

The United States–Mexico Border in the Twentieth
Century: A Quantitative Overview of
Basic Economic and Social Trends

DAVID E. LOREY

James W. Wilkie and Carlos Alberto Contreras, eds., *Statistical Abstract of Latin America*, vol. 29, part 1 (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, University of California, 1991).

At the beginning of the twentieth century the United States–Mexico border region was a vaguely defined territory in which two sparsely populated frontier areas came into uncertain contact. Ninety years later, the 2,000–mile international boundary demarcates a region in which “two different civilizations face each other *and overlap*.”¹ During a century of rapid and dramatic change in both the United States and Mexico, the border has come to unite as well as divide the two countries and their historical experiences.

The border region has emerged in the 1990s as an area of pressing concern for local, regional, and national leaders. And, as the United States and Mexico move rapidly toward the establishment of a free-trade area to confront the economic blocks of Europe and the Far East, the border region is becoming a major stage in the international economic and geopolitical theater. Formal free-trade agreement or not, however, the progressive integration of the U.S. and Mexican economies is sure to bring with it a wide array of economic, social, and political challenges for policymakers.

This essay offers an overview of the emergence of the U.S.–Mexican border region in the twentieth century using quantitative data on the ten states that straddle the international boundary. For all the importance of the ten border states to both the United States and Mexico, and for all the fascinating history of their interaction in the twentieth century, we know very little about the quantitative dimensions of life in the border region since 1900. There are few sources of reliable data on the economic development of the region or on the role the region plays in the national economies of the two countries. Statistics on the society and economy of the border quoted in the mass media and popular press, whether they involve illegal immigrants, the flow of drugs, or the development of *maquiladoras*, tend to focus on short time periods and frequently vary by large margins.

DAVID E. LOREY is Coordinator of the UCLA Program on Mexico in the Latin American Center. He received his Ph.D. in history from UCLA. He has taught Latin American history at the University of Southern California, Pomona College, and UCLA in the United States and at the Universidad de las Américas in Puebla, Mexico.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: I want to thank my senior research assistant, Christof Weber, for his valuable contributions to the completion of this study.

¹Stanley R. Ross, ed., *Views Across the Border: The United States and Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1978), p. xii. Emphasis mine.

The data presented here are drawn from my *United States–Mexico Border Statistics since 1900* (UCLA Program on Mexico/UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1990) and have been selected (and adapted for this study) to focus on long-term economic and social trends. Political and cultural phenomena, so much more difficult to quantify, are given attention primarily as they relate to larger economic and social issues. An attempt has been made throughout to integrate treatment of the U.S. and Mexican sides of the border to emphasize how areas falling into two national divisions at the border have developed in symbiosis with one another.

Two general notes on the definitions and on the data gathered here are necessary: care must be exercised in working with information on the “border region” and with binational statistics. These notes should be added to the general cautions on the use and interpretation of statistical data discussed in the SALA Preface above.

The definition of the border region employed here has been especially adopted for the purposes of gathering and presenting historical statistics on the region. The border is defined as the area composed of the ten U.S. and Mexican border states: Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas in the United States and Baja California, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León, Sonora, and Tamaulipas in Mexico. This definition based on state boundaries is imposed principally by the nature of available quantitative data: the state is the basic unit for the presentation of data by data-gathering agencies in both countries. Use of state-level data introduces certain distortions and complexities to the statistical series. On the one hand, the state is larger than the optimal unit for analysis. Some states are more closely tied to the international boundary and life on the border than others. The border-region segment of state economies, for example, is more significant in Baja California, Chihuahua, Arizona, and New Mexico than it is in Nuevo León, California, and Texas. California and Nuevo León have large, non-border populations and economies. And while the economies of the two urban hubs in these states, Los Angeles and Monterrey, are clearly affected by their proximity to the U.S.–Mexican border, they are much more independent of the border than such twin city pairs as Ciudad Juárez–El Paso and Tijuana–San Ysidro. On the other hand, data on the border states sometimes do not go far enough. The effects of the border economy, and the impact of its social structure, are felt far and wide in the non-border United States promi-

nently in the states of Colorado, Oregon, Washington, Illinois, and Indiana and the SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area) of Chicago, to mention only the most important regions. And, clearly, the remittances sent home by Mexican workers in the United States have a profound impact on Mexico's national economy. Yet aggregation by state remains the best way, and in many cases the only possible way, to abstract meaningful data on the border region.

The bilateral nature of the statistical data employed in the following overview makes certain additional cautions necessary. These data on the evolution of the border region were not collected by agencies in the United States and Mexico in a collaborative or cooperative fashion. For this reason, care must be exercised in comparing data from Mexican with those from U.S. sources. Methods of collection, and more important, definitions and categories used in collection of data, differ between the two countries. Methods of data collection also differ *among* states within each country a factor that is probably more important in the United States than in Mexico, with the highly decentralized nature of much of the U.S. statistics-gathering process.

The Economic Development of the Border

The course of the twentieth century has seen a group of scattered outposts strung along both sides of the U.S.-Mexican border, isolated from national and international economies and from one another, merge into one of the most economically dynamic regions in the world. The economic significance of the border region for both the United States and Mexico increased dramatically after 1945; its population boomed as migrants flocked to the region. And, as the U.S.-Mexican border region as a whole has been caught up in the momentous shift of the world economy from an Atlantic to a Pacific axis, the economy of the border has emerged as the focus of intense scholarly attention, public-policy debate and increasing general interest.

How did the peripheral economy of the U.S.-Mexican border region in 1900 evolve into its present-day dynamism and importance? What are the distinguishing characteristics of these changes?

The Period from 1900 to 1930

The rapid economic growth that we now associate with the border region is, in fact, a fairly recent phenomenon.²

²Notes on sources have been kept to a minimum in the following discussion. The original sources for the statistical tables are found in the author's *United States-Mexico Border Statistics since 1900* (SALA-USMBS). Because presentation in the present study entailed extensive reorganization of tables in SALA-USMBS, the reader is advised to refer to that volume for notes on the data, alternate series, and full citations for the original sources.

The first forty years of the twentieth century saw the economy of the border region develop fairly slowly in its traditional sectors: small-time agriculture, extensive cattle raising on the vast and arid plains, and mining, with limited development of lumber and petroleum resources. In the United States, the economic growth of the West was still dependent on that of the East; and the U.S. West was not one of the principal beneficiaries of World War I as it would be of World War II. For the Mexican border states, the early pull of the U.S. economy was much weaker than it would be after World War II.

World War I and the economic boom of the late teens in the United States led to some stimulation of the economy of the U.S. border states. The first two decades of the twentieth century saw the development of large-scale water projects—Roosevelt Dam and the Arizona Canal in Arizona, the Imperial Dam for California's Imperial and Coachella valleys, the Elephant Butte Dam in Texas—that would establish the Bureau of Reclamation as one of the main pillars of economic growth in the borderlands West. Such projects made possible the tremendous expansion of western farming, which reached an all-time peak during World War I. The first two decades of the twentieth century also saw an oil boom in the U.S. West, as California and Texas became major producers of crude petroleum.

The small boom brought on by water projects and the demand for agricultural products sparked by World War I was followed by bust in the early 1920s as the economies of the western states settled into deep depression. The postwar depression helped spur a massive population movement from rural to urban areas. Those farmers who remained in agriculture shifted steadily toward more capital-intensive, mechanized farming practices in order to remain competitive in an era of low prices for farm commodities. Water projects and increasing mechanization did lead to the rapid growth of agriculture in California's Central Valley, which during the 1920s developed into one of the country's most important centers of cotton, fruit, and vegetable production.

The mining industry of the U.S. West mirrored the boom and bust cycle of agriculture during the first three decades of the twentieth century. In a significant shift, mining increasingly moved away from the production of gold and silver to the production of copper.³ For copper there existed a steady demand for industrial applications; thus the shift from precious metals to copper shows the West evolving in step with the changing technological basis of national industrial development. At the end of the 1920s, the U.S. West produced 90 percent of the minerals of the United States, excluding coal.

In Mexico the years from 1910 to 1917 were spent in violent revolution as various groups of contenders attempted

³For twentieth-century trends in mining production, see SALA-USMBS, Tables 1300 and 1301.

to attain national power. Peaceful political change was not firmly established until the mid-1920s and the threat of regional strongmen remained a destabilizing factor until the first official party of the Revolution (the PNR) was organized in 1929. While the violent phase of the Revolution did not destroy the Mexican economy as was once thought, it certainly did not encourage long-term investment or instill much confidence in the economic future. Revolutionary chiefs such as Pancho Villa could keep the economy operating, but did not create a strong base for growth after the end of the civil war.

In the 1920s Mexico was led by politicians from the North, including three men from the border state of Sonora: Alvaro Obregón (president, 1924–28), Plutarco Elías Calles (president, 1920–24), and Adolfo de la Huerta. Both Calles and Obregón stepped up federal investment in economic infrastructure, particularly in roads and irrigation works.⁴ As might be expected, a large majority of federal funds expended in infrastructure projects went to the northernmost states of the country, significantly strengthening the economy of the Mexican border.⁵

In the border region as a whole, the 1920s saw the first stirrings of growth based on tourism along the U.S.–Mexican frontier. Prohibition and restrictions on gambling and night life in the United States during the 1920s provided the impetus for some early development of Mexican border-town economies based on the liquor, gambling, and excitement that could not be found in the United States.⁶ But the impact of the violent phase of the Mexican Revolution retarded the evolution of a binational economic boom at the border between the two countries. Mexican leaders were concerned primarily with the politics of centralization and with reconstituting the social fabric of the war-torn country.

The Impact of the Depression and World War II

It was the regional impact of the Great Depression and World War II that brought rapid and momentous change to the U.S.–Mexican border region. The Great Depression and the New Deal touched off the transformation of the economy of the U.S. West while the 1930s saw the beginnings of an impressive economic consolidation in Mexico which would have far-reaching implications for the development of the Mexican border states. World War II in turn brought significant economic changes to the border states in both Mexico and the United States. In both countries an active federal government increasingly provided border states with a stable foundation for rapid development and a way to free

themselves from regional imperialism, from the domination of the East in the United States and from the center (Mexico City) in Mexico.

In the United States the most important and longest lasting impact of the 1930s and 1940s would characterize the western states until the present day: the use of federal funds to pay for infrastructure projects and to subsidize western economic development in other ways. While the Great Depression brought hardship to the U.S. West, it would also bring Roosevelt's New Deal. With the New Deal came an enhanced presence by the federal government in the affairs of the West, creating a precedent which still stands at the end of the century. The federal government provided subsidies to both producers and consumers. Great water projects such as Boulder Dam, Hoover Dam, and the All-American Canal, for example provided irrigation water and inexpensive electric power as well as much-needed employment opportunities.

U.S. involvement in World War II, and associated leaps in federal expenditure, brought with it dramatic and prolonged economic growth to the U.S. border states. The war effort brought the navy to the West, with the construction of huge bases in San Diego, San Francisco, and Los Angeles–Long Beach. The army and marines built up large concentrations of men and materiel at Fort Bliss, Fort Ord, Travis Air Force Base, the Presidio in San Francisco, and Camp Pendleton. New industries related to the war effort—particularly shipbuilding and airplane production—created a wartime employment boom and provided a foundation for continued growth after the end of the conflict. The government helped turn the western states into a high-tech laboratory during the war by funding research on military technology at the most advanced western institutions, including the California Institute of Technology, the University of California, and the University of Texas. High-technology industries such as electronics, computers, aviation, and applications of nuclear energy drew federal investment funds and spurred the western economy.

The period spanning the 1930s and World War II also saw important economic changes in Mexico and in the Mexican border states. During the 1930s Mexico began several thoroughgoing transformations of its economic infrastructure that in some important ways paralleled those of its northern neighbor. For the first time, the government took a predominant role in planning and funding infrastructure projects. While the impact of the policies of the 1930s was limited in the sparsely populated border states, important precedents were established that provided for dramatic growth during the phase of rapid industrialization after 1940. And several economic measures would have a lasting impact in the Mexican border states. In response to dislocations caused by depression in both Mexico and the United States, for example, president Lázaro Cárdenas established Free Ports, Free Areas, and Free Zones along the northern border to allow free imports of consumer goods from the United States for sale in border towns.

⁴See Enrique Krauze, Jean Meyer, and Cayetano Reyes, *La Reconstrucción Económica* (vol. 10 of *Historia de la Revolución Mexicana*) (México, D.F.: El Colegio de México, 1977).

⁵See the example of irrigation in SALA-USMBS, Table 1101.

⁶See Oscar Martínez, *Border Boomtown* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975), *passim*.

974

Mexico's "Industrial Revolution" after 1940, based on rapid expansion of manufacturing to satisfy a growing domestic market, underwrote the development of Monterrey and other urban centers in Mexico's six border states. U.S. involvement in World War II provided two crucial stimuli to Mexican industrial development: implicit protection from imports (because goods previously exported were reserved for the war effort) and increased wartime demand (and high prices) for Mexican exports. World War II and the Korean War provided rapidly expanding markets for Mexico's traditional exports in the decade after 1940—particularly minerals, cotton, and oil seeds—fueling a surge in foreign exchange earnings that could not be exhausted in available imports. Upon the twin pillars of protection and high demand for strategic exports the basis for the "Mexican Miracle" of the 1950s and 1960s was established.

During and after the wars in Europe, the Pacific, and Korea, the Mexican border states gradually became incorporated into Mexico's industrial boom. Monterrey, Nuevo León, had been a leading Mexican manufacturing center since the late nineteenth century. But now the rest of the far northern region began to experience rapid industrialization. The introduction of manufacturing into a region previously dominated by agricultural, pastoral, and extractive pursuits set the region on the course to its present-day economic profile.

World War II strongly influenced traditional economic activities in both the United States and Mexico. Agriculture which had benefited from irrigation policies and land reform in the 1920s and 1930s, saw increased emphasis on capital-intensive, mechanized methods, large-scale irrigation works, and greater use of pesticides and herbicides to increase productivity after 1940. As California became the leading agricultural producer in the United States (boasting one quarter of all irrigated farm land in the United States), the agricultural complex of the Mexican North turned increasingly to the U.S. market, first for cotton, then for fruits and vegetables. The population of Mexican border towns such as Mexicali, Reynosa, Matamoros, and Juárez swelled to serve the agricultural economy and the tides of seasonal farm-workers bound for both Mexican fields and the expanding agricultural belt of the U.S. southwest.

Arid soils on both sides of the border presented a common problem met in both countries by significant support from the federal government for irrigation and other infrastructure development. Table D1 shows the growth in the area of irrigated lands in the ten border states from 1930 to 1980. Clearly, the most rapid expansion of irrigation occurred after the 1940s. By the 1980s the area of once arid land under irrigation was more than twice that in 1930. Because most of that irrigation was made possible by federally funded water projects, data on the amount of irrigated land also provide a good gauge of federal expenditure in the region.

Table D1

IRRIGATED LAND ON THE BORDER, 1930-80
(T Acres)

State	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980
Baja Calif.	227	366	482	568	442	511
Chihuahua	286	336	378	558	457	299
Coahuila	612	597	674	741	494	593
Nuevo León	162	244	232	287	203	84
Sonora	285	376	692	1,371	1,561	1,398
Tamaulipas	91	131	442	785	877	963
Mexico						
Border	1,663	2,050	2,900	4,310	4,034	3,848
State	1930	1940	1949	1959	1969	1982
Arizona	576	576	964	1,152	1,178	1,099
California	4,745	4,277	6,438	7,396	7,249	8,460
New Mexico	527	436	655	732	823	808
Texas	799	895	3,123	5,656	6,888	5,573
U.S. Border	6,647	6,184	11,180	14,936	16,138	15,940

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1100.

The war years saw the first large-scale use of immigrant Mexican farm labor in the United States and the establishment of the bracero program, which provided for the legal, temporary employment of Mexican agricultural laborers in the U.S. border states. This flow of labor north to the U.S. border states and beyond marked the beginning of the massive influx of Mexican immigrants to both the Mexican and U.S. border states. The northward movement of inexpensive Mexican labor, beginning as an implicit subsidy to U.S. agriculture, would gradually mold the economic and social profile of the late twentieth-century U.S. West.

Within the overall development of the border region during and after the war, California in the United States and Nuevo León and Chihuahua in Mexico saw the most dramatic transformation of their economies. California, which received 10 percent of all government expenditure during the war years, saw its economy boom and its population soar. At the same time, Nuevo León consolidated its position as the center of Mexico's heavy industrial development, with the expansion of facilities for steel, cement, and glass, and consumer goods production. Monterrey, the capital of the state of Nuevo León, could also boast a high degree of participation by Mexican nationals in the industrialization process. Tijuana in the state of Baja California and Ciudad Juárez in Chihuahua grew rapidly during the war years in response to the entertainment needs of servicemen stationed in California and Texas.

World War II thus left its mark on both sides of the border. High levels of government spending and high technol-

ogy would characterize the economy of the U.S. West long after the end of the war. And the pattern of growth in the Mexican economy associated with the war years would leave a strong imprint on Mexican development in the 1950s and 1960s. The World War II years had the effect, in both Mexico and the United States, of transforming the regional economies along the international boundary from economies based largely on agriculture and mining to economies based on manufacturing and technological innovation.

Economic Trends since 1950

After the boom on both sides of the border caused by the expanded demand of the war effort, the border economy settled into a prolonged period of sustained growth the first in its history. New economic pursuits and the stability brought by the increasing diversity of the economic base undergirded this pattern of development. The federal government in both Mexico and the United States continued to help that development along with stepped up investment in infrastructure. This was particularly the case in the U.S. West, where "[t]he rising federal role as regional financier-resources manager, which had begun so abruptly in 1933-45, was heightened, expanded, and institutionalized. . . ."⁷

The period since the 1950s has seen remarkable changes in the size and shape of state economies all along the U.S.-Mexican frontier. Data on the evolution of Gross State Product—the total value of all goods and services produced—(Tables D2 and D3) reveal impressive growth in both the United States and Mexico. The structure of regional production changed markedly over the course of the postwar period, as data on economically active population by sector in the ten border states show (Tables D4 and D5). By 1980 only 15.4 percent of Mexicans in border states were working in agriculture. In the United States the shift away from primary activities was even more impressive: in 1980 only 3.1 percent of the economically active population worked in agriculture, while a fifth were employed in industry and almost a third were employed in services. In Mexico, in comparison with the national average, the border states claimed a greater proportion of the economically active population in manufacturing and services.

Federal investment in the border states remained one of the main foundations of border development in both the United States and Mexico after 1950; it underwrote growth and contributed to changing patterns of employment. Table D6 shows that federal expenditure in the U.S. border states increased steadily from less than one cent per capita (in dollars of 1958) in 1950 to almost 280 dollars in 1980. At the same time, federal expenditure accounted for a large proportion of all spending in the U.S. border states. While

⁷Michael T. Malone and Richard W. Etulain, *The American West: A Twentieth-Century History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989), p. 262.

Table D2
MEXICO GROSS STATE PRODUCT, BY ECONOMIC
SECTOR, 1970, 1980

Sector	1970		1980	
	Border Total	Mexico Total	Border Total	Mexico Total
Total (M NC)	93,714	444,271	813,848	4,276,490
Percent of Total				
Agriculture	12.7	12.2	8.6	8.4
Mining	3.5	2.5	3.4	6.8
Manufacturing	21.6	23.7	22.9	23.0
Construction	6.0	5.3	7.2	6.5
Electricity	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.0
Trade, Restaurants, Hotels	28.0	25.9	25.0	23.4
Transportation	5.0	4.8	6.9	6.5
Financial Services	9.6	11.3	7.6	7.9
Services	13.6	14.3	18.0	17.7
Imputed Banking Services	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.1

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1601.

there was a shift in the manner that federal underwriting of western development was expressed—from providing inexpensive lands and water to freeways and aerospace projects—the trend itself has continued uninterrupted since the 1930s.

Agriculture boomed on both sides of the border in the postwar period, as large, capital-intensive farms benefited from massive investment in irrigation works. While Tijuana was growing as the center of the west coast industrial hub in Mexico, Mexicali prospered from major investments in irrigation and mechanized agriculture linked to the U.S. market. The area around Mexicali would become one of Mexico's most productive agricultural regions and would also attract numerous *maquila* plants and other national and international manufacturers. In the U.S. border states, the agricultural boom was accompanied by a progressive concentration of farmlands as family farms gave way to large, integrated agribusiness concerns.

By the second half of the twentieth century, the border states in both Mexico and the United States counted agriculture on irrigated lands, lands irrigated largely at federal expense, among their most important economic activities. In Sonora, Tamaulipas, Chihuahua, and Baja California, the percentage of state product derived from agricultural pursuits was significantly above the national average (Table D2 above). The most striking growth in the period from 1960 to 1983 was in the production of animal-feed grains, as shown in data on the makeup of agricultural production in the Mexican border states (Table D7).

Manufacturing was increasingly a mainstay of the U.S.-Mexican border economy after 1950. By the mid-1980s Los

Table D3

U.S. GROSS STATE PRODUCT, BY ECONOMIC SECTOR, 1963-85
(%)

PART I. BORDER STATES

Sector	1963	1972	1982	1985
Total Gross State Product (M NC)	103,027	213,940	680,675	876,941
Percent of Total				
Farms	3.4	2.5	2.0	1.7
Agricultural Services, Forestry, Fisheries	.4	.6	.6	.5
Mining	5.0	3.4	8.3	5.9
Construction	5.5	5.4	5.0	5.1
Manufacturing	20.5	18.2	17.3	17.2
Durable Goods	12.1	10.8	10.7	10.9
Nondurable Goods	8.4	7.4	6.6	6.3
Transportation, Public Utilities	9.2	9.0	8.7	9.0
Wholesale Trade	6.7	7.0	7.0	7.2
Retail Trade	10.3	10.4	9.6	10.0
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	15.1	16.2	14.6	15.2
Services	11.7	13.1	15.4	16.8
Federal Civilian Government	2.4	2.9	2.1	2.1
Federal Military	2.5	2.7	1.8	1.7
State and Local Government	7.2	8.6	7.5	7.6

PART II. UNITED STATES TOTAL

Sector	1963	1972	1982	1985
Total Gross State Product (M NC)	598,847	1,195,975	3,104,127	3,963,347
Percent of Total				
Farms	3.4	2.7	2.5	1.9
Agricultural Services, Forestry, Fisheries	.3	.4	.4	.4
Mining	2.2	1.7	4.3	3.0
Construction	4.8	5.3	4.5	4.7
Manufacturing	28.1	24.5	20.4	20.2
Durable Goods	16.4	14.4	11.7	11.9
Nondurable Goods	11.7	10.0	8.8	8.3
Transportation and Public Utilities	9.2	9.0	9.3	9.5
Wholesale Trade	6.7	7.0	7.1	7.1
Retail Trade	9.7	10.0	9.3	9.6
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	14.4	14.6	15.3	15.7
Services	10.6	12.1	14.9	16.2
Federal Civilian Government	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.5
Federal Military	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.4
State and Local Government	6.3	8.1	7.9	7.8

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1605.

Table D4

**MEXICO ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION,
BY ECONOMIC SECTOR, 1970, 1980**

(%)

Sector	1970	1980
Mexico Border		
Total EAP	100.0	100.0
Primary Activities	29.1	15.4
Extractive Industry	2.4	7
Manufacturing	17.4	15.2
Construction	5.8	6.7
Electrical Engineering	4	3
Commerce	11.7	11.1
Transportation	3.7	4.6
Services	20.6	17.0
Government	3.0	~
Unclassified	5.8	29.0
Mexico Total		
Total EAP	100.0	100.0
Primary Activities	39.4	25.8
Extractive Industry	1.4	2.2
Manufacturing	16.7	11.7
Construction	4.4	5.9
Electrical Engineering	4	5
Commerce	9.2	7.8
Transportation	2.8	3.0
Services	16.7	12.8
Government	3.1	~
Unclassified	5.8	30.3

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 701.

Angeles was the most important manufacturing center in the United States. In the United States clean industry led the way after the 1960s, as data on the most important branches of manufacturing in 1980 (ranked in order of value added) show (Table D8). Mexican border industry remained more concentrated in basic industrial sectors such as food processing and mineral refining.

Both U.S. citizens of Mexican descent and undocumented Mexican immigrants played a major part in the economic boom and particularly in the success of the manufacturing sector in the border region during the postwar period. Data on the occupations of Mexican immigrants by period of entry show that more than a third of immigrants who arrived after 1975 were employed in manufacturing in 1980 (Table D9). Data on the employers of illegal aliens in the United States (Table D10) reveal that recent immigrants are concentrated in the lowest paying and least secure sectors: agriculture, construction, and manufacturing (particularly apparel).

The Mexican government established a Border Industrialization Program in 1965 with the twin goals of stimulating the depressed northern regional economies and providing employment for workers displaced by the end of the bracero

Table D5

**U.S. EMPLOYED PERSONS, BY ECONOMIC
SECTOR, 1970, 1980**

(%)

Sector	1970	1980
U.S. Border		
Total Employed	100.0	100.0
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries	3.7	3.1
Mining	1.3	1.7
Construction	6.3	6.9
Manufacturing	19.9	18.7
Transportation, Communications, Public Utilities	7.0	7.2
Wholesale Trade	4.5	4.6
Retail Trade	17.0	16.6
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	5.6	6.7
Services	28.5	29.4
Public Administration	6.2	5.1
U.S. Total		
Total Employed	100.0	100.0
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries	3.7	3.0
Mining	.8	1.1
Construction	6.0	5.9
Manufacturing	26.0	22.4
Transportation, Communications, Public Utilities	7.7	7.2
Wholesale Trade	4.4	4.3
Retail Trade	15.7	16.1
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	5.0	6.0
Services	26.0	28.7
Public Administration	4.7	5.3

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 702.

program in 1964. The industrialization program had as its main feature the establishment of maquilas or maquiladoras, plants that import components and raw goods from the United States, assemble them into finished products, and then export them back to the United States for sale. The attraction of maquila operations for U.S. investors was that import taxes were paid solely on the value added by manufacture in Mexico, a substantial savings. Table D11 shows another advantage of locating assembly operations at the border: few strikes were either threatened or carried out in maquila plants.

The number of maquila plants and the number of workers they employed grew rapidly in the 1970s and 1980s (Table D12). By 1980 maquila production accounted for 25 percent of Mexico's manufactured exports. Maquilas produced a wide variety of goods for export to the United States, including electrical and electronic goods, clothing, transportation equipment, furniture, toys, and processed foods (Table D13). By the early 1980s the majority of television sets sold in the United States were assembled in border maquiladoras.

The maquila-led economic development of the northern Mexican states has been much criticized, both in Mexico

978

Table D6

**U.S. BORDER STATES GENERAL REVENUE AND FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO
GENERAL REVENUE PER CAPITA, 1915-84
(US of 1958 PI)**

Year	Arizona		California		New Mexico		Texas		U.S. Total	
	Total	Federal	Total	Federal	Total	Federal	Total	Federal	Total	Federal
1915	27	.01	.26	=	20	.01	14	=	14	=
1930	64.40	9.63	40.99	1.71	44.62	4.56	38.96	2.45	36.93	1.98
1940	126.20	25.97	137.33	15.68	118.91	18.22	69.87	9.47	91.97	11.42
1950	127.89	27.25	151.27	21.39	141.61	27.61	83.25	18.44	108.70	16.73
1960	302.41	48.10	365.19	44.76	334.30	77.77	239.48	39.10	272.68	37.66
1970-71	541.67	96.11	688.91	133.14	585.13	162.43	425.22	81.91	527.27	95.12
1983-84	707.97	95.11	821.28	153.53	998.28	150.26	651.20	92.40	716.49	128.10

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1903, Part II.

Table D7

**MEXICO BORDER STATES DISTRIBUTION OF
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION,
BY CROP, 1960-83**

(%)

Crop	1960	1965	1971	1983
Human Consumption	60.3	62.6	52.3	55.5
Basic Foods	51.9	56.4	33.8	39.4
Processing	7.2	5.2	.5	14.9
Direct Consumption	1.1	1.0	.0	1.2
Export	34.5	28.7	11.0	5.4
Wheat	33.0	27.3	9.6	4.5
Tomato	.8	.2	.2	.2
Animal Consumption	2.8	6.7	15.7	33.9
Subtotal	97.8	98.0	79.0	94.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1108.

Table D8

**THREE PRIMARY BRANCHES OF MANUFACTURING,
1980 (MEXICO) AND 1982 (U.S.)**

PART I. MEXICO (1980)

Baja California	Nuevo León
Food and Kindred Products	Primary Metals
Beverages	Non-Metallic Minerals
Non-Metallic Minerals	Chemicals and Allied Products
Chihuahua	Sonora
Mining and Refining	Non-Ferrous Minerals
Electric/Electronic Equipment	Food and Kindred Products
Lumber and Wood Products	Electric/Electronic Equipment
Cochuila	Tamaulipas
Primary Metal Industries	Chemicals/Allied Products
Machinery, Except Electrical	Electric/Electronic Equipment
Electric/Electronic Equipment	Food and Kindred Products

PART II. UNITED STATES (1982)

Arizona	New Mexico
Electric/Electronic Equipment	Petroleum and Coal Products
Machinery, Except Electrical	Electric/Electronic Equipment
Transportation Equipment	Food and Kindred Products
California	Texas
Printing and Publishing	Machinery, Except Electrical
Electric/Electronic Equipment	Chemicals and Allied Products
Transportation Equipment	Food and Kindred Products

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, tables 1400 and 1401.

Table D9

**INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION, BY IMMIGRANT STATUS AND SEX,
MEXICAN-ORIGIN POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1980**
(%)

Industry	Males		Females	
	Immigrant Status ¹		Immigrant Status	
	I	II	I	II
Agriculture, Mining	17.3	9.0	10.4	4.0
Construction	11.1	13.0	.6	.9
Manufacturing	35.3	23.7	44.5	19.2
Transportation, Communication, Utilities	2.4	9.3	1.0	3.7
Wholesaling, Non-Foods Retailing	8.7	12.9	8.4	13.5
Food Retailing	12.2	7.1	8.0	11.0
Business, Repair, Personal Services	8.7	7.7	15.3	10.8
Professional Services, Finance, etc., Public Administration	4.3	17.4	11.8	37.0
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1

1. I: Mexican-born noncitizens who immigrated to the United States in 1975 or later;
II: Persons born in the United States who self-identify as of Mexican origin.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1009.

Table D10

U.S. MAJOR EMPLOYERS OF ILLEGAL ALIENS, 1980

Industry	% Illegal Alien Employees	Industry	% Illegal Alien Employees
Crop Farming	6.48	Fabricated Metals	2.53
Agricultural Services	.87	Electronic Computing Equipment	.73
Horticulture	.93	Electrical Machinery	3.06
Construction	6.46	Transportation Equipment	2.40
Meat Products	1.40	Miscellaneous Manufacturing	2.26
Canned Fruits and Vegetables	1.79	Wholesale Grocers	1.33
Grain and Bakery Products	2.03	Department Stores	.80
Beverages and Miscellaneous Food Products	.83	Retail Grocers	1.40
Textiles	1.66	Eating and Drinking Places	7.39
Apparel	10.59	Real Estate, Services to Dwellings	1.20
Paper and Allied Products	1.00	Auto Repair	1.00
Chemical and Allied Products	1.26	Private Households	1.80
Rubber and Plastics	1.26	Motels and Hotels	1.93
Leather and Footwear	1.66	Cleaners	.93
Lumber and Wood Products	1.00	Hospitals	1.53
Furniture and Fixtures	1.86	Educational Institutions	2.26
Primary Metals	1.39	Other	21.49

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 724.

Table D11

**STRIKES AND DECLARED STRIKES IN MAQUILADORAS,
SELECTED CITIES, 1967-83**

(N)

Year	Strikes Declared			Actual Strikes		
	Tijuana	Juárez	Mexicali	Tijuana	Juárez	Mexicali
1967	3	~	~	~	~	~
1968	~	~	~	~	~	~
1969	~	1	~	~	~	~
1970	2	~	~	~	~	~
1971	~	~	~	~	~	~
1972	4	5	~	~	~	~
1973	10	14	11	5	1	~
1974	7	10	13	1	1	~
1975	7	8	17	1	1	1
1976	5	10	18	~	~	~
1977	3	8	26	~	~	~
1978	9	15	12	1	1	~
1979	16	15	12	1	1	~
1980	11	12	17	~	2	~
1981	14	14	16	~	2	~
1982	24	38	53	~	~	1
1983	20	21	25	1	1	~

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1514.

Table D12

**MEXICO EMPLOYMENT IN MAQUILADORAS,
BY BORDER MUNICIPALITY, 1975-85**

Year	Mexico Total	Tijuana	Mexicali	Ciudad Juárez	Nuevo Laredo	Reynosa	Matamoros	Other Border Municipalities
1975	67,214	7,844	6,324	19,775	1,928	1,255	9,778	15,008
1976	74,796	7,795	6,604	23,580	1,605	1,381	10,966	15,327
1977	78,433	7,111	6,351	26,792	1,651	1,258	11,357	15,974
1978	90,704	8,778	6,543	30,374	1,916	2,897	13,443	18,179
1979	111,365	10,889	7,965	36,206	2,254	4,237	15,894	22,693
1980	119,546	12,343	7,146	39,402	2,462	5,450	15,231	24,174
1981	130,973	14,482	7,628	43,994	2,529	7,848	15,607	24,054
1982	127,048	14,959	6,268	42,695	2,602	9,259	14,643	22,449
1983	150,867	17,423	7,392	54,073	2,839	10,660	15,639	26,060
1984	199,684	23,047	10,624	72,495	3,752	13,867	19,459	32,899
1985	211,968	25,913	10,876	77,692	3,603	12,761	20,686	33,133

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 715.

Table D13
**MAQUILADORAS, BY TYPE OF GOOD
 PRODUCED, 1980, 1985**
 (N)

Category	1980	1985
Total in Border Municipalities	551	672
Food Preparation and Packing	12	12
Clothes and Textiles	94	81
Shoes and Leather Goods	18	32
Furniture Assembly	56	74
Chemical Products	4	~
Transport Equipment	50	54
Tools and Equipment	16	21
Electric and Electronic Equipment	63	73
Electric and Electronic Materials and Accessories	137	177
Toys and Sports Materials	21	26
Other Manufacturing	53	86
Services	27	34
Non-Border Municipalities	69	88

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1502.

and in the United States. As debate over implementing a free-trade agreement between the United States and Mexico became more intense in the early 1990s, fears that such an agreement would make all of Mexico a "maquiladora country" were voiced. Critics charged that maquila production constituted a U.S. enclave on Mexican soil, that it left little real economic benefit for Mexican industry, that the basis of the industry in low-wage labor indicated hyper-exploitation of Mexican nationals in the interest of the U.S. consumer, and that the maquiladoras brought little long-term benefit to Mexican industrial infrastructure through technology transfer. One critic has pointed out that while social infrastructure remains underdeveloped in Mexican border cities, the United States government receives a large amount of revenue from taxes on goods produced in maquilas (see Table D14).⁸ An infrequently noted criticism is that maquiladoras create limited employment for professionals and technicians; thus, the maquila boom has fostered little upward social mobility and has not yet led to significant technological innovation in Mexican industry. The impact of maquiladoras on the environment and on the health of workers has also caused concern among observers. Pro-maquila observers counter these charges and call for increased scholarly study of such issues as health and housing.⁹

⁸See George Baker, "Social Costs and Revenues of the Maquiladora Industry," in SALA-USMBS, p. 466 and passim.

⁹For debate on maquiladoras, see Ellwyn R. Stoddard, *Maquila: Assembly Plants in Northern Mexico* (El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1987); Mitchell Selligson and Edward J. Williams, *Maquiladoras and Migration: Workers in the Mexico-United States Border*

It seems clear that early worries that the maquilas were "runaway" assembly plants and would move on at the earliest sign of opportunity (cheaper labor or less labor trouble), leaving little benefit for Mexico, were unfounded: assembly plants have expanded their operations and appear to be on the border to stay. Accompanying the expansion of the maquilas has been a deepening of the industry as more and more maquiladora plants have moved beyond assembly operations to full-scale manufacturing involving significant wage and technical benefits. And the industry has become more diverse—even agricultural enterprises have used the maquila option to export agriculturally derived products such as house plants and onion powder to the U.S. market.¹⁰

Maquila-led development has been accompanied by huge growth in "clean industries" as service and high-technology industries have flocked to the borderlands. A wide range of services—legal, financial, medical, tourist, entertainment, educational, transportation, to name a few—now employ important portions of the work force in both U.S. and Mexican border states (see Tables D4 and D5 above). Particularly remarkable in the growth of services and high-tech industries were areas such as Silicon Valley and Orange County in California, Phoenix in Arizona, and Austin in Texas; the trend toward high-tech was also widespread in Baja California and Chihuahua. On both sides of the border, electronic and computer industries have driven the regional economy, with innovation taking place in the United States and assembly being carried out in Mexico in a symbiotic manner. Many high-tech industries were outgrowths of development following World War II and remained closely tied to federal defense spending.

On both sides of the border the most traditional economic pursuits fell into permanent decline and stagnation in the years after 1960. The most important traditional sector to experience long-term slump was the mining of copper, silver, and gold. Once the lifeblood of significant areas of the borderlands, mining of almost all minerals decreased in importance after a short-lived boom in the 1950s, while the ownership of mining concerns became increasingly concentrated. A few states remained important national and international sources of key, particularly strategic, metals and minerals. The state of Chihuahua in Mexico, for example, continued to produce important amounts of lead, silver, gold, copper, and fluorite while Coahuila became an important source of coal for the nearby steel factories in Monclova

Industrialization Program (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981); Leslie Sklair, *Assembling for Development: The Maquila Industry in Mexico and the United States* (Boston and London: Unwin Hyman, 1987); Norris Clement et al., *Maquiladora Resource Guide* (San Diego: Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias, San Diego State University, 1989); and Richard Rothstein, "A Hand for Mexico, a Slap for Us," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 23, 1990, p. 87.

¹⁰See Joel Millman, "There's Your Solution," *Forbes*, Jan. 7, 1991.

and Monterrey. The states of Sonora and Arizona continued to be important sources of copper.

But tourism, another "traditional" economic activity of the border region, which had touched off economic booms during prohibition and World War II, remained one of the mainstays of the border economy after 1950. In fact, tourism was important to the local economies on both sides of the border, to the U.S. as well as to the Mexican economy, as a great majority of all Mexican tourists traveled to the United States. Tourism is the most important earner of foreign exchange in Tijuana and several other border cities.¹¹ Table D15 presents data on the tourist flow to Mexico from the U.S. border states, and Table D16 shows what goods and services tourists buy in Mexican border cities. The number of tourists to Mexico from U.S. border states grew 24 times between 1935 and 1970. Most tourists went to Mexico for traditional tourist pursuits such as entertainment (food and alcohol) and bargain hunting (apparel and personal-care items).

By the late twentieth century, Mexico had moved from the position of a conquered foe of the United States (1848) to its third largest trading partner (1990). This change in the relationship between the two countries was articulated most clearly at the U.S.-Mexican border and the border remains at the center of key economic aspects of the bilateral relationship. The border is no longer a line surveyed across sparsely populated desert lands, as it was in 1900, but a sensitive membrane of utmost importance for both the United States and Mexico, a membrane through which goods and services were exchanged at an ever increasing clip.

As the end of the century draws near, urban nuclei span the international boundary, bringing vast stretches of territory within their economic grasp and giving impulse and shape to the social development of a large and expanding region. Rapid industrialization and urbanization have left a distinct social imprint in the border region. The many social challenges resulting from the border's rapid economic development over the course of the twentieth century are the subject of the next section.

Life on the Border

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the ten states that make up the U.S.-Mexican border region were sparsely inhabited and their populations were growing relatively slowly. By the 1990s the same ten states were among the largest and fastest growing in Mexico and the United States. At the same time, the border states increased in social importance in the national life of both countries as the proportion of persons living in border states climbed to one out of every six.

¹¹Paul Ganster and Alan Sweedler, "The United States-Mexico Border Region: Security and Interdependence," in SALA-USMBS, p. 437.

Accompanying rapid population growth on the border after the 1940s were a large variety of social problems; some were difficulties associated simply with rapid population growth, as might occur anywhere, but many others were directly related to the nature of the border region and its economic development. Over the course of the twentieth century, the experience of living along the international boundary fused two peoples and their historical experiences into a large and complex transboundary population group with unique social characteristics.

What have been the main features of the social evolution of the U.S.-Mexican border region over the course of the twentieth century? What characteristics make the border region unique as a social matrix, and how has the social development of the border influenced national reality in both countries?

Population and Migration

The rapid population growth of the U.S.-Mexican border region is remarkable in that it is a phenomenon that has spanned the twentieth century. In the first forty years of the century, population growth on the border was rapid (Table D17), almost tripling from a total population of 6 million in 1900 to about 17 million by 1940, an annual rate of 2.5 percent. Most of this growth took place on the U.S. side of the border, the rate of growth on the Mexican side of the border being significantly slower than the overall rate at 1.6 percent per year. Between 1940 and 1980 the pattern was reversed. Growth on the Mexican side was 3.6 percent per year, that on the U.S. side 2.7 percent per year, with yearly growth for the entire region of 2.9 percent.

The border region of Mexico saw its most dramatic population growth in the period during and after World War II. Overall, the Mexican border states substantially outpaced the rest of the nation's annual growth of 3.1 percent between 1940 and 1980. The fastest growth was experienced during the 1940s and 1950s, when the population of the border states jumped 43.8 percent in the first of the two decades and 47.3 percent in the second (an annual rate of 3.8 percent for the twenty-year period).¹²

From 1950 forward, population growth on the Mexican side of the border outpaced growth on the U.S. side. During the thirty-year period from 1950 to 1980, the population of Mexican border states almost tripled, while in U.S. border states it almost doubled. The urban areas on the Mexican side of the border were densely populated, with the urban cores of the municipalities (*municipios*) generally claiming at least 65 percent and sometimes as much as 95 percent of the population within the territory of the municipality. Data show that rapid demographic growth of Mexican border states was also due to rates of natural increase that were much higher than across the border.

¹²Implicit compound rate.

983

Table D14
ESTIMATED U.S. FEDERAL AND STATE TAXES COLLECTED FROM
MAQUILA OPERATIONS, 1980-86
(B US)

Taxes	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Total Taxes	3,283	4,176	3,575	4,353	5,976	6,261	6,673
By U.S. Government	2,203	2,804	2,397	2,900	3,987	4,181	4,446
By State Government	1,080	1,373	1,179	1,453	1,989	2,080	2,227

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 2210.

Table D15
U.S. TOURISTS IN MEXICO, BY U.S. STATE OF DEPARTURE, 1935-70

State	1935	1940	1945	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970
Arizona	3,636	5,787	8,182	31,487	28,389	50,727	134,340	220,890
California	9,577	18,864	20,999	63,867	95,280	151,332	319,112	492,981
New Mexico	759	1,531	2,059	8,039	9,879	11,371	18,513	30,941
Texas	40,801	47,361	86,017	150,911	183,502	219,576	410,408	592,480
U.S. Border	54,573	73,543	117,257	254,304	317,050	433,006	882,373	1,337,292
U.S. Total	85,055	139,626	165,988	391,126	532,834	719,138	1,266,260	1,980,873

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1801.

Table D16
ARTICLES PURCHASED IN RETAIL ESTABLISHMENTS
BY U.S. VISITORS TO MEXICAN BORDER
ZONES, BY TYPE, 1983

Category	% of Visitors (Multiple Response)
Foodstuffs	58
Alcohol	72
Apparel	46
Electronic Household Appliances	2
Furniture	8
Perfumes	14
Medicines	25
Articles of Personal Care	30
Gasoline	33
Auto Parts	12
Other	10

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1808.

As a whole, the border region grew not only remarkably fast but also, because of its rapid growth, came to claim an ever greater share of the total national populations of both countries. From only 6.4 percent of national total in 1900, the four U.S. border states claimed 18.5 percent of the national population by 1980. California, which claimed 56.5 percent of the border population in 1980, had become the most populous U.S. state by the early 1960s. By 1980 one of every ten Americans lived in California. In Mexico the border states accounted for 10.3 percent of the national population in 1900 and by 1980 for 16 percent. Unlike the U.S. border with its concentration of population in the two states of California and Texas, the population of the Mexican border region was relatively evenly distributed in the six northernmost states.

One of the greatest early stimuli to migration and population growth along the border was the Mexican Revolution of 1910, which in its violent phase from 1910 to 1920 constituted a major "push factor" for Mexican migrants caught in the shifting path of disruption and destruction. The U.S. economic boom resulting from preparation for World War I created a complementary "pull factor" in both field and factory and drew migrants from across the United States as well as from Mexico. (Mexicans were largely exempted from the restrictions of the U.S. Immigration Act of 1917.) And the railroads which had linked Mexico to the United

984

Table D17

BORDER STATE POPULATION, 1900-80

PART I. 1900-40					
State	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940
Baja Calif.	7,583	9,760	23,537	48,327	78,907
Chihuahua	327,784	405,707	401,622	491,792	623,944
Coahuila	296,938	362,092	393,480	436,425	550,717
Nuevo León	327,937	365,150	336,412	417,491	541,147
Sonora	221,682	265,383	275,127	316,271	364,176
Tamaulipas	218,948	249,641	286,904	344,039	458,832
Mexico Border	1,400,872	1,657,733	1,717,082	2,054,345	2,617,723
Mexico Total	13,607,272	15,160,369	14,334,780	16,552,722	19,653,552
Arizona	122,931	204,354	334,162	435,573	499,261
California	1,485,053	2,377,549	3,426,861	5,677,251	6,907,387
New Mexico	195,310	327,301	360,350	423,317	531,818
Texas	3,048,710	3,876,542	4,663,228	5,824,715	6,414,824
U.S. Border	4,852,004	6,805,746	8,784,601	12,360,856	14,353,290
U.S. Total	76,212,168	92,228,496	106,021,537	123,202,624	132,164,569
PART II. 1950-80					
State	1950	1960	1970	1980	
Baja Calif.	226,965	520,165	870,421	1,177,886	
Chihuahua	846,414	1,226,793	1,612,525	2,005,477	
Coahuila	720,619	907,734	1,114,956	1,557,265	
Nuevo León	740,191	1,078,848	1,694,689	2,513,044	
Sonora	510,607	783,378	1,098,720	1,513,731	
Tamaulipas	718,167	1,024,182	1,456,858	1,924,484	
Mexico Border	3,762,963	5,541,100	7,848,169	10,691,867	
Mexico Total	25,791,017	34,923,129	48,225,238	66,846,833	
Arizona	749,587	1,302,161	1,775,399	2,718,215	
California	10,586,223	15,717,204	19,871,069	23,667,902	
New Mexico	681,187	951,023	1,017,055	1,302,894	
Texas	7,711,194	9,579,677	11,188,655	14,229,191	
U.S. Border	19,728,191	27,550,065	33,962,178	41,918,202	
U.S. Total	151,325,798	179,323,175	203,302,031	226,545,805	

a. Data for Mexico are for 1921.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 100.

States in the 1880s provided inexpensive transportation northward. Between 1900 and 1930 it is estimated that almost 10 percent of Mexico's population migrated north to the United States. The Great Depression slowed these population movements as hard times fell on the economy of the U.S. West. Hundreds of thousands of Mexicans lost their jobs in the United States and tens of thousands were sent back across the border to Mexico.

The dimensions of the migrant flows from East to West within the United States, to the North within Mexico, and across the border grew dramatically after the early 1940s. Large numbers of migrants were pushed out of central Mexico by rapid population growth, declining opportunity in the countryside, and sluggish employment-creation in indus-

try. Frequently, they were drawn by significantly greater opportunity—less employment and higher income levels (see tables and discussion below)—in the border states and in the United States. Long-term trends in Mexican migration to the United States are shown in Table D18.

In the United States, World War II and the jobs it created drew a great number of people west, the largest of three migrations spanning the first half of the century. In the brief period of the war years alone, two million migrants headed to California, attracted by high-paying jobs in wartime industries such as steel, shipbuilding, aircraft manufacture, textiles, and service industries. In the war decade spanning 1940 to 1950, eight million people moved to the states west of the Mississippi River, 44 percent of them to California.

985

Table D18

MEXICAN IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES, 1930-85

Year	Mexican Immigrants ¹ (N)	As % of All Immigrants to U.S.	Year	Mexican Immigrants ¹ (N)	As % of All Immigrants to U.S.
1930	12,703	5.3	1960	32,708	12.3
1931	3,333	3.4	1961	41,476	15.3
1932	2,171	6.1	1962	55,805	19.7
1933	1,936	8.4	1963	55,986	18.3
1934	1,801	6.1	1964	34,448	11.8
1935	1,560	4.5	1965	40,686	13.7
1936	1,716	4.7	1966	47,217	14.6
1937	2,347	4.7	1967	43,304	11.9
1938	2,502	3.7	1968	44,716	9.8
1939	2,640	3.2	1969	45,748	12.8
1940	2,313	3.3	1970	44,821	12.0
1941	2,824	5.5	1971	50,324	13.6
1942	2,378	8.3	1972	64,209	16.7
1943	4,172	17.6	1973	70,411	17.6
1944	6,598	23.1	1974	71,863	18.2
1945	6,702	17.6	1975	62,552	16.2
1946	7,146	6.6	1976	74,449	14.8
1947	7,558	5.1	1977 ^a	44,646	9.7
1948	8,384	4.9	1978	92,681	15.4
1949	8,083	4.3	1979	52,479	11.4
1950	6,744	2.7	1980	56,680	10.7
1951	6,153	3.0	1981	101,268	16.9
1952	9,079	3.4	1982	56,106	11.2
1953	17,183	10.1	1983	59,079	10.7
1954	30,645	14.7	1984	57,557	10.6
1955	43,702	18.4	1985	61,077	10.7
1956	61,320	19.1			
1957	49,321	15.1			
1958	26,791	10.6			
1959	22,909	8.8			

1. Mexican immigrants are defined as nonresident aliens (i.e., non-U.S. citizens) having Mexico as country of last permanent residence and admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

a. Beginning 1977, for fiscal year ending September 30.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1001.

The World War II era saw the beginning of the large, sustained Mexican migration northward that now characterizes the border region and social relations between the United States and Mexico generally. The formal bracero agreement between the United States and Mexico (1942-64) arranged for the legal transfer of hundreds of thousands of Mexican temporary workers to the United States (Table D19). Originally a measure enacted to relieve the U.S. labor shortage caused by the war and the Mexican labor surplus caused by the Green Revolution's agricultural restructuring, the bracero agreement with Mexico was extended during the Korean War and was not completely ended until 1964. At least half of the imported hands worked in the agricultural areas of California. The program saw its peak of popularity

during the war, after which time mutual dissatisfaction with the agreement led to its gradual demise. The bracero program created a precedent and established an advance guard that would direct a continuing flow of Mexicans to the United States up to the present day.

The bracero program had important social impacts beyond the direct effects of the program itself. For example, the program encouraged an increased flow of illegal as well as legal migration to the United States after the 1940s. The seemingly endless supply of inexpensive and hard-working migrant Mexican labor kept wages low in U.S. agriculture during the 1940s and 1950s and conditioned U.S. employers to the immediate availability of inexpensive field labor. Large agribusinesses remain one of the long-term supporters

986

Table D19
**COMPARISON OF MEXICAN BRACEROS
 ADMITTED AND ILLEGAL MEXICAN
 ALIENS EXPELLED, 1942-73**

Year	Braceros	Undocumented Mexican Immigrants Returned to Mexico
1942	4,203	10,603
1943	52,098	16,154
1944	62,170	39,449
1945	120,000	80,760
1946	82,000	116,320
1947	55,000	814,543
1948	35,345	193,852
1949	107,000	289,400
1950	67,500	469,581
1951	192,000	510,355
1952	197,100	531,719
1953	201,380	839,149
1954	309,033	1,035,282
1955	398,650	165,186
1956	445,197	58,792
1957	436,049	45,640
1958	432,857	45,164
1959	437,643	42,732
1960	315,846	39,750
1961	291,420	39,860
1962	194,978	41,200
1963	186,865	51,230
1964	177,736	41,589
1965	20,286	48,948
1966	8,647	89,683
1967	7,703	107,695
1968	0	142,520
1969	0	189,572
1970	0	265,539
1971	0	348,178
1972	0	430,213
1973	0	609,673

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 921.

of flexible immigration policy to provide a steady supply of this cheap labor.

Critics of the bracero program charged numerous abuses, including nonpayment of wages, forced deportation of laborers after work had been performed, pesticide and herbicide poisoning, long work days, and other exploitative working conditions. The bracero program also encouraged the belief that Mexican workers could be asked to return to Mexico when they were no longer needed, a belief that led to the infamous "Operation Wetback" of 1953-55 during which two million Mexicans (and many U.S. citizens of Mexican heritage) were deported to the Mexican border states. This massive repatriation effort had the effect of transferring the social dislocations caused by economic slow-

down in U.S. agriculture following the Korean War to Mexican border cities. Short-term economic slump in the United States and even the deportation of two million Mexicans had little effect on the overall trend of rapid population growth and migration in the border states, however.

The effects of the wartime economic boom in the U.S. West continued after 1945 and attracted the largest migrant flows in U.S. and Mexican history to the border states. The U.S. economic boom spread its influence to Mexico, drawing migrants and buoying demand for the raw materials and manufactured products of the Mexican North. Rural populations in Mexico that had been increasingly impoverished by Mexican economic development based on rapid industrialization and commercialization of agriculture moved to regional urban centers and then frequently north toward the border. The rapidly growing cities on the Mexican side of the international boundary—Tijuana, Hermosillo, and Mexicali, for instance—became staging areas for migrants seeking to relocate to rural areas and urban conglomerations of the U.S. border states.

Much of the more recent internal migration of Mexicans to the Mexican North, and some share of the migration across the international boundary, can be linked to the development of maquila assembly plants along the far northern rim of Mexico. The principal social impact of maquila development in the Mexican border states was on employment as the maquila-led growth of the border-state economies drew increasing numbers of migrants north. Maquiladora managers preferred female workers because their skills were thought more appropriate than men's in assembly work, because it was felt that women were less likely to join labor unions, and appeared to be less prone to outside "agitation" than male workers. One of the possible social impacts of maquila development has been a destabilizing effect on Mexican family structure as women work and men are frequently left idle, although as yet little reliable data exist on this phenomenon. Many critics of the border's dependence on the maquila industry for its recent development spurt have focused on the assumed effects of the maquila on the families and health of employees. Other observers counter that much of the classic maquila profile is changing, noting that new maquila plants are more likely to be capital-intensive and to provide new technologies to Mexican firms than the older plants, and are also more likely to employ males, offer training for technicians and professionals, and provide childcare and other social benefits to workers.

Urbanization

The great migration to the border states was increasingly a migration to urban areas. Whereas the bracero program of the 1940s and 1950s led Mexican migrants, legal and illegal, to rural areas and agricultural occupations, new migrant flows by the 1960s headed for large urban concentra-

tions and for jobs in manufacturing, construction, hotels, restaurants, and services.

New cities sprouted up throughout the West while previously small towns like Phoenix boomed and old cities like Los Angeles grew into megalopolises. Fully 55 percent of all Mexican migrants to California, for example, settled in Los Angeles, and about 80 percent settled in urban areas in both northern and southern parts of the state.¹³ While already predominantly an urban society by 1930, forty years later the U.S. border region was almost 90 percent urban.

It is ironic that a highly urban profile characterizes the West when to many North Americans and Mexicans the U.S. West is a place of wide open, sparsely populated spaces and pastoral occupations. The West is, in fact, the most urban region of the United States. And perhaps high levels of urban concentration were inevitable in the development of a "hydraulic society" in the arid regions of the borderlands West. The data in Table D20 reveal that the border states of the West, already more urban than rural by 1930, grew from 55.1 percent urban in 1930 to 56.9 percent in 1940, 71.5 percent in 1950, 81.2 percent in 1960, 86.0 percent in 1970, and 86.3 percent in 1980. In 1980 for the United States as a whole, the percentage of persons living in urban areas was significantly lower, at 73.7 percent.

Rapid population growth in the Mexican North was accompanied by the development of urban concentrations in an area where previously small towns and villages had been common. Monterrey, Nuevo León, already a large city by the standards of the Mexican north in 1940 with almost 200,000 inhabitants, grew to more than a million by 1980. Desert cities like Chihuahua and Hermosillo grew rapidly as they expanded beyond traditional rural economic pursuits into industry and services. By 1980, 77.9 percent of the population of the Mexican border states lived in urban areas, as contrasted with 42.5 percent in 1940. Mirroring the national reality, the rapidly growing urban populations of the Mexican North came to be dominated by recent migrants from rural areas.

By mid-century, a pattern of twin cities had emerged all along the international boundary from Tijuana/San Ysidro-San Diego on the Pacific to Matamoros/Brownsville on the Gulf coast (Table D21). Each twin city pair shared some growth characteristics and differed in others. San Diego grew with World War II and the stationing of military bases in the area while Tijuana grew apace as a tourist center not only for military personnel but also for Southern Californians who came initially for the gambling and the nightlife. Ciudad Juárez and El Paso grew together to form an important commercial hub straddling the lines of communication from northern Mexico to the U.S. Midwest, a development

Table D20

BORDER-STATE URBAN POPULATION, 1900-80
(%)

PART I. 1900-40

State	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940
Baja Calif.	0	0	28.8	54.4	50.5
Chihuahua	32.0	25.8	28.2	33.0	36.7
Coahuila	34.6	42.4	50.7	52.1	50.6
Nuevo León	33.6	33.9	37.7	41.2	43.9
Sonora	18.1	22.6	32.4	36.7	32.7
Tamaulipas	29.0	23.7	44.0	42.8	45.5
Mexico Border	30.1	30.2	38.5	41.4	42.5
Mexico Total	28.6	28.7	31.2	33.5	35.1
Arizona	15.9	31.0	36.1	34.4	34.8
California	52.3	61.8	67.9	73.3	71.0
New Mexico	14.0	14.2	18.0	25.2	33.2
Texas	17.1	24.1	32.4	41.0	45.4
U.S. Border	27.7	37.0	45.8	55.1	56.9
U.S. Total	39.6	45.6	51.2	56.1	56.5

PART II. 1950-80

State	1950	1960	1970	1980
Baja Calif.	64.5	77.7	84.3	85.3
Chihuahua	44.1	57.2	65.4	70.3
Coahuila	57.4	66.7	72.7	77.4
Nuevo León	55.9	70.4	76.5	87.4
Sonora	45.3	57.8	66.5	70.5
Tamaulipas	53.0	59.8	68.9	75.1
Mexico Border	52.1	63.8	71.8	77.9
Mexico Total	42.2	50.7	58.7	66.3
Arizona	55.5	74.5	79.6	83.8
California	80.7	86.4	90.9	91.3
New Mexico	50.2	65.9	69.8	72.1
Texas	62.7	75.0	79.7	79.8
U.S. Border	71.5	81.2	86.0	86.3
U.S. Total	64.0	69.9	73.6	73.7

a. Data for Mexico are for 1921.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 100.

that would make it easy for Juárez to become the most important center of the maquiladora industry in the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁴

The twin city pairs developed complex interrelationships and interdependencies. Table D22 shows the massive flow of people back and forth across the border between Tijuana and San Ysidro. Mexican consumers on both sides of the border became an important market for North American

¹³SALA-USMBS, Table 1011.

¹⁴See Martinez, *Border Boomtown*, and Thurber D. Proffitt, "The Symbiotic Frontier: The Emergence of Tijuana since 1769," Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1988.

Table D21

TWIN CITY¹ POPULATIONS

PART I. 1900-40

Twin Cities, State	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940
Matamoros, Tamps.	8,347	7,390	9,215	9,733	15,699
Brownsville, Tex.	6,305	10,517	11,791	22,021	22,083
Reynosa, Tamps.	1,915	1,475	2,107	4,840	9,412
McAllen, Tex.	~	~	5,331	9,074	11,877
Nuevo Laredo, Tamps.	6,548	8,143	14,998	21,636	28,872
Laredo, Tex.	13,492	14,855	22,710	32,618	39,274
Piedras Negras, Coah.	7,888	8,518	6,941	15,878	15,663
Eagle Pass, Tex.	~	3,536	5,765	5,059	6,459
Ciudad Juárez, Chih.	8,218	10,621	19,457	19,669	48,881
El Paso, Tex.	15,906	39,279	77,560	102,421	96,810
Nogales, Son.	2,738	3,117	13,445	14,061	13,866
Nogales, Ariz.	~	3,514	5,199	6,006	5,135
Mexicali, B.C.	~	462	6,782	14,842	18,775
Calexico, Calif.	~	797	6,223	6,299	5,415
Tijuana, B.C.	242	733	1,028	8,384	16,486
San Diego, Calif.	17,700	39,978	74,683	147,897	203,341

PART II. 1950-80

Twin Cities, State	1950	1960	1970	1980
Matamoros, Tamps.	45,737	143,043	186,146	188,745
Brownsville, Tex.	36,066	48,040	52,522	84,997
Reynosa, Tamps.	34,076	134,869	150,786	194,693
McAllen, Tex.	20,067	32,728	37,636	66,281
Nuevo Laredo, Tamps.	57,669	96,043	151,253	201,731
Laredo, Tex.	51,510	60,678	69,024	91,449
Piedras Negras, Coah.	27,578	48,408	46,698	67,455
Eagle Pass, Tex.	7,267	12,094	15,364	21,407
Ciudad Juárez, Chih.	122,566	276,995	424,135	385,603
El Paso, Tex.	130,485	276,687	322,261	425,259
Nogales, Son.	24,480	39,812	53,494	65,603
Nogales, Ariz.	6,153	7,286	8,946	15,683
Mexicali, B.C.	64,658	281,333	396,324	341,559
Calexico, Calif.	6,433	7,992	10,625	14,412
Tijuana, B.C.	59,950	165,690	340,583	429,500
San Diego, Calif.	334,387	573,224	697,027	875,538

1. Contiguous or near contiguous cities separated by the Mexican-U.S. border.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 110.

Table D22
**BORDER CROSSINGS AT SAN YSIDRO,
 CALIFORNIA, 1956-79^a**
 (N)

Year	Alien ¹	U.S. Citizen
1956	4,174,052	9,758,034
1957	4,551,131	10,554,408
1958	5,059,200	11,763,559
1959	8,417,568	8,017,757
1960	10,127,001	8,204,772
1961	11,581,706	9,414,155
1962	11,858,921	9,662,646
1963	12,006,031	9,784,501
1964	11,278,840	10,554,873
1965	10,588,808	11,491,351
1966	11,946,427	10,352,487
1967	15,301,373	11,279,879
1968	15,301,373	12,058,503
1969	16,759,804	12,583,586
1970	15,018,902	12,343,251
1971	13,071,586	11,377,301
1972	13,990,407	12,226,548
1973	18,714,586	14,396,636
1974	19,932,055	14,350,919
1975	22,164,979	14,050,212
1976	24,382,078	14,401,199
1977	24,256,040	14,598,264
1978	21,699,367	12,760,129
1979	21,085,053	12,042,770

1. INS term.

a. For 1980-85, see SALA-USMBS, tables 420, 421.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 904.

businesses. Mexican laborers, particularly those employed in services, crossed daily to work in U.S. hotels, restaurants, and private homes. In a reverse flow, thousands of U.S. citizens also crossed the border daily to shop, eat, and take advantage of low prices for services such as dental care, automotive repair, and medical consultations. The size of the daily flow between twin cities grew to the point where by the mid-1980s two-way traffic crossing the border, most of it commuters, tourists, and shoppers, probably exceeded the population of the United States (one-way flow is shown in Table D23).

Much disparity existed between border cities sharing important interconnections. A view from the air showed a sprawling, hastily built, partly unpaved Mexican city with a significant area made up of the temporary shacks of the most recent and poorest migrants. On the U.S. side, one saw a smaller urban settlement characterized by modern public services and transportation facilities. Underneath this general pattern of asymmetry there existed significant differences in wages (Table D24), rates of un- and underemployment (Table D25), and unemployment rates between Mexican/

Latino workers in the United States and Mexican workers across the border (Tables D26 and D27).¹⁵

Rapid population growth in the U.S. cities in the border region brought with it numerous serious social problems that would come to characterize the West and the border region as a whole: traffic congestion, rising crime rates, increasing numbers of divorces, incidents of ethnic strife (in a region of great and growing ethnic diversity), and the rapid spread of diseases. All of these problems and more stemmed from the frenetic pace of development in the border states and their urban oases, from both economic boom and massive population movements. The stresses placed on social and cultural infrastructure were also great. For example, Tables D28 and D29 demonstrate that Los Angeles became the largest Roman Catholic archdiocese in the United States at such a rapid rate that the number of Catholics served by each priest was the highest in the country.

With the extremely rapid growth of Mexican border cities after 1950 came pressing social problems, the most important being the severe strain put on undeveloped public-service infrastructure. Most Mexican migrants to Tijuana would spend years living in homemade shacks before their neighborhoods were reached by electricity, potable water, or sewerage lines. Table D30 presents data on housing units with piped water and sewerage; while the situation has improved somewhat over time since 1950, service remains at a low average of 80 percent with piped water and only 57 percent with sewerage. The lack of these basic services has meant a large public health problem, with waterborne diseases a leading cause of death on the border, particularly among infants.¹⁶

Mexican Americans

Population growth fueled by migrant flows came to shape the ethnic makeup of the U.S. border states. The population of Mexican origin in the U.S. border states grew steadily throughout the twentieth century as a tide of Mexicans, drawn by the economic expansion of the U.S. West, gradually moved north through Mexico, crossed the border, and spread throughout the U.S. Southwest, eventually extending as far afield as Colorado, Washington state, and Chicago. Table D31 shows the number of persons born in Mexico living in the border region of the United States during the hundred years from 1880 to 1980. The Mexican population of California grew 420 times in the century, that of Texas 64 times, while the total Mexican-origin population of the United States grew 128 times. The vast majority of Mexican-origin population growth took place in the border region of

¹⁵See also the data on per capita income in border municipalities in Ganster and Sweedler, "The United States-Mexico Border Region," p. 434 (Table 2010). These data show that per capita income in the Mexican border region was significantly higher than the national average in 1980.

¹⁶See SALA-USMBS, Tables 315 and 316.

990

Table D23

U.S. ENTRIES OF ALIENS¹ AND CITIZENS AT BORDER, 1928-85^a
(M)

Year	Via Mexican Border			Mexican Border as % of Total		
	Total	Aliens	Citizens	Total	Aliens	Citizens
1928-30	81.0	49.0	32.0	47.4	53.3	40.5
1931-40	225.0	137.0	87.0	47.2	53.7	39.2
1941-50	360.0	196.0	165.0	57.3	64.1	51.2
1950	48.7	24.7	24.1	55.7	59.8	52.2
1955	71.8	36.8	35.0	59.9	59.7	60.1
1960	98.5	59.2	39.3	64.0	66.5	60.5
1965	116.0	68.5	47.5	66.0	67.3	64.2
1970	144.4	86.7	57.7	66.9	68.5	64.4
1975	158.4	97.5	60.9	66.9	69.1	63.6
1980	163.7	104.5	59.2	66.7	68.6	63.7
1985	177.3	108.0	69.3	65.3	66.1	64.2

1. INS term.

a. For years ending June 30 except, beginning 1977, ending September 30.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 900.

Table D24

**RATIO OF U.S. DAILY MINIMUM WAGE TO
TIJUANA DAILY MINIMUM WAGE,
1950-83**

Year	Ratio
1950	5.19
1955	4.34
1960	4.00
1965	3.90
1970	3.47
1975	2.50
1980	3.20
1981	3.34
1982	12.35
1983	8.84

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 2107.

Table D25

U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT RATE,¹ 1970-85

State	1970	1975	1980	1985
Arizona	4.1	12.1	6.7	6.5
California	6.0	9.9	6.8	7.2
New Mexico	6.3	10.0	7.5	8.8
Texas	3.6	5.6	5.2	7.0
U.S. Border	~	~	6.3	~
U.S. Total	4.9	8.5	7.1	7.2

1. Percent unemployment of civilian population 16 years and over.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 731.

Table D26

MEXICO ESTIMATED UNDEREMPLOYMENT,¹ 1970

State	Underemployment		% EAP	
	Estimate I	Estimate II	Estimate I	Estimate II
Baja Calif.	27,254	36,894	12.3	16.6
Chihuahua	51,219	88,761	12.3	21.3
Coahuila	24,711	45,624	8.5	15.8
Nuevo León	34,892	56,585	7.1	11.5
Sonora	13,657	37,548	4.8	13.2
Tamaulipas	40,198	70,335	10.5	18.4
Mexico Border	193,764	339,435	9.2	16.1
Mexico Total	2,162,635	3,292,635	16.6	25.3

1. Estimates are the results of two different studies by the Second Study Commission of the National Tripartite Commission.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 728.

Table D27

U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT RATE OF HISPANIC-ORIGIN WORKERS, 1976-82

State	1976	1978	1980	1982
Arizona	11.9 ^a	8.6 ^a	10.2	17.2
California	13.2	9.7	10.0	15.3
New Mexico	~	~	11.3	13.2
Texas	7.9	8.1	8.5	10.4
U.S. Total	11.6	8.6	10.1	13.8

a. Includes Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 732.

Table D28

U.S. PRIESTS IN SEVEN LARGEST ARCHDIOCESES, 1989

(N)

Archdiocese	Total Catholics	Total Priests	Catholics per Priest
Los Angeles	2,753,952	1,280	2,151
Chicago	2,350,000	2,228	1,054
New York	1,839,204	2,201	835
Boston	1,807,312	2,176	830
Detroit	1,484,443	900	1,649
Newark	1,359,787	1,130	1,203
Philadelphia	1,351,177	1,407	960
All U.S. Archdioceses and Dioceses	53,496,862	53,522	999

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 506.

Table D29

LOS ANGELES ARCHDIOCESE PRIESTS, 1940-85

(N)

Year	Total Catholics	Total Priests	Catholics per Priest
1940	327,952	652	502
1950	832,500	727	1,145
1960	1,297,584	1,161	1,117
1965	1,621,101	1,393	1,163
1970	1,707,605	1,414	1,207
1975	2,208,989	1,447	1,526
1980	2,089,682	1,265	1,651
1985	2,561,602	1,313	1,950

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 507.

Table D30

OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS WITH PIPED WATER AND DRAINAGE, 1950-80

(%)

Region	1950	1960	1970	1980
Mexico Border				
With Piped Water	50.3	44.7	70.8	80.6
With Drainage	~	34.8	47.5	56.6
Mexico Total				
With Piped Water	43.4	32.3	61.0	70.7
With Drainage	~	28.9	41.5	51.0
U.S. Border				
With Piped Water	87.3	95.9	98.8	99.4
With Drainage	79.5	93.8	97.9	98.9
U.S. Total				
With Piped Water	81.6	92.9	97.5	98.7
With Drainage	74.3	89.7	96.0	98.2

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 305.

Table D31

U.S. POPULATION OF MEXICAN ORIGIN

State	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980
Arizona	14,172	29,987	61,580	47,855	24,902	24,917	105,342	239,811	396,410
California	8,086	33,694	88,771	191,346	134,312	62,309	695,643	1,857,267	3,637,466
New Mexico	6,649	11,918	20,272	15,983	8,875	9,666	34,459	119,049	233,772
Texas	71,062	125,016	251,827	262,672	159,266	196,077	655,523	1,619,064	2,752,487

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 120.

Table D32

U.S. POPULATION ACCORDING TO VARIOUS MEASURES
OF ETHNIC STATUS, 1970

(T)

PART I. MEXICAN FOREIGN STOCK¹

State	Persons Born in Mexico	Native of Foreign Parentage	Self-Identified as of Spanish Origin
U.S.	759.7	1,579.4	9,070.1
Southwest	652.3	1,347.0	5,008.5
Arizona	31.3	82.5	264.8
California	411.0	701.0	2,369.3
Colorado	5.4	19.3	225.5
New Mexico	11.0	26.8	308.3
Texas	193.6	517.4	1,840.6

PART II. SPANISH LANGUAGE OR SPANISH SURNAME

State	Spanish Surname	Spanish Mother Tongue	Spanish Language	Others of Spanish Surname	Total, Language or Surname
U.S.	~	7,823.6	10,042.3	~	~
Southwest	4,668.0	4,727.6	5,662.7	525.7	#
Arizona	246.4	259.1	306.6	26.7	333.3
California	2,222.0	2,150.6	2,738.5	363.1	#
Colorado	211.6	194.7	256.0	30.5	286.5
New Mexico	324.2	329.7	379.7	27.6	407.3
Texas	1,663.6	1,793.5	1,981.9	77.8	#

1. Each column is an independent measure of ethnic status.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 119.

the United States. By the second half of the century, the Mexican-born and Mexican-origin population of the U.S. border states was not only large but also was growing rapidly, through both natural increase and continued population movements from Mexico to the United States followed by naturalization or permanent residence.

Data gathering agencies have had a difficult time standardizing the definition of the Mexican-origin population of the United States. Table D32 presents several different ways of measuring the "Mexican American" population: "Spanish Mother Tongue," "Spanish Language," "Spanish Origin," "Born in Mexico," and "Native of Mexican Parentage," among others. Data gathered on the basis of these various definitions, all determined to some extent by self-identification of census informants, show a wide disparity in estimates of that population and point to the difficulty of judging with certainty the number of documented and undocumented residents in the United States of Mexican origin.

From very early on in the twentieth century, Mexicans comprised the largest ethnic minority group in the U.S. border states. California, Texas, and New Mexico, with their strong Mexican heritages, each claimed millions of Mexican inhabitants. Sixty percent of all U.S. "Hispanics" were to be found in the border states and Colorado, according to the census of 1980. And the large urban centers of the late twentieth-century West would be characterized by the weight of Mexican American population concentrations: in the early 1980s, 14.9 percent of residents self-reported as "Latin" in San Diego, 27.5 percent in Los Angeles, 62.5 percent in El Paso, 87.3 percent in Brownsville, and 93.0 percent in Laredo.¹⁷

The Mexican-origin population as a whole is compared to other Latin ethnic groups in the United States in Table D33. The Mexican-origin population is clearly characterized by a large number of males compared to females, a large proportion of young persons, and low levels of educational attainment. Also noteworthy are the high concentration of Mexican Americans in service occupations (although not as high as Caribbean or Central American groups) and low median household income.

Data on occupational structure by surname in El Paso, Texas, for the period from 1910 to 1970 sheds light on the long-term evolution of the occupational profile in the Mexican American population of the United States (Table D34). While persons with Spanish surnames employed in unskilled and domestic occupations declined from 57.4 percent in 1910 to 23.5 percent in 1970, so did those employed in skilled positions, from 12.8 percent to 7.4 percent. Those persons did not move far, however: employment in semi-skilled and service occupations rose from 17.0 percent to 33.7 percent over the same period. Movement into the upper-

most strata has been slow, from 11.2 percent to 29.2 percent between 1910 and 1970 in lower white-collar occupations, and from 1.6 to 6.3 in upper white-collar positions.

For Mexicans living in the countryside in the U.S. border states and employed in agriculture, life was difficult and insecurity a constant presence. The plight of braceros and other Mexican and Mexican American farmworkers, both legal and illegal residents of the United States, led to increasing political organization and militancy. Victories for César Chávez in 1966 against grape growers in California led to increasing organization of farmworkers throughout that state and in other border states. In 1966 the U.S. Congress extended federal minimum wage laws to agricultural work.

The poverty of Mexican farmworkers was matched by poverty of urban-dwelling Mexican immigrants. Table D35 presents data on poverty in U.S. border counties. The data show that there was a good deal of variation along the length of the border, with 48.0 percent of Spanish-origin families in Kinney County in Texas finding themselves in poverty compared to an average of 16.8 percent for counties in California. Tables D36 and D37 present data on income differences among different ethnic groups for 1969, 1975, and 1978. Both tables make clear not only that poverty was widespread among Mexican American families but also that, among all ethnic groups, Mexican Americans were generally the worst off. On the Mexican side of the border, poverty would appear to have increased during the 1970s and 1980s. Minimum-wage data on the Mexican side of the border (Table D38) suggest that, since at least the mid-1970s, real wages have declined precipitously in the border region.

The society of the U.S.-Mexican border region has grown increasingly complex over the course of the twentieth century as rapid population growth and urbanization have shaped the daily experiences of millions of relatively recent immigrants. At the same time, life on the border has become a more common experience in both countries as the border comes to claim an ever larger share of Mexican and U.S. national populations. By the sheer weight of its population, the social evolution of the border region has forced its way onto national and binational agendas.

That a single complex social matrix has emerged from what at the beginning of the century were two very distinct social contingents is clear. It is no longer possible to describe Los Angeles, for example, as Octavio Paz did in the opening pages of his *Labyrinth of Solitude* of 1957: "Mexicanism—delight in decoration, carelessness and pomp, negligence, passion and reserve—floats in the air. I say 'floats' because it never mixes or unites with the other world, the North American world based on precision and efficiency." Century-long migratory trends and economic development have shaped a true "Mexamerica" all along the border. In the process, U.S. citizens' perceptions of Mexicans, and Mexicans' perceptions of themselves, have changed since the mid-1950s.

¹⁷Ganster and Sweedler, "The United States-Mexico Border Region," p. 423.

Table D33

**SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE U.S. POPULATION,
BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, 1980**

Country of Birth	Age (%)	Education (%)		Occupation of Employed Persons (%)		Median Household Income (US 1979)
	Under 15 Years	High School Graduates	College Graduates	Professional	Service	
Mexico	14.7	21.3	3.0	2.5	16.6	12,747
Cuba	4.1	54.9	16.1	9.2	12.2	16,326
Jamaica	10.2	63.5	11.0	10.2	29.9	15,290
Dominican Republic	9.2	30.1	4.0	3.1	18.5	10,130
Colombia	10.6	62.8	14.0	8.1	15.8	15,883
El Salvador	10.7	41.4	6.0	2.6	31.7	12,261
Haiti	8.3	64.4	13.4	8.0	27.4	13,377
Ecuador	9.1	56.0	9.3	5.3	14.7	15,402
Argentina	9.3	70.0	24.2	16.3	13.1	18,892
Trinidad and Tobago	9.4	70.3	12.4	10.3	23.3	14,733
Guatemala	13.3	42.7	6.9	3.9	27.9	13,385

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 118.

Table D34

EL PASO OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION, BY SURNAME¹ 1910-70

Category	1910		1920		1930		1940		1950		1960		1970	
	SS	NSS	SS	NSS	SS	NSS	SS	NSS	SS	NSS	SS	NSS	SS	NSS
Upper White Collar	1.6	17.0	3.8	21.6	1.8	25.9	1.8	18.4	1.8	17.8	3.4	21.7	6.3	27.4
Lower White Collar	11.2	47.2	18.5	45.9	17.6	44.9	18.4	47.2	26.4	49.4	28.6	50.4	29.2	50.6
Skilled Workers	12.8	15.8	10.5	12.5	13.1	11.2	12.6	9.6	11.2	12.4	12.2	8.1	7.4	3.6
Semiskilled and Service Workers	17.0	16.0	21.0	16.9	19.7	16.3	25.8	22.0	33.2	165.6	27.6	13.2	33.7	17.3
Unskilled Workers and Domestics	57.4	4.2	46.2	3.1	47.9	1.8	41.4	2.8	27.4	4.8	28.2	6.5	23.5	1.2

1. SS = Spanish surname; NSS = Non-Spanish surname.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 711.

Table D35

U.S. SPANISH-ORIGIN FAMILIES IN POVERTY AND FAMILY SIZE, 1980

State	Median Family Income	Mean Family Income	Mean Per Capita Family Income	Total Families	Poverty Families	% Families in Poverty	Persons per Family
Arizona	15,468	17,188	4,006	92,286	17,524	18.2	4.29
California	15,170	17,729	4,432	976,474	164,292	16.8	4.00
New Mexico	13,512	15,679	4,137	112,270	23,258	20.7	3.79
Texas	13,293	15,669	3,767	655,102	162,065	24.7	4.16

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 211.

995

Table D36

U.S. MEDIAN INCOME OF SPANISH-ORIGIN, WHITE, AND BLACK FAMILIES, 1969, 1975
(US)

Category	Arizona		California		New Mexico		Texas	
	1969	1975	1969	1975	1969	1975	1969	1975
Spanish Origin	7,350	10,717	8,430	10,066	5,890	9,396	5,600	9,363
White	9,482	13,841	10,966	15,466	8,113	12,356	8,926	13,299
Black	5,716	~	7,482	8,374	5,203	~	5,330	8,791
All Families	9,185	13,569	10,729	15,069	7,845	11,798	8,486	12,672
Ratio								
Spanish-Origin to White	.78	.77	.77	.65	.73	.76	.63	.70
Spanish-Origin to Black	1.29	~	1.13	1.20	1.13	~	1.05	1.07
Spanish-Origin to All Families	.80	.79	.79	.67	.75	.80	.66	.74

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 809.

Table D37

U.S. INCOME OF ALL FAMILIES AND MEXICAN AMERICAN FAMILIES, 1978
(%)

Family Incomes (US)	All U.S.	Mexican American
Less than 4,000	5.6	9.3
4,000 to 6,999	8.7	11.7
7,000 to 9,999	9.7	14.3
10,000 to 14,999	16.6	22.9
15,000 to 19,999	16.9	17.4
20,000 to 24,999	14.5	10.8
25,000 or More	27.9	13.5
Median Income	17,640	12,835

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 810.

Table D38

**MEXICO INDEX OF MINIMUM WAGE AND CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (CPI),
SELECTED BORDER CITIES, 1976-84**
(Wage Index as Percent of CPI; CPI: 1976 = 100)

State	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983 ^a	1984
Tijuana, B.C.	99.8	98.4	91.7	86.5	78.5	71.2	61.8	43.0	64.2
Ciudad Juárez, Chih.	83.0	82.6	78.4	75.5	68.6	72.7	56.6	43.9	65.5
Piedras Negras, Coah.	70.3	69.9	66.7	65.2	61.0	59.3	46.7	34.9	52.5
Nogales, Son.	78.0	77.5	74.2	72.7	67.6	69.7	57.1	43.4	64.9
Matamoros, Tamps.	80.5	80.1	76.1	74.3	69.7	70.1	56.4	43.6	65.1

a. The 1983 CPI is an average for the period January to November 1983.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 802.

Serious social problems, poverty and inequality, remain; they pose major challenges for the twenty-first century. The social profile of the border region is perhaps even more complex than its economy, varying greatly over the length of the international boundary from the relatively wealthy West to the poorer Gulf coast. The problems confronting the society of the region as a whole are many and diverse: the health threats of environmental degradation, the spreading public service crisis, the widespread psychological and social stresses inherent in the new multiethnic society. All of these problems contribute to making life on the border a challenge for scholars and policymakers as they attempt to understand and mold a rapidly changing region.

U.S.—Mexican Relations at the Border

Looking forward, the economic and social trends which have defined the border region in the twentieth century show all signs of continuing, for the most part unbroken, into the next century. As the economy and society of the region continue to evolve, the region will continue to play an ever more important role in the social and economic lives of Mexico and the United States. And the border will come to play an ever larger role in relations between the two countries and their peoples.

Issues in U.S.—Mexican relations are frequently most pronounced, and sometimes most divisive, at the border. There, international and domestic issues come face to face and have a noticeable impact on one another. Retail sales on the U.S. side of the border, to cite just one example, are extremely sensitive to fluctuations in the dollar-peso exchange rate and plunged dramatically during the 1970s and 1980s with each devaluation of the Mexican peso. Merchants on the U.S. side of the border sought federal assistance and President Reagan created a Border Aid Program in response.

Several important issues in bilateral relations are worth discussing by way of conclusion, placing them in the context of the long-term historical changes since 1900. The historical development and resolution of tensions along the border provide a portent of things to come and a few models for mutually beneficial bilateral relations in the border region.

Relations between Mexico and the United States have often focused directly on the border that unites and divides the two countries. The boundary itself was arbitrarily drawn in much of the natural terrain through which it cuts, and this fact has had a lasting impact on border conflicts. Natural resources such as water and environmental problems such as air pollution have never paid much attention to the location of the international boundary and have become bilateral, binational problems.

Not only was the boundary drawn in an arbitrary fashion, but the physical border has also moved in the relatively recent past, engendering serious tensions and mistrust between Mexico and the United States. Beginning in the late

nineteenth century, conflict between the United States and Mexico repeatedly came to a head over issues such as the shifting of the Rio Grande/Río Bravo boundary between the two countries and the dividing of the waters of the Colorado River for irrigation on both sides of the border. Lost to the United States in the nineteenth century, the Chamizal territory was finally returned to Mexico in 1963 as U.S.—Mexican tensions reached a high point fueled by U.S. concerns about the spread of Fidel Castro's revolution in Latin America.

In a region where water constitutes the lifeblood of both urban and rural existence, the flows of the Colorado River became the topic of lasting conflict between the two countries in the 1940s and 1950s as infrastructure investment in agricultural production in both countries boomed. The conflict was only finally resolved in 1973 with agreements on the amount of water that would be available to the Mexican side of the border and acceptable salinity levels of the water delivered (as of 1991, however, the water-treatment plant called for in the agreements had not yet begun to operate). But new conflicts over water have continued to develop. As groundwater sources are depleted and both groundwater and the Pacific Ocean become polluted, water issues will again be pronounced in U.S. Mexican relations. One of the best examples of both interdependence and international cooperation to resolve common environmental and health problems was the construction of a binational sewage treatment plant at Tijuana in the early 1980s.

Following from the agricultural boom built on large-scale irrigation projects, issues of agricultural production and supply have increasingly come into play in the bilateral relationship expressed at the border. Mexican growers on or near the border have challenged the market dominance of the U.S. states of California and Florida, particularly during the winter, when Mexico has a clear climatic advantage. Battles over tomatoes, green peppers, oranges, strawberries, grapes and raisins, broccoli, and other vegetables have recently joined long-standing disagreements over more traditional Mexican exports like cattle and cotton. U.S. producers have employed various means—from quantitative controls to health regulations—to stem the flow of cheap Mexican crops across the border.

The longest lasting and most sensitive issue between Mexico and the United States has been migration; the flow of people across the international boundary and into the urban centers of the U.S. border states has time and again been the center of conflict between the two countries. The issues raised by legal and illegal immigration to the United States from Mexico, and the status and treatment of legal and illegal residents of the border region, are centered in the border region and on the international boundary itself. The migration debate has pitted citizens of Mexico against citizens of the United States and citizens of the United States against one another.

The immigration "problem" has existed for as long as there has existed a formal boundary between the two coun-

tries, since 1848. But the tensions caused by the migrant flow as we now think of them began with the institutionalized flow of Mexican temporary workers under the bracero agreement between the two countries as U.S. farmers sought Mexican labor during the peak of the wartime economic boom. The bracero program instituted a network throughout Mexico, at the border, and in the United States that both stimulated and facilitated migration for seasonal or permanent employment in the United States.

Once a network was established and family members were in place to provide communications and assistance, the migrant flow could not be simply shut off whenever the United States economy cooled down. The fact that migrant populations from Mexico have historically been recognized and accepted as U.S. citizens after a period of work and acculturation, regardless of reforms in U.S. immigration laws, has reinforced the migration network and migrant lore. The fate of the much-debated Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) has proved that the immigration dilemma is not easily solved: after a brief period during which promulgation of the Act seemed to slow the flow of migrants across the border, migration levels climbed to their previous levels. The Act also sent a mixed signal to potential migrants by creating a framework for legalization for millions of Mexicans who had been living illegally in the United States.

While recent research seems to show that both Mexico and the United States gain more than they lose from the northward flow of Mexican population, that flow has historically been accompanied by acrimonious debate over both its short-term and long-term economic and social effects. In the United States large farmers and agribusinesses have generally argued for easy access to inexpensive Mexican labor. Organized labor, in contrast, has argued that low wage rates put U.S. workers out of jobs. Many residents of the United States feel that by allowing, or implicitly encouraging, Mexican migration the United States is losing control of its borders and thus of its sovereignty. Further complicating the picture is the importance of the migration "safety valve" to Mexican political stability, a stability that constitutes a prime concern for U.S. "national security."¹⁸

A crucial problem in stemming the flow of illegal immigrants to the United States from Mexico has been measuring both the flow and the policepower needed to control it (see Tables D39 and D40).¹⁹ Problems in INS data collection, such as multiple countings of individuals and the fact that seizures of undocumented migrants rise when the INS and the Border Patrol receive greater funding, have led to a situation in which policymakers know very little about the real dimensions of the immigrant flow. The seasonal nature

of the flow, for example, remains largely unappreciated. And the basic dimensions of migration have changed over time in ways that are little understood but will have a major impact on policy: migrants come increasingly from urban as opposed to rural areas, more women and families have joined the flow, migrants increasingly look for manufacturing and service employment instead of agricultural work, migrants more and more frequently come to the U.S. border states intending to stay permanently.

The continuing flow of immigrants across the porous border and into the border region has from time to time been accompanied by violence and by heightened tensions in the bilateral relationship. Periodic bouts of violence against immigrants at the hands of the U.S. Border Patrol, proven or alleged, have led Mexico to lodge formal complaints with the United States and to bring the issue to meetings between Mexican and U.S. presidents.²⁰

Like migration, environmental degradation is a problem that involves various interrelated forces on both sides of the border. Along with the practice of U.S. businesses of escaping stringent environmental regulations in the United States,²¹ there are more general environmental effects of rapid industrialization and population growth in the border region.²² Pollution leads to health threats on both sides of the border as, for example, untreated sewage from Tijuana flows north to San Diego and air pollution from San Diego blows south to Tijuana. Lack of data and control mechanisms is a major problem; one-third of border maquila plants, for example, are not registered with SEDUE (the Mexican counterpart of the EPA). And more than one-half of maquiladoras have toxic-discharge problems, according to the Mexican government.²³

Bilateral border issues have certain traits in common. The nature of the border—long, porous, unmarked, and unguarded for most of its length—makes it difficult to both formulate and implement policy. The complex economic and social development of the region, and shifting economic and social borders, preclude simple solutions. But the fact that the border, while being an arbitrary or nonexistent barrier in many senses, does divide two legal systems and two systems

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹See Sam Fulwood III, "Uncountable Problem at the Border," *Los Angeles Times*, May 17, 1990, p. A5.

²⁰See, for example, Marjorie Miller and Patrick McDonnell, "Rise in Violence Along Border Brings Call for Action," *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 9, 1990, p. A4, and Gloria J. Romero and Antonio H. Rodríguez, "A Thousand Points of Xenophobia," *Los Angeles Times*, May 21, 1990, p. B7.

²¹See, for example, Chris Kraul, "A Warmer Climate for Furniture Makers," *Los Angeles Times*, May 14, 1990, pp. D1, D4.

²²See, for example, Lonnie Shavelson, "[Mexican] Border Plants Polluting Salton Sea [in California]," *The Times of the Americas*, Nov. 15, 1989, p. 16.

²³On the environment of the border in general, see Paul Ganster and Hartmut Walter, eds., *Environmental Hazards and Bioresource Management in the United States-Mexico Borderlands* (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1990).

Table D39

ESTIMATE OF MEXICAN UNDOCUMENTEDS IN THE UNITED STATES,
BY PERIOD OF ENTRY, 1960-80^a

Period of Entry	Mexican Undocumented (T)	As % of Western Hemisphere Undocumented in U.S.	As % of Total Undocumented in U.S.
Total Entered			
Since 1960 ^b	931	64.1	45.5
Entered 1960-69	138	42.3	24.2
Entered 1970-74	280	64.7	50.8
Entered 1975-80	292	72.3	53.5

- a. Estimates based on differences between 1980 census alien population as modified and 1980 alien registration (I-53) data adjusted for underregistration.
- b. Includes 36,000 Mexican undocumented who entered before 1960.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1019.

Table D40

BORDER PATROL AGENTS AND ACTIVITIES, 1970-85
(T)¹

Category	1970	1975	1980	1985
Agents				
Border Patrol Agents on Duty (N)	1,708	1,708	2,392	3,023
Deportable Mexican Aliens ² Located	219.3	579.4	734.2	1,218.7
Activities				
Deportable Mexican Aliens ² Located	58.1	100.9	83.3	48.3

- 1. In thousands, except as indicated. For years ending June 30 except, beginning 1977, ending September 30.
- 2. INS term.

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 910.

Table D41

FISHERIES PRODUCTION, 1960-80
(T MET)

State	1960	1965	1970	1975	1980
Baja Calif.	44.0	64.1	61.3	130.5	340.1
Chihuahua	#	.2	.2	~	.3
Coahuila	.1	.1	.1		1.1
Sonora	9.6	12.0	37.4	90.3	252.9
Tamaulipas	9.0	5.6	8.5	15.2	27.8
Mexico Border	62.7	82.0	107.5	236.0	622.2
Mexico Total	142.4	199.8	273.5	451.3	1,058.6
California	245.4	207.7	318.9	396.9	364.7
Texas	117.0	69.9	66.7	39.0	42.6
U.S. Border	362.4	277.6	385.6	435.9	407.3
U.S. Total	2,242.1	2,167.3	2,230.4	2,211.8	2,934.8

SOURCE: SALA-USMBS, table 1218.

of authority makes the transborder, collaborative resolution of problems a necessity.

In both Mexico and the United States, the border states are removed geographically from the centers of political power, Washington, D.C., and Mexico City, and geographical isolation makes the resolution of problems stemming from domestic trends and bilateral relations in the border region difficult. Residents of both border regions feel themselves neglected and misunderstood by federal officials and policymakers. But the border region attracted increasing attention in both national capitals in the 1980s: an Office of Border Affairs was created in the U.S. Department of State and there are groups in the U.S. Congress that meet regularly to discuss border issues. In Mexico, El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (COLEF) was founded with government support as a branch of the prestigious El Colegio de México to serve as the northern border's graduate-level think tank.

At the same time, mechanisms have been developing since the 1950s for dealing with problems, as they arise, with convocations of local authorities. At many points along the border local officials have worked out bilateral agreements on such issues as pollution, tourism, transportation, and industrialization. Governors of the ten border states meet regularly and over time have come to take up substantive matters of common concern to inhabitants of the border region. These sorts of regional political processes may provide the best model for managing the bilateral relationship as it is expressed along the border into the twenty-first century. Increasingly, U.S. and Mexican leaders at the highest levels have chosen the U.S.-Mexican border as a site of key meetings and acts of state. Both Ronald Reagan and George Bush have met with their Mexican counterparts at the border to discuss issues of regional, national, and bilateral significance.

While the border region has seen the development of innovative ways to deal with problems common to inhabitants of both sides of the boundary, the expanding nature of the border region has introduced new complexities. The maritime boundaries between the United States and Mexico

at the border, for example, proved a continued source of friction in the 1980s and 1990s as the Mexican fishing industry boomed (Table D41) and environmentalists concerned about dolphin kills achieved an embargo on Mexican tuna imports.²⁴ The dumping of hazardous waste and toxic substances south of the border has blurred the relevance of the border to the point where both countries have recognized the need to work out bilateral policies to stem the tide of illegal entry of waste to disposal grounds on both sides of the boundary. The underdeveloped and overburdened public service network in Mexico has caused a spill-over of effects into the U.S. border states.

A well-known observer of U.S.-Mexican relations has stated that the bilateral relationship is fundamentally structured by three characteristics: "proximity, interpenetration, and asymmetry."²⁵ These traits are most pronounced at the U.S.-Mexican border, where the two societies meet and intermingle.

All three of these characteristics as they are expressed in the U.S.-Mexican border region have changed over the course of the century. Simple proximity has given away to a complex overlapping and integration; interpenetration has increasingly become interdependence. Perhaps only asymmetries of economic might and political power have remained more or less unchanged over the course of the century. Because of their potential to undermine bilateral attempts at problem solving, lingering asymmetries remain the most pressing challenge facing the border region as it enters the twenty-first century.

²⁴See *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 29, 1990, and Feb. 21, 1991, p. A27.

²⁵Abraham Lowenthal, *Partners in Conflict: The United States and Latin America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), p. 77.