integrating the painful or conflicting parts of one-self, rather than *splitting*, is crucial for mental health."[50] Trinitarian theology also gives us a framework for understanding this idea, if in a limited way. Miroslav Volf contends that when speaking of the Trinity in terms of *perichoresis*, we must understand the interiority of God. This means that the fullness of the Father indwells the Son and the Spirit, as does the Son indwell the Father and the Spirit, as does the Spirit indwell the Father and the

Son; herein the unity of God is found without diminishing any of the three persons of God.[51]

People with strong ethnic/racial cultures who live in a society dominated by those not of the same culture are the polycentric people I speak of here. As we shall see, the borderlands are a place of cultural friction.[52] Particularly for people of ethnicity, it is important to find ways to cross the cultural borders. Minow suggests that "frequent border-crossing can render uncertain the distinctions between groups, communities and identities."[53] Further, Minow states, "Individuals who "crossover" from one racial identity to another expose the incoherence off the racial categories just as do others who insist on a racial identity that does not match the expectation of others."[54] Likewise, Krebs suggests that this crossing between cultures is part of the development of cross-cultural understanding: "We figure out how to love and work with people different from ourselves without abandoning parts of who we are."[55] Krebs also offers a helpful word to those in the dominant culture:

> It is important to keep in mind that *edgewalking* isn't limited to people of color, and it occurs on a two-way street. It is not the sole obligation of those within minority groups to teach those in more powerful places how to relate. People who move from the mainstream culture to explore and support other possibilities are significant contributors.[56]

La Frontera: A Brief Description

Cultural influence is not a one-way exchange. In forensic science, Locard's Exchange Principle dictates that when people or objects come into contact with one another, there is always an exchange of some kind (DNA, fibers, fingerprints, etc.).[57] Similarly, when cultures interact, each exchanges something, no matter how small, with the other. Cultural exchanges between the conquerors and the conquered have occurred throughout history. In those exchanges, sometimes the conqueror's culture dominates and sometimes the conquered's culture wins out; in either case, neither is unaffected by the exchange.[58] For pastors leading homogeneous congregations in the borderlands,[59] ignoring the regional realities promotes a failure to understand the church's situation. I re-

tell some of the regional history here with emphasis on a non-Euro-American telling of that history. To some degree, I emphasize the Arizona context in part because of my personal history there and because of the international attention Arizona has drawn for its part in these very difficult issues.

Historical Background

Geo-politically, the borderlands consist of the Southwestern United States and Northern Mexico.[60] Historically, the region provides a constant backdrop to the saga of conquest: first because of warfare between native tribes, then with the coming of the Spanish, and finally by the Euro-Americans. Before 1846, Spain, and later Mexico, refused U.S. offers to purchase the region.[61] In 1846, the U.S. created a pretext for war that led to the utter defeat of Mexico, including the invasion of Mexico City.[62] The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo forced Mexico to surrender most of its northwestern territory, from Texas to California,[63] turning 100,000 Mexican citizens into U.S. citizens with its surrender.[64] While technically U.S. citizens, most Mexican descendents found that socially, culturally, ethnically, and economically they had become foreigners in their own land.[65]

In the end, property transferred hands: first from Mexico to the United States, then from Mexican Americans to Euro-Americans. For Euro-Americans, it was the natural conclusion of the Manifest Destiny myth and westward expansion. For Mexican Americans, the transfer was a heist of which they were victims without recourse, perpetuating a legacy of conquest that persists to this day.[66]

Sociocultural Implications

The physical border becomes inter-related with social borders of conquest. The loss of property and the formation of borders to keep them off that property disempowered Mexican Americans economically and politically.[67] Limerick emphasizes that the transfer of land is largely the result of conflicting cultural perspectives on the use of land.[68] The result was a transfer of power that "paralleled the loss of land."[69] The particular establishment of Arizona as a "southern, White state" further demonstrates the intention of Euro-Americans to maintain ethnocentric sociopolitical dominance.[70]

For Mexican Americans, the loss of language and the commodification and criminalization of "Mexicaness" emphasized a loss of power in the region.[71] Further, the border creates a unique environment where a Mexican American's "Mexicaness" prohibits full participation in dominant Euro-American contexts and their "Americaness" prohibits full participation in traditional Mexican contexts.[72] The border separates Mexican descendents in the U.S. from the primary source of their cultural influence.[73]

While the borderlands as a place of "grating" or "cultural bumping"[74] makes it a place of conquest, friction, and pain, it is also a place of new creation–Anzaldúa's "third country." In this sense, the borderland has metaphorical meaning. The Euro-American adoption of Mexican geographic names, foods, and other particularly Mexican cultural amenities indicates Mexican cultural influence on the dominant culture and a mixing of the two. Other significant ethnic groups add to the complexities and beauty of this mixing. The close proximity of Asian Americans (particularly Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Indian, and Pakistani communities), African Americans, Native Americans, and various immigrant groups from all parts of the world, along with the Latino and Euro-American communities, constitutes the borderlands as a place of alternating friction and fusion.

Borderland scholars emphasize *mestizaje*[75] as an important metaphor for understanding this new world. Social, racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural norms become walls of separation needing social deconstruction for societal growth by the mixing of people ethnically, socially, religiously, and so forth.[76] Mixing of ethnicities, cultures, languages, and understandings provide new opportunities, creating a border-crossing people. From a theological perspective, the borderlands teach a gospel truth: borders are to be crossed and diversity embraced. The way of Jesus requires border crossing.[77] The borderland teaches that adaptive change, despite the pain and loss it brings, is an opportunity to embrace the call to cross cultural barriers as testimony to God's reign. Homogeneity is unnatural and has no place in this environment.

People of Mexican descent have long been ignored in the dominant, Euro-American telling of history (the narrative myth of "Manifest Destiny" or that the west was not won until the Euro-American tamed it) or worse, been made

the villains of the stories (the narrative myth of the "bandito" or of the "lazy" Mexican). For many students learning in a typical American classroom, U.S. history doesn't begin until the Pilgrims land at Plymouth Rock, neglecting the fact that Spaniards and the newly forming *mestizo* people had settled portions of the current Southwestern U.S. almost a hundred years earlier. Where does the person of Mexican descent find his or her story? Are they only destined to be the nap-taking losers of a poorly led and ill-fated war? How does what a student learns in the classroom mesh with the stories told at home by *abuela*?[78] This is why Gutiérrez-Jones argues for the recovery of the Chicano narratives.

> The incentive to read Chicano narratives for how they might rethink historiography and the battle over rhetoric itself becomes all the more pressing as we consider ways in which these narratives might easily be assimilated into an academic framework that is ideologically structured around notions of pluralism, notions that give priority to humanistic universalism and liberal-legal consensus rather than to historically situated cultural conflict.[79]

Robert Schreiter likewise explains that culture is made of our memories, which help us to accept or reject new cultural input. This information in turn moves people toward development of identity.[80] It will be this process of understanding narratives that offers pastoral people a place of ministry in understanding *la frontera*.

Toward Some Implications for Ministry

The opportunities for conflict in light of this different understanding of the borderland creates unique struggles for churches and pastoral leadership within those churches in *la frontera*. As I stated at the outset, the very real differences in how we understand the history of the region and the way in which those histories define each group create the context by which we think of such issues as who God is, how we read the Bible, and the nature of how the church functions. One relatively obvious example is in the use of Spanish pronouns in relationship to the second person plural which makes for a more accurate

communal reading of the biblical text versus the more traditional reading of "you" as a singular "you" when the plural is intended by the Greek writer.[81] Thus, the life and role of the church is seen as being much more connected to the suffering of individuals (job, family, school, immigration status, etc.) than in the Euro-American context where these are viewed as individual difficulties for each person to bear and overcome. It is more likely that a Hispanic/Latino congregation will come to the aid of a fellow congregant in need than will their Euro-American counterpart.

Thus a pastor of a Euro-American congregation who seeks to minister to a Mexican/Mexican American community has to do more than just pray with those in need. They and the church must mobilize on behalf of those in need. This becomes difficult particularly when the Euro-American narrative of Manifest Destiny comes in conflict with the Mexican/Mexican American narrative of Conquest. Furthermore, Euro-American adherence to law (particularly as it relates to civil and criminal law) creates conflict with Mexican/Mexican American desire for justice (in relation to work, healthcare, education). This is not unlike the same kind of conflict that the African American community faced in the Civil Rights era.[82]

Real ministry in this context begins with our entering into the stories of the other, embracing the ones who tell those stories, and in letting our own stories be more fully understood by the retelling. It requires coming to the other with more questions than answers and with a desire to learn and understand how history is interpreted through the other's experience. It is in this humility and learning posture that we can begin to see ourselves in the other and a new blended, *mestizo* identity as church together can begin to form.

In the end, all narratives must be redeemed. Adherence to a Euro-American national narrative or a Chicano/Latino narrative that fails to recognize a transethnic, intercultural calling to Kingdom values misses the point of the Christian community. There is clearly room in the church of the borderland for people of Euro-American ethnicity and Mexican/Mexican American (and a whole host of others) to engage in conversations about repentance and forgiveness, about justice and grace, about action for the community and individual responsibility, about the redemption of languages (all languages), and about the realization

that God's *eschaton* is one in which every nation, tribe, people, and tongue stands before the Lamb in worship and adoration (Rev. 7:9).

NOTES

1 For more information on cross-cultural conflict and patterns of conflict resolution see David W. Augsburger, *Conflict Mediation across Cultures: Pathways and Patterns* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992).

2 A reference to Ronald Takaki, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1993), 16. David G. Gutiérrez states that, "It goes without saying that immigrant minorities—particularly the ethnic Mexican minority—have been profoundly affected by Americans' habit of engaging in such selective, sanitized historical memory. David G. Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants and the Politics of Ethnicity* (Berkley: University of Berkley Press, 1995), 212.

3 See Justo L. González, *Mañana: Christian Theology from a Hispanic Perspective* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990).

4 I concur with Don Browning, among others, that objectivity is not only impossible, but also unfruitful. See Don Browning, *A Fundamental Practical Theology: Descriptive and Strategic Proposals* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 34-54, especially 38-42.

5 For a sampling of commentators on these two books, see David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament series, ed. Robert W. Yarbrough and Robert H. Stein (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), especially 588-604; Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament series, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), especially 582-625; E. K. Simpson, *Ephesians and Colossians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament series, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), especially 58-96; Walter L. Liefeld, *Ephesians*, The IVP New Testament Commentary Series, ed. Grant R. Osborne (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997), especially 67-111.

6 See specifically Revelation 7: 9-10. Robert H. Mounce states, "The universality of the multitude is stressed by the fourfold division into nations, tribes, peoples and tongues." See Robert H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, in The New International Commentary on the New Testament series, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), 171.

7 See for example: Gerhard Lohfink, *Jesus and Community* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), particularly 87-98; Curtiss Paul DeYoung, et. al., *United by Faith: The Multiracial Congregation as an Answer to the Problem of Race* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 9-37; Martin Luther King, Jr., *Strength to Love* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), especially 140-43; Manuel Ortiz, *One New People: Models for Developing a Multiethnic Church* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1996); Brad Christerson, et. al., *Against All Odds: The Struggle for Racial Integration in Religious Organizations* (New York: New York University Press, 2005).

8 Martin Luther King, Jr. makes the argument that the oppressor also is damaged by his or her actions as those actions destroy the soul of the actor. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Why We Can't Wait* (New York: Mentor Press, 1964), 82; King, *Strength*, 53. See also Richard Lischer, *The Preacher King: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Words that Moved America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 221-24. See also similar thoughts in Booker T. Washington, *Up from Slavery* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 2003), 103-104.

[9] Paula Harris offers a short but good discussion on this idea of betraying white privilege in Paula Harris and Doug Schaupp, *Being White: Finding Our Place in a Multicultural World* (Downer Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 171-179. For persons ethnically part of the dominant culture, Harris suggest three course of action based on the Exodus narrative: 1) harden our hearts as did Pharaoh; 2) respond in fear and go with what ever group has control as did the Egyptians; or, 3) respond in mercy by supplanting the dominant culture as did Pharaoh's daughter. See 172-175.

[10] The following are a sampling of the authors who have made these very arguments: James V. Brownson, et al., *StormFront: The Good News of God* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003); Justo L. González, *Santa Biblia: The Bible through Hispanic Eyes* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996); Darrell L. Guder, ed., *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1998); Lohfink, *Jesus*; Letty M. Russell, *Church in the Round: Feminist Interpretation of the Church* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993); Ronald Sider, *Just Generosity: A New Vision for Overcoming Poverty in America* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999); Glen H. Stassen and David P. Gushee, *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003).

[11] See Pablo Vila, *Crossing Borders, Reinforcing Borders: Social Categories, Metaphors, and Narrative Identities on the U.S. – Mexico Frontier* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000), 228-49. In particular Vila states, "In racially and regionally conscious societies like the United States and Mexico, people tend to cite 'evidence' to support their claims that 'others' have negative properties and attitudes, or that 'we' are better than 'them.' Narratives about ourselves and 'others,' then, are presented as 'facts,' because they are about events that we have personally witnessed or participated in." Vila, *Crossing*, 239.

[12] To this end, I use principles from both social psychology and sociology. In using social psychology and sociology, I maintain that there is an interplay between ways in which societies form individuals and individuals form societies. While social psychology focuses primarily on group/individual interaction and sociology focuses on group/group interaction, the interplay between the two makes their concepts interdependent. I acknowledge Alfredo Mirandé's criticism of traditional sociology in relation to people of Mexican descent. See Alfredo Mirandé, *The Chicano Experience: An Alternative Perspective* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985), 2-13. As he states, "A basic problem is that the sociology of Mexican-Americans has not developed new paradigms or theoretical frameworks that are consistent with a Chicano world view and responsive to the nuances of Chicano culture." Ibid., 2.

[13] David G. Meyers, *Social Psychology*, 7th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2002), 43.

[14] Debra Van Ausdale and Joe R. Feagin, *The First R: How Children Learn Race and Racism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001), 18.

[15] Ibid. Van Ausdale and Feagin specifically reference Mead here. For a further look at Mead's work see George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

[16] Elliot Aronson, *The Social Animal* (New York: The Viking Press, 1972), 13.

[17] Ibid., 16.

[18] Aronson clarifies that *compliance*, *identification*, and *internalization* are degrees of conformity. Compliance is the minimum degree, while internalization is the maximum degree of conformity. Ibid., 27-45, especially 28-29.

[19] Ibid., 14.

[20] According to Meyers, in-group formation is the process of like people banding together for the purpose of advancing the group and protecting the individuals within that group. He explains that group definition occurs in part by comparisons against others—the outgroup. Behind this grouping process is an assumption that one's own group is better than the outgroup, an attempt at achieving esteem known a "in-group bias." Meyers, *Social Psychology*, 346-52.

[21] C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 29.

[22] Don Martindale, "The Formalization of Personal Identity," in *Readings in Sociology*, eds. John F. Cuber and Peggy B. Harroff (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962), 147.

[23] Ibid., 147-48.

[24] Rodolfo Acuña, *Anything but Mexican: Chicanos in Contemporary Los Angeles* (New York: Verso, 1996), xi.

[25] Ibid., xi-xii

[26] Prison and death are the two most prominent. See Carl Gutiérrez-Jones, *Rethinking the Borderlands: Between Chicano Culture and Legal Discourse* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1995); Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, 5th ed. (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2002), especially 414-16; Mirandé, *Chicano*, especially 70-90, 223-40.

[27] Harold R. Isaacs, *Idols of the Tribe: Group Identity and Political Change* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1975), 38.

[28] Ibid., 39; Isaacs develops each of these traits in the chapters that follow.

[29] Ibid., 40.

[30] In particular he states: "But what is needed in our own perplexing times is not so much a 'distant' mirror, as one that is 'different.' While the study of the past can provide collective self-knowledge, it often reflects the scholar's particular perspective or view of the world." Takaki, *Different Mirror*, 16.

[31] Ibid., 1-17, esp. 16-17.

[32] Acuña, *Anything*, 20.

[33] Jacqueline J. Lewis, "Living on the Border," *Congregations* 29:3 (Summer 2003): 25.

[34] W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 2003), 9.

[35] Takaki writes, "What happens when historians leave out many of America's peoples? What happens, to borrow the words of Adrienne Riche, 'when someone with the authority of a teacher' describes our society, and 'you are not in it?' Such an experience can be disorientating — 'a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing.'" Takaki, *Different Mirror*, 16, quoting Adrienne Rich, *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose, 1979-1985* (New York: Norton Press, 1986), 199.

[36] Daisy L. Machado, *Of Borders and Margins: Hispanic Disciples in Texas, 1888-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), xiii.

[37] Meyers, *Social Psychology*, 357-59.

[38] Pablo Vila, *Border Identifications: Narratives of Religion, Gender, and Class on the U.S.-Mexico Border* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005), 18-20; quote from 18.

[39] Thomas Sowell, *Race and Culture: A World View* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 62-78. Sowell specifically states: "In short, there has been no single pattern for the cultural diffusions which occur as the result of conquests. Sometimes it is the conqueror's culture which prevails, sometimes that of the conquered, but seldom does either prevail unmodified. What is clear, however, is that such diffusions are common, widespread, and historic in their consequences." Ibid., 73.

40 Carlos G. Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1996), 5-6.

41 Mark Lau Branson, *Intercultural Church Life and Adult Formation: Community, Narrative, and Transformation*, (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1999), 141-42.

42 Barry A. Harvey, *Another City: An Ecclesiological Primer for a Post-Christian World* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, International, 1999), 17.

43 Virgilio Elizondo, *The Future is Mestizo: Life Where Cultures Meet*, revised ed. (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2000), 15-17.

44 Martha Minow, *Not Only for Myself: Identity, Politics, and the Law* (New York: The New Press, 1997), 40-46.

45 Nina Boyd Krebs, *Edgewalkers: Defusing Cultural Boundaries on the New Global Frontier* (Far Hills, NJ: New Horizon Press, 1999), 9.

46 Du Bois, *Soul of Black Folk*, 9.

47 Minow, *Not Only*, 40-41.

48 Krebs, *Edgewalkers*, 9-10.

49 Ibid., 10.

50 Ibid.

51 Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church in the Image of the Trinity* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 208-13, especially 209-211. Note that Volf argues that "there can be no correspondence to the interiority of the divine persons at the human level. Another human self cannot be internal to own self as the subject of action. Human persons are always external to one another *as subjects*." Ibid., 210-11. Strictly speaking, I concur with Volf. However, in the context of polycentric personhood, each person carries within herself or himself his or her other-centered self. In Branson's example, for instance, the Chinese-American, female Christian does not stop being a Chinese descendant when operating in her Christian life experience, nor does she cease to be Christian in the midst of her experiences as a woman. She carries all these identities, each within the other. The limitation is that we are still speaking of one person in one being as opposed to three Persons in one Being as is the Trinity.

52 See Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border*, 23ff. Vélez-Ibáñez speaks of this as "cultural bumping" and demonstrates how some in the Chicano community see the need for navigating "multiple dimensions of experience." Ibid., 225.

53 Minow, *Not Only*, 41.

54 Ibid.

55 Krebs, *Edgewalking*, 10-11; quote from 11.

56 Ibid., 11.

57 See Keith Inman and Norah Rudin, "The Origin of Evidence," *Forensic Science International* 126, no. 1 (28 March 2002): 11-16.

58 Thomas Sowell, *Race and Culture: A World View* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 62-78. Sowell uses the term "cultural diffusion" specifically stating: "In short, there has been no single pattern for the cultural diffusions which occur as the result of conquests. Sometimes it is the conqueror's culture which prevails, sometimes that of the conquered, but seldom does either prevail unmodified. What is clear, however, is that such diffusions are common, widespread, and historic in their consequences." Ibid, 73. Similarly, Carlos Vélez-Ibáñez: "Whether divided by geography, language, or culture, human populations may often become more distinct but sometimes more similar after bumping into one another." Carlos G. Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border*

Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996), 5-6.

59 In speaking of this region, there are several options. "Southwest," while geographically and regionally accurate from a U.S. perspective, ignores the Mexican experience in the region. "*La frontera*" is a viable option, however it considers the region in its prior state as a frontier buffer between nations when in fact there is no buffer—the nations have met. The use of the term *la frontera* signifies one of the distinct concepts regarding the region. Patricia Limerick explains that from the perspective of the Spanish and later the Mexican governments, the region was a protective frontier. Patricia Nelson Limerick, *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1987), 226-27, 228-30. Herbert Bolton coined the term "borderlands." The use of the term "border" and/or "borderlands" emphasizes the political line separating Mexico and the U.S. Herbert E. Bolton, *The Spanish Borderlands: A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921); see also Machado, *Of Borders*, 14-22. I choose to work with the terms "*la frontera*" and "borderlands" interchangeably as they embrace both the U.S. and Mexican realities while emphasizing the realities created by the border's existence. Regarding the borderlands, see: Rodolfo F. Acuña, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, 5th ed. (New York: Pearson Longman, 2004); Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999); John R. Chávez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984); Patricia Nelson Limerick, *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (New York: Norton, 1987); Alfredo Mirandé, *The Chicano Experience: An Alternative Perspective* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985).

60 The U.S. borderlands include California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas and to a lesser degree Nevada, Utah, and Colorado. These are not the only states where persons of Mexican descent reside. These are states where, because of the border, there is considerable and ongoing cultural friction for Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Euro-Americans, and others. The Mexican states include Baja California, Sonora, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León, and Tamaulipas. A discussion specific to Euro-American and Mexican/Mexican American interaction is appropriate for two reasons: 1) persons of Mexican descent are the Latino population's overwhelming majority at 58.5 percent—compare to 9.6 percent for Puerto Ricans, the next largest group (see U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: Census 2000 Brief*, prepared by Elizabeth M. Grieco and Rachel C. Cassidy (Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census, March 2001), 2.); 2) Euro-American interaction with Mexicans and Mexican Americans is indicative of general interaction with Latinos.

61 Mexico adopted the Spanish view that the territory was a defensive buffer, which "guaranteed a borderlands area that was to serve as a defensive territory against the North Americans" specifically protecting Mexico City. See Limerick, *Legacy*, 226-27, 228-30; Daisy L. Machado, *Of Borders and Margins: Hispanic Disciples in Texas, 1888-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 5-45, especially 13. Mexicans held a "seemingly casual stewardship of private property" which was "unfathomable to the notoriously litigious Americans." Gutiérrez cites the use of cow skulls, rocks, trees, and such as property boundaries under Spanish and later under Mexican law. David G. Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants and the Politics of Ethnicity* (Berkley, CA: University of Berkley Press, 1995), 23. Mexican and native populations saw the land as open. This is not to say that the acquisition or use of land was non-existent, as purported by American myth. See Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border*, 20-56. By contrast, the Euro-Americans understood the frontier as tied to control and exact borders. Ibid., 45. Surveying the border was a U.S. priority following the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

See Limerick, *Legacy*, 233-34. The Border Patrol's creation in 1924 further exemplifies the U.S.'s policy that the border is a demarcation between "us" and "them"; Ibid., 249-51; also Acuña, *Occupied*, 371-72. The re-immergence of nativism by the "Minuteman Border Project" citizen patrol expresses a furthering of this conceptualization, demonstrating the border as demarcation of the in-group from out-group. Minuteman Project, "Frequently Asked Questions," http://www.minutemanproject.com/project/ FAQ.html (accessed November 9, 2005). Regarding similar activities in Arizona, see Matthew C. Whitaker, *Race Work: The Rise of Civil Rights in the Urban West* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 153-54. For other vigilantes, see Chávez, *Lost*, 152-53.

62 By Acuña's account, it is apparent that events leading to the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, including Texas's war of "independence" (1836), were manufactured by the Jackson and Polk Administrations as expansionist movements, seizing control of the region. Acuña, *Occupied*, 42-59. Notable in their opposition to the Mexican-American War are Abraham Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Tom Corwin (U.S. Senator, Ohio), and Henry David Thoreau. Even Nicholas Trist, the U.S. negotiator to Mexico, admitted shame as a North American because of the war. Ibid., 51, 56-58.

63 The transfer of these lands occurred over 30 years, beginning with Texas in 1836. Ibid., 48-50. In 1848, Mexico ceded the territory from New Mexico to California. Finally, Mexico sold 45,000 square miles to the U.S. in 1853 for $10 million. Known in Mexico as the sale of Mesilla, Gadsen's "purchase" had militaristic overtones. Ibid., 102-03. The only time land passed to Mexico was in 1962 when President Kennedy transferred ownership of 630 acres that had become Mexico's because of the Rio Grande's shift. While small, it was significant because 1) the U.S. refused to acknowledge the shift for nearly a hundred years prior; 2) from the Mexican-side, this tract of land, known as El Chamizal, had become symbolic of all lands lost to the U.S.; and 3) it momentarily eased Mexican concern regarding the U.S.'s imperialistic intentions. See Chávez, *Lost*, 132-33.

64 Acuña states that, "Articles VIII, IX and X specifically referred to the rights of the Mexicans in what became the United States." These article concerned three issues: 1) Mexican freedom for one year in the newly "ceded" territories to choose between U.S. citizenship or Mexican citizenship; 2) guaranteed U.S. Constitutional rights to Mexicans choosing U.S. citizenship (approximately 2,000 moved to Mexico; the rest stayed on their land.); and 3) Article X guaranteed protection of land rights previously established under Mexican custom and law. When the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty, Article X was deleted under the premise that the article would be honored in existing U.S. legal code. The affect of Article X's omission is questionable, as the U.S. did not honor much of the treaty that was ratified. Acuña, *Occupied*, 57.

65 Chavéz comments, "The image of the Southwest as lost and of Mexicans as dispossessed developed another dimension: although the region had been occupied by the United States, it was still perceived as an extension of Mexico and Latin America, while its indigenous Spanish-speaking people were still seen as Mexican, despite the U.S. citizenship of many." Chavéz, *Lost*, 63. Gloria Anzaldúa states it this way: "The border fence that divides the Mexican people was born on February 2, 1848 with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. It left 100,000 Mexican citizens on this side, annexed by conquest along with the land. The land established by the treaty as belonging to Mexicans was soon swindled away from its owners. The treaty was never honored and restitution, to this day, has never been made." Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 29.

[66] See Limerick, *Legacy*, especially 24-26, 55-77, 222-258, 339-349; Gutiérrez, *Walls*, 23-25; Thomas Sowell, *Ethnic America: A History* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 247; Acuña, *Occupied*, 63, 88-90, 133-134.

[67] See Chávez, *Lost*, especially 23, 43, 49; Gutiérrez, *Walls*, 23. For more on the continuing impact, see Rodolfo Rosales, *The Illusion of Inclusion: The Untold Political Story of San Antonio* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000), especially 19-39. Notably, the two ethnic groups with the largest percentages of poor in the U.S. were denied land ownership: African Americans and Mexican Americans.

[68] Patricia Limerick puts the situation into historical perspective: "Western history is a story structured by the drawing of lines and the marking of borders. From macrocosm to microcosm, from imperial struggles for territory to the parceling out of townsite claims, Western American history was an effort first to draw lines dividing the West into manageable units of property and then to persuade people to treat those lines with respect. White Americans saw the acquisition of property as a cultural imperative, manifestly the right way to go about things. There was one appropriate way to treat land—divide it, distribute it, register it…. Like the settlers themselves, we steadfastly believe in the social fiction that lines on a map and signatures on a deed legitimately divide the earth. Of all the persistent qualities in American history, the values attached to property retain the most power." Limerick, *Legacy*, 55-56.

[69] Ibid., 235-43.

[70] Before Arizona's statehood, there were several indicators of Euro-American Southern sympathies. In 1861, a group met in Mesilla and proclaimed "Arizona" as attached to the Confederate States of America. The Confederacy recognized this group dividing the New Mexico/Arizona territory in half east to west at the 34th parallel (formally proclaimed by Jefferson Davis on February 14, 1862), recognizing Mesilla as the capital. In March 1862, the U.S. Congress separated the New Mexico/Arizona territory north to south along the meridian 109º2'59" and was officially recognized as such on February 24, 1863, with Tucson as the capital. New Mexicans were generally sympathetic to Union ideologies and the Mesilla group's attempts were meant to undermine Santa Fe's influence and that of the predominately Mexican American agriculturalists in power. Jay W. Wagoner, *Arizona Territory, 1863-1912: A Political History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1970), 3-33. Later attempts at statehood also indicated Euro-American ethnocentrism. Attempts at admitting the Arizona/New Mexico territories as one unified state were overwhelmingly rejected by Arizonans (3,141 to 16,265) and generally favored by New Mexicans (26,195 to 14,735). Ibid., 432-39. That New Mexico was recognizably Mexican American ("Spanish") and Arizona recognizably Euro-American was certainly a factor. Chavéz, *Lost*, 55. See also Lawrence Clark Powell, *Arizona: A Bicentennial History* (New York: Norton, 1976), 60. Interestingly, Arizona finally was admitted to statehood on February 14, 1912, exactly fifty years to the day of Jefferson Davis's proclamation. Wagoner, *Arizona Territory*, 489. See also, Whitaker, *Race Work*, 9-14.

[71] Regarding loss of language, see Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 81; Aurora Lucero White Lea, "Plea for the Spanish Language," in *Herencia: The Anthology of Hispanic Literature in the United States*, ed. Nicolás Kanellos (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 135-39; Carl Gutiérrez-Jones, *Rethinking the Borderlands: Between Chicano Culture and Legal Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 55; Acuña, *Occupied*, 391, 394-95; Mario T. García, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology, and Identity, 1930-1960* (New Haven, CT: Yale Press, 1989), 44-45. Regarding "commodity identity," see Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border*, 7ff.; García, *Mexican Americans*, throughout, but especially 25-53, 269-70; Gutiérrez, *Walls*, 39-68; Limerick, *Legacy*, 245-46. One particular focus of writers on this topic is the

existence of a dual-wage system. This dual-wage/job system made it more difficult for Mexican descendants to overcome because of racist justifications for employing Mexicans to do menial labor. Vélez-Ibáñez, *Borders*, 79-80, 82, 94. Regarding justice and the "Bandito"/Ranger myth, see Acuña, *Occupied*, 61, 66-67, 71, 73-74; Américo Paredes, *With His Pistol in His Hand: A Border Ballad and Its Hero* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1958); David Montejano, *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1886* (Austin: University of Texas, 1987), 113-16; Katherine S. Mangan, "White Hat, Black Tales: A Texas Scholar Digs into the Dark Truths about the Role of the Texas Rangers in Early-20th-Century Border Wars," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51.48 (August 5, 2005): A11-13. See also Benjamin H. Johnson, *Revolution in Texas: How a Forgotten Rebellion and Its Bloody Suppression Turned Mexicans into Americans* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003); Gary Clayton Anderson, *The Conquest of Texas: Ethnic Cleansing in the Promised Land, 1820-1875* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005); Mirandé, *Chicano*, 82-90; Gutiérrez-Jones, *Rethinking*.

72 According to Pablo Vila while similarities exist all along the border, there are four distinct border environments: Tijuana-San Diego-Los Angeles, the Sonora-Arizona border, Juárez-El Paso, and the Lower Rio Grande Valley-Tamaulipas border. In each environment, identity questions specific to their region are negotiated on an ongoing basis. Vila, *Crossing*, 6-7.

73 Vélez-Ibáñez argues to the contrary stating, "In fact, much is owed to the peripheries of the central Mexican core institutionally, culturally, economically, and politically, and the Greater Southwest region cannot be understood as a separate or isolated region during any one of these periods. Imaginary political borders do not define the historical and cultural mosaic of this region nor of its Mexican population in the present." Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border*, 8. However, Vélez-Ibáñez's is the minority perspective. For Anzaldúa, the emptiness of the borderlands is expressed as a "vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary." Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 25. Anzaldúa remarks that the border separated families and changed the culture in her own situation; Ibid., 234-35. Gutiérrez contends that the socioeconomic situation of the Mexican Americans creates further tension and separation from Mexican immigrants, even though the Mexican Americans welcomed the cultural reinforcement. Gutiérrez, *Walls*, throughout but especially 40. Pablo Vila likewise demonstrates that narratives south of the border differ greatly from those north of the border as to just how "Mexican" Mexican Americans are. See Vila, *Crossing*; Pablo Vila, *Border Identifications: Narratives of Religion, Gender, and Class on the U.S.-Mexico Border* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005).

74 Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border*, 5-6. Per Anzaldúa" "The U.S.-Mexican border *es una herida abierta* where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds. And before a scab forms it hemorrhages again, the lifeblood of two worlds merging to form a third country—a border culture. Borders are set up to define the places that are safe and unsafe, to distinguish *us* from *them*. A border is a dividing line, a narrow strip along a steep edge." "*es una herida abierta*" translation: "is an open wound." Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 25.

75 *Mestizaje*, which refers to broader concepts of social mixing, is a variation of *mestizo*. *Mestizo* is translated "mixed racially," referring to the Spanish and Native-Mexican heritage of Mexican descendents.

76 Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*; Gutiérrez-Jones, *Rethinking*; Vélez-Ibáñez uses the metaphor "fences," see Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border*, 265-73.

77 Virgilio Elizondo, *The Future is Mestizo: Life Where Cultures Meet*, rev. ed. (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2000).

78 Trans.: "grandmother."

79 Gutiérrez-Jones, *Rethinking*, 31.

80 Robert J. Schrieter, *Constructing Local Theologies* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2004), 55.

81 González, *Mañana*, 85. See also Miguel De La Torre, "Breaking Barriers: Reading the Bible in Spanish," http://www.ethicsdaily.com/breaking-barriers-reading-the-bible-in-spanish-cms-15706 (accessed February 9, 2011).

82 Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from the Birmingham Jail" in *Why We Can't Wait* (Penguin: New York, 1964), 82-85.