

MARCIENNE

THE CHILDREN OF
THE SUN

Mexican-Americans in the
Literature of the United States

Translated by
Edward G. Brown, Jr.

Publication of this book was made possible in part by a grant from the Southwest Center of the University of Arizona.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA PRESS

Copyright © 1989
The Arizona Board of Regents
All Rights Reserved

Original copyright © by G.-P. Maisonneuve et Larose in 1980

This book was set in 10/12 Linotron 202 Bembo.

⊗ This book is printed on acid-free, archival-quality paper.
Manufactured in the U.S.A.

94 93 92 91 90 89 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rocard, Marcienne.

[Fils du soleil. English]

The children of the Sun : Mexican-Americans in the literature of the United States / Marcienne Rocard : translated by Edward G. Brown, Jr.

p. cm.

Translation of: Les fils du soleil.

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-8165-0992-1 (alk. paper)

1. American literature—History and criticism.

2. Mexican Americans in literature.

3. American literature—Mexican American authors—History and criticism. I. Title.

PS173.M39R613 1989

810'.9'352036872—dc 19

88-39772

CIP

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data are available.

THE CHILDREN OF
THE SUN

Translator's Note

In the interest of readability, and in consultation with the University of Arizona Press, this translation is slightly abridged from the original manuscript. Also, the preface to the original edition does not appear here. Notes and bibliographical references have been restructured to agree with the 1985 edition of the *MLA Style Manual*.

I have observed the following procedures in rendering Professor Rocard's *Les Fils du soleil* into English:

1. Historical Present. A good 80 percent of the French verbs in Professor Rocard's book are in the present tense. I have retained the present tense in some cases and have rendered others into the past, depending upon the context. The choices were not always simple ones.

2. Semicolons. The author has used the semicolon quite liberally. I have observed her stylistic use of this punctuation mark except when its use would have made the English translation awkward.

3. Accents. I have followed the use of Spanish accents in the original manuscript. As Professor Rocard notes, some Anglo-American writers were not well versed in the use of Spanish diacritical marks, and direct quotes from their works often reflect this. The author of this book has also used the names of many characters exactly as they appear in the works cited.

4. Quotations in Spanish. Wherever possible, I have gone to the bibliographical sources cited to find existing translations of quotations in Spanish. Such translations are denoted by asterisks. Where existing translations are not available, I have used the author's own translations (into French) as a guide. The passages from Octavio Paz's "*El laberinto de la soledad*" were taken from the

English translation by Lysander Kemp (New York: Grove, 1961); the lengthy translation of the *Corrido de Gregorio Cortez* was taken from Américo Paredes's *With His Pistol in His Hand* (Austin: U of Texas P, 1958); the passages from Tomás Rivera's ". . . y no se lo tragó la tierra" were taken from Herminio Ríos's translation in the bilingual edition (Berkeley: Quinto Sol, 1971).

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of my good friend and colleague, Professor Jean F. Goetinck, with respect to some particularly problematic passages. His invaluable suggestions are sincerely appreciated.

E. G. B.

*Mexican-American, Chicano, Hispano, Latino-americano, Boy, Latin American, Legless war vet, Spanish-surnamed, Spanish American, Spanish-speaking American. People who refuse to go back to where they came from, namely, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, California, etc.*¹

Introduction

The Mexican-American was born in 1848, the date of the annexation of the Southwest by the United States. This vast territory, which stretches along the border with Mexico from Brownsville, Texas, on the Gulf of Mexico to Tijuana on the Pacific, includes the five states of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and California. For almost four centuries, this land was the homeland of the Mexican-Americans' ancestors. Only the Indians were there before them. The history of Mexican-Americans goes back to the Spanish *conquistadores* and, even further, to the Aztecs. In 1519, Hernán Cortés captured the Aztec capital of Tenochtitlán; two years later, after the surrender of Emperor Cuauhtémoc, twenty million Indians came under Spanish dominion. The almost systematic interracial crossbreeding practiced by the Spanish, unlike the British colonists, gave their enterprise a unique character.² From the coupling of Aztec and Spaniard was born the *mestizo*, the ancestor of today's Mexican-American.

After gradually establishing the Vice-Kingdom of New Spain at the end of the sixteenth century, the colonizers moved north of the Rio Grande. In 1598, they founded the first capital of New Mexico, San Juan de Caballeros, nine years before the birth of Jamestown, the oldest English settlement in the New World.³ The founding of the second capital, Santa Fe, in 1609, preceded by eleven years the Pilgrims' landing of the *Mayflower* in Plymouth Bay. The wife of Juan de Oñate, the founder of this new kingdom in New Mexico, was the great-granddaughter of the Aztec emperor Montezuma; many who accompanied the Spanish colonist were either of mixed or Indian blood. Similar groups established the Indo-Hispanic civilizations of Arizona, Texas, and California.

The attitude of the indigenous populations, and their level of development, affected the method of settlement. In Arizona, the expansion movement was plagued by Indian hostility. New Mexico was colonized before the end of the seventeenth century, however, and Spaniards and Mexicans assimilated and profited from a native culture that they judged to be equal, if not superior, to their own. In Texas and California, by contrast, where the colonists encountered only the political maneuverings of foreign powers⁴ and not the hostility of the Indians, the settlers did not adopt the Indian culture. They arrived almost two centuries after New Mexico was explored, and they found the Indian society archaic. Of the three provinces in the Southwest, only New Mexico, the first Spanish and Mexican outpost, was able to achieve the "Indo-Hispanic synthesis"⁵ that Spanish colonial policy attempted to establish.

Isolated from one another and shaped by differing geographic and economic conditions, *Nuevo Mexicanos*, *Tejanos*, and *Californios* quickly formed three distinct communities that were nonetheless linked by a common Hispano-Mexican cultural heritage. But these communities were also different from the Mexican society they sprang from. Although they shared a semifeudal system with Mexico, their socioeconomic structures were simplified by the absence of Spanish bureaucrats (*gachupines*). Nothing prevented the *ricos* (the "rich"), from gaining absolute power over the *peones* ("laborers"), the *mestizos* who were more Indian than Mexican, and the Indians, especially in New Mexico. There reigned an oligarchy of some twenty loosely allied families, who claimed to be descendants of the first pioneers. They controlled the territory's economy and politics. In Texas, the absence of democratic traditions was just as flagrant. California had a seemingly more flexible caste system, with three classes: the *gente de razón*, the great landowners of Spanish ancestry who comprised 10 percent of the population; the *cholo*, poor illiterates, for the most part *mestizo* or mulatto, who were usually cowherds, shepherds, artisans, or small landowners; and, at the lower end of the social scale, the Indians, subjected to the most menial labor.

In New Mexico, as in California, the mission system only reinforced this stratification. By proselytizing, the priests extended their control over the Indians, and, like the *patrones* ("bosses"), used their labor to develop a prosperous system of stock-raising and mixed-crop farms. The missions of the Southwest, like those in Mexico, received land grants; parcels were also granted to private citizens for services rendered to the crown. The number of grants increased after Independence in 1821.⁶ During the secularization of the missions in California, the *hacendados*, or landowners, also were given domains confiscated from the Franciscans. Cattle-raising and diversified agriculture on these vast *ranchos* made California the wealthiest province of the Mexican Southwest. Texas specialized in raising longhorn steers, and New Mexico continued its traditional seminomadic sheep-raising while developing copper and gold mining.

The first Anglo-American immigrants from the United States found not an arid desert, but a flourishing economy with irrigated land and opulent *rancherías*

("settlements"), where food and lodging were generously offered to the passing traveler. Each locality, even the most remote mountain village, had its *plaza* ("town square"), the center of an active social life. The frequent fiestas drew upon all of the musical and artistic resources of the Hispanic-Mexican people, and permitted them for a time to forget their arduous labors. The Anglo colonists' fascination with this way of life is too well documented in the literature for us to dwell on it here. They also profited from Hispanic-American achievements: the *hacienda* would serve as a model for the future ranches of the American West; the *vaquero* was the prototype of the cowboy;⁷ and American gold prospectors would rely upon Mexican mining techniques.

In a sense, this first Anglo immigration paved the way for the future conquerors. What were individual enterprises in the beginning slowly took on national and political importance; the arrival of foreigners ended up destroying the precarious balance that had been established between metropolitan Mexico and the provinces north of the Rio Grande. Lured by adventure and commerce, the first Anglo colonists gained the confidence of the native population. Mixed marriages sealed friendships between the American trappers and the *gente de razón* in California, between Eastern merchants, who came after the opening of the commercial Santa Fe Trail, and the *ricos* ("rich") in New Mexico.⁸ In Texas, ironically, the Mexican government itself called for Anglo colonization to enlarge the population and to prevent meddling by France and England. The good will was nonetheless illusory. Cordial relations existed only within limited circles; most Anglo colonists displayed open contempt for the Mexican culture, so different from their own. The distance between these two ethnic groups widened after 1840 with the arrival of a new type of immigrant who was proud of belonging to an American nation convinced of its "Manifest Destiny,"⁹ of its right to possess the entire continent, and of its duty to regenerate it. Negative stereotypes of Mexicans prevailed even before the United States waged war against Mexico; the accounts of travelers during this period are filled with them.¹⁰ The Mexican-American War, in a sense, was no more than one episode in a continuing conflict between two incompatible cultures.

The war was precipitated both by the American desire for expansion and by the American residents' skillful exploitation of the growing irritation of Mexican provincials toward an overly centralized government. Mexico's centralizing policy, begun in 1834 by Antonio López de Santa Anna, paradoxically, was to serve the American expansionist objectives. The final repression of California's independence movement and the restoration of order in Santa Fe following the assassination of New Mexico's governor, Albino Pérez, in 1835 reflect the unstable dependence of these far-flung provinces with regard to metropolitan Mexico. Even more precarious was the situation in Texas, where the overwhelming numerical superiority of the Anglos (25,000, as opposed to 4,000 *Tejanos*) could only result in secession. The independence of Texas, exacted in 1836 after a fierce struggle and a bloody, long-remembered defeat suffered at the Alamo,¹¹ lasted nine years, until its annexation by the United States.

This was followed by a complete, rapid, and nearly bloodless conquest of the Mexican Southwest. From 1846 on, Americans encountered no resistance from New Mexico, whose leaders were seduced by the promises of the invaders. The following year, after the revolt of southern California was swiftly crushed (the only serious engagement of the campaign), the American flag was flying over what is now the state of California.

On February 2, 1848, in the village of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the treaty that officially ended the Mexican-American War was signed. The United States forced Mexico to recognize the right of Texas to enter the Union and to cede the two immense provinces of New Mexico and California;¹² in compensation, Mexico received \$15 million. Clause IX guaranteed former Mexican citizens the exercise of their civil and political rights, freedom of religion, property rights, and cultural autonomy.¹³ Article 2 of the protocol attached to the treaty guaranteed the retention of Spanish and Mexican land grants and property titles recognized by Mexican law. The fact that the American government did not live up to these clauses would strain forever the relations between the vanquished people and their conquerors.

How many Mexicans were affected by this treaty? Very few, despite the area of these ceded provinces, which represented 50 percent of the national Mexican territory but less than one-hundredth of its population. There were no more than 23,000 in 1790. The troubles following Mexican Independence set off the first large migration northward. Of the some 80,000 Mexicans who resided in the Southwest on the eve of the annexation, about 2,000 went back across the Rio Grande in order to retain their Mexican citizenship; those who remained automatically became American citizens after one year. After the annexation, by a reverse process, a certain number of Mexicans chose to move "north of Mexico"; they "emigrated,"¹⁴ trusting the terms of the treaty and hoping to find better living conditions and a more liberal society. The wave of immigration intensified between 1890 and 1930, and again after World War II.

It has always been difficult to determine the exact number of Mexican-Americans in the United States (increased annually by several thousand illegal immigrants). Which criterion should be used—place of origin, language, or surname? After the census of 1940, they were no longer classified as Mexicans, but rather, among whites, as "Spanish-Speaking Whites" (1940), then as "Spanish-Surnamed Whites" (1950, 1960, 1970).¹⁵ The term "Mexican-American," which acknowledges both their Mexican cultural heritage and their participation in the American nation, would have been more appropriate; it should have been made official in the treaty of 1848, which made the Mexicans of the Southwest American citizens. Indeed:

Seventy years ago there were no "Mexican Americans." There were people in the Southwest who were somehow both from Mexico and natives of the United States. But in the view of the regular Americans who knew them best, the transplanted Easterners, Midwesterners, Southerners, Irish, Italians, Jews, and Chinese busy Americanizing the Southwest, and the

Negroes serving them, these people did not belong there as Americans. They were “Spaniards” if they were prosperous and pale, and “greasers”¹⁶ or “Spics”¹⁷ or “Mexicans” if they were poor or brown.¹⁸

For a long time, the terms “Mexican” and “Spaniard” (including its variants, “Hispanic-American” and “Hispanic”) prevailed. Both are improper. Formerly used by Anglo-Americans and by Mexican-Americans themselves to designate two different social classes, they still retain this original meaning. The great landowners prided themselves on their Spanish ancestry. But with the exception of a handful of families in isolated villages of New Mexico, few could really substantiate a direct line of descent from Spanish colonists and *conquistadores*. The *Hispanos* rejected the term “Mexican” as an insult. It was reserved for the “mixed-blood” lower classes and has been geographically incorrect since 1848. The term “Hispanic-American” survived the collapse of the grand “Spanish” families and has enjoyed a resurgence each time the affluent, assimilating middle class wanted to dissociate itself from the foreign-born and poor. This was the case during the 1920s in New Mexico, where increasing immigration created a rift between long-established Mexican-Americans and newly arrived Mexicans.¹⁹ During the same era, another euphemistic label was adopted in Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado: “Latin-American.” It is found in the title of the first association of leading Mexican-Americans, the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), created in 1929. The middle class considered itself either “Hispanic-American” or “Latin-American.”

In the years after 1960, the militant residents of the *barrio*, or Mexican neighborhood, introduced the term “Mexican-American,” especially in Southern California. They refused to disguise their ethnic origin in vague terminology. The title of the association they founded in 1960, the Mexican American Political Association (MAPA), is eloquent. This straightforward name was too direct for those who moved in circles outside the *barrio*, among Anglos. They preferred “American of Mexican origin,” which highlighted their American citizenship. However, “Mexican-American” was little used outside California and was considered insulting by the *Hispanos* of New Mexico and elsewhere.

The hyphen was rejected by many as a humiliating sign of Mexican-Americans’ “minority,” or second-class, status. The activists sought a more specific name. As playwright Luis Valdez put it:

Our insistence on calling ourselves Chicanos stems from a realization that we are not just one more minority in the United States. We reject the semantic games of sociologists and whitewashed Mexicans who frantically identify us as Mexican-Americans, Spanish-Americans, Spanish-Surnamed, Americans of Mexican descent, etc. We further reject efforts to make us disappear into the white melting pot. . . .²⁰

The term “Chicano” was used officially for the first time by Rodolfo (“Corky”) Gonzales at the Chicano Youth Liberation Conference in Denver in

1969. He revived a word that had been in use previously and gave it a new meaning by applying it to young Mexican-American activists. The origin of the word is obscure and it is difficult to define. The interpretation of Professor Philip D. Ortego of the University of Texas at El Paso, that Chicano is derived from the Nahuatl *meshicano*, seems to be generally accepted.²¹ It may also come from the Nahuatl word *mexicanoob*, which designated the god Quetzalcoatl; as appealing as this explanation is, it appears rather implausible. On a more prosaic level, *Chicano* might be nothing more than a slang expression, an abbreviated form of *Mexicano* or a compound word composed of two elements: *Chihuahua* (a Mexican state that borders the United States) plus *Texano*; or from *chico* (“young boy”) plus *-ano*. A Chicano would therefore be a Mexican-American who acts childishly. A link to the word *chicazo*, which designates an uneducated young street urchin, is interesting, if not conclusive. In other inventive hypotheses, Chicano is a deformation of *chinaco*, a nickname given by the French to the Mexicans, or from *Chichimeca*, an Indian tribe.²² Some people have likely confused Chicano with the almost identical *chicana* and *chicanero*, which, respectively, mean “ruse” and “scoundrel” in Spanish. It may be that the discredit heaped upon this term derives in part from this unfortunate confusion.²³ The word *Chicano* is generally unknown in Mexico.²⁴

The meaning of the word has varied depending upon the period. It appeared for the first time, in a variant spelling, in the early 1930s in the works of sociologist Manuel Gamio, to designate newly arrived immigrants whose status was not yet well defined and whom the local people had named *cholos* or *chicanos*.²⁵ It is these Chicanos of whom union leader Ernesto Galarza wrote, forty years later, in his autobiography. He arrived at the same definition as his predecessor: the “name by which we called an unskilled worker born in Mexico and just arrived in the United States.”²⁶ It was no more than “a nickname given in sympathy and exasperation. . . .”²⁷

The word was used once again in the forties during the Zoot Suit race riots, then, in the same period, used for the first time in a literary work, a short story by Mario Suárez. The author describes a Tucson barrio, whose inhabitants, the Chicanos,

. . . raise hell on Saturday night and listen to Padre Estanislao on Sunday morning. While the term *chicano* is the short way of saying *Mexicano*, it is not restricted to the *paisanos* who came from old Mexico with the territory or the last famine to work for the railroad, labor, sing, and go on relief. *Chicano* is the easy way of referring to everybody.²⁸

At the end of the 1960s, under the influence of student groups in Southern California and the Raza Unida party,²⁹ the term took on a specifically political connotation. The Mexican-American Law Students Association of the University of California at Los Angeles renamed itself the Chicano Law Students Association. Richard Vásquez published the novel *Chicano* in 1970; the barrio newspaper in San Bernardino, California, was named *El Chicano*, and so forth.

The term became more and more common, without dethroning "Mexican-American," even among militants (while Black activists completely rejected "Negro" in favor of "Black"). The literary review *El Grito* [The Cry], for example, was subtitled *A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought*,³⁰ and it was founded by Berkeley professors who ardently defended *chicanismo*.

The fortunes of the term generally were tied to its political, social, and economic context. While Republicans remained resolutely faithful to "Mexican-American," and even to "Hispanic" and "Spanish-Speaking," Democrats quickly established a semantic equivalency between "Mexican-American" and "Chicano," the latter becoming a synonym for "*La Raza*," and for "brown" or "bronzed." There was a parallel with Black Americans, among whom "Negro" (Mexican) slowly gave way to "Afro-American" (Mexican-American), and then to Black (Chicano). Brown Power and the Brown Berets of the 1970s evoked Black Power and the Black Panthers of the preceding decade.³¹

In the strictest sense, Chicanos subscribe to Brown Power; they represent no more than a "minority within a minority,"³² and not the entirety of Mexican-Americans. They are usually from the *barrio*.

The word "Chicano" has thus undergone many transformations in meaning since the 1930s. Formerly a term of derision, it now stands for *La Raza*. It is more difficult than ever to define, as indefinable as the "soul" of Blacks.³³

What image of this minority is projected by Anglo-American literature and the literature of the Mexican minority itself?

Anglo literature now treats this subject less often than it used to, while Mexican-American literature, now in full flower, appeared to have been non-existent for decades. In an anthology, for example, Edward Simmen ascribes the first Mexican-American literary work to the year 1947,³⁴ while critics generally discuss only the militant Chicano literature of the past few years. Were there really no literary works earlier? Not a single literary history mentions any intellectual activity within the Mexican minority, and the earliest Mexican-American works, with rare exceptions, are not to be found in American libraries.

Yet, a body of literature derived from a long Spanish and Mexican tradition persisted long after 1848 but never became popular, for several reasons. The difficult situation of Mexicans just after the annexation, their ambiguous position toward both Mexico and the United States,³⁵ hardly created a climate favorable to literary development.

Some works of the years immediately following annexation were probably burned,³⁶ others lost; written in Spanish, they were published in Mexico, where they were studied in universities, then forgotten. Mexican-Americans were in no position to publish their own literature. Works that conformed to neither the linguistic nor literary standards prevailing in the rest of the country could hardly expect to receive a favorable reception from Eastern publishers or from the Anglo public; so they were sent instead to Mexico. Mexican-American newspapers became more and more numerous and published short

pieces, poems, essays, and short stories, as well as news reports, but the majority of these newspapers were short-lived.³⁷

Apart from these publication difficulties, there was a cultural problem: ties to Mexico remained very strong. After 1848, the children of the affluent continued to go south of the Rio Grande for their studies. For the rest, the family was the school. It carefully safeguarded the language and the inexhaustible reservoir of songs, poems, and legends, which were passed on orally from generation to generation. But those who made a career of writing found themselves in a dilemma: if they published in Mexico, they had to follow Mexican models to please the Mexican public and, consequently, disregard their experiences as Mexican-Americans. To succeed in the United States, they would have had to abandon their language and consequently a certain intellectual orientation.

Thus oral literature predominated.³⁸ To a certain degree, the conquered people, living in isolation on ranches or distant farms, locked into their language, limited in opportunities to publish, lost interest in a higher literature. The literary impulse had such difficulty in blossoming that it ended up flowering only in oral and folkloric form. However, the abundant folklore did not obscure the beauty of the *corridos*, whose form was inherited from Mexico but whose content reflected the personal experience of the author. There still exists an entire body of this literature, which is either in need of publication or, neglected, in need of resurrection.³⁹

This was the task undertaken from 1967 to 1974 by a team from the Berkeley literary review *El Grito*, under the direction of Octavio Romano;⁴⁰ it sought out unpublished works in the hands of private citizens,⁴¹ it cataloged old newspapers,⁴² and it searched through private collections.

Mexican-American literature was not born during the Chicano movement. Like its authors, it was shaped by annexation, immigration, the struggle for survival in a hostile society, difficult socioeconomic conditions, and, finally, a long period of intellectual and literary maturation.

I propose here to study the image of the Mexican-American in Anglo-American literature and both the oral and written literature of the Mexican minority. By "Mexican-American," I mean the American of Mexican origin as well as any Mexican worker residing in the United States. I will examine how the image of the Mexican-American was formed and transformed by its historical, social, and political context, from the annexation in 1848 to 1974. By the latter date, the young Chicano literature had become abundant and varied enough to evaluate.

Two types of presentation were possible: one thematic and diachronic, the other synchronic. The first possibility was tempting; indeed, some major themes were discernible: the primitivism of Mexican-Americans, acculturation, rebellion, the alienation of the worker, the *barrio*, and so forth. But this method did not account for the problems posed by the language; in Mexican-American literature, the choice of linguistic vehicle is a function of the sociohistorical context. With few exceptions, Spanish, the native language, remained

the favored form of expression during the problematic period of adaptation to American culture; the assimilation phase, on the other hand, was marked by the predominance of the majority society's language. Most recently, with the return toward ethnicity, the vernacular language has reestablished its rights: while some Chicanos write in English, others have returned to Spanish. An original mode of expression has also appeared in which the two languages are used alternately within the same work, especially in poetry; this internal bilingualism is not only a literary form of expression but, as we shall see, a political act as well.

The division I have chosen for the study corresponds to the three traditional phases through which most minorities pass in the United States and elsewhere. In the case of the Mexican minority, the first and longest phase covers the period extending from the annexation to World War II. In the postwar years, the second period, acculturation definitely took hold. Beginning in 1965, the year of the strike in Delano, there is a veritable sociopolitical and literary explosion, accompanied by an impassioned rediscovery of the past.

The sociohistorical perspective unifies this study, even though it risks introducing a disconcerting segmentation. This method also raises the problem of fragmentation and repetition. I have tried to remedy this by comparing the two perspectives, Anglo-American and Mexican-American, in each period, and to clarify the evolution of each distinct epoch.

Anglo-American writers at first conformed to fixed ideas without really "seeing" the Other, writing of this person only in stereotypes that originated before the annexation, stereotypes that would long persist in the collective memory of Americans. For their part, Mexicans first gave themselves a static image that fully corresponded to their role as the Other. Once they had cut the umbilical cord and gone beyond the folkloric stage, they regained their literary and intellectual autonomy. Turning inward, they defined themselves as Mexican-Americans confronting Anglo-American society—instead of allowing themselves to be defined by the Other, they made themselves "visible." Gradually, a more objective image took shape in the mind of the Anglo-American and a more personal one in the mind of the Mexican-American.

About the Author

MARCIENNE ROCARD was born in Paris in 1931. She completed her undergraduate studies at the Sorbonne, earning B.A. degrees in German and English. In 1963, she received a Master's Degree in French from the University of California at Los Angeles. Professor Rocard earned the French *agrégation* in 1970 and received a doctorate from the University of Lyon II in 1978. She has taught French, English, and German language courses in France, Switzerland, Canada, and the United States. In 1971, she joined the faculty of the University of Toulouse–Le Mirail, where she has taught English and courses in American and Canadian literature. In 1981, she spent the spring semester at Ohio University as a Fulbright exchange professor. In addition to *Les Fils du soleil*, Professor Rocard has published numerous articles and book reviews in the fields of Canadian and Chicano literature.

Contents

Translator's Note	vii
Introduction	ix
PART ONE: 1848–1940	
THE CONQUERED: THE YOKE OF THE STEREOTYPE	
The Anglo-American Point of View	
1848–1930: The Placing of the Yoke	3
Chapter 1. Ethnocentrism: The Myth of Anglo Superiority	11
Chapter 2. Romanticism: The California Myth	24
Chapter 3. Realism: The Mexican-American Faces Anglo Society	40
1930–1940: The Yoke of the Stereotype Loosens	51
Chapter 4. Admiration for a Different People	53
Chapter 5. The Defenders of the Oppressed	62
The Mexican-American Point of View	
Early Modes of Expression	67
Chapter 6. Mexicans Take Refuge in Their Myths	72
Chapter 7. Mexican-Americans Confront the Present	82

PART TWO: 1940–1965

THE INVISIBLE BUT INVINCIBLE MINORITY

The Anglo-American Point of View

Introduction to the Period 109

Chapter 8. Flight Into the Past: The Children of Nature 113

Chapter 9. The Barrio: Refuge and Trap 129

The Mexican-American Point of View

The First Literary Spokesmen 153

Chapter 10. In the Traditional Framework of the Barrio 155

Chapter 11. The Pocho's Dilemma 171

PART THREE: 1965–1974

CHICANOS PRESENT THEIR OWN IMAGE

The Anglo-American Point of View

Confronting the Chicano Phenomenon 189

Chapter 12. One Last Beautiful Dream 191

Chapter 13. Marginality and Difference 193

Chapter 14. Mexican-Americans Confront the Debacle 201

The Mexican-American Point of View

Chapter 15. The Chicano Movement: Sociopolitical and Literary
Awareness 207

Chapter 16. Strangers in Their Own Land 217

Chapter 17. Enough! The Chicanos in a Rage 246

Chapter 18. I Am Joaquín / *Yo Soy Joaquín*: Chicanos Affirm
Their Identity 266Chapter 19. The Children of the Sun: Chicanos as Precursors of a
New World 281

Conclusion 293

Notes 297

Bibliography 359

Index 385