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Discussions examining the differences between Congregational and Anglican religion, tradition, and architecture could have been paralleled, for example, by a discussion of the differences between Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism, differences so obviously revealed in their architecture. While there is some new information in the book about the relationship between region, religion, and architecture, the book will disappoint Iowa readers looking for information about religious architecture in the Midwest.


REVIEWED BY LOUISE A. KERR, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO

In _Mexicans in the Midwest_, Juan R. García has done an admirable job of uncovering, digesting, categorizing, and arranging materials about the history of Mexican settlement in the Midwest, which he defines as the region including the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Wisconsin. He is limited to studies that have already been done and by materials available to him for research, which results in uneven coverage of some of these states. Histories of Detroit, East Chicago (his own and others'), Kansas City, and Chicago made the early twentieth-century history of those areas considerably easier to describe than were those of either Nebraska or Iowa. In addition, it is evident that he has added a great deal of his own research to the work of others.

Most of the available research concentrates heavily on the period covered in this book (1900–1932). Still, it was no easy task to find a workable organizational framework for the plethora of primary and secondary material, which has significant gaps in topical coverage as well as in geography and chronology. The strategy he uses is to take a modified chronological approach and supplement it with coverage of topics for which there was sufficient information to draw inferences about the experience of Mexicans across the Midwest, whether urban or rural, whether in large barrios or small communities. Thus there are chapters on housing, women, Mexican consular activity, organizational efforts, and mutual aid societies. Much of the information for these sections comes from newspapers of the period as well as from primary reports—apparently derived from the secondary sources. García acknowledges the sketchiness of some of the information in the chapter, “Social and Cultural Life of Mexicans in
Some [emphasis added] Midwesten Cities”; by doing so he recognizes that in some instances the experiences were often local rather than general.

The study is helpful in showing that much of the Mexican immigrant experience followed patterns established by earlier European immigrant groups. Men arrived first, followed by wives and families. The immigrants formed unions—sometimes despite the resistance of other workers—and social and cultural organizations, and founded mutual aid societies to help them traverse typical rites of passage such as birth, marriage, and death. At the same time, García describes the hardships suffered specifically by Mexicans, including racial bias in employment and housing. He also shows how happenings in the homeland affected local events. The Mexican Revolution, which played an especially important role in fueling emigration throughout most of this period, coincided with the slowing of European immigration during World War I and the virtual halt that came with the U.S. immigration quota laws of 1921 and 1924.

There are some troubling aspects to the study, however. There is a tendency to overgeneralize. For example, in the chapter, “Women and Work,” we are told that “all women worked.” We understand, of course, that women’s work is never done. But when García says, “They labored in a variety of occupations both in and outside of the home,” we are not given a clear understanding of Mexican women’s labor participation in the Midwest. How did it differ from other ethnic and immigrant women or from native-born women? What were the urban-rural differences? Did it make a difference where they came from as well as where they settled? Because of the uneven nature of the research, this kind of generalization is particularly problematic.

Perhaps more troubling are the citations. For example, the reference for a newspaper account of a “veritable invasion of Mexican laborers” is given as Stanley West’s 1973 Syracuse University dissertation on the Mexican Aztec Society. While one expects a synthesis such as this to be derivative, the citations do not clearly distinguish García’s original research from the work of others.

That said, however, the work is a welcome one. It brings together a great deal of information and should spur much more research on this important, understudied subject.