

SHRUGGING ATLAS: THE BOX BILLS AND U.S. ATTITUDES
REGARDING MEXICAN MIGRATION IN THE 1920s

by

George N. Otey

At the base of the agricultural pyramid stands the Mexican; and as transportation and manufacturing depend upon agriculture, he is the Atlas who supports the industrial southwest.

--Robert N. McClean¹

In June of 1984, the Senate passed the Simpson-Mazzoli bill which proposed restrictions on Mexicans entering the United States. Although not accepted by the House of Representatives, the measure was an echo of past attempts to regulate the flow of immigrants across the southwestern border. The most notable efforts occurred in the 1920s under the guidance of Congressman John C. Box, who introduced legislation that would have placed all Western Hemisphere countries under the 1924 quota law. Box's multiple bills, and the debates surrounding them, were only an extension of the American nativist mentality of the times.

The post-World War I era was a period of solidifying a distinctive nationalism which associated the war time mentality of "100 per cent Americanism" with the myth of a superior white Nordic race. The concept of being 100 per cent American called for a national loyalty that required a mental conformity. The preception of "right thinking" rested on a zealous spirit of duty to promulgate the cause of protecting American institutions. This attitude, necessary for supporting the country's war effort, represented a part of the national psyche and found expression in the hysteria of the Red Scare as well as the anti-European isolationism that finally resulted in the exclusion of foreign immigration.²

Along with economic arguments, a fundamental tenant supporting the restrictionist movement was the belief in a superior white Nordic race. Using a quasi-scientific approach to eugenics, proponents extrapolated that "America's immigration problem was mainly a problem of blood."³ The argument, based on the writings of Madison Grant, Louis L. Snyder, Gino Speranza, Kenneth Roberts,

and Roy L. Garis, stressed that the greatness of the United States rested on the foundation of a culturally homogenous race which had colonized America. This pure Nordic race had biologically developed democracy as a way of life. The dominant whites and their institutions were in danger of dilution through the immigration of inferior ethnic groups whose heredity had not prepared them for self-government. Most immigrants were thus considered incapable of amalgamation into American society and politics.⁴

By insisting that national unity and ethnicity were integral to the U. S. democratic system, restrictionists argued that in order for the Nordic race to safe-guard itself and its institutions, the exclusion of unassimilable foreigners was necessary. Roy Garis summerized the idea:

Everyone realizes, almost intuitively, that in any community, particularly a democratic one, unity is one of the essentials of stability, order, and progress. . . . What chance have the half-breeds of Brazil and Mexico today to develop a great civilization?

The answer is that the idea, ideals, and institutions of a nation--in a word, its civilization--change with its racial composition. The same phenomenon can be observed the world over. Where a great race is, civilization flourishes, where the great race is not, the best possible environment cannot produce it.

We must restrict drastically the admission of those peoples whose traits of nationality will not combine with ours, for, with negligible exceptions, nationalities cannot be mixed.⁵

Early in the 1920s those favoring foreign exclusion achieved success. In 1921 Congress enacted a quota law limiting certain nationalities. The restrictionists major victory came later in 1924 when Congress passed the Johnson bill. Named for Albert Johnson, the Republican Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the act limited the number of immigrants entering the country to no more than 2 per cent of the foreign-born population residing in the United States according to the 1890 census. The framework for the measure had been proposed in earlier legislation submitted by Congressman Box, a Texas Democrat and member of the Johnson committee.⁶

Although the act passed by large majorities, Congress had not included

the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Out of consideration for the diplomatic attempts to improve Pan-American relations, especially with Mexico, the Americas were left unaffected by quota limitations in the 1924 Immigration Act. In an effort to appease restrictionists, Congress added a \$10.00 visa fee to the pre-existing \$8.00 head tax required of those coming into the country. This made the cost of legal entry prohibitive for most Mexicans and necessitated the creation of a border patrol to stop those ignoring the law.⁷

Not wanting the issue to fade, Congressman Box pursued the problem of closing the southern border by submitting H. R. 11072 to "amend the Immigration Act of 1924 by making the quota provisions thereof applicable to Mexico, Cuba, Canada, and the countries of continental America and adjacent islands."⁸ Support for this corrective measure was wide spread as some Congressmen believed the "could have cleaned up the whole matter in one piece of legislation . . . by placing Canada and Mexico under the same quotas."⁹ The reasons given for backing the proposal were candidly to "protect American standards of living for American labor . . . and American government and American institutions against the imperfect and distorted ideas of those who have never been trained to self-government and who have but little understanding of its true meaning and significance."¹⁰ Even though the initial attempt to change the law failed, it became the basis for further legislation designed to make the Western Hemisphere, and specifically Mexico, subject to the same exclusionary standards as Europe.

Box reintroduced his legislation in 1926, 1927, and 1930.¹¹ As a member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, he was able to insure his bills received prompt attention. His zealous crusade for restricting immigration from the Western Hemisphere became an obsession that sparked an intense national debate in Congress and the American press.

The committee hearings on the legislation degenerated into a dispute over Mexican labor that trapped the proposal in a labyrinth of arguments which fused economic, social, political, and racial issues within the context of nativist concerns. Although public opinion held no moral dilemma as to the correctness of stopping Mexicans from entering the country, stiff resistance developed around certain domestic and international situations. Fearing that passage of the measure would curtail the supply of migrant workers in the southwest, representatives of the beet sugar industry, chambers of commerce, railroads, and mining interests as well as western farmers, cattlemen, and sheep herders, readily came to Washington to testify and lobby as to their need for Mexican laborers. These anti-quota forces enlisted the support of the State Department, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and their Congressmen in ultimately blocking the legislation.¹²

The defense of an open border was straightforward. The State Department viewed the possibility of placing quotas on Western Hemisphere countries as detrimental to relations with Latin America. The major fear was one of economic reprisals from the nations excluded. Being concerned about the ramifications, Secretary of State Kellogg testified that over 60 per cent of U. S. foreign investments and 30 per cent of its trade went to countries in the Western Hemisphere. To exclude immigration from the Americas would be courting financial disaster to the growing U. S. economy and undo the diplomatic headway made by Ambassador Morrow.¹³

The Departments of the Interior and Agriculture became embroiled in the debate when western farmers, already suffering from falling produce prices, seemed faced with more financial problems if they could not find sufficient workers for their labor intensive endeavors. The government had attempted to aid farmers by suggesting and supporting the diversification of crops. Through

the Bureau of Reclamation, millions of dollars had been invested in irrigation sites which, for a fee, provided water to large growers in semi-arid lands that had previously been used for grazing purposes. The projects had permitted agribusiness to expand and experiment with various crops, chief among them being sugar beets. The high qualities of the glabrous herb and the financial arrangements made with the sugar companies made it appear that the sugar beet was the panacea of all the farmers' problems. For government agricultural agencies, the restriction of Mexicans would create an agricultural labor shortage and force growers to cut production. The farmers would then have problems "making their payment back to the government on these reclamation projects."¹⁴

Farmers and writers reiterated the argument of the government agencies. Testifying before the House committee, S. P. Frisselle of the California Federated Farm Bureau argued that a cut back in production caused by a labor shortage would force growers "back to the grainfields . . . against the precepts given us from Washington, and which we realize and recognize as the salvation of the farmer in the West."¹⁵ For agribusiness and representatives of the beet sugar industry, the key to diversification was an abundant work force.¹⁶ Supporting this idea was Robert McClean. Writing for The New Republic he noted that the "expansion of our industries after the War, the growth of irrigation projects in the southwest, and the quota law of 1924, which barred all cheap labor except Mexican, have all combined to draw a stream of Mexicans"¹⁷ into the country. For McClean, the growing southwestern industries would be crippled should the quota be applied.¹⁸

Fully understanding the ramification of their position, the anti-restrictionists were openly sensitive to the racial concerns of Box's supporters. Witnesses before the Johnson committee conceded the principle of restriction as good and continually stated their preference for white workers. Farmers asserted they

"loathe[d] to burden [the] state with this type of immigrant,"¹⁹ but felt compelled to use Mexicans because "there [was] nothing else available."²⁰

Deponents emphatically declared that white labor refused to do the hard work of preparing and harvesting the labor intensive crops. According to Congressman Addison Smith of Idaho, the work was "so irksome and so tiresome that the ordinary man will not hire himself out to do that sort of labor."²¹ Whites were too ambitious and "too well equipped to do other things in which there is more money."²² W. J. Breakenridge, a farmer from Iowa, declared that farm wages could not be raised to compete with organized labor which attracted white workers and then admitted:

. . . these Mexicans can not be assimilated in our social structure. We appreciate that and know it presents a problem. We do not deny it. We would like to have the white labor; but, as I have said, it is not available to us.²³

The presence of Mexicans was a near social necessity for some. Fred Cummings, a Colorado beet grower, claimed that Americans did not belong in the fields and that the country's youth "must have enough education so that [they] can get the benefit of the other fellows labor and get somewhere."²⁴ Using a Jeffersonian and Aristotelian framework, he testified:

You will be on the present plane, with a reasonably stable government, as long as you have a wealthy class, as long as you have a middle class, that is always a balance to society, and the poorer class that does the common labor. . . . But there is always a class of labor that must be done by ignorant people. For instance, this building [the Capitol], some men dug the ditches. Your boys and my boys did not do it, and I hope they never have to, but in every civilization you must have the three classes of people, the agricultural class, the middle class, and you must have wealth in order to put over the big industries. . . . Whenever you do away with the agricultural class, the nation is ruined.²⁵

Added to the defense of an open border was the seasonal nature of the work required of the Mexicans. Opponents to the Fox proposal claimed restrictions on Mexico were unnecessary as the workers were not permanent immigrants. only

temporary entrants who went back after working and harvesting the crops. Their desirability was further heightened because they did not buy land and go into competition with the American farmer.²⁶ The anti-Box bill forces received a boost in their argument when Congressman John Garner of Texas, later vice president under Franklin Roosevelt, told the Johnson committee that his first-hand knowledge of the situation showed that a majority of the Mexican workers returned to Mexico. Supporting the idea of allowing farmers to acquire plenty of inexpensive labor, he asserted:

In order to allow landowners now to make a profit on their farms, they want to get the cheapest labor they can find, and if they get the Mexican laborer, it enables them to make a profit. . . . In order to make money out of this, you have to have cheap labor.²⁷

Backing for the Box legislation came from a combination of American labor and ardent nativists. For these groups the problem was one of protecting and bolstering an American way of life that cheap labor, low standards of living, and unassimilable races were destroying. Edward Dowell of the California State Federation of Labor, while calling the Mexicans a "menace to our standards,"²⁸ asserted that:

We must have working people here of our own kind and color, because all the lessons of history have taught us this inexorable fact, that a people or a nation that can not or will not do its own menial or manual work is doomed, it is gone. . . . And when the American people have concluded that their sons and daughters can not and will not do their own menial and manual work, then we are done for.²⁹

For Congressman William Vaile of Colorado, the solution called for excluding the laborers who did the nation's "dirty work."³⁰ Congressman Fox implied that restricting Mexicans would help restore American virtues as a consequence of working with their hands which "builds character."³¹

American farmers, Fox argued, would ultimately be aided by exclusion of Mexican workers. For the Texas Congressman, the farm problem was simply one

of overproduction caused by the existence of too much peon labor:

The importers of . . . Mexican laborers . . . want them to increase farm production, not by the labor of American farmers, for the sustenance of families and the support of American farm life, but by serf labor working mainly for absentee landlords on millions of acres of semi-arid lands. Many of these lands have heretofore been profitably used for grazing cattle, sheep, and goats. Many of them are held by speculative owners.

A great part of these areas can not be cultivated until the Government has spent vast sums in reclaiming them. Their development when needed as homes for our people and in support of American communities is highly desirable. Their occupation and cultivation by serfs should not be encouraged. These lands and this mass of peon labor are to be exploited in the enlargement of America's surplus farm production, possibly to the increased profit of these speculative owners, but certainly to the great injury of America's present agricultural population, consisting of farmers, living and supporting themselves by their own labor and that of their families, on the farms of America.

The dreaded surplus, which already makes an abundant crop worse for farmers as a whole than a scant one, is to be made more dreadful by the importation of foreign labor working for lower wages and under harder conditions.³²

The solution alluded to was easy. By restricting the amount of labor available for farmers, they would be forced to curtail production thus creating a shortage and driving up the price for their crops.

According to Congressman Box, American farmers were not the only ones suffering from the influx of Mexican workers. His patriotic sensibilities led him to analyze the problem of unemployed veterans as stemming from the presence of Mexican laborers:

God pity America when it gets to the point where men we send forward to hold up our banners and push them to the front have to come down and live under the conditions they exact of these aliens, and would exact of our own men before finding them work. I honor them for saying, 'I must live like a white man.' /Applause./ Poor pay and bad living conditions cause some of these men not to accept employment.³³

Restriction thus became imperative for protecting the job opportunities of thousands of ex-service men.³⁴

One of the strongest supporters of placing the Mexicans under the quota was American organized labor. Rebutting the claims that whites would not do farms work as a "deliberate misrepresentation of the facts,"³⁵ a union spokesman stated there was no place "so hot or so cold, so wet or so dry that an American laborer will not work, when he is paid a decent wage and given reasonable hours and tolerable working conditions."³⁶ Not only did Mexican migrant workers hold down the wages of farm laborers, but also those in manufacturing areas. Edgar Wallace of the American Federation of Labor asserted that:

Mexicans cross the river into Texas, invited by cotton planters, and then into other agricultural endeavors as far north as North Dakota. Then they get lost and we find them in factories in the East, always working cheap, and while their numbers compared to the 110,000,000 in the United States are small, wages tend to the lowest amount that any set of men will work for.³⁷

Labor representatives equated poor pay with a low standard of living and called for the application of the quota on Mexico in order to help the American people "survive as a race."³⁸ In a rhetorical question Edward Dowell of the California State Federation of Labor asked if Congress wanted the "kind of people that sit in this Capitol, or that you have in the north or middle west, or do you want a mongrel population consisting largely of Mexicans and orientals?"³⁹

Closely interwoven with economic arguments against allowing Mexicans into the country was one of social undesirability. While one writer characterized them as having the standards of a "Chinese coolie,"⁴⁰ Congressman Box claimed the "socially inadequate" Mexicans continued to enter the country and gather in slum districts where they became "objects of charity and charges on the public treasury."⁴¹ In support of his contention, the Texas representative submitted various reports from around the nation indicating that Mexicans were the largest percentage of recipients of local and religious welfare services.⁴²

The social menace of the Mexican haunted restrictionists. One ardent nativist portrayed Mexicans as having a propensity toward crime and possessing

the "revengeful instinct of the savage."⁴³ Not only was he a criminal element being introduced into the country, but he was threatening American standards of sanitation:

Disease spreads among the undernourished, thoroughly exploited peon population. Tuberculosis, venereal infection, amebic dysentery, smallpox, take their toll. And pestilence is no respecter of persons; Americans suffer too as Mexicans constantly break quarantine.⁴⁴

Seeing himself as the spokesman for the "great mass of people who have not the money to come to Washington,"⁴⁵ Congressman Box strenuously harangued Congress as to the undesirability of Mexican migration.⁴⁶ Using Bob Shuler's Los Angeles magazine to summarize his nativist position, he quoted:

Hordes of Mexicans have crossed to this country and are now migrating hither and thither, paying no taxes, rendering no public service, supplying no sinews for Government or civilization. They are a burden on the charity of every community. They crowd the halls of our county hospitals and deplete the funds of our county charities. They contaminate the communities into which they rove and are constantly active in petty thievery and other kindred crimes. They are diseased of body, subnormal intellectually, and moral morons of the most hopeless type. This does not mean we are against Mexico. We are ready to help them in every way possible to come out from under the cloud of ignorance, poverty, and superstition that has made of them a backward people. But we are not willing to poison our own civilization with them and we ought not to be asked to do so.⁴⁷

By fusing social and economic arguments, Box found the principles of restriction sound in sustaining American standards of living and emphatically declared that the same reasons for excluding the "most wretched, ignorant, diseased, and degraded people of Europe or Asia demand ed that the illiterate, unclean, peonized masses moving this way from Mexico be stopped at the border."⁴⁸

Viewed as being highly unassimilable, the presence of Mexicans became a national liability to nativists. Not only did Mexicans keep their own language but also their national customs. For proponents of the quota, the fact that the state legislature of New Mexico was bi-lingual was proof enough of how stubborn the Mexican was in refusing to be Americanized. To allow the border to re-

main open would only increase the problem.⁴⁹

Even though Catholicism was integral to Mexican culture, Congressman Box had uncommon trouble generating the usual nativist anti-Catholic sentiments. Box, himself an ordained Methodist minister, described the Mexican migrant as one who took the "places of white Americans in communities and often thereby destroy[ed] schools, churches, and all good community life."⁵⁰ Yet Box's position left some Protestant groups in a quandary as they viewed the Mexican as a target for conversion away from the Catholic Church.⁵¹ Nativists were more concerned with other issues.

One theme stressed by a few proponents of the quota, was that of protecting American political institutions. Attempting to fan the flames of a new Red Scare, nativists warned of the great peril facing American democracy. Fred Marvin of the American Hour Broadcasting Committee claimed:

The Mexican--and this is true also largely of others from the nations to the south including the West Indies--are saturated with Socialist-Communist theories. Indeed, many of those now coming to the U. S., especially from Mexico, are trained agitators and they are here not to secure employment but, on the contrary, to take part in Communist activities, whether these activities appear on the surface under the name of Communism, Socialism, or I. W. W.-ism. Mexico . . . is a hot bed of Socialism and Communism.⁵²

While Congressman Box argued that "Bolshevistic tendencies are strong down there,"⁵³ he expressed concern over low political ideals held by Mexicans. The Texas Congressman stated that the Mexican government had "always been an expression of Mexican impulses and traditions . . . [and] an exhibition of the lack of better traditions and the want of intelligence and stamina among the mass of its people."⁵⁴

While nativists found many reasons for excluding Mexicans, the primary issue was race. Few found fault with the idea that one "purpose for the immigration laws [was] the protection of the American racial stock from further degradation or change through mongrelization."⁵⁵ Congressman Box stated:

The Mexican peon is a mixture of Mediterranean-blooded Spanish peasant with low-grade Indians who did not fight to extinction but submitted and multiplied as serfs. Into that was fused much negro slave blood. This blend of low-grade Spaniard, peonized Indian, and negro slave mixes with negroes, mulattoes [sic], and other mongrels, and some sorry whites, already here. The prevention of such mongrelization and the degradation it causes is one of the purposes of our laws which the admission of these people will tend to defeat.

. . . [A] mixture of blocs of peoples of different races has a bad effect upon citizenship, creating more race conflicts and weakening national character.⁵⁶

The writer found the American situation deplorable when "numerous, intelligent, and enterprising one hundred per cent. [sic] Americans, to say nothing of other brands, [were] busy in helping along this insidious elimination of their own breed in favor of the progeny of Mexican peons who [would] continue to afflict us with an embarrassing race problem."⁵⁷ The admission of Mexicans thus was similar to bringing black slaves in as cheap labor. The end result was the Civil War and a continuing "Negro race question."⁵⁸ Application of the quota then became a necessity in order to protect American civilization from an invasion of racially inferior peoples "who have come in such large numbers . . . as almost to reverse the essential consequences of the Mexican War."⁵⁹

One of the most intense arguments regarding the race problem as nativists saw it came from Harry Laughlin, a well known eugenist of the times and an employee of the Carnegie Institute. In his testimony before the House committee, he condensed American history into six epochs of racial conflict: The Nordic colonizers against the indigenous native Indians; the British settlers against those of the Spanish, French, and Dutch; the importation of black slaves; the great influx of Asian immigrants; the shift of immigration from northwestern Europe to southern and eastern Europe; and finally, the Mexican invasion.⁶⁰ To Laughlin, the issue was restricting Mexicans in order to keep the superior white Nordic race the dominant one in America. He implied that restriction was necessary as an indirect safeguard for American women:

Mate selection is the key to the non-white problem in America. So long as race crosses are not made between the women of the dominant races and the men of the so-called lower races and the fertility of the better class women of the dominant races remains high, the dominant races are secure. But if the time ever comes when men with a small fraction of colored blood would readily find mates among the white women, the gates would be thrown open to a final radical race mixture of the whole population. The racial integrity of the white races would be jeopardized. The perpetuity of the white race and consequently of American institutions depends upon the virtue and fecundity of American women.⁶¹

Laughlin then proposed that Congress pass a statute that only white persons could be admitted into the United States. This was necessary, he argued, in order for America to select immigrants who were racially similar and possessed the "hereditary ability to perform the work of the receiving country."⁶²

The American press, with few exceptions, supported the Box efforts to close American borders. Articles appeared in various publications that attacked Mexican laborers as being socially and racially inferior. The leading periodical favoring the quota was the Saturday Evening Post. Editorials printed excerpts from newspapers around the nation that warned of a "race problem of the greatest magnitude,"⁶³ and called for the exclusion of Mexican workers. One Post editorial pointed to supposed benefits of restriction:

The lessening influx of cheap labor prove[s] a powerful stimulus to the invention and adoption of an unbelievable number of mechanical devices for the accomplishment of rough and heavy tasks formerly done only by hand. They do the work better and, best of all, they do not breed undesirable American citizens.⁶⁴

To put Mexico under the quota would keep out cheap labor that undermined "racial values, [and] decent living and American traditions."⁶⁵

To further its position, the Post published series of articles by Roy L. Caris, Caret Garrett, and Kenneth Roberts.⁶⁶ Ostensibly being objective about Mexican migration, these writers clearly sided with the idea of exclusion. The basis for this contention was the racial inferiority of Mexicans who were becoming

social parasites:

The conviction that the Mexican is an undesirable immigrant is ably supported by witnesses who talk of racial histories, eugenics, seed stock, and biological sequences. It is supported too, from another point of view, by organized labor, talking of the American standard of living, the competition by which it is undermined or retarded in its rise, and how when the asylums of cities such as Los Angeles are burdened with Mexican humanity, the liability of this immigration, which American labor has already felt in a direct manner, is felt indirectly by the taxpayer also.⁶⁷

For the Post writers, "every test as to the desirability of this immigration, including the assumed economic demand for peonage or common labor, ends in out one answer--it must be restricted."⁶⁸

Quota advocates won a partial victory in 1930 when the Senate approved the Harris bill which was a restatement of the Box proposal. Although national sentiment favored immigration restriction of the Western Hemisphere, public opinion was not strong enough to overcome the political clout of the various groups lobbying against the legislation.⁶⁹ With the coming of the Great Depression the issue seemed to fade from national attention. Testifying before the House committee, E. F. Heckman of the American Beet Sugar Company asserted, in what turned out to be a prophetic utterance, that the "only way that white labor would become available again for farm work would be a general business depression, forcing this labor to leave the city and go to the country to earn their support."⁷⁰ And so it did.

The Box legislation was an outgrowth of a parochial view of America that did not accept any interpretation of history except a narrow vision of a myth that existed in the minds of many Americans. Box's measures expressed his own vehement racism and a real desire on the part of white Americans to exclude those considered ethnically inferior and a threat to national institutions. The failure of Congressman Box to get his legislation passed was not due to its unacceptability to the American public but to the resourceful politicking of a few

important pressure groups who placed their economic survival above nativist desires.

ENDNOTES

¹Robert N. McClean, "A Dyke Against Mexicans," The New Republic, August 14, 1929, p. 336.

²John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955), pp. 204-220, 225-227.

³Roy L. Garis, "The Necessity of Excluding Inferior Stocks," Current History 24 (August 1926): 666.

⁴Higham, Strangers in the Land, pp. 262-263, 270-277; Robert A. Divine, American Immigration Policy, 1924-1952 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1957), pp. 11-15; Lawrence A. Cardoso, Mexican Emigration to the United States, 1897-1931: Socio-Economic Patterns (Tucson, Ariz.: The University of Arizona Press, 1980), p. 136. Some of the major nativist authors and their works include: Madison Grant, The Passing of the Great Race; Louis L. Snyder, Race, A History of Modern Ethnic Theories; Gino Speranza, Race or Nation; Kenneth Roberts, Why Europeans Leave Home; and Roy L. Garis, Immigration Restriction.

⁵Garis, "The Necessity of Excluding Inferior Stocks," pp. 666-667.

⁶Arthur F. Corwin, "A Story of Ad Hoc Exemptions: American Immigration Policy Toward Mexico," in Arthur F. Corwin, ed., Immigration--And Immigration: Perspectives on Mexican Labor Migration to the United States (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976), pp. 141-142; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Fox speaking on Immigration Problems, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 23 May 1928, Congressional Record 69:9608. For his position regarding immigration, Albert Johnson received high praise from the Ku Klux Klan, see "Klan Organ Opens War on Wadsworth," New York Times, 26 September 1926, 2:3.

⁷Mark Reisler, By the Sweat of Their Brow: Mexican Immigrant Labor in the United States, 1900-1940 (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976), pp. 59, 200-202.

Divine, American Immigration Policy, pp. 52-53, 59; U. S., Congress, House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 6741, H. R. 7559, and H. R. 9036. 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926, pp. 19, 289, 325; Corwin, "A story of Ad Hoc Exemptions," p. 144.

⁸U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box introduces H. R. 11072, 68th Cong., 2d sess., 29 December 1924, Congressional Record 66:974.

⁹U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Cole speaking on Immigration, 68th Cong., 1st sess., April 17, 1924, Congressional Record 65:6478.

¹⁰U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Black speaking on Immigration, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 10 February 1928; Congressional Record, 69:2860.

¹¹U. S. Congress, House, Congressman Box introduces H. R. 6741, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 5 January 1926, Congressional Record, 67:1553; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box introduces H. R. 6465, 70th Cong., 2d sess., 8 December 1927, Congressional Record, 69:282; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box introduces H. R. 8523, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 13 January 1930, Congressional Record, 72:1557; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box introduces H. R. 12341, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 13 May 1930, Congressional Record, 72:8891; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box introduces H. R. 12382, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 15 May 1930, Congressional Record, 72:8968. For a complete listing of other bills through 1929 which were designed to exclude Mexican laborers, see Ethel Mae Morrison, "A History of Recent Legislative Proposals Concerning Mexican Immigration," M. A. thesis, University of Southern California, 1929, pp. 69-70.

¹²Divine, American Immigration Policy, pp. 52-53; Higham, Strangers in the Land, pp. 320-321; Reisler, By the Sweat of Their Brow, pp. 177-178, 209-212.

¹³Reisler, By the Sweat of Their Brow, p. 212; "Morrow Has Won Says Calles Friend," New York Times, 4 December 1927, II:1; McClean, "A Dyke Against Mexico," p. 336.

¹⁴Reisler, By the Sweat of Their Brow, p. 209; House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, pp. 79, 83-84, 237.

¹⁵House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, p. 6.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷McClellan, "A Dyke against Mexico," p. 334.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, pp. 8, 15, 63, 99, 103, 126-127, 181, 251; U. S., Congress, House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Immigration from the Western Hemisphere, Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 6465, H. R. 7358, H. R. 10955, and H. R. 11687, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, p. 274.

²⁰House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, p. 6.

²¹Ibid., p. 226.

²²Ibid.

²³House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Immigration from the Western Hemisphere, 1928, p. 590.

²⁴House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal Agricultural Workers, 1926, p. 68.

²⁵Ibid., p. 62

²⁶Ibid., p. 112.

²⁷Ibid., p. 183.

²⁸U. S., Senate, Committee on Immigration, Restriction of Western Hemisphere Immigration, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Immigration on S. 1437, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, p. 9.

²⁹Ibid., p. 7.

³⁰William N. Vaile, "Who Will Do the Dirty Work?" Collier's Magazine,
17 May 1924, pp. 12-13.

³¹House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal
Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, p. 68.

³²U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Restriction of Mexican
Immigrants, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 9 February 1928, Congressional Record, 69:2817.

³³U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Mexican Immigration,
71st Cong., 2d sess., 13 January 1930, Congressional Record, 72:1541.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal
Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, pp. 297-298; House, Committee on Im-
migration and Naturalization, Hearings on Immigration from the Western Hemisphere,
1928, p. 733.

³⁶House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Immigration
from the Western Hemisphere, 1928, p. 733.

³⁷House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal
Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, p. 296.

³⁸Ibid., p. 301; Senate, Committee on Immigration, Hearings on Restriction
of Western Hemisphere Immigration, 1928, p. 8.

³⁹Senate, Committee on Immigration, Hearings on Restriction of Western Hemi-
sphere Immigration, 1928, p. 7.

⁴⁰C. M. Goethe, "Peons Need Not Apply," The World's Work 59 (November 1930): 48.

⁴¹House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal
Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, pp. 132, 278.

⁴²Ibid., p. 15.

⁴³Goethe, "Peons Need Not Apply," p. 48.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵"Should Quota Law Be Applied to Mexico?" Congressional Digest 7 (May 1928): 155.

⁴⁶Congressional Record, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, 69:2817-2818, 9608-9618; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Immigration Conditions on the Mexican Border, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 2 July 1926, Congressional Record, 67: 12812-12814; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Immigration from Mexico, 71st Cong., 3d sess., 29 January 1931, Congressional Record, 74: 3549-3558; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Imported Mexican Peon Labor and the Farm Problem, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 25 March 1930, Congressional Record, 72:6089-6092; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Mexican Immigration, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 24 May 1928, Congressional Record, 69:9745; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Mexican Immigration, 70th Cong., 2d sess., 12 February 1929, Congressional Record, 72:3347; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Mexican Immigration, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 13 January 1930, Congressional Record, 72:1540-1542; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Mexican Immigration, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 29 January 1930, Congressional Record, 72:2650-2651; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking onf Mexican Laborers in Beet-Sugar Production, 71st Cong., 1st sess., 11 May 1929, Congressional Record, 71:1163-1164; U. S., Congress, House, Congressman Box speaking on Regulation of Immigration, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 10 February 1928, Congressional Record, 69:2844.

⁴⁷"Should Quota Laws Be Applied to Mexico?" p. 156.

⁴⁸Congressional Record, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, 69:2817-2818.

⁴⁹Glenn E. Hoover, "Our Mexican Immigrants," Foreign Affairs 8 (October 1929): 103.

⁵⁰Reisler, By the Sweat of Their Brows, p. 66: Congressional Record, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, 69:2817.

⁵¹Reisler, By the Sweat of Their Brow, pp. 157-158; Cardoso, Mexican Emigration to the United States, pp. 120-125.

⁵²House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Immigration from the Western Hemisphere, 1928, p. 645.

⁵³House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, p. 113.

⁵⁴Congressional Record, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928, 69:2817-2818.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 2817.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 2818.

⁵⁷S. J. Holmes, "Perils of the Mexican Invasion," The North American Review 227 (May 1929): 622.

⁵⁸Congressional Record, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 1930, 72:2650.

⁵⁹Roy L. Garis, "The Mexican Invasion," The Saturday Evening Post, 19 April 1930, p. 43.

⁶⁰House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Immigration from the Western Hemisphere, 1928. pp. 702-714.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 709.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 706, 714.

⁶³"The Mexican Conquest," The Saturday Evening Post, 22 June 1929, p. 26: "Present and Future," The Saturday Evening Post, 15 March 1930, p. 28.

⁶⁴"Protection for Unskilled Labor," The Saturday Evening Post, 7 January 1928, p. 32.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Garis, "The Mexican Invasion," pp. 43-44; Roy L. Garis, "The Mexicanization of American Business," The Saturday Evening Post, 8 February 1930, pp. 46-47, 178, 181-182; Garet Garrett, "Government By Tumult," The Saturday Evening Post, 16 March 1929, pp. 14-15, 43-44, 46, 50; Kenneth L. Roberts, "The Docile Mexican."

The Saturday Evening Post, 10 March 1928, pp. 39, 41, 165-166; Kenneth L. Roberts, "Mexicans or Ruin," The Saturday Evening Post, 18 February 1928, pp. 14-15, 142, 145-146, 149-150, 154; Kenneth L. Roberts, "Wet and Other Mexicans," The Saturday Evening Post, 4 February 1928, pp. 10-11, 137-138, 141, 146. As a way of presenting a balanced argument the Post published an article favoring an open border, see Charles C. Teague, "A Statement on Mexican Immigration," The Saturday Evening Post, 10 March 1928, pp. 169-170.

⁶⁷Garrett, "Government By Tumult," p. 14.

⁶⁸Garis, "The Mexican Invasion," p. 15.

⁶⁹Rudolfo Acuña, Occupied America: A History of Chicanos, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1981), p. 134-137.

⁷⁰House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, 1926, p. 155.

APPENDIX A

WITNESSES, INTERESTS REPRESENTED, AND RELATIVE POSITIONS
TOWARD THE BOX BILL DURING THE HOUSE HEARINGS ON
SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL LABORERS FROM MEXICO, 1926.*

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
Congressman August H. Andersen(R)	Third Congressional District of Minnesota	Against
Harry H. Austin	United States Sugar Manufacturers' Association	Against
D. A. Bandeen	El Paso Chamber of Commerce National Livestock Association Border Chamber of Commerce Farmers of Upper Rio Grande Re- clamation Project	Against
Charles P. Bayer	Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce	Against
Congressman John C. Box(D)	Second Congressional District of Texas	For
W. J. Breakenridge	Palo Alto County Farm Bureau Beet growers from Iowa and southern Minnesota	Against
C. S. Brown	Arizona State Farm Bureau Fed- eration Salt River Valley Water Users' Association Pima Cotton Growers' Association Roosevelt Hay Growers' Association Phoenix Chamber of Commerce	Against
Congressman Olger B. Burtness(R)	First Congressional District of North Dakota	Against
E. K. Cumming	Nogales, Arizona Chamber of Com- merce Tuscon Chamber of Commerce	Against
Fred Cummings	Beet growers served by the Great Western Sugar Company	Against

*SOURCES: U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico, Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 6741, H. R. 7559, and H. R. 9036. 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1926; U. S. Congress, Joint Committee on Printing, Official Congressional Directory. 71st Cong., 2d sess., (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1929). This list has been alphabetized and does not reflect the order in which the witnesses testified.

APPENDIX A (Continued)

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
S. P. Frisselle	Fresno County Chamber of Commerce California Development Association California Federated Farm Bureau	Against
Congressman John N. Garner(D)**	Fifteenth Congressional District of Texas	Against
Congressman Guy U. Hardy(R)	Third Congressional District of Colorado	Against
Congressman Gilbert N. Haugen(R) [†]	Third Congressional District of Iowa	Against
Congressman Carl Hayden(D)	At large population of Arizona	Against
E. F. Heckman	American Beet Sugar Company	Against
Congressman C. B. Hudseph(D)	Sixteenth Congressional District of Texas	Against
Congressman Scott Leavitt(R)	Second Congressional District of Montana	Against
C. V. Maddux	Great Western Sugar Company	Against
Congressman Joseph J. Mansfield(D)	Ninth Congressional District of Texas	Against
S. R. McLean	Holland-St. Louis Sugar Company	Against
S. Matson Nixon	Blacklanders Farmers Association	Against
I. D. O'Donnell	Yellowstone County Farm Bureau Billings Chamber of Commerce Yellowstone, Henetty, Milk River, and Sun River Reclamation Districts	Against
Howard Ottinger	County Farm Bureau of Chaska, Minnesota	Against
Congressman Addison T. Smith(R)	Second Congressional District of Idaho	Against

**John N. Garner later served as vice president under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[†]Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

APPENDIX A (Continued)

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
T. A. Sullivan	Red River Valley farmers of Minnesota and North Dakota	Against
Congressman Edward T. Taylor(D)	Fourth Congressional District of Colorado	Against
Congressman Charles B. Timberlake(R)	Second Congressional District of Colorado	Against
T. W. Tomlinson	American National Livestock Association National Woolgrowers' Association	Against
L. B. Tompkins	Columbia Sugar Company	Against
E. J. Walker	Arizona Cotton Growers' Asso- ciation	Against
Edgar Wallace	American Federation of Labor	For
J. T. Whitehead	Federal Reclamation projects in the North Platt Valley and growers serviced by the pro- jects	Against
Congressman Charles E. Winter(R)	At large population of Wyoming	Against
Congressman Roy O. Woodruff(R)	Tenth Congressional District of Michigan	Against

APPENDIX B

WITNESSES, INTERESTS REPRESENTED, AND RELATIVE POSITION
TOWARD THE BOX BILL DURING THE HOUSE HEARINGS ON
IMMIGRATION FROM COUNTRIES OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE, 1928.*

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
A. Ahlf	California Farm Bureau Federation American Farm Bureau Federation	Against
Congressman Miles C. Allgood(D)	Seventh Congressional District of Alabama	For
Congressman August E. Andersen(R)	Third Congressional District of Minnesota	Against
Harry A. Austin	United States Beet Sugar Association	Against
J. C. Bailey	Holly Sugar Company	Against
D. A. Bandeen	El Paso Chamber of Commerce West Texas Chamber of Commerce El Paso County Farm Bureau Hudspeth County Water Improvement District No. 1 Tornillo Chamber of Commerce Canutillo Farm Bureau Fabens Farm Bureau	Against
Fred H. Bixby	National Cattlemen's Association California Cattlemen's Association Cattlemen from Arizona and New Mexico	Against
Congressman Eugene Black(D)	First Congressional District of Texas	For
Congressman John C. Box(D)	Second Congressional District of Texas	For
W. J. Breakenridge	Farmers of northwestern Iowa	Against
L. C. Bright	National Livestock Association	Against
C. S. Brown	American Farm Bureau Federation	Against

*SOURCE: U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Immigration from Countries of the Western Hemisphere, Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 6465, H. R. 7358, H. R. 10955, and H. R. 11687, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928; U. S. Congress, Joint Committee on Printing, Official Congressional Directory, 71st Cong., 2d sess., (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1929). This list has been alphabetized and does not reflect the order in which the witnesses testified.

APPENDIX B (Continued)

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
Congressman Olger B. Burtness(R)	First Congressional District of North Dakota	Against
Jess Crosby	Farmers of northern Wyoming	Against
Congressman L. J. Dickinson(R)	Tenth Congressional District of Iowa	Against
Congressman Lewis W. Douglas(D)	At large population of Arizona	Against
T. G. Gallagher	Continental Sugar Company	Against
Congressman John N. Garner(D)**	Fifteenth Congressional District of Texas	Against
A. C. Hardison	California State Grange California Farmers' Union	Against
C. O. Harris	Agricultural and stock raising interests around San Angelo, Texas	Against
E. F. Heckman	American Beet Sugar Company	Against
Congressman Clifford B. Hope(R)	Seventh Congressional District of Kansas	Against
Congressman D. E. Hudspeth(D)	Sixteenth Congressional District of Texas	Against
J. E. Keller	Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Brotherhood of Locomotive Fire- men and Enginemen Order of Railway Conductors Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Twelve other organizations not indicated	For
Francis E. Kinnicut	Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc. Committee on Legislation of the Immigration Restriction League, Inc.	For
Harry K. Laughlin	Eugenics Record Office of the Carnegie Institute of Washington	For
J. V. Maddux	Great Western Beet Sugar Company	Against

* John N. Garner later served as vice president under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

APPENDIX B (Continued)

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
Congressman Joseph J. Mansfield(D)	Ninth Congressional District of Texas	Against
Fred R. Marvin	Key Men of America American Hour Broadcasting Committee	For
E. E. McInnis	Atchinson, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Company	Against
Charles McKemy	Texas State Labor Commission (Texas Department of Labor)	For
George Moffatt	Private interests near Chillicothe, Texas	For
Frank W. Mondell	Personal from Wyoming	Against
C. B. Moore	Vegetable Growers of the Imperial Valley	Against
Dayton Moses	Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association	Against
Howard Oliver	Personal from New York City	Against
Howard Ottinger	Farmers near Chaska, Minnesota	Against
James H. Patten	National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America Twelve other organizations not indicated	For
A. S. Robertson	Elephant Butte Irrigation District	Against
F. H. Ross	Farmers near Crookston, Minnesota	Against
Congressman Morgan G. Sanders(D)	Third Congressional District of Texas	For
John R. Sanford	Eagle Pass Chamber of Commerce	Against
Congressman John C. Schafer(R)	Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin	For
Congressman C. G. Selvig(R)	Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota	Against
Hubert L. Shattuck	Denver Chamber of Commerce	Against
Congressman Addison T. Smith(F)	Second Congressional District of Idaho	Against

APPENDIX B (Continued)

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
Howard D. Smith	American Mining Congress	Against
R. H. Smith	South Texas Chamber of Commerce and forty-two other organizations including the chambers of commerce of San Antonio, Waco and Dallas	Against
Ralph H. Taylor	Agricultural Legislative Committee of California	Against
Alfred Thom	Association of Railway Executives American Railway Association	Against
Congressman Charles B. Timberlake(R)	Second Congressional District of Colorado	Against
E. J. Walker	Arizona Cotton Growers Association	Against
Henry DeCourcy Ward	Immigration Restriction League of Boston, Massachusetts	For
W. E. Weatherbee	Del Rio Chamber of Commerce	Against
Congressman Richard J. Welch(R)	Fifth Congressional District of California	For
Congressman Roy O. Woodruff(R)	Tenth Congressional District of Michigan	Against

APPENDIX C

WITNESS, INTERESTS REPRESENTED, AND RELATIVE POSITION
TOWARD THE BOX BILL DURING THE HOUSE HEARINGS ON
WESTERN HEMISPHERE IMMIGRATION, 1930.*

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
Harry H. Austin	United States Beet Sugar Association	Against
Arthur S. Bent	United States Chamber of Commerce	Against
W. O. Blair	Imperial Valley Irrigation District	Against
W. M. Bond	Farmers of southern Arizona	Against
Congressman John C. Box(D)	Second Congressional District of Texas	For
Richard M. Bradley	Personal from Boston, Massachusetts	For
Frederick Breckman	National Grange	Against
Chauncey D. Brewer	United States Chamber of Commerce	Against
J. C. Canales	Brownsville Chamber of Commerce Mercedes Chamber of Commerce West Lago Chamber of Commerce Harlingen Chamber of Commerce McLean Chamber of Commerce Vitago Chamber of Commerce	Against
Harry Chandler	Los Angeles Times Company	Against
Felix C. Davila	Office of the United States Commissioner for Puerto Rico	Non-Committal
Monnett E. Davis	Foreign Inspection Office of the Department of State	Non-Committal
F. Stuart Fitzpatrick	United States Chamber of Commerce	Against

*SOURCE: U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Western Hemisphere Immigration, Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 8523, H. R. 8530, and H. R. 8702. 71st Cong., 2d sess., 1930; U. S. Congress, Joint Committee on Printing, Official Congressional Directory, 71st Cong., 2d sess., (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1929). This list has been alphabetized and does not reflect the order in which the witnesses testified.

APPENCIX C (Continued)

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
B. P. Fleming	Elephant Butte Irrigation District	Against
Congressman John N. Garner**	Fifteenth Congressional District of Texas	Against
Ben Garza	League of United Latin American Citizens	Against
Chester H. Gray	American Farm Bureau Federation	Against
James O. Gulnac	Personal from Bangor, Maine	For
Fred S. Hart	California Farm Bureau Monthlies	Against
W. E. Husband	Department of Labor	Non-Committal
William C. Hushing	American Federation of Labor	For
Francis I. Jones	United States Employment Service (Department of Labor)	For
Cal E. Mangum	Personal from Eagle Pass, Texas	Against
Congressman Joseph W. Martin, Jr.(R)	Fifteenth Congressional District of Massachusetts	Against
Col. Lawrence Martin	Division of Maps of the Library of Congress	Non-Committal
E. E. McInnis	Atchinson, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway System	Against
K. E. McMicken	Arizona Cotton Growers Association	Against
Chester B. Moore	Western Growers Protective Association	Against
John E. Noyes	Junior Order of United American Mechanics	For
Frank J. Palomares	Agricultural Labor Bureau of the San Joaquin Valley	Against
James T. Patten	Immigration Restriction League of New York	For
Alonzo S. Perales	Personal from Washington, D. C.	Non-Committal

**John N. Garner later served as vice president under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

APPENDIX C (Continued)

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
E. C. Peterson	United States Chamber of Commerce	Against
John F. Simmons	Visa Office of the Department of State	Non-Committal
Congressman Albert G. Simms (R)	At large population of New Mexico	Non-Committal
A. F. Stout	Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen Order of Railway Conductors Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen	For
Ralph H. Taylor	Agricultural Legislative Committee of California and twenty-nine other agricultural associations including: California Cattlemen's Association; Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union; Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California; and the California Dairywomen's Federation	Against
D. B. Wiley	Arizona Farm Bureau	
Henry L. Yates	Economic community of Brownsville, Texas	Against

APPENDIX D

WITNESSES, INTERESTS REPRESENTED, AND RELATIVE POSITION
TOWARD THE BOX BILL DURING THE HOUSE HEARINGS ON
IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS ON MEXICO, 1930.*

WITNESS	INTEREST REPRESENTING	POSITION
Joseph Cotton	Department of State	Against

*SOURCE: U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Immigration Restrictions on Mexico, Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 12382. 71st Cong., 2d sess., 1930. Mr. Cotton was the only witness called before the committee regarding this bill.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

- U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Immigration from Countries of the Western Hemisphere. Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 6465, H. R. 7358, and H. R. 11687, 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928.
- U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Immigration Restrictions on Mexico. Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 12382, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 1930.
- U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Seasonal Agricultural Laborers from Mexico. Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 6741, H. R. 7559, and H. R. 9036, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926.
- U. S. Congress. House. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Western Hemisphere Immigration. Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on H. R. 8523, H. R. 8530, and H. R. 8702, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 1930.
- U. S. Congress. House. Congressional Record, 68th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 65.
- U. S. Congress. House. Congressional Record, 68th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 66.
- U. S. Congress. House. Congressional Record, 69th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 67.
- U. S. Congress. House. Congressional Record, 70th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 69.
- U. S. Congress. House. Congressional Record, 70th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 69.
- U. S. Congress. House. Congressional Record, 71st Cong., 2d sess., vol. 72.
- U. S. Congress. House. Congressional Record, 71st Cong., 3d sess., vol. 72.
- U. S. Congress. Joint Committee on Printing. Official Congressional Directory. 71st Cong., 2d sess. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1929.

J. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Immigration. Restriction of Western Hemisphere Immigration. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Immigration on S. 1437. 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928.

J. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Immigration. Restriction of Western Hemisphere Immigration. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Immigration on S. 1296, S. 1437, and S. 3019. 70th Cong., 1st sess., 1928.

ARTICLES

Able Leadership in Immigration." The World's Work 47 (April 1924): 598.

eals, Carleton. "Mexico and the Harris Bill." The Nation, 9 July 1930, pp. 51-52.

ogardus, Emory S. "The Mexican Immigrant and the Quota." Sociology and Social Research 12 (March-April 1928): 371-378.

alverton, V. F. "The Myth of Nordic Superiority." Current History 24 (August 1926): 671-677.

erguson, Erna. "New Mexico's Mexicans." The Century Monthly Magazine 116 (August 1928): 437-444.

aris, Roy L. "The Mexican Invasion." Saturday Evening Post, 19 April 1930, pp. 43-44.

-----, "The Mexicanization of American Business." Saturday Evening Post, 8 February 1930, pp. 46-47, 178, 181-182.

-----, "The Necessity of Excluding Inferior Stocks." Current History 24 (August 1926): 666-671.

arrett, Garet. "Government by Tumult." Saturday Evening Post, 16 March 1929, pp. 14-15, 43-44, 46, 50.

ethe, C. M. "Peons Need Not Apply." The World's Work 59 (November 1930): 47-48.

ndman, Max Sylvius. "Economic Reasons for the Coming of the Mexican Immigration." American Journal of Sociology 35 (January 1930): 601-611.

lmes, S. J. "Perils of the Mexican Invasion." North American Review 227 (May 1929): 615-623.

- Hoover, Glenn E. "Our Mexican Immigrants." Foreign Affairs 8 (October 1929): 99-107.
- Hull, Harry E. "America's Immigration Restriction Policy: An Official Analysis of How the Law Operates." Congressional Digest 7 (May 1928): 149-151.
- "Immigration 'An Investment in Family Stocks'." The World's Work 47 (April 1924): 599-600.
- "Is This Country to Become a Collection of Racial 'Blocs'?" The World's Work 47 (April 1924): 598-599.
- Johnson, Albert. "How Present Congress is Dealing with Proposals to Change Immigration Law." Congressional Digest 7 (May 1928): 152-154.
- "'Little Mexico' in Northern Cities." The World's Work 48 (September 1924): 466.
- Marvin, George. "Monkey Wrenches in Mexican Machinery." Independent, 14 April 1928, pp. 350-352.
- McLean, Robert N. "A Dyke Against Mexicans." The New Republic, 14 August 1929, pp. 334-337.
- "Tightening the Mexican Border." The Survey, 1 April 1930, pp. 28-29, 54-56.
- "The Mexican Conquest." Saturday Evening Post, 22 June 1929, p. 26.
- "Present and Future." Saturday Evening Post, 15 March 1930, p. 28
- "Protection for Unskilled Labor." Saturday Evening Post, 7 January 1928, p. 32.
- "The Question of Immigration Not Yet Settled." The World's Work 48 (September 1924): 466.
- Roberts, Kenneth L. "Mexicans or Ruin." Saturday Evening Post, 18 February 1928, pp. 14-15, 142, 145-146, 149-150, 154.
- "The Docile Mexican." Saturday Evening Post, 10 March 1928, pp. 39, 41, 165-166.
- "Wet and Other Mexicans." Saturday Evening Post, 4 February 1928, pp. 10-11, 137-138, 141, 146.
- Scharrenberg, Paul, ed. "A New Principle On Trial: Immigration Between Mexico and the United States." Pacific Affairs 1 (January 1928): 7-10.

"Should Quota Law Be Applied To Mexico?" Congressional Digest 7 (May 1928):

155-164, 177-178.

Simpich, Frederick. "The Little Brown Brother Traks North." Independent,

27 February 1926, pp. 237-239.

Strout, Richard Lee. "A Fence for the Rio Grande." Independent, 2 June 1928,

pp. 518-520.

Taylor, Paul S. "More Bars Against Mexicans?" The Survey, 1 April 1930, pp. 26-27.

----- "Some Aspects of Mexican Immigration." Journal of Political Economy

38 (October 1930): 609-615.

Teague, Charles C. "A Statement on Mexican Immigration." Saturday Evening Post,

10 March 1928, pp. 169-170.

Thomson, Charles A. "The Man form Next Door: The Mexican Who is Filling the

Cheap Labor Vacuum." Century Magazine 111 (January 1926): 275-282.

"The Time to Settle the Question is Now." The World's Work 47 (April 1924): 600-601.

Vaile, William N. "'Who Will Do the Dirty Work?'" Collier's, 17 May 1924, pp. 12-13.

Walker, Helen W. "Mexican Immigrants as Laborers." Sociology and Social

Research 13 (September 1928): 55-62.

Woeheke, Walter V. "Don't Drive Out the Mexicans." Review of Reviews 81

(May 1930): 66-68.

NEWSPAPERS

The New York Times, 1921-1930.

SECONDARY SOURCES

BOOKS

Acuña, Rudolfo. Occupied America: A History of Chicanos. 2nd ed. New York:

Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1981.

Cardoso, Lawrence A. Mexican Emigration to the United States, 1897-1931: Socio-

- Economic Patterns. Tuscon, Ariz.: The University of Arizona Press, 1980.
- Corwin, Arthur F., ed. Immigration--And Immigration: Perspectives on Mexican Labor Migration to the United States. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Divine, Robert A. American Immigration Policy, 1924-1952. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Higham, John. Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955.
- Meier, Matt S., and Rivera, Feliciano. The Chicanos: A History of Mexican Americans. New York: Hill and Wang, a division of Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1972.
- Reisler, Mark. By the Sweat of Their Brow: Mexican Immigrant Labor in the United States, 1900-1940. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976.

ARTICLES

- Bach, Robert L. "Immigration Perspectives: A Review Essay." Journal of International Affairs 33 (Fall-Winter 1979): 339-350.
- Corwin, Arthur F. "Historia De La Emigración Mexicana, 1900-1970: Literatura E Investigación." Historia Mexicana 22 (Octubre-Diciembre 1972): 188-220.
- Garcia, Mario T. "On Mexican Immigration, the United States, and Chicano History." Journal of Ethnic Studies 7 (Spring 1979): 80-88.
- Hammond, W. J. "Some Aspects of International Labor Relations Between the United States and Mexico, 1924-1940." Southwestern Social Science Quarterly 25 (December 1944): 208-221.
- Hoffman, Abraham. "El Cierre De La Puerta Trasea Norteamericana--Restricción De La Inmigración Mexicana." Historia Mexicana 25 (Enero-Marzo 1976): 403-422.
- Kiser, George. "Mexican American Labor, before World War II." Journal of Mexican-American History 2 (Spring 1972): 122-142.
- Kiser, George, and Silverman, David. "Mexican Repatriation during the Great Depression." Journal of Mexican-American History 3 (1973): 139-164.

- Levenstein, Harvey A. "The AFL and Mexican Immigration in the 1920s: An Experiment in Labor Diplomacy." Hispanic American Historical Review 48 (May 1968): 206-219.
- Mohl, Raymond A. "The Saturday Evening Post and the 'Mexican Invasion'." Journal of Mexican-American History 2 (1973): 131-138.
- Redfield, Robert. "The Antecedents of Mexican Immigration to the United States." American Journal of Sociology 35 (November 1929): 433-438.
- Redwine, Augustin. "Lovell's Mexican Colony." Annals of Wyoming 51 (Fall 1979): 26-35.
- "Shall We Apply the Quota to Our Nearest Neighbors?" Literary Digest, 27 August 1927, p. 12.
- Smith, Michael M. "Beyond the Borderlands: Mexican Labor in the Central Plains, 1900-1930." Great Plains Quarterly 1 (Fall 1981): 239-251.
- Spalding, Rose. "Mexican Immigration: A Historical Perspective." Latin American Research Review 18 (February 1983): 201-209.
- "To Put Mexico on a Quota Basis." Literary Digest, 7 April 1928, p. 14.
- "What of the Mexican Immigrant?" Literary Digest, 24 August 1929, p. 11.

THESIS

- Morrison, Ethel Mae. "A History of Recent Legislative Proposals Concerning Mexican Immigration." M. A. thesis, University of Southern California, 1929.