

Structural Violence Against Indigenous Oaxacans: A Transnational Phenomenon

Andrew Tarbox

Submission for Social Sciences

---

Structural violence refers to the “social arrangements that systematically bring subordinated and disadvantaged groups into harm’s way and put them at risk for various forms of suffering” (Benson, 2008, p. 590). In the agricultural labor sector in the United States, structural violence takes the form of “deplorable wages and endemic poverty, forms of stigma and racism, occupational health and safety hazards, poor health” (Benson, 2008, p. 591). This system of structural violence began to develop in the agricultural sector in the nineteenth century. Before the nineteenth century, “the living and working conditions faced by farmworkers were not markedly different from those of industrial workers” (Thompson & Wiggins, 2002, p. 140). However, continuing into the twentieth century and especially through the New Deal reforms, the same degree of protection toward industrial workers did not extend to workers in the agricultural sector (Thompson & Wiggins, 2002). The lack of regulation in the agricultural sector has persisted. In addition, the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) sparked the flight of about 400,000 Mexican immigrants to the United States between 2000-2005 because American farmers were given large subsidies and could export agricultural goods cheaply; Mexican farmers migrated to the United States because it became difficult to earn wages in Mexico from exports to the United States (Delgado-Wise & Márquez Covarrubias, 2007). Indigenous Mexicans, especially from the state of Oaxaca, made up a large proportion of those who fled. Within Mexico, there is an ethnic hierarchy and a system of structural violence toward the indigenous, which restricts their economic advancement (Kearney, 2000). When these groups migrate to the United States, this same ethnic hierarchy and structural violence persists, especially when indigenous Mexicans work alongside non-indigenous Mexicans, suggesting that there is an added dimension to structural violence on agricultural farms in the United States that have Mexican workers.

In addition to NAFTA serving as an explanation for why indigenous Mexicans left and are leaving areas of Mexico such as Oaxaca, it is also necessary to understand how ethnic and racial categorization have contributed to indigenous oppression and consequent flight. Lynn Stephen, professor of Anthropology at the University of Oregon writes about the history of racial and ethnic classifications and tension in her book *¡Zapata Lives! : Histories and Cultural Politics in Southern Mexico*. According to Stephen, the racial and ethnic categorization in Mexico during Spanish colonial rule set the stage for regarding indigenous Mexicans as part of the out group because they were not white Spaniards. Furthermore, although Mestizos did have indigenous blood, they were not purely indigenous; because of this distinction and the fact that their population size increased, they were regarded with higher status than were purely indigenous Mexicans (Stephen, 2002). After the failed ratification of the San Andrés Accords on Indigenous Rights in 1996, which would have granted equal rights and self-determination to Mexico's indigenous population, indigenous Mexicans still exist "within... a colonially inherited system of merged racial/ethnic classification in which they are ranked below Mestizos...and White Spaniards, who supposedly have preserved their Spanish heritage over 500 years" (Stephen, 2007, p. 209). Because of this system of racial/ethnic classification, it is difficult for indigenous peoples to protect their economic and cultural interests within the confining Mexican state.

This system of racial/ethnic hierarchy established during the colonial era is highly inflexible and does not permit indigenous groups to express cultural or economic autonomy in their everyday lives. One way the state restricts the economic interests of indigenous peoples is by discouraging land ownership. In Oaxaca there is "assassination, torture, disappearance, and intimidation of indigenous leaders, which usually can be understood within the context of disputes over...land...Such conflicts take place within almost feudal-like rural bossism, which links local relations of domination and intimidation to the repressive power of the state..."

(Kearney, 2000, p.183). Because state structure restricts these indigenous groups from obtaining the right to economic resources such as land and also because there are conflicts over these same resources among indigenous groups, a system of structural violence is promoted by the Mexican state government toward indigenous populations. In addition to the racial/ethnic hierarchy structure over land ownership, there is evidence that indigenous Mexicans also notice this hierarchy in their daily interactions in states such as Oaxaca. For example, in Lynn Stephen's book *Transborder Lives: Indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California, and Oregon* she describes and provides an ethnographic account of everyday racism even within the state of Oaxaca in her interview with Lucia Morales, a Mixteco from San Agustín Atenango who describes her experience going into the primarily Mestizo district of Silacayoapan when she tries to obtain a corrected birth certificate to use as a voting identification card. She describes her experience:

I waited there for four hours. They waited on other people. Then the señorita who works there tells me, 'I am leaving now and you will have to come back on Monday.' She saw me sitting there with my two little kids for hours and hours. She just thinks she is better than us. They all do there... (Stephen, 2007, p. 210).

This account demonstrates the racial/ethnic division especially between the indigenous and the Mestizos. Furthermore, the fact that this account took place within Oaxaca, which is home to 17 indigenous groups, reveals that indigenous Mexicans even experience mistreatment in areas in which they have large populations (Kresge, 2007). Along these same lines, indigenous Mexicans experience this racial/ethnic hierarchy when they try to exercise basic civil rights such as obtaining a birth certificate in order to vote, as is evident from this ethnographic account.

In another account of the containing racial/ethnic hierarchy, Stephen describes instances in which Zapotec women go to Oaxaca City in order seek assistance from government agencies.

According to one account, “You will walk in and they peg you as Indian from one of the towns—especially if you are speaking Zapotec. Then, it is as if you aren’t even there...we have to sit there for hours. We might as well be invisible” (Stephen, 2007, p. 210). Like the previous account, this account demonstrates the discrimination that indigenous populations in Oaxaca face when they try to obtain public services. However, this account also adds another dimension to the discrimination that indigenous populations face, which is language discrimination. This language discrimination as well as other forms of physical discrimination continues when indigenous groups travel outside of Oaxaca and they are grouped together as indigenous people from Oaxaca. Stephen describes this phenomenon in the following way:

When indigenous families...travel in Mexico, as soon as they identify themselves as coming from Oaxaca they are immediately classified as *chaparritos* (short ones), *Oaxaquitos* (little people from Oaxaca), or *Inditos sucios* (dirty little Indians), and sometimes they are told they can’t speak because of their use of their native Mixteco or Zapoteco (Stephen, 2007, p. 210).

This racial/ethnic hierarchy directed toward indigenous Mexicans extends outside of Oaxaca, and it presents itself in the form of a derogatory classification system through the use of words such as *chaparritos*, *Oaxaquitos*, and *Inditos sucios*. These classifications fixate around the fact that the indigenous Oaxacans are shorter than non-indigenous Mexicans, such as the Mestizos, or that there is a language difference between these groups. The classifications also emphasize the in/out group philosophy that exists outside of Oaxaca and the fact that marked physical differences are observed between those who are indigenous and those who are not. According to Professor Emeritus Pierre Van den Berghe, an anthropologist and sociologist at the University of Washington, “Racism is conceivably a case of culture ‘highjacking’ genes which were selected for different ends...and making them serve a totally different social agenda. Yet that social

agenda itself had an underlying biological programme: fitness maximisation through nepotism” (Van den Berghe, 1996, p. 62). Van den Berghe’s theory emphasizes that racism is based on social interaction; however, the way racism comes about is through observed biological differences which groups use to benefit those in their own category and exclude those outside their group. When applied to the racial/ethnic hierarchies directed toward indigenous Mexicans when they are outside Oaxaca, Van den Berghe’s theory fits because indigenous receive classifications such as *chaparritos* (short ones), *Oaxaquitos* (little people from Oaxaca), or *Inditos sucios* (dirty little Indians) because those who are considered ethnically superior, an idea reinforced by especially Mestizo Mexicans, observe physical and linguistic differences between themselves and indigenous populations. As a result, these differences are played up in everyday interactions between indigenous and non-indigenous Mexicans, and they reinforce and contribute to a system of structural violence that is evident especially when indigenous Mexicans try to exercise basic civil rights such as obtaining a birth certificate in order to register to vote, or seeking out government assistance.

It is necessary to examine how the racial/ethnic hierarchy restricts the social and civil rights of indigenous Mexicans before examining how this hierarchy takes shape in the Mexican agricultural sector and consequently enforces a system of structural violence. More specifically, indigenous Mexicans, especially the Mixtecs, migrate north to work in the agricultural sector in the northern Mexican states of Sinaloa and Baja California Norte. At the agricultural farms, “human right abuses...are associated with the abysmal working and living conditions to which Mixtec agricultural workers are subjected: pesticide poisoning, over work, slave wages, dangerous conditions, debt peonage, and so forth” (Kearney, 2000, p. 184). Given the poor working conditions that indigenous Mexicans are subjected to, Mixtec laborers have organized independently run labor unions to defend their rights. However, union membership is a

requirement to work in Mexico, and in the Northwest Mexican export agriculture sector an official government union, the Confederation of Mexican Workers, forces all workers to join and pay dues to this official union. Therefore, this official union invalidates the attempts of indigenous Mexicans to defend themselves through their own unions (Kearney, 2000). In addition, the Mixtec labor force in Northern Mexico experiences poor working conditions such as over work, low wages, pesticide poisoning and even peonage, which is “a condition of enforced servitude by which a person is restrained of his or her liberty and compelled to labor in payment of some debt or obligation” (“Peonage”). In this case, the Mexican government imposes a system of structural violence on the workers by obliging them to work for the Mexican government instead of for their own goal of making money; however, this system of ethnic/racial, hierarchical structural violence does not just stop at the act of performing labor. It extends to the fact that although Mixtec laborers can form unions, they have to join the government union, and their own unions are not recognized or registered by the federal government. Consequently, “...a significant proletarian identity and consciousness has never emerged among the Mixtec migrant agricultural workers” (Kearney, 2000, p.185). As a result, the inability to form unions that are autonomous from the government imposes a second tier of structural violence on the Mixtec laborers, because not only can they not unionize apart from the government but they also cannot unionize to fight for better worker rights and wages to deconstruct the first tier of structural violence imposed on them in this oppressive agricultural labor equation.

Thus far, this paper has focused on how a system of structural violence toward indigenous Mexicans is played up in society in general and how this system of structural violence in the general society has led to exclusionary government policies especially toward unionization by indigenous Mexicans in the agricultural labor sector. It is important to examine

the racial/ethnic hierarchy and consequent system of structural violence in Mexico in order to study how this system is reinforced when indigenous Mexicans migrate to the United States.

However, first it is necessary to examine why indigenous Mexicans came to the United States in the first place and also how the racial/ethnic hierarchy against indigenous Mexicans is a cause of Migration and also is shown in the process of migration. In her book, *Transborder Lives: Indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California*, Lynn Stephen describes the historical context through which indigenous Mexicans, specifically Mixtecs in her descriptions, came to work in the United States agricultural sector. According to Stephen:

For more than four decades, Mixtec migrant farmworkers have provided the cheap, mobile labor force needed to support the commercialization of agriculture in Mexico and the United States. When the economic integration of the U.S. and Mexican economies accelerated in the 1970s and Mexico's economy underwent a process of 'structural adjustment' in the 1980s, Mixtec workers were part of the invisible glue of poverty and extremely difficult working conditions that held the integration together... The new model reduced government support for peasant agriculture in order to encourage peasants to migrate to high-wage regions... The result was massive mobilization of migrant workers from the traditionally peasant regions of the country such as Oaxaca... (Stephen, 2007, p.122).

The system of structural adjustment in which support for peasant agriculture was reduced as well as the description of the "invisible glue of poverty" by which Mixtec indigenous Mexicans were held demonstrate that within Mexico a system of structural violence was created. This system of structural violence was characterized by low wages and massive migration of indigenous populations to northern states such as Sinaloa, Sonora, and Baja California because these states, in addition to gaining the indigenous labor force, also gained agricultural investments. However,

between the 1960s and 1990s the trade barriers for agricultural products were reduced, which increased trade between Mexico and the United States (Stephen, 2007). According to Stephen, “Nearly two decades of free trade have deepened the poverty and unemployment in Mexico’s countryside...Mexico’s three million peasants were simply outgunned by 75,000 farmers in Iowa who—with the help of...millions of dollars in government subsidies—could produce twice as much corn at half price” (Stephen, 2007, p.123). By gaining subsidies, American farmers were able to export agricultural goods more cheaply which consequently reduced Mexico’s exporting power and therefore, the need for labor. The structural resettlement of the agricultural industry in Mexico created a system in which Mexicans in agricultural areas, like Oaxaca, which contains much of Mexico’s indigenous population had to go to Northern Mexico to work in low-wage jobs. Furthermore, another structural change in the Mexican economy, in the decades preceding, during, and after NAFTA, caused extreme poverty for those Mexicans living in the countryside. Consequently, rural Mexicans, especially indigenous Mexicans who live in these rural agricultural areas were forced to move to the United States and Northern Mexico in search of labor. In these agricultural areas, a system of structural violence in which workers are subjected to low wages, poor working and living conditions, and language discrimination is present (Kearney, 2000).

Similar to the previously mentioned analysis of the racial/ethnic hierarchy in Mexico, which disadvantages indigenous Mexicans, it is necessary before looking at how this system of racial/ethnic hierarchy presents itself on agricultural farms to examine how indigenous Mexicans fit into the racial/ethnic hierarchy on the broader societal level. In her research as outlined in *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*, Dr. Mary C. Waters, M.E. Zukerman Professor of Sociology at Harvard University, studies white Europeans of the third and fourth generation living in suburbs in California and Pennsylvania in order to examine the importance of their

European ethnic heritage and to what extent they have assimilated into American society. Waters analysis and interviews with white ethnics of European descent suggests that a person's European descent was once important in determining access to services and also "interactions with the native-born population" in the United States (Jiménez, 2008, p. 1528). However, as Europeans began to come to the United States over generations, the nativist feeling towards them by individuals already living in the United States faded and they became "white." Tomás Jiménez, Professor of Sociology at the University of California at San Diego, includes this summary of Mary Water's research in his article *Mexican Immigrant Replenishment and the Continuing Significance of Ethnicity and Race*. In his analysis of Mary Water's research, Jiménez concludes, "although many European groups were once classified as racially distinct from the 'white' majority, their phenotypic similarity to the Anglos eased their assimilation" (Jiménez, 2008, p. 1559). For Jiménez the ease of the assimilation for white Europeans stands in contrast with individuals of Mexican origin who are more "phenotypically diverse." This phenotypic diversity refers to the variation in skin color among Mexicans. In reference to this phenotypic diversity Jiménez states, "the lighter the skin color that some people of Mexican origin possess may allow them to escape the most pernicious forms of nativism, easing their ability to cross intergroup boundaries" (Jiménez, 2008, p. 1559). On the contrary, darker individuals are "easier to negatively racialize than people of European extraction" (Jiménez, 2008, p. 1559). Darker-skinned individuals are more likely to come from indigenous descent; therefore, indigenous Mexicans are more likely to stand on the opposite side of this racial/ethnic dichotomy than the lighter-skinned non-indigenous Mexicans. In the United States, there is a similar racial/ethnic hierarchy to that in Mexico in which the lighter-skinned individuals have higher positions in the racial/ethnic hierarchy while darker-skinned individuals stand at the bottom of this hierarchy. Lighter-skinned individuals within the downtrodden ethnic group

therefore have greater possibility to fight for the advancement of their rights compared to darker-skinned individuals.

While Jiménez's concludes that lighter-skinned Mexicans still fall below whites in the ethnic/racial hierarchy in the United States, he emphasizes that lighter-skinned individuals have the opportunity to advance compared to darker-skinned individuals. An example, of this phenomenon, which will be compared with the hierarchy that is present on agricultural farms later in this paper, comes from a study performed by sociologists Drs. Edward Murguia and Edward Telles titled *Phenotype and schooling among Mexican Americans*. In this study, the investigators examined the light/dark-skinned dichotomy of Mexican American students in the United States education system. According to their analysis, Mexican American students "may find it easier to defuse the negative stereotypes that have been...associated with being Mexican in the United States. Since Mexican American children seem to understand that certain social avenues are more open to Anglos, light skinned Mexican Americans...may be...able to overcome some of the barriers that hinder the mobility of their ethnic group" (Murguia & Telles, 1996, p. 287). This analysis suggests that since light-skinned Mexicans already have the advantage of being able to "defuse the negative stereotypes" of being Mexican, they can try to obtain benefits more commonly characteristic of the white population because they are seen as being more on par with white individuals than are indigenous populations.

Dr. Seth Holmes, Professor of Health and Social Behavior at the University of California Berkeley School of Public Health, discusses how the racial/ethnic hierarchy applies to the treatment of indigenous Mexicans on agricultural labor farms in the United States. While the previously mentioned study discusses the difference in advancement for light-skinned and dark-skinned Mexican Americans in American schools, this study drives home the idea that the racial/ethnic hierarchy in American society can be treated as a spectrum in which the closer a

person or group is to being white, the greater the opportunity for advancement and the farther away someone is from being white, the more poor treatment and discrimination in policies they face by the most white and the subsequent most white groups. On the United States agriculture farms in Washington and California that Holmes introduces in his book, the highest group on this racial/ethnic spectrum is white Americans followed by Mestizo Mexicans and U.S. Latinos, and the lowest groups are indigenous Mexicans. Holmes specifically studies Triqui and Mixtec indigenous populations from Oaxaca. This racial/ethnic spectrum when applied to the setting of the agricultural farm creates a system of structural violence, which takes the form of unjust working conditions, substandard healthcare, and inadequate language or translation services (Holmes, 2013).

In order to understand how this system of structural violence toward indigenous Mexicans is played up on American agricultural farms due to the enforcement of the racial/ethnic spectrum, it is necessary to understand how jobs are structured across agricultural farms according to ethnicity and race. In his book, Holmes includes a detailed analysis of this structure based on the Tanaka Brothers farm in Washington State's Skagit Valley (Holmes, 2013). The hierarchy of these agricultural farms is as follows: farm executives, administrative assistants, crop managers, supervisors, checkers, and hourly field workers (pickers). Another group that is involved on agricultural farms consists of doctors and employees at migrant health clinics. While Holmes, in his discussion of each of these groups describes how they tend to have negative impressions of indigenous Mexicans, he states, "those in closer contact with the farmworkers came to distinguish between 'regular Mexicans' and 'Oaxacans,' and those working in the fields themselves often differentiated among Mestizo, Triqui, and Mixtec people" (Holmes, 2013, p. 85). The groups on the agricultural farm that typically have the most contact with indigenous laborers are supervisors and checkers. Supervisors are in charge of 10-20 pickers and on the

Tanaka farm they “walk through the rows, inspecting and telling workers to pick faster without leaving too many berries behind, allowing too many leaves into their berry buckets, or picking too many pounds of berries per bucket” (Holmes, 2013, p. 65). The supervisors are usually U.S. Latinos or Mestizo Mexicans, and a few are white Americans. Barbara, one of the crew bosses on the Tanaka farm, is a U.S. Latina. According to Barbara’s account “she gets upset that other [supervisors] call Oaxacan people ‘pinche Oaxaco’ (damn Oaxacan) or ‘indio estúpido’ (stupid Indian)” (Holmes, 2013, p. 66). This account demonstrates that based on the direct contact that supervisors have with the pickers, they are able to form derogatory judgments. Furthermore, the fact that other supervisors are typically U.S. Latinos or are Mestizo Mexicans who are making judgments about indigenous Mexicans such as “damn Oaxacans” or “indio estúpido” shows that they view marked differences between themselves and indigenous Mexicans despite coming from a similar geographic region. Including Indian into their derogatory judgment emphasizes that the marked differences that U.S. Latinos and Mestizo Mexicans assume are ethnically based. Barbara’s account demonstrates that the supervisors, who are usually U.S. Latinos or Mestizo Mexicans, internalize this ethnic hierarchy, which in turn converts into a relationship of structural violence between these groups. For example, according to Barbara’s account, on the Tanaka Family Farm there is a policy that if a supervisor fires a picker then the picker can never be hired again by anyone else on the farm. While this policy mainly shows how the supervisors can enforce structural violence, ultimately this system of structural violence is instated at the policy level of the agricultural farm. Farm executives enact policies that are put in place on agricultural farms regarding workers’ rights, and these executives on the Tanaka Family Farm are typically Anglo-Americans. In the context of the racial/ethnic spectrum previously mentioned, white Americans enact this policy, and U.S. Latinos or Mestizos are able to occupy the next level of the racial/ethnic hierarchy because they are closer to white than indigenous

Mexicans on this hierarchy (Holmes, 2013). Another way in which this racial/ethnic hierarchy is enacted by upper level positions on the hierarchy and is enforced by supervisors is through the ability of pickers (who are typically indigenous) to learn English. While farm executives on the Tanaka Family Farm intend that everyone be able to take English classes (which are important for the promise of advancement), employees on the farm do not understand these classes are open to pickers (Holmes, 2013, p.66). Indirectly, individuals who restrict access to these classes or do not help pickers gain access to these courses, restrict their advancement and promote structural violence.

Along the same lines of the structural violence observed when considering language, a system of structural violence is also observed when considering how the structure of agricultural farms, such as the Tanaka Family Farm, treats indigenous migrant laborers when they obtain healthcare, especially when they need translation services. In the Skagit Valley “very few migrant clinics offer services in languages other than Spanish or English” (Holmes, 2013, p.131). Therefore, when Triqui migrant workers, the indigenous populations in this area of Washington State (many of whom either cannot speak Spanish or speak broken Spanish, as well as many women who did not attend school in Mexico and do not speak Spanish) obtain medical services there is a communication gap. When there are translation services available for these populations in indigenous languages, “a Mixtec translator is often called when hospital staff find out a patient is from Oaxaca, even if the patient speaks only Triqui” (Holmes, 2013, p.131). In a system where patients cannot advocate for their healthcare needs due to a language barrier, a system of structural violence is perpetuated.

The fact that indigenous populations cannot advocate or be involved in their own health promotion relates to the structure of agricultural labor farms. In Seth Holmes’ book he includes a section on how migrant workers receive education about pesticides. According to Holmes, the

“only education about pesticides came from a short warning cassette tape in monotone Spanish... After the tape, the farm administrator... asked if [the workers] had any questions... [he] moved on to explain where we should sign the forms all of which were printed in English. One of the forms stated in English that [the workers] agreed not to organize” (Holmes, 2013, p.173). By playing the cassette tape about pesticides in Spanish, farm administrators on the top of the ethnic/racial hierarchy ignore the fact that some indigenous Mexicans cannot speak Spanish at all or have limited Spanish proficiency, as indicated above. Along these same lines, by printing in English the forms that workers need to sign to acknowledge the dangers of pesticides and agreement not to organize the farm administrators give important documents to indigenous Mexicans in a language they do not know at all. Furthermore, by including in English a clause that restricts organization, the farm administrators do not allow indigenous Mexicans to understand a basic right that may be important to them in the future. Therefore, structural violence is promoted by the fact that by not understanding the dangers of working with pesticides, these indigenous laborers may be affected by health and safety hazards in the future.

In conclusion, on agricultural labor farms structural violence, a system that brings disadvantaged groups closer to suffering, takes the form of low wages and poverty, racism, and occupational health and safety hazards, and overall poor health. Within Mexico, there is a racial/ethnic hierarchy that was instated during Spanish colonial rule in which Mestizo Mexicans have a higher position than indigenous Mexicans as a result of their whiter skin color, which is closer to that of the Spanish. This racial/ethnic hierarchy, which has presented itself in the society at-large, exists on agricultural labor farms. However, as previously mentioned, on agricultural labor farms this ethnic/racial hierarchy translates into a system of structural violence. In addition to the use of derogatory terms toward indigenous Mexicans, which reinforces the structural violence, these workers are also kept from advocating for their rights. One example of

this structural violence on agricultural labor farms in Mexico is that although there are no laws restricting indigenous Mexicans from forming their own unions, they are told they have to join the official agricultural labor union, which does not advocate for better wages and working conditions, and they are also told that they cannot join more than one union, thereby invalidating any attempt they have to try to improve working conditions. When indigenous Mexicans were forced to flee the state of Oaxaca after the United States government enacted NAFTA, there was mass migration of this population to agricultural labor farms in the United States. However, a similar racial/ethnic hierarchy presents itself on American agricultural farms, in which those who are white or whiter than other groups, including American citizens and Mestizo Mexicans, have more rights and are higher on the hierarchical labor structure. Because Mestizo Mexicans are higher on the agricultural labor structure than indigenous Mexicans in Mexico, when these groups interact on American agricultural farms, U.S. Latinos or Mestizo Mexicans of Mestizo descent propagate this racial/ethnic hierarchy and establish it among white Americans. This racial/ethnic hierarchy results in a system of structural violence that is enacted by the policies of white Americans in terms of farm policies and enforced by U.S. Latinos or Mestizo Mexicans, who typically occupy supervisor positions in which they have direct contact with indigenous Mexicans. The structural violence takes the form of unjust working conditions and inadequate understanding of healthcare and safety due to poor translation services. Therefore, the system of structural violence that is seen in Mexico due to a racial/ethnic hierarchy continues transnationally in the United States and is perpetuated by not one but two levels of the labor hierarchy on agricultural farms.

## References

- Benson, P. (2008). El CAMPO: Faciality and Structural Violence in Farm Labor Camps. *Cultural Anthropology*, 23(4).
- Delgado-Wise, R., & Márquez, H. (2007). The Reshaping of Mexican Labor Exports under NAFTA: Paradoxes and Challenges. *International Migration Review*, 41(3).
- Holmes, S. (2013). *Fresh Fruit, Broken Bodies: Migrant Farmworkers in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jiménez, T. R. (2008). Mexican Immigrant Replenishment and the Continuing Significance of Ethnicity and Race. *American Journal of Sociology*.
- Kearney, M. (2000). Transnational Oaxacan indigenous identity: The Case of Mixtecs and Zapotecs. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 7(2).
- Kresge, L. (2007, November). *Indigenous Oaxacan Communities in California: An Overview*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Murguía, E., & Telles, E. E. (1996). Phenotype and Schooling among Mexican Americans. *Sociology of Education*, 69(4).
- Peonage. (n.d.). Retrieved from The Free Dictionary website: <http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Peonage>
- Stephen, L. (2002). *Zapata Lives!: Histories and Cultural Politics in Southern Mexico*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stephen, L. (2007). *Transborder Lives: Indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California, and Oregon*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Thompson, C. D., & Wiggins, M. F. (2007). *The Human Cost of Food: Farmworkers' Lives, Labor, and Advocacy*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Van den Berghe, P. (1996). Does race matter? In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Authors),  
*Ethnicity*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.