

*A Captive Audience* explores some lesser-known themes surrounding the experiences of internment in Arkansas. In one chapter, Welky shows that poor blacks and whites living in the delta sometimes expressed anger and jealousy because the interned Japanese had access to social services, hospitals, and schools and they did not. She devotes a chapter to friendships and romances that developed over time, noting that there were more than 250 marriages in the Arkansas camps. She also explains that most families left Arkansas quickly after the war ended because the state tried to prevent Japanese Americans from acquiring land. Only one Japanese-American student stayed in the state to attend what is now the University of the Ozarks.

Overall, *A Captive Audience* is a well-balanced and informative addition to the growing body of literature on the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. With the renewed interest in Rohwer and Jerome, this book will make a welcome addition to classrooms around the state, helping young Arkansans gain a deeper understanding of wartime experiences and legacies.

KELLY ANNE HAMMOND  
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE

\*\*\*

*Corazón de Dixie: Mexicanos in the U.S. South since 1910.* By Julie M. Weise. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015. Pp. x, 344. Acknowledgments, maps, illustrations, tables, appendix, notes, bibliography, index. \$32.50, paper.)

The anti-immigrant movement that swept the U.S. South starting around 2004—demands that undocumented students not receive in-state tuition discounts, local ordinances designed to harass immigrants and those who give them comfort, and criminalization of undocumented status—serves as the starting point for Julie Weise's compelling study of the past one hundred years of Mexican migration to the region. Drawing on archival sources in both the United States and Mexico and for later periods on oral histories in both Spanish and English, she rejects the common assumption that southerners' recent hostility to the mostly Mexican immigrants was simply a continuation of Dixie's particularly deep-rooted commitment to white supremacy. Instead, she maintains that it was the rise of the modern Sunbelt South and the region's increasing resemblance

to the rest of the nation that “resulted in greater, not lesser, exclusion and subjugation” of Mexican immigrants (p. 220).

In the first half of the book, Weise uses three case studies—New Orleans during the Mexican Revolution (1910-1920), the Mississippi Delta in the 1920s and 1930s, and the Arkansas Delta from World War II through the early 1960s—to examine the ways in which Mexicanos fit into the white-black binary of the Jim Crow South. She finds the supposedly rigid race relations of the Jim Crow South were in fact quite flexible when it benefited the economic interests of the region’s elite. New Orleans proved to be a magnet for members of the Mexican middle and upper classes fleeing the economic disruptions of the Mexican Revolution. Crescent City elites, anxious to benefit from Gulf trade, welcomed these refugees, emphasizing their European heritage and integrating them on the white side of the color line. Mexicano sharecroppers in 1920s Mississippi initially found themselves on the black side of that line, and they appealed to Mexican consular officials to help. Motivated by visions of Mexican nationalism produced during the revolution, these officials convinced Gov. Theodore Bilbo that moving Mexicanos to the other side of the color line would better relations between the two countries and ensure a ready supply of migrants willing to work on shares. By the 1930s, Mississippi’s “Mexican Americans sent their children to white schools, and from the 1940s they married white people in substantial numbers” (p. 81).

The size of Mexicano migrations to New Orleans and Mississippi paled in comparison to that of the *bracero* program in Arkansas. Between 1946 and 1964, some 300,000 Mexican *braceros*—male workers annually contracted through an agreement between the U.S. and Mexican governments—made their way to the cotton fields of eastern Arkansas. Like their counterparts in Mississippi a few decades earlier, Arkansas’s *braceros* started out on the black side of the color line but ended up on the white side. Weise argues that the *braceros*’ notions of citizenship in the Mexican state informed their demands for better working conditions and for access to white spaces. To help these workers achieve their goals, the Mexican central government and its consulate in Memphis threatened to withhold labor from not only individual planters but also entire areas. Dependence on this inexpensive labor source forced the region’s planters and landowners to improve working conditions and open white spaces to Mexicans. Perhaps most astonishing, in 1952 planters convinced the Marked Tree City Council to pass an ordinance prohibiting persons and businesses from discriminating against Mexicans.

The end of the Jim Crow era, Weise contends, led to the emergence of a “pro-God, pro-business, and pro-Mexican” conservatism in farm-

ing communities by the 1970s and 1980s (p. 150). Using a case study of southern Georgia, she shows that landowners sought Mexican guest workers to fill the void created by newfound black economic mobility. Landowners came to perceive Mexicans as hard-working, appreciative, and moral and, thus, unlike their black predecessors, worthy recipients of Christian charity and patronage. Community support for the continued employment of Mexicans was so strong in these rural areas that when landowners replaced their guest workers with lower-paid undocumented migrants in the 1990s, they faced little opposition from local politicians, white or black.

The tenuous accommodation that Mexicanos found in much of the twentieth-century South gave way to efforts to exclude Mexicanos in the twenty-first. Weise locates the origins of the region's anti-immigrant movement in the exurbs of the urban centers (she uses Charlotte as a case study). Unlike earlier generations, Mexicanos in the 1990s tended to migrate in family units and see their migrations as permanent. They wanted things not readily available to low-skilled workers in Mexico—affordable homes, a chance to enjoy consumer culture, companionate marriage, and opportunities for their children. Migrants increasingly found these things in Charlotte's exurbs and began consuming social services. It was conflicts over these governmental services, especially education—rather than competition over jobs—that fueled the anti-immigrant movement. As Weise explains, “white middle-class home owners worried that their family's economic progress was stunted when resources for which they paid taxes became diverted to Latino immigrants” (p. 201). The leader of anti-immigration forces in the North Carolina legislature told her that he felt compelled to act only after seeing his son seated in a kindergarten classroom next to a recent arrival from Mexico: “It's not only a matter of how much money this child is costing the school but where does the attention of the teacher go?” (p. 201). Weise insists that there was little particularly “southern” about this anti-immigration movement. The middle-class whites at its center were just as likely to be Rust Belt refugees as they were to be southern-born, and the movement borrowed heavily from the rhetoric of earlier anti-immigrant movements in places like California's Orange County.

*Corazón de Dixie* is smart, insightful, compelling, well-written, and masterfully researched, but I wish Weise had paid more attention to the structures of Mexicano employment. The migrations of sharecroppers to Mississippi, braceros to Arkansas, and guest workers to Georgia were all sponsored by forces that had derived much of their outsized political power through disfranchisement or its legacies. These landowners used their

vast political resources to tamp down opposition to the Mexicano presence (and, in the case of Arkansas, Weise downplays the persistence and strength of the challenges that African Americans and labor offered to the bracero program). Mexicano communities in these agricultural areas used the limited power they had not to confront those opposed to their presence but to motivate landowners to act on their behalf. But Mexicano workers in Charlotte's highly fragmented service sector had no such powerful patrons. Opposition to the Mexicano presence in the South did not simply appear after the turn of the twenty-first century; it had always been there. What allowed this opposition to make headway in places like Charlotte was the decline of employment structures built on systems of patronage. In places where the Mexicano presence continues to be tied to powerful industries—like the poultry industry in Northwest Arkansas—the anti-immigration movement has made little headway even among exurbanites.

MICHAEL PIERCE

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE