A group of entrepreneurial Midwestern farm owners is not the image most Americans hold of Latinos. Instead, the U.S. public usually thinks of Latinos as seasonal farm laborers, service employees, and construction workers in the U.S. Southwest. Ethnic Mexicans have recently become small farm owners in Michigan, where 80 percent of farms are family owned. Their grandparents' generation initially arrived in the state as farmworkers in the early twentieth century. Without bank financing, ethnic Mexicans have self-financed to buy farms. These new farm owners are Mexican immigrants, Texas Mexican transplants, and other Latinos intermarried with white Michiganians.[1] Although they grow a variety of crops, they make up 18 to 20 percent of growers of blueberries, in which the state is the world's principal grower. Juan Marinez describes the transformation of workers to farm owners: "They're great savers – wait to accumulate between $40,000 and $80,000, and that's good enough to get them a down payment on a farm in southwest Michigan. They could then buy a 40-, 20-, or 10-acre family farm. … As they make these moves in farm ownership, they bring others along with them to do the same."[2]

The last twenty years have witnessed an increase in similar news stories about Latina/o immigrants contributing to the labor force and culture of the Midwest.[3] In 2006, immigrant rights activists staged massive demonstrations throughout the nation (including the Midwest) to protest the proposed Sensenbrenner bill (authored by a Midwestern congressman) that would have converted illegal entry into the United States into a felony.[4] Two years later, Postville, Iowa, became the site of the largest workplace raid in the nation when some 400 undocumented workers were detained in the Agriprocessors meat packing plant, and subsequently nearly 300 were deported.[5] At the same time, Chicago became a hub for student activists working on behalf of the DREAM (Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors) legislation as they spearheaded demonstrations, civil disobedience events, and teach-ins. This activism was partially motivated by the Obama administration's aggressive immigration policies that led to record number of

deportations.[6] The increasing number of mixed-status families has meant that the deportation of parents often caused family separations, especially when young U.S.-born children are involved.[7] These high-profile cases have made Latina/o immigrants more visible throughout the Midwest, and led some observers to characterize Latinas/os as new immigrants to the Midwest despite having worked in the region since the late nineteenth century.

Frequent references to the Midwest as "the heartland" in U.S. popular and mass culture bring to mind archetypes associated with rural and small-town settings populated by the descendants of European settlers, as well as core cultural values, including niceness and politeness as default modes of public interaction. This essay challenges the common image of the Midwest as a hegemonically white heartland, and the notion that Latinas/os are newcomers to the Midwest. In place of these outdated concepts, I posit that Latinos have resided in the region for over a century, and have contributed to the social, cultural, and economic dimensions of rural and urban Midwestern communities. Since the late nineteenth century, Latinas/os have provided their labor to various Midwestern industries and spread their culture throughout rural and urban areas. Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants were the first Latinos to arrive in large numbers, followed by Puerto Ricans, Cuban Americans, and eventually Central and South Americans. Knowing this immigration history will help us understand Latinos' long-standing ties to the Midwest, the region's appeal to new migrants, and the opportunities and tensions introduced by successive waves of Latino newcomers.

Early Mexican Migration to the Midwest

Jobs in agriculture and railroads attracted the first ethnic Mexicans to the Midwest. They began working for railroad and sugar beet companies throughout the U.S. Southwest in the late nineteenth century. Subsequently, they migrated to the Midwest to work in these industries as

European American laborers left these jobs to become farmers or urban industrial workers.[8] Prior to World War I, the majority of agricultural migrants were not permanent settlers but sojourners who moved within the region according to seasonal harvests, and returned to Texas or Mexico after a period of work. Considered non-whites by white Midwesterners, most were either single or married men traveling without their families. Others were attracted to the region by seasonal work on the region's railroad yards.[9] Employers purposefully recruited unaccompanied men to depress wages by not paying enough to support families. This strategy also appeased local residents' fears that ethnic Mexicans might settle permanently in their communities. This early recruitment strategy racialized Mexican immigrants as non-white laborers who should not become permanent residents nor U.S. citizens. Nevertheless, by 1900, the recruitment strategies of the agricultural and railroad industries had resulted in a small, but significant, ethnic Mexican population throughout the Midwest with 499 Mexicans in Michigan, 162 in Missouri, and 156 in Illinois.[10] While sugar and railroad companies initially invested in recruiting ethnic Mexican workers in Texas and in U.S.-Mexico border cities, these workers gradually established informal social networks that linked the Midwest with Texas and northern Mexico. Such networks helped continue the stream of ethnic Mexicans into the region for several generations.[11]

The number of Mexicans swelled over the next two decades as the turmoil of the Mexican Revolution (1910-1920) pushed them out of Mexico, and the increasing employment opportunities created by the United States' entry into World War I pulled them north. Migrants had begun leaving Mexico in the mid-nineteenth century to escape their debts, obtain higher wages in the U.S., and flee the nation's political instability. This emigration stream increased after 1877 as the economic policies of Mexico's dictator Porfirio Díaz increased landlessness by consolidating property among wealthy *hacendados* and by the nation's industrialization, which displaced skilled artisans.[12] In 1910, the beginning of the Mexican Revolution led to a surge in emigrants fleeing

forced enlistments and military conflict. Approximately one tenth of Mexico's population emigrated and most arrived in the United States attracted by social stability, political refuge, and economic opportunities. While the majority of Mexican immigrants arrived to work in the U.S. Southwest's burgeoning railroad development projects and expanding agricultural fields, some ventured into the Midwest to labor in sugar beet fields, railroads, and other industrial jobs. Mexicans would fill a labor need created by the outbreak of World War I, which led to a decrease in the number of European immigrants who had supplied the Midwest's agricultural workforce. While some European immigrants moved to cities for better-paying industrial jobs.[13] Although few ethnic Mexicans lived in the Midwest prior to World War I (3,014 in 1910), by 1920, they numbered 13,490.[14]

In the 1920s, families began accompanying ethnic Mexican workers as a result of a shift in the recruiting strategy of the agricultural and railroad industries. Employers throughout the Midwest initiated recruitment efforts targeting Mexican immigrant workers and their families.[15] In order to address an unstable workforce, Midwestern agricultural employers (such as the Great Western sugar company) began recruiting married men with families, who employers believed were more stable than single males who frequently switched jobs. This recruitment strategy also increased the available workforce because employers could now hire entire families (wives and children), who were underpaid or unpaid. Moreover, Mexican immigrant families were accustomed to practicing family labor, which involved women and children working in the fields.[16] At approximately the same time, the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Company (ATSF, or Santa Fe) also encouraged Mexican immigrant track workers to bring their families. This recruitment strategy was part of the Santa Fe's effort to implement scientific management techniques that promoted efficiency, productivity, and loyalty. By recruiting families, the ATSF sought to prevent track workers from easily leaving their jobs and from unionizing.[17] The railroad

companies' recruitment efforts significantly increased the number of Mexican immigrant track workers. For example, while they made up 55 percent of railway maintenance workers in Kansas City in 1910, by 1927, ethnic Mexicans were 91 percent of track workers.[18] The new recruitment strategy also led ethnic Mexicans to establish permanent residence throughout the Midwest. However, various Midwestern employers denied this reality and instead sought to assure local residents and federal officials that Mexicans would not remain in the U.S. because their "homing" instinct would motivate them to return to Mexico after the harvests.[19] Despite the recruitment of families, most ethnic Mexican laborers in the Midwest remained single men.[20]

Formal and Informal Recruitment

Facing labor shortages in the early twentieth century, U.S. agricultural employers viewed Mexico as a convenient labor source because of its proximity and abundance of workers. Businesses could easily recruit and transport workers from Mexico and back via the railroads. Such a strategy allowed employers to guarantee that Mexicans did not become permanent residents because white Midwesterners racialized Mexicans as "non-whites" who were not welcomed as long-term community members. The agricultural industry also sought Mexicans because of their lack of political strength in the Midwest, which made them more susceptible to labor controls and exploitation. Mexicans gradually replaced European immigrants in the Midwest's sugar-beet industry as the latter became farmers or industrial laborers. Wage increases in industrial jobs and expanding employment opportunities in cities during World War I had combined to lower the number of European immigrant agricultural workers. Intent on hiring Mexican immigrants, agricultural employers successfully lobbied U.S. government officials for an exemption from the Immigration Act of 1917.[21] In response to growers' requests, the U.S. Department of Labor (USDL) waived the Immigration Act's head tax and literacy requirement for

Mexicans. It also allowed for the temporary admission of Mexican laborers and their families for six months as contract agricultural laborers, restricted their employment to farm work, and prohibited laborers from becoming U.S. citizens.[22] The USDL thereby created a "form of racialized and nationalized labor" in a "unilateral guest worker program" that "defined Mexicans as workers but not as future neighbors or citizens."[23] The need for Mexican agricultural workers increased further in the 1920s with the so-called quota laws in 1921 and 1924, which restricted the annual number of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. To fill the resulting labor need, recruiters again sought recently-arrived Mexican immigrant workers in Texas.[24] The complete transformation of the sugar beet labor force was evident by the late 1920s, when ethnic Mexicans made up 70 to 90 percent (or 15,555 to 20,000 yearly Mexican laborers) of all sugar beet workers in the Midwest.[25]

Increase employment on railroad construction and maintenance led to the establishment of permanent Mexican settlements in the Midwest. Several railroad companies in the Southwest turned to Mexican immigrants as replacements for Asian and European immigrants whose numbers dropped due to immigration restrictions. Initially hired as railroad construction workers who would return to Mexico after their contract ended, some immigrants remained in the U.S. to work on track maintenance crews. Like their agricultural counterparts, ethnic Mexican railroad workers began seasonal migrations from the Southwest to the Midwest. Others were hired along the U.S.-Mexico border without any prior railroad experience. In some Midwestern regions, track maintenance and repair work became racialized as labor reserved for Mexicans or African Americans.[26] Gradually, these laborers began establishing Mexican enclaves (culturally or ethnically distinct region) throughout the Midwest consisting of boxcar communities on company property or boardinghouses. These *barrios* (Mexican neighborhoods) were located near the immigrants' workplace, which included the railroad roundhouse and maintenance yards. In

addition to boxcars, immigrants lived in shanties constructed from discarded railroad materials. The railroad routes influenced the location of early Mexican settlements as workers tended to establish communities in cities along major railway lines. Other boxcar communities were located in smaller rural towns, which led to isolation of workers' families when men were away on months-long maintenance jobs. These long absences along with the makeshift housing, lack of running water and electricity, and sporadic schooling for children led some immigrants to abandon track work for urban industrial jobs. Track workers grew tired of having to find temporary employment as day laborers or in sugar beet work when companies instituted seasonal layoffs in winter.[27] Turnover in railroad maintenance work was high as laborers left for higher paying and more stable urban jobs. Some contracted railroad workers skipped out on their contracts in route to their destination as they became aware of the desirability of industrial jobs in Midwestern cities.[28]

Immigrant laborers relied on their social networks to obtain information on industrial jobs after abandoning their contract. They acquired job information from Spanish-language newspapers, word of mouth, and potential employers. The ATSF aggressively recruited Mexican immigrants in El Paso, Texas, where they maintained a recruiting office. Based in Topeka, Kansas, ATSF labor contractors traveled to El Paso where they preferred recruiting Mexican immigrants (who were more vulnerable) over Mexican Americans who had more rights as U.S. citizens. These labor contractors, who spoke Spanish and had experience hiring Mexican laborers, would then accompany the new hires to their destinations. En route to their destinations, immigrants sometimes discovered new employment opportunities through word of mouth, so they used aliases to skip their contracts.[29] Instead of continuing to his contracted destination in Galesburg, Illinois, Santiago Salazar assumed the alias "Santiago Alvarez" to abandon his contract in Fort Madison, Iowa, after he encountered friends who informed him of local work with the same railroad company.[30] Some employers also tried to "poach" employees from other jobs. Steel

companies in Chicago attempted to syphon off railroad workers by distributing Spanish-language circulars offering higher wages and better working conditions.[31] Yet, employers and the public interpreted Mexican immigrants' use of aliases as signs of sketchiness and criminality, another aspect of their racialization. According to a white woman in Fort Madison, Mexican men used aliases to abandon wives in Mexico, and to establish new romantic relations.[32] While some immigrant men might have established such relationships, others had more virtuous reasons for using aliases. Instead of using an alias to hide from their past, Mexican immigrants used assumed names to hide from their present circumstances of restrictive labor controls.[33]

Ethnic Mexicans often arrived in the Midwest after an extended process of step migration from Mexico to Texas, Oklahoma, and then onto various Midwestern states. As they traveled from one job to another across the Southwest and into the Midwest, immigrants learned more English, acquired new skills, and forged social networks with other itinerant Mexican laborers.[34] For Mexican immigrants, the Midwest was appealing because it offered higher wages, and less overt racism than Texas.[35] Those migrating to Midwestern rural areas also liked the slower pace of life, which was similar to their rural hometowns.[36] A yearly pattern of circulation migration between the Midwest and Texas or Mexico emerged for some agricultural and railroad workers and would eventually result in permanent settlement in the Midwest when some laborers left the migrant stream.

Contract Laborers

Most ethnic Mexicans had been attracted by agricultural jobs prior to the 1950s. The beet industry employed more Mexican immigrants than any other employer throughout the Midwest.[37] The vast majority of ethnic Mexicans recruited to the Midwest were unskilled immigrant laborers from Texas. Working for various sugar companies (like Michigan, Continental, and Columbia),

enganchistas (labor contractors) enticed immigrants to move to the Midwest by visiting U.S.-Mexico border states or traveling into Mexico with promises of good pay and working conditions in seasonal agricultural work.[38] The labor contracts detailed specific wages, work tasks, transportation arrangements, and housing. While the agricultural companies often claimed to offer free transportation to and from the fields, in reality the employers paid the costs in advance, but later deducted them from the workers' wages. Contracts also offered free housing, which included some furniture, bedding, and kitchen utensils. This rudimentary and substandard housing, however, was often abandoned farm houses, storage sheds, or barns converted into worker's quarters.[39] While the contracts were made among sugar companies, farmers, and heads of households, immigrant men understood they were signing up for family labor as wives and children often worked in the fields.[40] The contracts helped companies assert control by limiting the number of times workers were paid to two to three per season. Since they did not receive paychecks for months at a time, farm workers had to obtain goods on credit from local stores, and then saw this credit deducted from their wages. By withholding their paychecks for months, companies attempted to ensure that workers would stay throughout the season without abandoning their jobs.[41]

Employers provided free or rental housing for Mexican immigrants because they, like U.S. government officials, racialized Mexicans as temporary workers. While some Midwestern agricultural employers had previously encouraged southern and eastern Europeans to become homeowners by offering them affordable houses, they did not extend these opportunities to Mexican immigrants, whom they viewed as only temporary laborers.[42] The sex ratios among Mexican immigrants were skewed in industrial settings, and more balanced in agricultural communities. In several Midwestern cities, adult men composed 80% of the Mexican immigrant population. This ratio was a result of the different hiring practices between industrial and

agricultural employers – the former recruited individual men, while the latter tended to recruit families. Iowa's Mexican communities had a more balanced sex ratio since many immigrants participated in agricultural labor. During the winter of 1926-27, adult men made up from 57.1% to 65.2% of the adult Mexican immigrants in six communities surveyed by labor officials. Towns with large agricultural bases tended to have more even sex ratios than towns where most immigrants worked in industrial occupations.[43]

Racialized Laborers

Throughout the Midwest, the majority white population struggled to locate Mexicans within the ethnoracial order of the United States. They viewed Mexicans simultaneously as "non-white" and as "non-black," but also "foreign."[44] White Midwesterners placed Mexican immigrants in an in-between status, below recent European immigrants but above African Americans. Because their ethno-racial status was unstable, there was no single pattern of reception for Mexican immigrants. Their reception varied by locale and social context. In some towns, Mexicans were grouped with southern and eastern European immigrants, while in others, they were classified with African Americans. Believing stereotypes that cast ethnic Mexicans as criminals and rowdy, white landlords often perceived ethnic Mexicans as threatening and refused to rent to them.[45] White Midwesterners' racial views were influenced by their reliance on "racial scripts," which are "the ways in which we think, talk about, and act toward one racialized group based on our experiences with other groups whose race differs from our own." Racial scripts are influenced by a variety of factors, including location, time period, power relations, material conditions, and specific issues.[46] In the early twentieth-century Midwest, the number of ethnic Mexicans in a particular location and these migrants' relations with European immigrants and African Americans shaped such racial scripts and white residents' views of Mexicans.

The demographic context not only influenced how white Midwesterners viewed Mexicans, but also influenced Mexican immigrants' opportunities for inter-ethnic and inter-racial alliances. Because Mexicans did not have a long-standing presence in the Midwest (compared to the Southwest), many white Midwesterners did not hold rigid views of Mexicans' ethnoracial status. Moreover, the Mexican population's low numbers required some immigrants to ally with non-Mexicans on a daily basis, which was less common in the Southwest where Mexicans enjoyed larger population numbers. In some towns, Mexicans were more likely to live in the same neighborhoods as southern and eastern European immigrants than they were with African Americans. Their housing arrangements, in turn, influenced social and political relations with other minority and immigrant populations. While Mexican immigrants experienced less racial antagonism in the Midwest than in Texas, discrimination was not absent in their lives.

Throughout the early twentieth century, ethnic Mexican laborers did not become farmers in the Midwest due to a lack of capital, declining agricultural wages, and their pattern of circular migration. Earlier German immigrants had brought some capital that enabled them to purchase farms. Other European immigrants arrived in the Midwest at the turn of the century when agricultural wages had not yet declined precipitously. They were able to accumulate savings from their wages and eventually purchase land to become farmers. Still others European immigrants moved into industrial occupations. In contrast, Mexican immigrants faced different obstacles and limited opportunities. Unlike earlier European immigrants, Mexican immigrants arrived with little or no savings. Some Mexican sugar beet laborers expressed an interest in purchasing farms, yet none were able to own or even rent a farm. Unsurprisingly, no Mexicans had become farmers by the late 1920s. Declining wages were the principal factor. Mexican immigrants entered the sugar beet labor force during a period when wages were low after a period of sustained decline. Agricultural wages continued dropping throughout the 1920s and were too low for the laborers to

save enough to buy farms or to purchase equipment as tenant farmers.[47] The seasonal wages for adult sugar beet workers in the Upper Midwest had declined by over 30 percent during the 1920s. Subsequently, agricultural laborers witnessed their wages drop by half during the Great Depression.[48] Other Mexican immigrants chose not to purchase farms in the Midwest because they intended to return to Mexico. This pattern of circular migration led some immigrants to invest their meager savings to support their families back in Mexico or to purchase property there.

End of Isolation in the Rural Midwest

Ethnic Mexicans in the rural Midwest experienced isolation during the early twentieth century. The Midwest, unlike the U.S. Southwest, had no native Mexican population, so the Mexican immigrants could not rely on pre-existing social and cultural institutions for support.[49] In an effort to appease local European-American residents, who racialized Mexicans as non-whites who were prone to violence and carried disease, the sugar companies attempted to keep Mexican immigrants residentially segregated from the majority population. Local officials and social workers reinforced these negative characterizations, which led to the exclusion of ethnic Mexicans from churches, restaurants, and theaters.[50] Contributing to the laborers' isolation was their lack of transportation prior to the 1920s. Moreover, because sugar companies relied on immigrant families' labor, local government failed to enforce mandatory school attendance for ethnic Mexican children. As a result, many Mexican immigrant children did not attend or rarely attended school in order to work in the beet fields.[51] Besides interacting with farmers and their supervisors, Mexican farm workers rarely intermingled with local residents, social service representatives, or law enforcement officials. Social workers demonstrated a general lack of concern for immigrant laborers, while white law enforcement officials were responsible for ushering the workers out of local communities at the end of the harvest season.[52]

The lure of higher wages in cities and the availability of affordable automobiles ended the Mexican immigrant workers' isolation in rural communities. After the growing season, immigrant farm workers returned to their previous homes in Mexico or Texas, moved to cities, or, in a few cases, established communities in rural Midwestern towns.[53] Some agricultural workers took part in a circular rural-urban migration. Others decided to settle in urban locales that offered more steady employment. Most immigrant laborers did not expect to remain agricultural workers for long due to the harsh conditions, seasonal nature of the work, and low pay. Railroad maintenance work was better paid and more stable than agricultural labor because it might provide year-round employment. Nevertheless, railroad workers had to travel to repair tracks away from their families who often lived in boxcar communities with few amenities. Factory work was the most desirable option for its high wages, stable employment, and benefits. In small midwestern cities, industrial work included railroad car manufacturing, food processing, farm equipment manufacturing, and cement factories.[54] Some farm workers abandoned the beet fields to seek higher wages and better working conditions in steel, automobile, and meat-packing jobs.[55] Beginning in the 1920s, the availability of mass-produced automobiles ended rural workers' isolation and gave them more freedom. Purchasing an automobile allowed farm workers to more easily leave an abusive employer, seek temporary work in cities, and purchase groceries at alternatives to the local general store. For those who returned to Mexico or Texas, automobiles also permitted them to transport household items, as well as to profit by selling their cars upon their return home.[56]

Urban Workers

Urban industrial jobs attracted migrants to cities like Detroit, Chicago, and Minneapolis. Railroad and industrial employers recruited some migrants directly to cities, while other Mexican migrants moved from rural to urban areas during slowdowns in agricultural labor. Among urban

industrial employers attracting ethnic Mexicans were steel mills, automobile, and meat-packing plants.[57] Like the sugar industry, steel companies used *enganchistas* to recruit laborers along the U.S.-Mexico border.[58] Social networks again functioned as unofficial recruiting mechanisms for steel companies as relatives and friends alerted immigrant workers of job openings and housing options. Higher wages, benefits, and hiring bonuses drew laborers to steel mills in Indiana and Illinois.[59] During the tense labor disputes of the post-World War I period, steel companies recruited ethnic Mexicans, who joined African American migrants from the U.S. South, as strikebreakers.[60] U.S. Steel heavily recruited Mexican immigrants as strikebreakers during the tense 1919 strike in order to avoid hiring too many African Americans after the 1919 race riots in Chicago.[61] This recruitment strategy created racial tensions as striking white ethnic steel workers blamed Mexican immigrants for disrupting their strike while African Americans resented losing jobs to "foreign" workers. As they entered the steel industry, ethnic Mexicans lost the independence that accompanied agricultural labor because they had to adjust to the regimented schedules and routines of industrial jobs.[62] They also moved into dangerous work environments, and lived in neighborhoods strewn with polluted streets, air, and water from the discharges of the steel companies.[63] Nevertheless, the success of steel companies' recruitment strategies was demonstrated by Inland Steel, which became the largest single employer of Mexicans in the nation in the 1920s with a peak employment of 2,526 Mexicans in 1926.[64] Ethnic Mexicans were also drawn to meat packing plants in South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, Illinois, and Minnesota. Laboring in dangerous unskilled jobs, they were subject to injuries as foremen demanded higher output at a faster pace. Despite the dangers, ethnic Mexicans made up about 5.9 percent (1,113 out of 18,714 total) of the work force in Chicago meat packing plants by the late 1920s.[65]

Immigrants who arrived in Midwestern cities often believed their stays would be short because they would eventually return to Mexico. This planned returned migration explains the low

levels of naturalization among Mexican immigrants.[66] However, as families grew with the addition of U.S.-born children, the mixed statuses of various family members placed additional pressure on heads of households to remain in the United States. Industrial employers actively recruited Mexican immigrants to Chicago, where they lived in polluted neighborhoods, labored in menial jobs, and faced discriminatory hiring practices. Ethnic Mexicans not only survived in such bleak conditions, but thrived by establishing businesses, creating social groups, and joining mutual aid societies that supported vibrant ethnic Mexican communities.[67]

Puerto Ricans join Mexicans as Essential Laborers during World War II

World War II created new employment opportunities for Latinos as European Americans left civilian jobs to join the military. For the agricultural industry, the shortage of workers was acute because many rural laborers moved to urban areas. As the war reduced agricultural production in Europe, harvests in the U.S. increased to meet worldwide demand so the need for agricultural workers in the U.S. rose sharply. To address this increased need, the U.S. and Mexico established a guest-worker agreement, the Emergency Farm Labor or Bracero Program, in 1942 that supplied contract male guest workers to the agricultural and railroad industries. While the majority of braceros were sent to work in the U.S. Southwest, some also worked in the agricultural fields of the Midwest.[68] In the aftermath of the war, Puerto Rican contract laborers joined Mexican braceros in the Midwest. As part of "Operation Bootstrap" and as an effort to control the island's "overpopulation," the Puerto Rican government sent male seasonal contract agricultural laborers and female domestic servants to the mainland United States. Until the 1950s, the mainland Puerto Rican communities were concentrated in the U.S. northeast, primarily in New York City. The post-war migration of contract laborers, however, led to the establishment of Puerto Rican

communities in various Midwestern cities including Chicago, Illinois, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Gary, Indiana.

These Midwestern communities provided some of the first opportunities for interactions between ethnic Mexicans and Puerto Ricans. Significantly, these Latinos experienced a similar process of racialization as non-whites and non-blacks in housing, employment, and migration policies.[69] The arrival of Puerto Ricans made the Midwest an example of a region where intra-Latino group processes occurred more frequently than along coastal areas where Latino populations tended to be dominated by Mexicans or Puerto Ricans. The success of managed contract labor migration led Congress to continue the Bracero Program for the agricultural industry after the war's end. Mexico and the U.S. formalized a new agreement, Public Law 78, in 1951 to extend the guest worker program to meet the labor shortages caused by the Korean War. Congress renewed this law continuously until 1964. Although the Bracero Program was supposed to decrease undocumented immigration, the reverse occurred as former braceros often returned to the U.S. as undocumented laborers if they were not selected for another work contract by Mexican officials.[70] They were aided by their previous experience as braceros, in which they acquired social networks, knowledge of potential employers, and familiarity with housing options. Ultimately, the Midwestern agricultural industry's experience with the Bracero Program and Operation Bootstrap demonstrated its increasing dependence on an inexpensive and convenient labor force that continues today.

Immigration Reform and Changing Latino Populations

Two immigration laws significantly transformed the U.S. Latino population beginning in the 1960s. The first was the Immigration Act of 1965, which abolished the national origins quota system established in the 1920s, and created preferences for immigrants who wanted to rejoin

family members in the United States. This immigration law along with the Civil Rights Act (1964) and the Voting Rights Act (1965) represented a "high-water mark in a national consensus of egalitarianism."[71] For a variety of complex reasons, the Immigration Act of 1965 radically reshaped the composition of subsequent immigrants. Under the Johnson-Reed Act (1924), most legal immigrants through the 1950s came from Europe and Canada. By the 1970s, however, half of the immigrants to the U.S. were from Latin America, a third from Asia, and the rest from Europe and Africa.[72] Concurrently, Operation Bootstrap's failure to increase employment in Puerto Rico led to more poverty, displacement, and migration to the U.S. mainland (which averaged 4,200 per year in the decade after World War II).[73] As they arrived in the Midwest, Puerto Ricans joined ethnic Mexicans and African Americans in acculturating to the region as non-white migrants. In addition to confronting struggles over discriminatory practices in employment and housing, they faced obstacles in education, which fueled their civil rights activism.

The second transformative law was the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986, which legalized some 2.3 million undocumented immigrants who had been in the country continuously since 1982 and established employer sanctions. While the U.S. government's enforcement of employer sanctions was spotty, the passage of IRCA signaled a new era in which the U.S. increasingly relied on the militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border to decrease undocumented immigration. This strategy change had the unintended consequences of encouraging undocumented laborers to remain in the U.S. longer, establish permanent residency, and become more regionally dispersed beyond the Southwest. It also changed the immigrants' composition from a seasonal, rural, and predominantly male labor force to a permanent, urban, and increasingly female population.[74] Moreover, after the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994, an increase in U.S. investments in and trade with Mexico led

to the displacement and migration of workers and farmers as markets in Mexico were flooded with lower-priced U.S. imports.[75] Many displaced laborers ended up immigrating to the U.S. where they joined Central Americans who were dislocated by similar economic processes and by their nation's civil wars in the 1970s and 1980s. Over time, these immigrants became essential community members and laborers throughout the nation, while their children absorbed American values, popular culture, and education. In addition to providing their labor to grow the U.S. economy, immigrants contribute more in taxes than they receive in benefits from the U.S. government. For undocumented workers, this pattern is quite pronounced as they contributed an estimated $12 billion net annually to the social security fund in 2010, but will most likely not claim retirement benefits because of their undocumented status.[76] Ultimately, both immigration reform laws (1965 and 1986) have led to a surge in U.S.-based families with undocumented members, and to the growth of the Latino population. NAFTA's enactment as well as the neoliberal policies adopted by Mexican and Central American governments spurred high levels of migration during the last third of the twentieth century. Unsurprisingly, the Latino population grew mostly through immigration from 1980 to 2000, but has since grown mainly as a result of native births as tougher border enforcement and hostile immigration laws have been implemented.[77] The increases in border enforcement have made international circular migration more expensive and dangerous so many undocumented migrants have lengthened their stays and remained in the United States.

The arrival of various Latino subgroups in the Midwest has made the region an exemplary location for the development and growth of Intralatina/os. Beginning in the 1970s, Central Americans, South Americans, and Caribbean immigrants began joining Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in various Midwestern cities. As they lived and worked alongside each other, they established relationships and in some cases, intermarried, with other Latinos. Intermarriage led to

the establishment of new Latino identities as the offspring of Mexican and Puerto Rican parents began identifying as MexiRicans or PuertoMexes.[78] Similarly, children with Bolivian and Cuban parents created new identities, and often foregrounded one national identity over another depending on social context. Others experienced the silencing of one of their national identities (e.g., Bolivian over Cuban) as their parents tended to socialize with one parents' families and not the other. In addition to navigating and negotiating among their different nationalities and cultures, Latinos of mixed ancestry often had to confront relative racializations within their communities. Children of Mexican and Puerto Rican parents often experienced the subordination of Puerto Rican identity because it is associated with darker skin. These Intralatina/os had to contend with ideas about race and skin color common in both Latin America and in the United States.[79]

Latina/o Demographic Growth

The growth of the Latino population has significantly influenced demographics and culture as they have become the nation's largest minority group. The Latino population, some 50.5 million in 2010, was responsible for more than half (56%) of the nation's growth between 2000 and 2010. By 2018, Latinos made up 18.3% (59.9 million) of the nation's population, and most lived in one of nine states with long-standing Latino communities, including Illinois.[80] Over the last three decades, the population has become more geographically dispersed as some regions have experienced phenomenal growth. For example, while the nation's Latino population grew by 43 percent from 2000 to 2010, it increased by more than 73 percent in eight of twelve Midwestern states. In 2018, Latinos make up 7.7% of the region's population, and are the largest minority population in Iowa, Illinois, and several other states in the region. Latino migrants to the Midwest include immigrants fleeing wars, poverty, and drug violence in Mexico and Central America, as well as Mexican American and Puerto Rican migrants escaping unemployment, gang violence,

and the high-cost of living in major metropolitan coastal areas.[81] While many Latinos were attracted by urban jobs, others settled in rural towns where the deunionization of the meatpacking industry has created economic opportunities for immigrants willing to work for non-union wages. Latinos are overrepresented in nonunion jobs, which are often dangerous and poorly paid.[82] Over the past several decades, deindustrialization in the Midwest has been accompanied by a restructuring of the economy, fueling the growth of service and construction jobs, which attracted more Latinos.[83] The "Latinoization" of the nation has created specific challenges in the Midwest where the continuous out-migration of white youth to urban locales has left behind an aging low-growth population in small towns.[84] Latino workers, who provide the labor for industrial and service industries, increasingly maintain a comfortable standard of living for older white Midwesterners. The integration of Latina/o migrants is especially important in order to diffuse tensions and fears that the newcomers are changing the "traditional" characteristics of cities and towns. The Latino population growth is particularly significant in the Midwest. According to the 2010 U.S. census, for example, Latinos accounted for all of the population growth in Illinois, and their growth in Michigan helped stem the state's declining population.[85]

As their numbers have grown, Latinos have gradually influenced the social and cultural activities of the Midwest. While large cities like Chicago and Detroit have long-standing Puerto Rican and Mexican neighborhoods with restaurants, nightclubs, and grocery stores catering to Spanish-speaking customers, the dispersal of Latinos have brought their influence into rural towns. This influence is evident in the growing number of Mexican and Salvadoran restaurants, Spanish-language newspapers, *tienditas* (small grocery stores), music festivals and radio stations, as well as the increasing popularity of soccer.[86] *Quinceañeras* (15-year-old girl's birthday celebrations) are routinely celebrated in local churches, while local fairgrounds are sites of annual *jaripeos* (Mexican rodeos).[87] Religious life has also changed as Catholic churches now

consistently offer Spanish-language services, and the region's Protestant denominations have expanded their outreach among Latinos.[88]

The demographic growth of Latinas/o has had a large impact on public schools and in higher education. In 2011, Latino students make up 24.7% of K-12 students in public schools across the nation.[89] Latinos in Iowa are the largest and fastest-growing ethnic minority population in the public schools. From 1985 to 2005, the number of Latino students in Iowa's public K-12 schools grew by nearly 600 percent.[90] Such rapid demographic changes have created unique challenges for school districts, which are trying to serve a growing immigrant population. In higher education, the number of 18-24 year-old Latinos attending college surged to a high of 2.1 million students in 2011.[91] Because Latinos are now the largest minority enrolled in the nation's college campuses, university administrators have a great opportunity to address this growing population by adding Latina/o studies courses to the curriculum, hiring additional Latina/o studies faculty, and creating programs to improve Latina/o students' graduation rates. The increasing Latino population in the Midwest impacts regional politics, as is evident in ongoing debates about voter registration, immigration policy, and language acquisition. Latino history, acculturation, and political involvement are therefore relevant and timely topics for university students and faculty seeking to understand the changing profile of the Midwest and Midwestern Latina/o Studies.

ENDNOTES

[1] I use the term "ethnic Mexicans" to refer to people with Mexican ancestry regardless of citizenship status, "Mexican immigrants" for citizens of Mexico living in the United States, "Mexican Americans" for U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry, and "Latinos" as an umbrella term for people of various ancestries originating in Latin America.
[2] Juan Marinez interview in Louis G. Mendoza, *Conversations Across Our America: Talking About Immigration and the Latinoization of the United States* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012), 46-52.
[3] According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the Midwest region consists of: Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. http://www.census.gov/geo/maps-data/maps/pdfs/reference/us_regdiv.pdf Accessed May 22, 2014.
[4] Aidé Acosta, "Reshaping the Rural Heartland: Immigration and the Migrant Cultural Practice in Small-Town America," in in Omar Valerio-Jiménez, Santiago Vaquera-Vásquez, and Claire F. Fox, eds., *The Latina/o Midwest Reader* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2017), 64-65.
[5] "A Court Interpreter Reflects on the Arrests of Undocumented Guatemalan Workers in Iowa, 2008," in Omar Valerio-Jiménez and Carmen Whalen, eds., *Major Problems in Latina/o History* (Boston: Cengage/Wadsworth: 2014), 469-472. A documentary on the Postville raid and its impact on white and Latino Iowans is "Abused: The Postville Raid."
[6] According to the Department of Homeland Security, the Obama administration deported over 3.4 million people from 2008 to 2016, with a peak of 433,034 deportations in 2013. "Table 39. Aliens Removed or Returned: Fiscal Years 1892 to 2016," https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/yearbook/2016/table39 Accessed February 29, 2020.
[7] The term "mixed-status families" refers to families in which members have different immigration statuses, for example, some might be U.S. citizens, others permanent residents, and still others undocumented workers.
[8] David G. Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants, and the Politics of Ethnicity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 44-45; Zaragosa Vargas, *Proletarians of the North: A History of Mexican Industrial Workers in Detroit and the Midwest, 1917-1933* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 25-26; Dennis Nodín Valdés, "Settlers, Sojourners, and Proletarians: Social Formation in the Great Plains Sugar Beet Industry, 1890–1940," *Great Plains Quarterly* 10 (Spring 1990),111-113.
[9] Jeffrey Marcos Garcilazo, *Traqueros: Mexican Railroad Workers in the United States, 1870 to 1930* (Denton, Texas: University of North Texas Press, 2012), 46, 53; Juan R. García, *Mexicans in the Midwest, 1900-1932* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996), 4-6, 11-12; Valdés, "Settlers, Sojourners, and Proletarians,"112-113.
[10] Rob Paral, *Mexican Immigration in the Midwest: Meaning and Implications* (Chicago: Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 2009), Figure 4 – "Mexican Immigrant Populations in the Midwest," 15.
[11] Valdés, "Settlers, Sojourners, and Proletarians," 112-113; Zaragosa Vargas, *Proletarians of the North*, 25-26.
[12] Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors,* 44-45; Omar S. Valerio-Jiménez, *River of Hope: Forging Identity and Nation in the Rio Grande Borderlands* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013),182–84.
[13] George T. Edson, "Mexicans in the North Central States," *Perspectives in Mexican American Studies* 2 (1989), 105; Kathleen Mapes, "'A Special Class of Labor': Mexican (Im)Migrants, Immigration Debate, and Industrial Agriculture in the Rural Midwest," *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 1:2 (2004), 66-67; Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 24-25; Jim Norris, *North for the Harvest: Mexican Workers, Growers, and the Sugar Beet Industry* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 2009), 26-27.
[14] The total population of 13,490 was from the eight Midwestern states with the largest ethnic Mexican population consisting of Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Paral, *Mexican Immigration in the Midwest*, "Table 4 – Mexican Immigrant Populations in the Midwest," 15.
[15] Lilia Fernandez, *Brown in the Windy City: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Postwar Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 63-64; Michael Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio: The Great Mexican Migration to South Chicago, 1915-1940* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 34-35; Garcilazo, *Traqueros*, 48, 117.
[16] Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 26; Valdés, "Settlers, Sojourners, and Proletarians," 112-113; Edson, "Mexicans in the North Central States," 105, 107.
[17] Garcilazo, *Traqueros,* 116-118.
[18] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 6.
[19] Kathleen Mapes, *Sweet Tyranny: Migrant Labor, Industrial Agriculture, and Imperial Politics* (Urbana Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 148-149; Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors,* 49.
[20] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 54.

[21] Dennis Nodin Valdés, *Al Norte: Agricultural Workers in the Great Lakes Region, 1917-1970* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 8-9; Mapes, *Sweet Tyranny,* 123; Norris, *North for the Harvest,* 27; Camille Guerin-Gonzales, *Mexican Workers and American Dreams: Immigration, Repatriation, and California Farm Labor, 1900-1939* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press), 44.
[22] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 19-21.
[23] Mapes, *Sweet Tyranny,* 129-130, 142. Mexican immigrants who deserted their contracts were subject to deportation if caught. In 1920, Iowa officials imprisoned some 40 Mexicans (including women and children) in the Polk County jail, and subsequently deported them, for deserting the beet fields of northern Iowa. *The Denison Review* (Denison, Iowa), September 1, 1920, <http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84038095/1920-09-01/ed-1/seq-8/>. Officials also deported Mexican immigrants who arrived in Fort Dodge but refused to work in the beet fields and sought work elsewhere. *Evening-Times Republican* (Marshalltown, Iowa), July 27, 1920, *<http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85049554/1920-07-27/ed-1/seq-10/>*.
[24] Paul Spickard, *Almost All Aliens: Immigration, Race, and Colonialism in American History and Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 277-282; Vargas, *Al Norte,* 10.
[25] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 15.
[26] Garcilazo, *Traqueros,* 56, 59.
[27] Edson, "Mexicans in North Central States," 105; Dennis Nodín Valdés, *Barrios Norteños: St. Paul and Midwestern Mexican Communities in the Twentieth Century* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000), 28-29, 81; García, "Mexican Room," 57-58; Frank Tobias Higbie, "Rural Work, Household Subsistence, and the North American Working Class: A View from the Midwest," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 65 (Spring 2004), 54-56.
[28] Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio,* 30; Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 39-40; García, *Mexicans in the Midwest*, 6-8.
[29] Edson, "Mexicans in Fort Madison, Iowa," 1927; Garcilazo, *Traqueros,* 50.
[30] García, "Mexican Room," 66.
[31] Edson, "Mexicans in Fort Madison, Iowa," 1927; Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio*, 34-35, 40.
[32] Edson, "Mexicans in Fort Madison, Iowa," 1927; García, "Mexican Room," 66; This white female observer omitted any mention of white and African American men using aliases to cheat on their wives.
[33] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 7-8; Garcilazo, *Traqueros,* 37.
[34] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest*, 5, 21-24, 34-35; Valdés, *Al Norte*, 10-18.
[35] Zaragosa Vargas, "Armies in the Fields: The Mexican Working Classes in the Midwest in the 1920s," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 7:1 (Winter 1999): 52; Valdés, "Settler, Sojourners, and Proletarians," 111–14; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 11.
[36] In the 1980s, Mexican migrants continued to note the "stable jobs and a calm exurban atmosphere" of Midwestern states like Indiana as reasons for skipping settling in the U.S. Southwest to settle in the Midwest. Sujey Vega, *Latino Heartland: Of Borders and Belonging in the Midwest* (New York: New York University Press, 2015), 30, 38.
[37] Valdés, *Barrios Norteños,* 26; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 11.
[38] Marc Simon Rodriguez, *The Tejano Diaspora: Mexican Americanism and Ethnic Politics in Texas and Wisconsin* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 4; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 9, 11.
[39] Valdés, *Al Norte,* 12-15.
[40] Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 29; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 13, 15.
[41] Valdés, *Al Norte,* 13-15.
[42] Mapes, *Sweet Tyranny*, 122-123.
[43] Valdes, *Barrios Norteños*, 52-53; García, "Mexican Room," 55.
[44] For a similar discussion of Mexicans' in-between racial status in Chicago, see Fernandez, *Brown in the Windy City*, 8-13, 16-17; Gabriela Arredondo, *Mexican Chicago: Race, Identity, and Nation, 1916-39* (Urbana: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 38, 58-64; Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio*, 26, 53, 71, 89, 94-97.
[45] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 56-57.
[46] Natalia Molina, "The Power of Racial Scripts: What the History of Mexican Immigration Teaches us about Relational Notions of Race," *Latino Studies* 8 (2010): 157.
[47] W.H. Baird, Mason City, in Edson, "Iowa and Wisconsin," George T. Edson Field Reports, 1927; Valdés, "Settlers, Sojourners, and Proletarians," 111-114.
[48] Valdés, *Al Norte,* 18; Valdes, "Settlers, Sojourners, and Proletarians," 114.
[49] Valdés, *Al Norte,* 18, 28.
[50] Omar Valerio-Jiménez, "Racializing Mexican Immigrants in Iowa's Early Mexican Communities," *Annals of Iowa* 74 (Winter 2016), 42; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 18-19.
[51] Zaragosa Vargas, *Crucible of Struggle: A History of Mexican Americans from Colonial Times to the Present Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 195; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 21, 23-24.

[52] Valdés, *Al Norte,* 20.
[53] Valerio-Jiménez, "Racializing Mexican Immigrants," 9-11, 15-16; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 27.
[54] Vargas, "Armies in the Fields and Factories," 56-62, Perry Beeman, "Families recall struggle to survive in search for work," *Des Moines Register*, January 16, 1985.
[55] Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio,* 40-41; García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 33, 40.
[56] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 35; Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 30; Valdés, *Al Norte,* 25.
[57] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 33, 40.
[58] Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio,* 28-29, 39.
[59] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 33; Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio,* 29; Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 41-42.
[60] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 38-42; Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 43.
[61] Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio,* 32-33.
[62] Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 42.
[63] Innis-Jiménez, *Steel Barrio,* 56-58.
[64] García, *Mexicans in the Midwest,* 40; Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 47-48; Francisco A. Rosales and Daniel T. Simon, "Chicano Steel Workers and Unionism in the Midwest, 1919-1945", *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 6:2 (Summer 1975), 267-268.
[65] Paul S. Taylor, *Mexican Labor in the United States,* volume 2 (New York: Arno Press, 1970, [1932]), 37-38; Vargas, *Proletarians of the North,* 48-49.
[66] Michael Innis-Jiménez, "Mexican Workers and Life in South Chicago," in Valerio-Jimenez, et al., eds. *The Latina/o Midwest Reader*, 77.
[67] Innis-Jiménez, "Mexican Workers and Life in South Chicago," 71-84.
[68] The Bracero Program employed approximately 4.8 million Mexicans, often with workers who agreed to multiple contracts over the course of several years. Garcia y Griego, "The Importation of Mexican Contract Laborers to the United States, 1942–1964," in *Between Two Worlds: Mexican Immigrants in the United States*, ed. David Gutiérrez, (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1996), 45–85; Manuel G. Gonzales, *Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 170–75; Omar S. Valerio-Jiménez, "The United States-Mexico Border as Material and Cultural Barrier," in *Migrants and Migration in Modern North America: Cross-Border Lives, Labor Markets, and Politics in Canada, the Caribbean, Mexico, and the United States*, eds. Dirk Hoerder and Nora Faires (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 228–50; Vargas, *Crucible of Struggle*, 263; Marc Rodriguez, *The Tejano Diaspora: Mexican Americanism and Ethnic Politics in Texas and Wisconsin* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 24–36.
[69] Lilia Fernández, "Latina/o Immigration before 1965: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in Postwar Chicago," in Valerio-Jimenez, et al., eds. *The Latina/o Midwest Reader*, 86, 90-92.
[70] Between 1964 and 1986, the number of legal immigrants from Mexico rose from 38,000 to 67,000 per year, while the gross undocumented migration increased from 87,000 to 3.8 million per year. Jorge Durand, Douglas S. Massey, and Emilio A. Parrado, "The New Era of Mexican Migration to the United States," *Journal of American History*, 86:2 (September 1999), 519. The gross undocumented Mexican migration of 3.8 million in 1986 was offset by an even larger number of departures, resulting in an estimated net undocumented in-migration of -340,200, which means that more Mexicans returned to Mexico than arrived in the United States. Between 1964 and 1986, "86% of all Mexican entries were offset by departures," which demonstrates the prevalence of circular migration for Mexican migrants. Douglas S. Massey and Audrey Singer, "New Estimates of Undocumented Mexican Migration and the Probability of Apprehension," *Demography* 32:2 (May 1995), 210.
[71] Rogers Daniels, *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life* (Princeton: Harper Collins, 1990), 338.
[72] Paul Spickard, *Almost All Aliens: Immigration, Race, and Colonialism in American History* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 1965.
[73] Virginia Sánchez-Korrol, "The Historical Narrative," Centro: Center for Puerto Rican Studies, http://centropr.hunter.cuny.edu/education/puerto-rican-studies/story-us-puerto-ricans-part-one Accessed May 13, 2014.
[74] Durand, Massey, and Parrado, "The New Era of Mexican Migration to the United States," 518-536.
[75] David Bacon, *Illegal People: How Globalization Creates Migration and Criminalizes Immigrants* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008), 60-64; David Bacon, "How US Policies Fueled Mexico's Great Migration," The Nation, January 23, 2012, http://www.thenation.com/article/165438/how-us-policies-fueled-mexicos-great-migration# Accessed May 13, 2014.
[76] Shaila Dewan, "Immigration and Social Security," *New York Times,* July 2, 2013. http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/07/02/immigration-and-social-security/ Accessed May 14, 2014.

[77] Pew Research, "Hispanic Nativity Shift," Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2014. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2014/04/29/hispanic-nativity-shift/ Accessed May 14, 2014.
[78] Frances R. Aparicio, "Afterword: Intimate (Trans)Nationals," in Valerio-Jimenez, et al., eds. *The Latina/o Midwest Reader*, 273.
[79] Aparicio, "Afterword: Intimate (Trans)Nationals," 280-281. For a more in-depth analysis of Intralatina/os, see Frances Aparicio, *Negotiating Latinidad: Intralatina/o Lives in Chicago* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2019).
[80] Antonio Flores, Mark Hugo Lopez, and Jens Manuel Krogstad, "U.S. Hispanic population reached new high in 2018, but growth has slowed," Pew Research Center, July 8, 2019, Accessed October 14, 2019. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/08/u-s-hispanic-population-reached-new-high-in-2018-but-growth-has-slowed/
[81] Mendoza, "Conversations Across 'Our America'," 28; Acosta, "Reshaping the Rural Heartland," 59.
[82] Acosta, "Reshaping the Rural Heartland," 60.
[83] Rubén O. Martinez, "Introduction," in Rubén, O. Martinez, ed., *Latinos in the Midwest* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2012), 7.
[84] Several scholars, including Louis Mendoza, have used the term "Latinoization" to refer to the social, economic, and political changes to the nation as a result of the increase in the Latino population. See Louis G. Mendoza, *A Journey Around Our America: A Memoir on Cycling, Immigration, and the Latinoization of the U.S.* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012).
[85] Louis Mendoza, "Conversations across 'Our America': Latinoization and the New Geography of Latinas/os," in Valerio-Jimenez, et al., eds. *The Latina/o Midwest Reader*, 25-39; Pew Research, Hispanic Trends Project, "Mapping the Latino Population, By State, County, and City," Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2013. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/08/29/mapping-the-latino-population-by-state-county-and-city/ Accessed May 11, 2014. "Hispanics Account for More than Half of Nation's Growth in Past Decade," Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2011. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/03/24/hispanics-account-for-more-than-half-of-nations-growth-in-past-decade/ Accessed May 14, 2014.
[86] Louis Mendoza, "Conversations across 'Our America'," 31; Ann V. Millard and Jorge Chapa, "*Aquí* in the Midwest (Here in the Midwest)," in Ann V. Millard and Jorge Chapa, eds., *Apple Pie and Enchiladas: Latino Newcomers in the Rural Midwest* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 1-21; Juan Javier Pescador, "¡Vamos Taximaroa!: Mexican/Chicano Soccer Associations and Transnational/Translocal Communities, 1967-2002," *Latino Studies* 2:3 (2004), 352-376.
[87] Acosta, "Reshaping the Rural Heartland," 59.
[88] Deborah Canter, *Chicago Católico: Making Catholic Churches Mexican* (Chicago: Latinos in Chicago and the Midwest, 2020); Felipe Hinojosa, *Latino Mennonites: Civil Rights, Faith, and Evangelical Culture* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2014); Jane Juffer, *Intimacy Across Borders: Race, Religion, and Migration in the U.S. Midwest* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013); Ken R. Crane and Ann V. Millard, "'To Be with My People': Latino Churches in the Rural Midwest," in Millard and Chapa, eds., *Apple Pie and Enchiladas*, 172-195.
[89] Richard Fry and Mark Hugo Lopez, "Hispanic Student Enrollments Reach New Highs in 2011," Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2012. https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2012/08/20/hispanic-student-enrollments-reach-new-highs-in-2011/ Accessed October 14, 2019.
[90] Iowa Department of Education, "A Report on Prekindergarten, Elementary, and Secondary Education in Iowa," Des Moines, Iowa: 2006, 31.
[91] Richard Fry and Mark Hugo Lopez, "Hispanic Student Enrollments Reach New Highs in 2011," Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2012. https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2012/08/20/hispanic-student-enrollments-reach-new-highs-in-2011/ Accessed October 14, 2019.