

# NEW DESTINATIONS



## Mexican Immigration in the United States

**Víctor Zúñiga  
and Rubén Hernández-León,**  
EDITORS

# NEW DESTINATIONS

"*New Destinations* describes, situates, and analyzes the new Mexican settlement in Pennsylvania, Iowa, Kentucky, Georgia, Delaware, Louisiana, Nebraska, North Carolina, and New York City. The editors' informed and scholarly chapters also provide an overview of Mexican dispersion to non-traditional localities. Rich with local detail, the contributors' chapters address the social impact of Mexican settlement, new intergroup relations in impacted places, community formation among Mexicans, and the local economic incorporation of the Mexican immigrants. In the coming decade, as Mexican resettlement continues, their dispersion will move to the top of the research agenda in American ethnic and immigration studies. *New Destinations* is only the beginning of the scholarship, but this volume will mold and inform the debate and discussion that will surely follow. For these reasons, everyone seriously interested in immigration and ethnic studies should read this timely, persuasive, and readable book soon."

—**Ivan Light**, *professor of sociology, University of California, Los Angeles*

"*New Destinations* is the definitive volume that will help map out, conceptually and spatially, the new geography of Mexican immigration in the United States. The story's narrative has gone from a regional to a national one, and the research in this book reveals many lessons about the new social and economic dynamics currently unfolding in the many new points of destination. This is a must read for anyone who aspires to understand the contemporary challenges and promises of Mexican immigration, as well as the changing face of America, from the heartland to the big apple."

—**Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo**, *professor of sociology, University of Southern California*

"The hundred year history of Mexican migration to the United States has involved many twists and turns, but perhaps none quite so unexpected as the development of new migrant destinations, in virtually every part of the United States, and most notably, in communities where immigrants—whether from Mexico or elsewhere—had never been a presence before. Víctor Zúñiga and Rubén Hernández-León have produced a carefully-focused collection of interdisciplinary essays, one that provides the essential background for understanding this newest phase of Mexican migration."

—**Roger Waldinger**, *professor of sociology, University of California, Los Angeles*

## contributors

Ana María Aragonés  
Carl L. Bankston III  
Chiara Capoferro  
Miguel A. Carranza  
Jasney Cogua  
Katharine M. Donato  
Timothy J. Dunn  
Jorge Durand  
Lourdes Gouveia  
Mark A. Grey  
David C. Griffith

Rubén Hernández-León  
Douglas S. Massey  
Marta Miranda  
Brian L. Rich  
George Shivers  
Debra Lattanzi Shutika  
Robert Courtney Smith  
Melissa Stainback  
Anne C. Woodrick  
Víctor Zúñiga

Russell Sage Foundation  
New York, New York  
[www.russellsage.org](http://www.russellsage.org)

ISBN 0-87154-988-3



90000



9 780871 549884



## The Russell Sage Foundation

The Russell Sage Foundation, one of the oldest of America's general purpose foundations, was established in 1907 by Mrs. Margaret Olivia Sage for "the improvement of social and living conditions in the United States." The Foundation seeks to fulfill this mandate by fostering the development and dissemination of knowledge about the country's political, social, and economic problems. While the Foundation endeavors to assure the accuracy and objectivity of each book it publishes, the conclusions and interpretations in Russell Sage Foundation publications are those of the authors and not of the Foundation, its Trustees, or its staff. Publication by Russell Sage, therefore, does not imply Foundation endorsement.

### BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Robert E. Denham, Chair

Alan B. Krueger  
Cora B. Marrett  
Eric Wanner  
Mary C. Waters

Larry V. Hedges  
Jennifer L. Hochschild  
Timothy A. Hultquist  
Kathleen Hall Jamieson  
Melvin Konner

Alan S. Blinder  
Christine K. Cassel  
Thomas D. Cook  
Christopher Edley Jr.  
John A. Ferrejohn

For Constanza, Clara, Nicolás, Aurelio,  
Patricia, Paz, and Jesús—V.Z.

For Olín, Paloma, Janna, Emilia, and Aurelio—R.H.L.

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

New destinations : Mexican immigration in the United States / edited by

Victor Zúñiga and Rubén Hernández-León.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-87154-988-3

1. Mexicans—United States. 2. United States—Emigration and immigration—Economic aspects. 3. United States—Emigration and immigration—Social aspects. 4. Mexico—Emigration and immigration. I. Zúñiga, Victor. II. Hernández-León, Rubén.

E184.M5N36 2005

331.6'272073—dc22

2004058801

Copyright © 2005 by Russell Sage Foundation. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Reproduction by the United States Government in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose.

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials. ANSI Z39.48-1992.

Text design by Genna Patacsil.

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

112 East 64th Street, New York, New York 10021

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1



# CONTENTS



	Contributors	ix
	Introduction	xi
Chapter 1	<i>Vicior Zúñiga and Rubén Hernández-León</i> The New Geography of Mexican Immigration <i>Jorge Durand, Douglas S. Massey,</i> <i>and Chiara Capoferro</i>	1
PART I		
Chapter 2	PROCESSES OF IMMIGRANT COMMUNITY FORMATION AND ECONOMIC INCORPORATION  The Great Plains Migration: Mexicanos and Latinos in Nebraska <i>Lourdes Gouveia, Miguel A. Carranza,</i> <i>and Jasney Cogua</i>	23
Chapter 3	Rural Industry and Mexican Immigration and Settlement in North Carolina <i>David C. Griffith</i>	50
Chapter 4	The Economic Incorporation of Mexican Immigrants in Southern Louisiana: A Tale of Two Cities <i>Katharine M. Donato, Melissa Stainback,</i> <i>and Carl L. Bankston III</i>	76

PART II	LOCAL IMPACTS AND REACTIONS FROM ESTABLISHED RESIDENTS	
Chapter 5	Bridging the Community: Nativism, Activism, and the Politics of Inclusion in a Mexican Settlement in Pennsylvania <i>Debra Lattanzi Shutika</i>	103
Chapter 6	"Latinos Have Revitalized Our Community": Mexican Migration and Anglo Responses in Marshalltown, Iowa <i>Mark A. Grey and Anne C. Woodrick</i>	133
Chapter 7	Recent Mexican Migration in the Rural Delmarva Peninsula: Human Rights Versus Citizenship Rights in a Local Context <i>Timothy J. Dunn, Ana María Aragonés and George Shivers</i>	155
PART III	INTERGROUP RELATIONS: CONFLICT AND ACCOMMODATION BETWEEN NEWCOMERS AND ESTABLISHED RESIDENTS	
Chapter 8	The Sociopolitical Dynamics of Mexican Immigration in Lexington, Kentucky, 1997 to 2002: An Ambivalent Community Responds <i>Brian L. Rich and Marta Miranda</i>	187
Chapter 9	Racialization and Mexicans in New York City <i>Robert Courtney Smith</i>	220
Chapter 10	Appalachia Meets Aztlán: Mexican Immigration and Intergroup Relations in Dalton, Georgia <i>Rubén Hernández-León and Víctor Zúñiga</i>	244
	Index	275

## CONTRIBUTORS



**RUBÉN HERNÁNDEZ-LEÓN** is assistant professor of sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles.

**VÍCTOR ZÚNIGA** is dean of the School of Education and Humanities at the Universidad de Monterrey.

**ANA MARÍA ARAGONÉS** is professor in the Department of Economics at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), Acatlán.

**CARL L. BANKSTON III** is professor and director of Graduate Studies in the Department of Sociology at Tulane University.

**CHIARA CAPOFERO** is manager of the Mexican Migration Project of the Office of Population Research at Princeton University.

**MIGUEL A. CARRANZA** is associate professor of sociology and ethnic studies and director of the Institute for Ethnic Studies at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

**JASNEY COGUA** is a doctoral student of comparative sociology at Florida International University.

**KATHARINE M. DONATO** is associate professor of sociology at Rice University and associate professor in behavioral sciences at the University of Texas School of Public Health.

**TIMOTHY J. DUNN** is associate professor in the Sociology Department, Fulton School of Liberal Arts, Salisbury University.

**JORGE DURAND** is professor and senior research investigator in the Department for the Study of Social Movements at the University of Guadalajara.

# CHAPTER 1



## THE NEW GEOGRAPHY OF MEXICAN IMMIGRATION

JORGE DURAND, DOUGLAS S. MASSEY, AND CHIARA CAPOFERRO

Mexican immigration has never been spread evenly across the United States. Historically, a few key states, mostly in the southwest, attracted the large majority of immigrants from Mexico. This pattern of regional concentration was partly a matter of geography, of course. The four states that border Mexico—California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas—naturally assumed greater importance than others, in part because until 1848 they were part of Mexico. Even among border states, however, geography wasn't everything. Some states consistently outdrew others. One nonborder state, for example, Illinois, has for many years been an important destination. Economic and political factors have also played significant roles.

What we undertake here is a descriptive analysis of the changing geography of Mexican immigration to the United States using representative census and survey data. Beginning early this century and continuing up to the present, we focus on four key periods: the classic era of open immigration before the restrictive policies of the 1920s; the Bracero era of 1942 to 1964, when the United States sponsored a large temporary worker program; the undocumented era, between the end of the Bracero Program and the passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA); and the post-IRCA era, from 1987 to the present.

The post-IRCA period has been one of notable change in the forces that promote and sustain Mexico-U.S. migration. First, the border has been selectively militarized (Dunn 1996; Andreas 2000; Nevins 2002). In the fifteen years leading up to 2000, the number of border patrol

officers increased by 368 percent and the agency's budget increased by a factor of six. The expansion of the border patrol gathered particular force in the 1990s with the launching of Operation Blockade in El Paso in 1993 and Operation Gatekeeper in Tijuana in 1994. The selective hardening of the border in these two sectors deflected migratory flows away from the most popular destinations and toward crossing points in Arizona and New Mexico (Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002).

At the same time that the militarization of the San Diego-Tijuana border drove up the costs of a California crossing, that state became relatively much less attractive as a potential destination. The post-Cold War recession hit southern California's economy particularly hard, raising rates of unemployment among both immigrants and natives and tarnishing the lure of U.S. jobs. The recession was also accompanied by an anti-immigrant backlash that culminated in the passage of Proposition 187 in 1994. This initiative sought to ban undocumented migrants from receiving public social services and required state and local officials to both verify a client's immigration status and report suspected undocumented migrants to INS officials. The rise in native hostility and the withering of economic opportunity combined to make California much less attractive a destination than it had been.

A third change stemmed from IRCA's legalization programs, which ultimately granted legal permanent residence to some 2.3 million Mexicans between 1988 and 1992, the large majority of whom lived in California (Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002). In other words, just as political and economic conditions for Mexico were deteriorating in California, millions of Mexican migrants received green cards that allowed them freedom of mobility. Kristin Neuman and Marta Tienda (1994) documented a clear pattern of geographic mobility by newly legalized migrants away from areas of Mexican concentration. With documents in hand, they were suddenly free to leave historical Mexican enclaves in search of better opportunities elsewhere (Durand, Massey, and Parrado 1999).

Finally, while the recession was slow to end in California the rest of the country quickly entered a sustained boom, which by the mid-1990s produced tight labor markets, rising wages, and improving work conditions in other regions. In the Midwest, northeast, and southeast, *New York Times* correspondent Louis Uchitelle pointed out, regions that had never experienced significant immigration from Mexico, unemployment rates fell to record low levels, generating a sustained demand for unskilled and semi-skilled workers, whose real wages rose for the first time since 1973 (May 23, 1997).

During the latter half of the 1990s, therefore, an unusual constella-

tion of factors came together to push Mexican migrants away from traditional gateways in general and from California in particular: a dramatic increase in the costs and risks of border-crossing in San Diego, a deterioration of the Californian economy, a nasty anti-immigrant political mobilization there, the sudden granting of freedom of mobility to millions of former undocumented migrants, and the emergence of strong labor demand throughout the country. After describing our data and using them to describe historical patterns of Mexico-U.S. migration, we show the effect of these structural changes on the geography of Mexican immigration during the 1990s.

## DATA AND METHODS

Our analysis relies on two basic data sources. The first is the Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples (IPUMS), a machine-readable file of public use samples of individual records from the U.S. censuses of 1900 to 1920 and 1940 to 1990, prepared by Steven Ruggles and Matthew Sobek (1997). These data are publicly available online at <http://www.ipums.umn.edu>. For each census year, we selected records for all persons born in Mexico. The number of such records was too small in 1900 to sustain reliable analysis, so we dropped that year from consideration, yielding an IPUMS-based dataset from 1910 to 1990, excluding the census of 1930 (its manuscripts having not yet been released into the public domain).

Our second source of data is the March supplement of the year 2000 Current Population Survey (CPS), which included a question on place of birth as part of its demographic module. The CPS is a representative household survey of the noninstitutionalized civilian population of the United States. Because we anticipated significant shifts in Mexican immigration as a result of economic and political changes during the 1990s, and given that the census only occurs once per decade, we sought to use the CPS to capture late-breaking developments. As with the IPUMS, we selected all persons born in Mexico to measure the population of Mexican immigrants.

For the period 1910 to 1960, we tabulated foreign-born Mexicans by state of U.S. residence to view the overall geographic distribution of immigration during the classic and Bracero eras. For the period 1970 to 2000 we also present these distributions; but because the geographic distribution of all immigrants in any year is heavily influenced by the behavior of those in the past, we developed an alternative set of tabulations for recent immigrants—those who entered the United States dur-



ing the five years prior to the census or survey. We also consider trends in the distribution of Mexican immigrants by metropolitan area since 1990.

For all geographic distributions, we compute Henri Theil's (1972) entropy index to summarize the diversity of destinations (henceforth the diversity index):

$$E = \frac{-\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log(p_i)}{\log(n)} \times 100$$

where  $n$  is the number of categories (for example, states) and  $p_i$  is the proportion of people in category  $i$  (for example, state  $i$ ). The index varies between 0 and 100. Minimum diversity occurs when all people are concentrated in one category and maximum diversity occurs when each category contains exactly the same number of people (see White 1986).

### IMMIGRATION IN THE CLASSIC ERA

Table 1.1 presents the distribution of foreign-born Mexicans by state of residence in two historical epochs: the classic era of open immigration (based on the censuses of 1910 and 1920) and the subsequent Bracero era of U.S.-sponsored labor migration (drawing on the censuses of 1940, 1950, and 1960).

The top panel shows the distribution of immigrants among gateway states. As can be seen, during the classic era about half of all Mexican immigrants were in Texas, with the percentage falling slightly between 1910 and 1920 (going from 55 percent to 50 percent). The next closest state is California, which increased from 17 percent to 22 percent over the decade, followed by Arizona, which stayed relatively stable between the two census dates (increasing just two points, from 12 percent to 14 percent). A small but declining number of Mexican immigrants lived in New Mexico, comprising just 3 percent of the total in 1920. Illinois had not yet emerged as a significant destination for Mexican immigration, accounting for less than 1 percent of all Mexican immigrants at both points in time.

During the classic era, therefore, Mexican immigrants flowed primarily to Texas, California, and Arizona. Together, these states absorbed roughly 85 percent of all Mexico-U.S. migrants, with nongateway states getting just 11 percent. The distribution of immigrants among the six categories clearly moved toward greater diversity be-

TABLE 1.1 Distribution of Mexican Immigrants by State of Residence: 1910 to 1960

State	Classic Era			Bracero Era		
	1910	1920	1960	1940	1950	1960
All immigrants						
Gateway states						
Arizona	11.8%	14.1%	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%	6.3%
California	16.9	21.6	35.6	34.0	41.9	41.9
Illinois	0.3	0.8	2.5	2.6	4.8	4.8
New Mexico	4.5	3.2	4.2	2.1	1.8	1.8
Texas	55.2	49.9	39.5	44.5	35.9	35.9
Other states	11.2	10.5	11.1	10.2	9.4	9.4
Diversity index	71.6	74.8	77.8	73.5	75.2	75.2
Sample n	947	2,380	4,178	6,818	5,838	5,838
Immigrants in nongateway states						
Colorado	9.4%	29.2%	15.8%	11.2%	11.2%	11.2%
Florida	5.7	0.4	0.4	2.0	2.0	2.0
Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.2
Idaho	0.0	0.8	1.1	1.2	0.9	0.9
Indiana	0.0	0.0	4.5	6.5	8.8	8.8
Iowa	1.9	2.0	3.9	4.6	2.0	2.0
Kansas	63.2	24.4	18.6	12.0	5.7	5.7
Michigan	0.0	0.8	6.3	14.4	10.3	10.3
Minnesota	0.0	1.6	3.2	1.9	1.5	1.5
Missouri	6.6	2.4	3.0	2.3	3.9	3.9
Nevada	0.9	2.4	1.3	1.3	1.8	1.8
New Jersey	0.9	0.4	0.9	1.3	1.5	1.5
New York	2.8	8.0	9.1	5.8	13.0	13.0
North Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.4
Oklahoma	4.7	5.6	2.2	1.9	1.7	1.7
Oregon	1.9	1.2	1.5	0.7	0.9	0.9
Pennsylvania	0.0	1.6	1.7	3.2	2.9	2.9
Utah	0.0	5.2	3.2	3.6	2.8	2.8
Washington	0.0	2.4	0.4	3.2	11.5	11.5
Other	2.0	11.6	22.1	22.9	17.0	17.0
Diversity index	47.1	70.9	79.3	82.0	84.9	84.9
Sample n	106	250	463	694	546	546

Source: 1910-1960 Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample.

tween 1910 and 1920, however, as relative numbers in Texas dropped while those in Arizona and California increased, yielding a more even distribution and a slight increase in the diversity index from 72 to 75.

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Mexico experienced a period of political peace and sustained economic expansion under President Porfirio Díaz (1876 to 1910). Under his rule, Mexico acquired a nationwide rail system, a nascent industrial base, growing urban centers, and a new economic structure based on export agriculture and extraction, financed mainly by foreign interests (see Hart 1987; Haber 1989). The Porfirian boom was accompanied by the consolidation of rural landholding, the substitution of cash for staple crops, and the widespread implementation of capital-intensive agriculture. These developments produced massive labor displacements and strong pressure for emigration from rural areas, forces that were exacerbated by the collapse of the Porfirian regime in 1910 and the inauguration of ten years of revolution and civil war (Cardoso 1980; Hart 1987).

In the western United States, meanwhile, the arrival of the railroads connected agricultural and mining areas in the southwest to booming industrial cities in the northeast and midwest, yielding sustained economic growth and rapid growth in labor demand. As the demand for workers grew, traditional sources were progressively closed off, first by the Chinese Exclusion Acts of the 1880s and then by the Gentlemen's Agreement with Japan in 1907 (Keely 1979). In response, U.S. railroads, agricultural growers, and mining companies began recruiting Mexican workers (Durand and Arias 2000).

The integration of the Mexican and U.S. rail systems (financed by the same American interests) provided the link to connect labor supply with demand, and recruiters followed the tracks into Mexico to initiate the first waves of migration to the United States (Cardoso 1980). By the 1920s, the flows became a "floodtide" as first World War I, then the creation of the Soviet Union, and finally the imposition of restrictive quotas cut industrialists off from traditional European labor sources (Massey 1996).

The effects of these macro-level forces are evident in the shifting distribution of Mexican immigrants between 1910 and 1920. Texas was the state most closely tied to Porfirian economic development (Hart 1987); but by 1920 California had emerged as the new economic power in the west, and Los Angeles, rather than San Antonio, had become the principal center of Mexican settlement north of the border. Thus, we observe an increasing percentage of immigrants located in California

accompanied by a decreasing percentage in Texas between 1910 and 1920.

Although small sample sizes in nongateway states caution against drawing strong conclusions, we see that other salient destinations early in the century were Colorado and Kansas, both containing important rail junctions and industrial centers (Kansas City and Denver), reflecting the growing importance of Mexicans as rail and factory workers (Cardoso 1980).

### THE GEOGRAPHY OF BRACERO MIGRATION

The last three columns of table 1.1 show the geographic distribution of Mexicans at points before, during, and just after the peak of the Bracero Program in the 1950s. Following the surge of Mexican immigration during the 1920s, the onset of the Great Depression triggered a wave of mass deportations and the population of foreign-born Mexicans fell during the 1930s (Hoffman 1974). By 1942, however, tight wartime labor markets had replaced the joblessness of the late depression and the United States once again turned to Mexico for workers, negotiating an agreement known as the Bracero Accords to arrange the annual importation of Mexican farmworkers under supervision of the U.S. government (Craig 1971). Although enacted as a "temporary" wartime measure, it was successively renewed and expanded for twenty-two years before finally being terminated in 1964 (Calavita 1992).

The Bracero years coincided with an unprecedented boom in California that dramatically increased labor demand in all economic sectors. Within Mexico, meanwhile, post-revolutionary governments distributed millions of hectares of land to peasants but failed to provide sufficient capital to allow them to begin producing, generating intense needs for cash among rural dwellers (Massey et al. 1987). The Mexican policy of import substitution industrialization yielded high rates of industrial growth in urban areas but failed to provide enough jobs for the rising tide of rural in-migrants (Hansen 1971). With pressures for out-migration building and a program in place to connect the burgeoning supply with rising demand, Mexicans quickly came to dominate farm labor within California and made significant inroads into manufacturing and service industries as well.

The geographic distribution of Mexican immigrants in 1940 illustrates the effect of forces in play ten years earlier, at the onset of the Great Depression. Given the emigration of Mexicans during the 1930s

and the absence of new arrivals in the interim, the geographic distribution prevailing in the late 1920s was essentially frozen in time. Although California represented a major locus of settlement on the eve of the Bracero Program, containing just over a third of all Mexican immigrants in 1940, it was still second to Texas, which contained 40 percent. But during the 1920s and 1930s, Illinois had also emerged as a gateway state, although still containing only a small share of all Mexican immigrants (2.5 percent). Compared with 1920, Arizona declined substantially in importance (to 7 percent) while New Mexico and the "other" category stayed roughly the same. Given the increase in the share of Mexicans in California and the decrease in Texas, the diversity index rose to nearly 78.

The geographic profile of Mexican immigration changed little between 1940 and 1950. Texas briefly reasserted its dominance as an immigrant destination, increasing its share from 40 percent to 45 percent and lowering the diversity index to 74. California remained roughly constant at 34 percent, and the share attributable to Arizona, Illinois, and other states stabilized. The real change is observed between 1950 and 1960, dates that bracket the largest expansion of the Bracero Program. As late as 1950, only sixty-seven thousand Braceros were imported into the United States; but during the late 1950s the number never fell below four hundred thousand (Calavita 1992). A disproportionate share of these migrants were sent to growers in California, and by 1960 that state had surpassed Texas as home to the largest concentration of Mexican immigrants. From 1950 to 1960, while the percentage of Mexicans in Texas fell sharply from 45 percent to 36 percent, the relative number in California rose from 34 percent to 42 percent. At the same time, the percentage located in Arizona, New Mexico, and other states declined. The era of Californian dominance had begun.

Besides California, only Illinois grew as a destination for Mexican immigrants during the 1950s. By 1960 roughly 5 percent of all Mexican immigrants were located in that state. Nearly all of these migrants went to Chicago, but figures for Illinois alone understate this urban area's importance as an immigrant destination. As the bottom panel of table 1.1 shows, over the period 1940 to 1960 Indiana also increased its salience among nongateway states. The vast majority of these immigrants settled in Chicago suburbs such as East Chicago, Hammond, and Gary, where they worked in the steel mills and factories (see Taylor 1932). When Mexican immigrants to Indiana are added to those in Illinois, the total reaches about 6 percent in 1960.

From 1940 to 1960, the states of Colorado and Kansas, which had

been of some importance for Mexican immigrants in the classic era, faded into obscurity as points of destination. At the same time, Mexican immigration to industrialized states such as Michigan and New York rose, as did the relative importance of Washington, where Mexicans constituted the backbone of its fruit-picking workforce. Among nongateway states, the long-term trend since 1910 has been one of increasing diversity, with the index rising from 47 in 1910 to 85 in 1960. Against this backdrop of diversification among secondary destinations, however, the lasting legacy of the Bracero era was a growing concentration of Mexican immigrants in California.

### IMMIGRATION DURING THE UNDOCUMENTED ERA

The first two columns of table 1.2 show the geographic distribution of Mexican immigrants in the years immediately following the Bracero Program, a period characterized by rapid expansion in Mexican immigration through both legal and illegal channels (Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002) but especially illegal (illegal migrants are, of course, undocumented in the census figures we use). Although the U.S. economy faltered during the 1970s, the demand for unskilled labor continued unabated, and Mexicans expanded their presence in economic niches where they had already established themselves during the Bracero era. In Mexico, the discovery of vast oil reserves set off an economic boom that intensified the desire for income, capital, and security available through U.S. migration.

From 1970 to 1980, California continued to grow in importance as a destination for Mexican immigration. By 1970, a clear majority (53 percent) of foreign-born Mexicans were located in this state, and by 1980 the total reached 57 percent. With the exception of Illinois, which rose from 6 percent to 8 percent, the percentage of Mexican immigrants in all other states fell, with Texas leading the way. As a result of California's growing dominance, the index of diversity among gateway states fell from 75 in 1960 to 71 in 1970 and reached 67 in 1980. At the same time, the percentage of Mexican immigrants in nongateway states fell, although the variety of destinations grew, with the diversity index climbing from 76 in 1970 to 84 in 1980.

### GEOGRAPHIC CHANGES IN THE WAKE OF IRCA

During the era of undocumented migration that prevailed before the passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986,



TABLE 1.2 Distribution of Mexican Immigrants by State of Residence: 1970 to 2000

State	Undocumented Era		Post-IRCA Era	
	1970	1980	1990	2000
All immigrants				
Gateway states				
Arizona	4.5%	3.3%	3.4%	5.9%
California	52.7	57.0	57.8	47.8
Illinois	6.2	7.7	5.2	5.8
New Mexico	0.8	0.8	1.9	1.0
Texas	26.5	22.6	22.1	19.0
Other states	9.4	8.5	10.3	21.1
Diversity index	70.5	67.8	68.6	76.1
Sample n	33,757	22,492	43,116	5,543
Immigrants in nongateway states				
Colorado	6.1%	7.9%	8.5%	10.7%
Florida	3.8	7.6	14.7	11.5
Georgia	0.6	0.4	4.4	3.3
Idaho	1.1	4.0	3.2	2.5
Indiana	6.9	6.0	1.3	1.1
Iowa	1.2	0.9	0.5	2.5
Kansas	4.1	3.0	3.0	2.3
Michigan	10.5	4.9	2.7	1.6
Minnesota	1.2	1.0	0.6	2.9
Missouri	2.4	0.9	1.0	0.6
Nevada	2.0	5.1	8.3	9.7
New Jersey	1.6	1.3	2.3	1.7
New York	7.3	6.3	8.1	8.7
North Carolina	0.5	0.6	1.7	6.8
Oklahoma	1.6	3.7	3.3	1.0
Oregon	2.2	5.5	7.6	6.4
Pennsylvania	2.1	1.6	1.0	0.1
Utah	2.4	2.4	2.8	3.7
Washington	3.0	8.9	11.0	6.6
Other	39.4	28.0	14.0	16.2
Diversity index	76.0	84.2	88.8	88.1
Sample n	3,156	1,916	4,425	1,055

Source: 1970–1990 Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples; 2000 Current Population Survey.

the clear trend in Mexican immigration was one of growing concentration in California, accompanied by a progressive diversification of immigrant destinations among all other states. Although the IRCA passed in late 1986, its various programs and provisions were gradually implemented in the period 1987 through 1989, so trends through the 1980s primarily reflect the pre-IRCA pattern of growing concentration in California and increasing diversification everywhere else. The percentage of foreign-born Mexicans in California peaked at 58 percent in 1990, while the share in Texas bottomed out at 22 percent; the share in other states rose very slightly (see the third column of table 1.2). Among nongateway states, the diversity index reached a high of 89 in 1990.

The full effects of the new regime of immigration were not felt until after 1990, when the IRCA's legalization program was completed and its employer sanctions fully implemented (Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002). As a result of the IRCA's general amnesty and a special legalization program enacted for farmworkers, some 2.3 million Mexicans acquired legal documents between 1987 and 1990 (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service 1991). Roughly 55 percent of those legalized lived in California, and 40 percent were in the southern portion of the state (in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, or San Diego counties).

This massive legalization had two immediate consequences for Mexican immigrants in California: first, it flooded local labor markets (particularly those around Los Angeles) with newly legalized immigrants; and, second, it gave the latter new freedom to move. Where illegal migrants generally seek to find a steady job and hold it, avoiding mobility to minimize the risk of detection, newly legalized immigrants suddenly had full U.S. labor rights and lost their fear of arrest. Not only did they have the freedom to move, other changes provided them with strong incentives to do so, for the legalizations occurred against a backdrop of new employer sanctions, deteriorating economic conditions, and growing hostility toward immigrants in California.

The IRCA for the first time made it illegal for employers to hire undocumented workers, imposing both civil and criminal penalties against those who did. In response, employers shifted to labor subcontractors to satisfy their needs (Martin and Taylor 1991). Subcontractors are typically citizens or legal immigrants who sign a contract with an employer to provide a specific number of workers, for a specified period, to engage in a particular task, at a set fee per worker. By working through a subcontractor, employers avoid the risk of prosecution under IRCA and escape the law's burdensome paperwork requirements. In re-



turn for absorbing these risks and burdens, the subcontractors keep a share of the migrants' earnings, thus lowering the wages of the immigrants themselves (Phillips and Massey 1999). Because enforcement was targeted to sectors known to employ undocumented migrants, the effects of restructuring were naturally greatest in California.

IRCA also increased the budget of the U.S. Border Patrol, and in response it launched a series of repressive crackdowns at the nation's two busiest sectors—San Diego and El Paso (Dunn 1996; Andreas 2000). As a result, flows of undocumented migrants arriving at the Mexico-U.S. border were diverted away from California and Texas toward less intensively patrolled regions in Arizona and New Mexico (Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002).

Just as employer sanctions were putting downward pressure on wages in California's labor markets, moreover, that state experienced a severe economic recession as a result of cutbacks in defense industries stemming from the end of the Cold War. As unemployment rose and wages stagnated, public sentiment turned sharply against immigrants. The anti-immigrant movement culminated in 1994 with the passage of Proposition 187. Passed with massive support from alienated natives, the referendum sought to bar undocumented migrants from receiving publicly provided health, education, and welfare services.

Thus the early 1990s witnessed an unusual coincidence of conditions in California: an IRCA-induced restructuring of immigrant employment toward subcontracting, declining net wages for immigrants, a severe recession and high unemployment, growing native hostility, and greater wage competition triggered by a flood of newly legalized immigrants entering local labor markets. All of these changes occurred precisely at a point in time when vast numbers of former undocumented migrants had acquired new geographic mobility thanks to the IRCA-authorized legalization.

On the heels of these changed circumstances north of the border, Mexico entered a profound economic crisis in December 1994, when a bungled peso devaluation led to a recession that not only created a need for greater income among poor families in traditional immigrant-sending states, but fostered new needs for capital, credit, and security among middle-class households in states that heretofore had not sent many migrants to the United States. As new migrants entered the binational labor market, they naturally sought to avoid the difficult and radically changed circumstances in California.

The end result was a rapid shift of Mexican immigrants away from California toward nontraditional destinations. The changed geography

is clearly observed between 1990 and 2000. In just a decade, the percentage of Mexican immigrants located in California dropped 10 points—from 58 percent to 48 percent. At the same time, in Texas it continued to fall, reaching an all-time low of 19 percent in 2000. In contrast, the relative number of Mexicans rose in most of the other gateway states. The percentage of Mexicans in Arizona went from 3 percent to 5 percent and in Illinois from 5 percent to 6 percent.

More important, the share located in nongateway states more than doubled during the 1990s, reaching the highest percentage in the history of Mexico-U.S. migration: 21 percent. After three decades of declining diversity, the variety of destinations increased dramatically in the early 1990s, with the diversity index going from 69 to 76 in just ten years. Looking at long term increases among nongateway states since 1970, it is clear that new centers of attraction are emerging in Florida, Idaho, Nevada, New York–New Jersey, North Carolina, and elsewhere.

Because the geographic distribution of immigrants at any point in time is heavily conditioned by where earlier cohorts of immigrants decided to settle, table 1.3 replicates the geographic analysis of table 1.2 selecting only Mexican immigrants who arrived in the United States over the prior five years. This table accentuates all of the trends observed earlier and underscores the recency of the geographic transformation. Whereas the large majority (63 percent) of Mexicans who arrived between 1985 and 1990 went to California, among those who arrived between 1995 and 2000 the percentage dropped dramatically to just 35 percent. As a consequence, the diversity index increased from 64 to 79.

At the same time, the percentage going to nongateway states rose from 13 percent to 35 percent, a radical shift unprecedented in the history of Mexico-U.S. migration. By the late 1990s, more than a third of all Mexicans were settling somewhere other than gateway states. Trends since 1970 once again document the emergence of Florida, Idaho, Nevada, New York–New Jersey, and North Carolina as destinations, but also hint at the emergence of Georgia, Iowa, Oregon, and Minnesota as poles of attraction, in addition to the re-emergence of Colorado as a significant receptor. As a result, immigrant destinations are now more diverse than ever.

Table 1.4 further documents this fact by showing the metropolitan area of residence for Mexican immigrants who arrived in the last half of the 1980s and the last half of the 1990s. The numbers going to Los Angeles and San Diego fell between the two periods, but rose for almost

TABLE 1.3 Distribution of Recent Mexican Immigrants  
(Those Arriving in Previous Five Years) Among  
Nongateway States: 1970 to 2000

State	Undocumented Era			Post-IRCA Era	
	1970	1980	1990	1990	2000
<b>All recent immigrants</b>					
<b>Gateway states</b>					
Arizona	4.4%	2.6%	3.7%		6.2%
California	59.0	58.7	62.9		35.4
Illinois	8.2	8.7	4.9		6.1
New Mexico	0.5	0.6	0.9		0.8
Texas	20.7	20.6	14.9		16.4
Other states	7.4	8.7	12.8		35.3
Diversity index	66.9	66.3	64.2		78.8
Sample n	4,042	7,173	12,795		1,055
<b>Recent immigrants in nongateway states</b>					
Colorado	4.0%	9.5%	6.5%		12.1%
Florida	8.4	8.8	15.7		13.0
Georgia	0.3	0.0	7.0		3.0
Idaho	0.3	5.9	3.3		1.3
Indiana	8.4	3.4	0.6		0.2
Iowa	0.3	0.3	0.1		4.3
Kansas	0.3	3.5	1.9		1.0
Michigan	5.7	2.9	1.3		1.5
Minnesota	0.3	1.9	0.8		1.3
Missouri	0.3	0.5	1.0		0.0
Nevada	3.0	6.5	6.6		7.1
New Jersey	3.7	1.3	3.8		0.0
New York	8.4	7.5	10.9		7.5
North Carolina	0.7	0.5	2.4		11.2
Oklahoma	0.3	3.8	3.0		0.0
Oregon	1.4	5.1	9.0		6.9
Pennsylvania	2.4	2.4	1.2		0.0
Utah	1.4	2.1	2.7		4.0
Washington	1.7	10.5	10.7		5.6
Other	48.7	23.8	11.5		19.9
Diversity index	64.6	84.6	87.3		80.9
Sample n	297	627	1,643		462

Source: 1970-1990 Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples; 2000 Current Population Survey.

TABLE 1.4 Distribution of Recent Mexican Immigrants  
(Those Arriving in Previous Five Years)

Metropolitan Area	Recent Mexican Migrants	
	1990	2000
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County	32.9%	17.0%
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha	4.3	5.9
New York-Northern New Jersey	4.9	2.5
Houston-Galveston	3.2	2.7
Phoenix	2.0	4.6
Dallas-Fort Worth	1.6	6.7
Las Vegas	0.5	2.3
Denver-Boulder-Golden	0.5	3.6
McAllen-Edinburg	1.3	1.0
Salinas-Seaside-Monterrey	0.8	1.4
Fresno	1.4	1.6
Albuquerque	0.2	0.1
San Diego	4.4	2.3
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose	3.0	5.9
Brownsville-Harlingen	1.0	0.3
Bakersfield	0.9	1.1
El Paso	1.8	0.9
Minneapolis	0.1	0.5
Visalia-Tulare	1.1	1.2
Other metro area	23.2	30.0
Diversity index	63.8	79.3
Nonmetro area	10.9	8.5

Source: 1990 Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples; 2000 Current Population Survey.

all other destinations. Thus the percentage going to Los Angeles fell from 33 percent to 17 percent, but to Chicago rose from 4 percent to 6 percent, to San Francisco from 3 percent to 6 percent, and to Phoenix from 2 percent to 5 percent. Although Los Angeles continues to dominate as a pole of attraction for Mexican immigrants, its importance appears to be slipping and newer metropolitan areas are coming to the fore. Although space limitations preclude us from presenting the data, tabulations suggest that this shift away from traditional destinations was not led by a random cross-section of Mexican immigrants, but by

a particular subset of migrants composed predominantly of working-age men working disproportionately in agriculture, who by 2000 were already shifting rapidly into urban jobs where they were joined by growing numbers of women and children (see table 1.5).

## CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis of the changing geography of Mexican immigration from 1910 to 2000 suggests several long-run trends linked to developments in the binational political economy. Early in the century, Mexican immigration was strongly oriented towards Texas, which had stronger financial and material interests in Porfirian Mexico than other U.S. states. As late as 1920, half of all Mexicans living in the United States were in Texas. The unraveling of the Porfirian regime after 1910 coincided with a heightened demand for Mexican workers elsewhere in the United States, and as Mexican immigration surged, destinations shifted, with California and, to a lesser extent, Chicago, emerging as alternative poles of attraction. This epoch came to an abrupt end in 1929 with the onset of the Great Depression.

The creation of the Bracero Program in 1942 and its massive expansion during the 1950s dramatically altered the geographic profile of immigration to the United States. As Texas faded in relative importance, California became the preeminent destination. By 1960, 42 percent of all Mexican immigrants lived in California, 36 percent in Texas, and 6 percent in Illinois or northwest Indiana. The termination of the Bracero Program in 1964 ushered in an era of extensive undocumented migration, during which California increasingly came to dominate among U.S. destinations. By 1990, California alone housed 57 percent of all Mexican immigrants, whereas Texas was home to only 22 percent and Illinois around 5 percent (6 percent including migrants in Indiana, who were mostly located in Gary). At the end of the 1980s, therefore, the diversity of Mexican immigrants' destinations reached an all-time low.

The Immigration Reform and Control Act broke with the past to establish a new regime of binational migration. The implementation of the act's tough new enforcement provisions coincided with a severe recession in California. The result was an unprecedented deflection of Mexican immigration away from that state toward new destinations that heretofore had received few Mexicans. Among those arriving over the five years prior to 1990 and 2000, the percentage going to California fell from 63 percent to 35 percent.

The new destinations include Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Minnesota, Ne-

TABLE 1.5 Characteristics of Recent (Those Arriving in Previous Five Years) Mexican Immigrants to the United States, 1990 and 2000

Characteristic	1990		2000	
	Gateway California	Non- gateway Other	Gateway California	Non- gateway Other
<b>Geographic<sup>a</sup></b>				
Central city	44.8%	40.5%	59.7%	56.7%
Suburbs	43.0	12.1	40.3	34.9
Nonmetropolitan	12.2	47.4	0.0	8.4
				28.0%
				51.1
				20.8
<b>Demographic</b>				
Age				
Under eighteen	29.8%	35.9%	25.8%	25.1%
Eighteen to sixty-four	69.4	62.6	71.4	74.2
Sixty-five or older	0.8	1.5	2.8	0.8
Average age	21.9	22.1	23.4	25.0
				25.1
				22.9%
				76.2
				0.9
				25.1
Family status				
Male	58.2%	53.3%	52.8%	53.9%
Married	32.9	35.8	34.5	30.3
				61.0%
				26.5
<b>Socioeconomic</b>				
Years of schooling				
Less than twelve	75.7%	77.7%	80.1%	78.0%
Twelve	16.1	12.6	13.8	14.4
Thirteen or more	8.2	9.7	6.1	7.7
				7.9
Labor force <sup>b</sup>				
Employed	82.9%	77.7%	55.3%	65.1%
Unemployed	7.7	8.3	11.7	8.9
Out of labor force	9.4	14.0	33.0	31.0
				69.6%
				6.1
				24.2
<b>Occupation</b>				
Managerial- technical- professional	12.8%	15.4%	2.3%	2.8%
Service workers	23.8	29.9	34.2	37.1
Skilled manual	37.2	32.2	24.8	29.3
Unskilled manual	15.7	15.1	15.1	22.0
Farm workers	10.5	7.4	23.6	8.8
				19.4
Sample n	8,042	3,110	288	305
				462

Sources: 1990 Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples; 2000 Current Population Survey. <sup>a</sup>In about 13 percent of the samples the Central city metropolitan statistical area status code is "not identified." These distributions are based on the other 87 percent of the sample. <sup>b</sup>In the sample, 20.0 percent of the migrants are not in the universe (age fourteen or younger). The distribution of the labor force is based on migrants fifteen years or older.



vada, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Oregon. The movement of Mexicans away from California and Texas was led by young single men of labor force age who worked in agriculture. By the mid-1990s, however, they had already begun moving to cities, where they were joined by growing numbers of women. While the number of Mexican immigrants going to large metropolitan areas in California (Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco) fell during the early 1990s, the number going to New York, Houston, Phoenix, Dallas, Las Vegas, and Minneapolis rose. The diversity of immigrant destinations reached new highs. In a few short years Mexican immigration has been transformed from a narrowly focused process affecting just three states into a nationwide movement.

This transformation has transfigured the political landscape of both countries. As they have put down roots in the United States, Mexican immigrants have come to value political participation as never before. They have begun to participate in its public debates, political organizations, and electoral contests, and ultimately to become important social and political actors on both sides of the border.

The interplay between politics in Mexico and the United States worries officials in both countries, but it is nonetheless a harbinger. Post-IRCA policies in the United States, when combined with political and economic developments occurring under the North American Free Trade Agreement, have had unexpected social, economic, and political consequences. Both Mexican and American authorities now face a mobilized population of Mexican immigrants simultaneously working to defend their rights in the United States while helping to bring about political change in Mexico, and ultimately contributing to greater integration—social, economic, and political—within North America.

## REFERENCES

- Andreas, Peter. 2000. *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Calavita, Kitty. 1992. *Inside the State: The Bracero Program, Immigration, and the I.N.S.* New York: Routledge.
- Cardoso, Lawrence. 1980. *Mexican Emigration to the United States: 1897-1981*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Craig, Richard B. 1971. *The Bracero Program: Interest Groups and Foreign Policy*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Dunn, Timothy J. 1996. *The Militarization of the U.S.-Mexico Border, 1978-1992: Low-Intensity Conflict Doctrine Comes Home*. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas at Austin.
- Durand, Jorge, and Patricia Arias. 2000. *La Experiencia Migrante: Iconografía de la Migración México-Estados Unidos*. Guadalajara: Altexto.
- Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Emilio A. Parrado. 1999. "The New Era of Mexican Migration to the United States." *Journal of American History* 86(2): 518-36.
- Haber, Stephen H. 1989. *Industry and Underdevelopment: The Industrialization of Mexico 1890-1940*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hansen, Roger D. 1971. *The Politics of Mexican Development*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hart, John M. 1987. *Revolutionary Mexico: The Coming and Process of the Mexican Revolution*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hoffman, Abraham. 1974. *Unwanted Mexican Americans in the Great Depression: Repatriation Pressures 1929-1939*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Keely, Charles B. 1979. *U.S. Immigration: A Policy Analysis*. New York: The Population Council.
- Martin, Philip L., and J. Edward Taylor. 1991. "Immigration Reform and Farm Labor Contracting in California." In *The Paper Curtain: Employer Sanctions' Implementation, Impact, and Reform*, edited by Michael Fix. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1996. "The New Immigration and the Meaning of Ethnicity in the United States." *Population and Development Review* 21(3): 631-52.
- Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand, and Humberto Gonzales. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Nolan J. Malone. 2002. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Immigration Policy in an Era of Free Trade*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Neuman, Kristin E., and Marta Tienda. 1994. "The Settlement and Secondary Migration Patterns of Legalized Immigrants: Insights from Administrative Records." In *Immigration and Ethnicity: The Integration of America's Newest Immigrants*, edited by Barry Edmonston and Jeffrey Passel. Lanham, Md.: Urban Institute.
- Nevins, Joseph. 2002. *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. New York: Routledge.
- Phillips, Julie A., and Douglas S. Massey. 1999. "The New Labor Market: Immigrants and Wages After IRCA." *Demography* 36(2): 293-46.
- Ruggles, Steven, and Matthew Sobek. 1997. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 2.0*. Minneapolis: Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota.
- Taylor, Paul. 1992. "Mexican Labor in the United States: Chicago and the Calumet Region." In *University of California Publications in Economics*, vol. 7, no. 2, edited by Carl C. Plehn, Ira B. Cross, and Melvin M. Knight. Berkeley: University of California Press.



Theil, Henri. 1972. *Statistical Decomposition Analysis*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1991. *1990 Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

White, Michael J. 1986. "Segregation and Diversity: Measures in Population Distribution." *Population Index* 52(2): 198-221.

## PART I



PROCESSES OF IMMIGRANT  
COMMUNITY FORMATION AND  
ECONOMIC INCORPORATION