Rodney D. Anderson

"Race, Class and Occupation: Guadalajara in 1821"

p. 305-316

La ciudad y el campo en la historia de México. Memoria de la VII Reunión de Historiadores Mexicanos y Norteamericanos. Papers presented at the VII Conference of Mexican and the United States Historians

Gisela von Wobeser y Ricardo Sánchez (editores)

México

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas

1992

466 + XII p.

ISBN 968-36-2347-6

Formato: PDF

Publicado en línea: 30 de noviembre de 2023

Disponible en:
http://www.historicas.unam.mx/publicaciones/publicadigital/libros/276-01/ciudad-campo.html

Rodney D. Anderson*

Race, Class and Occupation: Guadalajara in 1821

In the fall of 1821, the newly appointed city commissioners of Guadalajara undertook a city-wide census (*padrón*) at the request of state authorities. When the first city election under the new republican government took place in December, 1821, the city government took a second census. Today nearly all the first and a substantial portion of the second padrones survive in the city's municipal archives. The padrón represents the most complete of all the extant censuses taken of Guadalajara in the nineteenth century, and would be the last to provide important data on race and social status.[1]

Two related sets of data form the basis for this study. One is a systematic sample of every tenth household, taken from the 1821 padron and supplemented by data from the 1822 padron where 1821 material was not available. The second set is a full count of all individuals for whom racial designation is available.[2] While race was given for not quite one-half of the city's households, they proved to be reasonably representative of the city as a whole.[3] The padrones of 1821 and 1822 were taken, for the most part, household by household for each of the city's 24 wards (*cuarteles*) and contained data on each resident's marital status, occupation, and age. In addition numerous cuarteles noted the individual's *calidad* , or race/ethnic designation, and the birthplace, usually referred to as the *patria*. Thus, the padrones provide an astonishingly rich and valuable picture of urban life in early modern Mexico.[4]

This paper will examine the socio-economic characteristics of the various racial groups. Of particular interest is the relevance of the Guadalajara data to the issue of caste versus class in late colonial Mexico. Recent studies by David A. Brading on Guanajuato, John K. Chance and William Taylor on Antequera, Patricia Seed on Mexico City, and Celia Wu on Querétaro have differed in their conclusions from earlier works by Magnus Mörner and Lyle N. McAlister, although they also differ from each other.[5] Chance and Taylor

Florida State University

[1]For the decree ordering the padrón, see the Archivo Histórico Municipal de Guadalajara (hereafter, AHM), caja 1123, legajo 41, expediente 230, dated October 8, 1821. On the election of the alcaldes, see Luis Pérez Verdía, *Historia particular del estado de Jalisco desde los primeros tiempos de que hay noticia, hasta nuestros días*, 3 vols. (Guadalajara, 1952), vol. 3, p. 244. The padrones are found in legs. 39 and 41bis, and one un-numbered legajo entitled "Varios padrones, 1821". A new numbering system has since been initiated but a conversion index is available.

[2]A systematic sample was taken from 19 *cuarteles* (wards) in 1821 and 5 cuarteles in 1822 in order to complete the survey of the entire city. The sample was coded by cuartel, with the data filed by individual, by household, and by family. The full count was done by hand of those individuals for whom race/ethnic data was given. Full racial/ethnic data were taken from cuarteles 3, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22, and 23. Partial data were taken from cuarteles 7 and 17.

[3]Each of the parishes of the city as they existed in 1821 is represented in the full count by race. In addition, the full count by race comes reasonably close to a number of socio-economic characteristics of those cuarteles which did not give racial data; for example, in the proportion of don and doñas, in the marital status for women heads of households, and in the portion of various occupations to the total employed.

[4]To date only limited use of the padrones has been made. See Sherburne F. Cook and Woodrow Borah, *Essays in Population History: Mexico and the Caribbean*, 3 vols. (Berkeley, 1974), vol. 1, pp. 312, 355; and Sherburne F. Cook, "Las migraciones en la historia de la población mexicana. Datos modelo del occidente del centro de México, 1793-1950", in Bernardo García Martínez, ed., *Historia y sociedad en el mundo de habla española* (Mexico City, 1970), pp. 355-377. See also Rodney D. Anderson *Guadalajara a la consumación de la Independencia: Estudio de su población según los padrones de 1821-1822*, trans. Marco Antonio Silva(Guadalajara, 1983).

[5]David A. Brading, *Miners and Merchants in Bourbon Mexico, 1763-1810* (Cambridge, 1971), and the same author's "Grupos étnicos, clases y estructura ocupacional en Guanajuato (1792)," *Historia Mexicana*, 21 (1972), pp. 476-477; John K. Chance and William B. Taylor, "Estate and Class in a Colonial City: Oaxaca in 1792", *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 19 (1977),

argue that the large number of individuals labeled creole who performed low-status jobs in Antequera indicates that race was no longer as significant a factor in determining one's life chances as were economic or class criteria.[6] They state: "By the end of the colonial period the complexity and range of variation within the economic class structure rivaled that of the status hierarchy embodied in the *sistema de castas*, if indeed the latter had not been overtaken in this respect".[7]

This position came under attack on methodological and empirical grounds from Robert McCaa, Stuart Schwartz, and Arturo Grubessich. They argued that Chance's and Taylor's own data showed creoles were still considerably over-represented in elite and higher artisan occupations, while mestizos and mulattoes were under-represented there and over-represented in the artisan and lower-status service occupations.[8] In a recent study Celia Wu essentially supported McCaa, Schwartz, and Grubessich.[9] Patricia Seed, however, has called the caste versus class controversy a "non-debate" because she believes it incorrectly focuses on stratification rather than class, on degree of change rather than kind of change, and on distribution and consumption rather than the "social totality".[10] Moreover, she disagreed with Taylor and Chance that creoles should be considered an "ambiguous middle layer".[11] She found that in Mexico City the creoles' "most notable characteristic was their employment as merchants and shopowners", resembling in this "their parent group, the peninsulars, more than any other racial group".[12]

It is my contention, however, that to understand the "social totality" of class, the social distances *within* racial categories must be measured more finely in order reasonably to compare distances *between* racial categories. At least for Guadalajara in 1821, when the city's large creole population is viewed in its social totality, as Seed recommends, we find that a large sub-group of creoles is virtually indistinguishable from non-Spaniards in terms of wealth, social status, and other socio-economic criteria.

In the three-quarters of a century prior to the census of 1821 Guadalajara underwent significant population expansion and economic growth. Throughout the first two centuries of its existence, Guadalajara was primarily a religious, administrative, and commercial center of relatively modest population, supported economically by the abundant agricultural resources of the surrounding countryside. After the mid-eighteenth century, the wealth from the recently discovered Bolaños silver mine, along with a significant and sustained increase in population, vastly increased the city's commerce and encouraged agricultural expansion in its hinterland. The resulting pressure on the region's small farmers, particularly Indian corn producers, probably added to the already substantial migration of rural people to Guadalajara in search of improved economic opportunities.[13] From a

pp. 454-487; John K. Chance, "The Colonial Latin American City: Preindustrial or Capitalist?", *Urban Anthropology*, 4 (1975), pp. 211-228; Patricia Seed, "Social Dimensions of Race: Mexico City, 1753," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 62 (1982), pp. 569-606; Celia Wu, "The Population of the City of Querétaro in 1791," *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 16 (1984), pp. 277-307. For earlier works see Magnus Mörner, *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America* (Boston, 1967); Lyle N. McAlister, "Social Structure and Social Change in New Spain," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 73 (1963), pp. 349-370; Woodrow Borah, "Race and Class in Mexico," *The Pacific Historial Review*, 23 (Nov. 1954), pp. 331-342. For an important revision of his earlier work, see Magnus Mörner, "Economic Factors and Stratification in Colonial Spanish America with Special Regard to Elites," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 63 (1983), pp. 335-369.

[6]Chance and Taylor, "Estate and Class," pp. 482-486.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 485.

[8]McCaa, Schwartz and Grubessich, "Race and Class in Colonial Latin America: A Critique," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 21 (1979), pp. 422-429.

[9]Wu, "The population of Querétaro," pp. 302-305.

[10]Seed, "Social Dimensions of Race," p. 571, and her Appendix I, pp. 602-604.

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 579.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]On eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century economic growth, see Richard Lindley, "Kinship and Credit in the Structure of Guadalajara's Oligarchy, 1800-1830" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1976), pp. 24-36. On agricultural expansion in the Guadalajara region, see Eric Van Young,"Urban Market and Hinterland: Guadalajara and its Region in the Eighteenth Century", *Hispanic American Historial Review*, 59 (1979), pp. 593-635.

population of barely 10,000 in 1760, the city had grown to nearly 40,000 according to the official figures for the 1821 padrón, no doubt aided by the flight to the cities during the violence of the insurgency. One-third of the city's inhabitants in 1821 were listed as having originated elsewhere than Guadalajara.[14]

With the broadening of the market, the expansion of credit, and the increased labor supply, the city's traditional commercial interests were augmented by light industry, particularly in cotton and woolen textiles, but also including tanning, milling, baking, and wax manufacturing. Textile manufacture remained generally a cottage craft but the other light industries were undergoing the transition from artisan crafts to more capital-intensive modes of production under the domination of elite mercantile families such as the Villaseñores and Cañedos.[15]

For the purpose of this paper, the relevant question is: to what extent the transition to a more modern economic structure involved the demise of the system of estates on which the post-conquest economy had been based? While the data from one census alone cannot establish the process of class formation and estate deterioration, the census-takers on their rounds unwittingly collected several key pieces of information which may aid in refining the question itself. First, they provided a racial designation for approximately 45 percent of the city's population. Second, they designated an occupation for a significant portion of the population. Race, I would suggest, no longer provided an adequate definition of the parameters of class, except at the very top of society, where socio-economic status "created" the ethnic designation of "español".

Occupation, however, while providing a much more accurate means to measure class, suffers from several weaknesses common to nineteenth-century census data.[16] For one thing, pre-industrial producers also tended to be distributors ("dealers"). Indeed, it is the separation of these two functions which characterizes the transition from a craft to an industrial economy. Miguel Esteban Ramírez, for example, was listed as a "platero" in the regular census of 1821 and a "comerciante" in a separate count of heads of households. More importantly, the census data do not differentiate either between masters and journeymen, or skilled craftsmen and semi-skilled industrial workers of the same occupation. "Obrajeros", for example, could have been weavers in a large *obraje*, skilled journeymen working under a master craftsman in the latter's shop, or "cottagers" working in their homes either independently or for a particular retail establishment. Not even apprentices were indentified as such. In other words, the occupation *per se* does not indicate where in the production process the individual fell, and it disguises the movement from a skilled to semi-skilled trade, a critical aspect of class formation.

Happily, the census takers provided us with a critical piece of data which enables us, if not to overcome, at least to mitigate these difficulties. They designated social standing using the don and doña with sufficient discrimination to point out status variations within

[14]For a discussion of the various estimates of the city's population, see Anderson, *Guadalajara a la consumación de la independencia*, pp. 44-48. On migrants to Guadalajara, see Cook, "Las migraciones en la historia de la población mexicana," pp. 355-377.

[15]Lindley, "Kinship and Credit," pp. 30, 40-44. For a detailed discussion of the division of labor for Guadalajara in 1821, and its craft versus industrial characteristics, see Anderson, *Guadalajara a la consumación de la Independencia*, pp. 108-112.

[16]W.A. Armstrong, "The Use of Information on Occupation," in E. A. Wrigley, ed., *Nineteenth-Century Society: Essays on the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data* (London, 1972), pp. 226-310; Michael B. Katz, "Occupational Classification in History," *The Journal of Inter-Disciplinary History*, 3 (1972). For an interesting look at the historiography of social classification based on occupational title, see J.A. Bansk, "The Social Structure of Nineteenth-Century England as seen through the Census," in Richard Lawton, ed., *The Census and Social Structure: An Interpretative Guide to Nineteenth-Century Censuses for England and Wales* (London, 1975), pp. 179-223. Also useful and important are: Peter Knight, *The Plain People of Boston* (New York, 1971), Appendix E, pp. 149-156; and Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship Between Classes in Victorian Society* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 355-357. For Latin America, especially in the late nineteenth century, see Mark D. Szuchman and Eugene F. Sofer, "The State of Occupational Stratification Studies in Argentina: A Classification Scheme," *Latin American Research Review*, 11 (1976), p. 166. For a survey of Mexican historiography on this issue, see María Teresa Huerta, "Estructuras de clases y de trabajo," María Teresa Huerta *et. al.* eds., *Balance y perspectivas de la historiografía social en México*, 2 vols. (Mexico City, 1979), vol. 1, pp. 109-198.

Table 1

Racial Composition of Guadalajara in 1821 by Sex and Social Status of All Individuals Given a Racial Designation *

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Español						
don/doña	1 879	44.0	2 394	56.0	4 273	24.1
no don/doña	1 939	46.6	2 218	53.4	4 157	23.4
Indio[1]	3 396	48.7	3 579	51.3	6 975	39.3
Mestizo[2]	875	49.7	887	50.3	1 762	9.9
Mulato[3]	153	43.1	202	56.9	355	2.0
Coyote	90	47.9	98	52.1	188	1.1
Others[4]	13	48.2	14	51.8	27	0.2
Total	8 345		9 392		17 737	

[1]Four indios were also don.
[2]Two mestizos were also don.
[3]One mulato was also don.
[4]The "others" were twelve *castizos* and fifteen *negros*
*Source: *Cuarteles* 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23

specific occupations. Of all persons in Table 1, 22.5 percent of the males and 21.1 percent of the females were awarded a don or doña. Most were Spanish, only five sampled individuals with the don/doña being non-Spanish. Of those labeled "Spanish" (meaning creoles as well *peninsulares*), 50.7 percent were given the honorific don/doña.[17]

Chance attempted to use the diagnostic don/doña in a limited way, but neither Seed nor Wu found reliable data or appropriate means to determine status differences between crafts.[18] As Table 2 indicates, however, the Guadalajara data provide a specific means to

[17]In order to test the consistency with which the title was used, the padrón samples for cuarteles 3 and 9 were compared to a full count of all heads of household for the same cuarteles but done by different alcaldes. The sampled padrón for cuartel 3 gave 54.3 percent don/doña to the heads of household and the full count 54.9 percent. For cuartel 9 the figures were 10.7 percent and 10.0 percent, respectively.

[18]John K.Chance, *Race and Class in Colonial Oaxaca* (Stanford, 1978), pp. 160-166; Seed, "Social Dimensions of Race," pp. 578-579, note 35; Wu, "Querétaro in 1791," p. 293.

determine at least where the alcaldes placed particular occupations on a scale of social status or "honor".[19]

Moreover, in this study the allocation of a don has been used to resolve the problem of distinguishing the masters from their journeymen within various occupations. Individuals given a don/doña, but who practiced a low-status trade, are assumed to be masters. By way of verification, the proportion of lower-status artisans awarded the don/doña title correlates reasonably closely with the ratio of masters to journeymen calculated from the number of masters voting in *gremio* elections and the number of journeymen counted in our sample.[20]

The occupation data adjusted by status (don/doña) are used here to construct a six-category, multi-dimensional view of the social order in which race can be compared to other social and economic factors. The results are not classes *per se*, but a rough hierarchy of social stratification.[21] Lower-status artisans, for example, are automatically placed in category three whenever they are dons. Various other adjustments in status have been made based on the same criteria.[22] Category one--high elites, and category two--auxiliary elites, both comprise just under nine percent of all employed persons (Table 3). By contrast, Richard Lindley estimates that the elite of Guadalajara in 1800 was approximately three percent of the population, or about two hundred families.[23] This suggests that category one is too large, the result perhaps of failing to include either a wealth or power factor.

If the number of servants employed by each household is introduced as a surrogate for household wealth (Table 4), the categories are altered dramatically. The number of category 1 households with two or more servants drops to 3.4 percent of all households, and category 2 (auxiliary elites) to less than one percent. Indeed, more than half of category 1 households had no servants whatsoever, and the same applies for nearly three-quarters of category 2 households.

At 16 percent of all employed persons, category 3--high-status artisans and all masters--is quite a bit smaller than category 4--lower-status artisans--which accounts for 42.3 percent of all employed persons. Surprisingly, perhaps, the laborer-service category accounted for less than a quarter of the employed individuals of our sample, and only 13.8 percent of employed males.[24] However, we need to remember that in pre-industrial urban economies the unskilled and domestic service categories are smaller and the manufacturing sectors larger than they would become in a more industrialized time.[25]

[19]The highest status artisans and craftsmen --the *plateros, pintores,* and *barberos*-- were those with complex trade skills (pintores) or in which the cost of owning a shop and the difficulty of entering the profession (platero/barbero) combined to insure elevated status for both masters and journeymen. The lower-status artisans had jobs in which either the journeyman artisan had a reasonable chance of becoming a master, but without prospect of great rewards (*carpinteros, zapateros, sombrereros*); in which an early form of "sweating" had already begun (*panaderos, curtidores*); or in which, as with the *obrajeros*, the craft was divided between cottagers and "sweat shops" (obrajes).

[20]AHM, caja 1124, leg. 42, exp. 73.

[21]Mörner, "Economic Factors and Stratification," pp. 336-337.

[22]*Comerciantes* without dons were put in category 4; *labradores* without dons in category 4; *policía* in category 5, or in 2 if dons; *arrieros* in 5, or in 3 if dons.

[23]Lindley, "Kinship and Credit," pp. 45-48. Category 1 includes high government officials, all clergy, hacendados, and those labradores and comerciantes given the don/doña. Category 2 --auxiliary elites-- includes professionals (lawyers, military officers, doctors, etc.), most clerical occupations and minor government officials, and such miscellaneous groups as *boticarios, barberos, cajeros* and *impresores.*

[24]When only heads of households are considered, the socio-economic structure is as follows: category 4, 47.9 percent; category 5, 10.9 percent, and category 6, 2.0 percent. Category 3 also includes all lower-status artisans awarded the don/doña, the assumption being that they were masters and owned their shops, and therefore their individual status brought them above the general status of their profession. Category five include the service occupations such as domestic servant, cooks and transport workers (*cargadores, arrieros*), and common laborers such as the *jornaleros* and *gañanes*.

[25]For example, see Sam Bass Warner, Jr., "If All the World were Philadelphia: A Scaffolding for Urban History, 1774-1930," *The American Historical Review*, 74 (1968), pp. 30-31. For U.S. and Canadian cities of the mid-nineteenth century, see Stuart Blunin, Laurance Glasco, Clyde Griffen, Theodore Hersberg, and Michael Katz, "Occupation and Ethnicity in Five Nineteenth-Century Cities," paper presented at the Organization of American Historians, Chicago, April, 1973; and Michael Katz, *The People of Hamilton, Canada West: Family and Class in a Mid-Nineteenth-Century City* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), pp. 52-53.

Table 2

All Occupied Individuals by Race and Social Status:
The full Count *

OCCUPATION	Number Employed	Español % don/doña	Español % no don/doña	Indio %	Casta %
High public officials	16	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ecclesiastical officials	8	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Doctors	14	92.9	7.1	0.0	0.0
Hacendados	14	92.9	7.1	0.0	0.0
Military officers	71	87.3	8.5	4.2	0.0
Lawyers	7	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0
Scribes	34	85.3	11.8	2.9	2.9
Administrators	13	84.6	0.0	7.7	7.7
Notaries	12	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Merchants:					
female	12	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
male	391	67.0	21.2	10.0	1.8
Small shop keepers:					
female	6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
male	17	64.7	23.5	5.9	5.9
Silversmiths	60	53.3	38.3	5.0	3.3
Seamstresses	278	52.5	33.1	10.8	2.9
Pork merchants	11	45.5	18.2	9.1	27.3
Musicians (*músicos*)	17	35.3	23.5	29.4	11.8
Painters	29	34.5	27.6	20.7	17.2
Tailors	141	31.9	33.3	14.2	19.9
Barbers	34	29.4	38.2	8.8	8.8
Carpenters	108	27.8	23.2	29.6	19.4
Blacksmiths	45	22.2	24.4	31.1	22.2
Soldiers (*soldados*)	101	20.8	33.7	25.7	19.8
Brokers (*corredores*)	32	18.8	12.5	56.3	12.5
Wheelwrights	29	17.2	34.5	37.9	10.3
Saddlers (*silleros*)	34	11.8	44.1	29.4	8.8
Tanners	47	11.8	17.0	61.7	12.8
Laundresses	20	10.0	25.0	40.0	25.0
Tallow chandlers	21	9.5	57.1	23.8	9.5
Mule skinners	51	7.8	21.6	60.8	9.8
Rebozo weavers	41	7.3	48.8	39.0	4.9
Bakers:					
female	8	50.0	12.5	12.5	25.0
male	87	6.9	23.0	48.2	20.7
Servants:					
female	392	5.4	25.3	45.7	23.7
male	294	4.8	22.5	48.6	24.2
Butchers (*carniceros*):					
female	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
male	36	5.6	22.2	47.2	25.0
Coach drivers (*cocheros*)	45	4.4	13.3	20.0	62.2
Hatters	68	4.4	20.6	55.9	19.1

Cotton weavers:					
female	77	0.0	14.3	48.1	37.7
male	686	2.5	24.9	60.0	12.5
Shoemakers:					
female	11	0.0	9.1	90.9	0.0
male	315	2.2	15.9	67.6	14.3
Cooks:					
female	58	1.7	19.0	53.5	25.9
male	27	3.7	14.8	11.1	70.4
Masons (*albañiles*)	105	1.0	6.7	71.4	21.0
Tortilla makers	316	0.3	6.0	85.8	7.9
Yarn makers:					
female	117	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
male	6	0.0	28.6	54.5	12.4
Carriers (*cargadores*)	26	0.0	19.2	19.2	61.5
Laborers (*operarios, obreros*)	67	0.0	11.9	73.1	14.9
Agricultural workers (*gañanes*)	18	0.0	27.8	59.9	12.4
Charcoal sellers	30	0.0	10.0	86.7	3.3
Sarape weavers (*saraceros*)	15	0.0	33.3	40.0	26.7
Stones masons	19	0.0	5.3	12.4	10.5
Adobe makers	12	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Total listed above	4 613				
Miscellaneous unlisted	988				
Total occupied persons identified by race	5 601	20.6	22.1	42.7	14.7
Total unoccupied	9 318	26.9	24.3	34.4	14.4
Total occupied and unccopied persons identified by race	14 919	24.5	23.5	37.5	14.5

*Source: *Cuarteles* 3, 5, 7, 9 10, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22, 23

Table 3

Socio-Economic Status of All Employed Persons, by Sex: Guadalajara, 1821 (Sample)

Socio-economic Categories	Male No.	Male %	Female No.	Female %	Total No.	Total %
1. Elite	97	10.8	2	0.8	99	8.6
2. Auxiliary elite	91	10.1	5	2.0	96	8.3
3. High-status artisan	155	17.3	29	11.5	184	16.0
4. Low-status arisan	419	46.7	68	26.8	487	42.4
5. Laborer-service	124	13.8	147	58.1	271	23.5
6. Unclassifiable	12	1.3	2	0.8	14	1.2

Table 4

Socio-Economic Status of All Imployed Heads of Households, Guadalajara, 1821 (Samples)

Socio-Economic Categories	Heads of Households No.	Heads of Households %	No.	Number of Servants %	Number of Servants No.	Number of Servants %
1. Elite	72	14.3	16	3.2	17	3.4
2. Auxiliary elite	31	6.2	6	1.2	3	0.6
3. High-status artisan	94	18.7	7	1.4	8	1.6
4. Low-status artisan	241	47.9	0	0.0	3	0.6
5. Laborer/service	55	10.9	3	0.6	2	0.4
6. Unclassifiable	10	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

On the other hand, lower-status individuals are almost certainly under-represented in nineteenth-century censuses.[26] Does the smaller laborer-service category represent under-numeration rather than the lack of laborers *per se*? We know, for example, that in 1816 the city of Guadalajara hired from 26 to 50 "peones" daily to do the common labor at various construction projects and yet no "peones" as such appear in the census manuscript for 1821. Probably a combination of factors was at work. First of all, the city's division of labor reflects at least the remnants of its once-dominant craft economy. There were more persons calling themselves artisans (and who would have been called so by the census-takers) and who likely had some training or experience as such, than there were unskilled workers. Yet by 1821 it is also likely that many of those craftsmen were taking unskilled work where they could find it in order to survive. This would have been particularly true for those crafts which in recent years had become increasingly "casual" trades, harboring a large number of artisans whose trade simply could not provide them with more than a few days work per month. Such occupations included the weavers (obrajeros), who were the most numerous of the craftsmen, as well as the bakers and the tanners, all trades most heavily under competition from larger, elite-owned establishments. Moreover, a certain portion of the unskilled and service functions of the city were performed by Indians migrating daily, or perhaps less often, from the nearby villages such as Tetlán and Mesquitán. The agricultural seasons would play a role here, providing temporary unskilled workers when planting and harvesting were over, workers either likely to have been missed by the census-takers or counted in their home villages instead.

Nonetheless, if we add to the unskilled-service sector a portion of the trades most likely to be "casualized" (weavers, bakers, etc.), all the *soldados* (generally conscripted from that sector), and 80 percent of all males over fourteen not given an occupation (likely unskilled), we still only end up with a figure of approximately 17 to 18 percent of the labor force.[27] Even if we estimate an additional 6 to 8 percent as representing those persons not counted by the census-taker, the final figure is no more than a quarter of the male labor force, at most, far less than would be the case in the more industrialized cities of the late nineteenth century.

To what extent did racial designations affect an individual's placement in this ranking? Clearly, as Table 5 shows, the impact is significant. The españoles monopolized the two elite categories, dominated the higher-status artisan category, and appeared far less frequently in the lower-status artisan and unskilled/servant categories. Just as clearly the Indians dominated the lower-status artisan and laborer/servant categories in an absolute sense (compare rows), and were over-represented as well in terms of their relative numbers (compare columns).

Nonetheless, there are some surprises. Patricia Seed, for example, found that in Mexico City the mestizos were far more often laborers or servants than were creoles.[28] Since the Guadalajara figures do not separate creoles from peninsulares, it is even more remarkable that mestizos were hardly more likely to be laborers or servant than the Spaniards (16.5 percent of all Spaniards compared to 17.9 percent of all mestizos). Mestizos in fact were significantly more over-represented in the high-status artisan category than were the Spaniards (28.2 percent of all mestizos vs. 18.4 percent of all Spaniards). While it is true that a mestizo was also more likely to be a lower-status artisan than in any other category, the proportion of mestizos in that category was only just representative of their proportion in the population being surveyed. That is, the mestizos constituted 8.7 percent of all low-status artisans in the

[26]Frederick J. Shaw, "The Artisan in Mexico City (1824-1853)," in Elsa Cecilia Frost, *et al.*, eds., *El trabajo y los trabajadores en la historia de México* (Mexico City, 1979), pp. 399-400. The contemporary statistitian, Victoriano Roa, quoted Baron von Humbolt to the effect that one-sixth of the population probably escaped counting; Victoriano Roa, *Estadística del Estado Libre de Jalisco* (Guadalajara, 1825; facsimile edition, 1981), p. 11.

[27]Anderson, *Guadalajara a la consumación de la Independencia*, p. 111.

[28]"Social Dimensions of Race", p. 581.

Table 5
Socio-Economic Status of All Employed Persons, by Race, Guadalajara, 1821 (Sample)

Socio-Economic Categories	Español	Indio	Mestizo	Mulato	Coyote	Other	Row Total
1. Elite							
No.	27	1	1	0	0	0	29
% of row	93.1	3.4	3.4				6.3
% of column	12.7	0.5	2.6				
2. Auxiliary elite							
No.	30	0	0	0	0	0	30
% of row	100.0						6.6
%of column	14.2						
3. High-status artisan							
No.	39	9	11	0	0	2	61
% of row	63.9	14.8	18.0			3.2	13.3
% of column	18.4	4.8	28.2			100.0	
4. Low-status artisan							
No.	78	112	19	5	4	0	218
%of row	35.8	51.4	8.7	2.3	1.8		47.7
% of column	36.8	59.3	48.7	45.5	100.0		
5. Laborer/service							
No.	35	64	7	6	0	0	112
% of row	31.3	57.1	6.3	5.4			24.5
5 of column	16.5	33.9	17.9	54.5			
6. Unclassifiable							
No.	3	3	1	0	0	0	7
% of row	42.9	42.9	14.3				1.5
% of column	1.4	1.6	2.6				
Column total	212	189	39	11	4	2	457
% of row total	46.4	41.4	8.5	2.4	0.9	0.4	100.0
Total population							
No.	655	459	145	24	10	3	1 296
% of row total	50.5	35.2	11.2	1.9	0.8	0.2	100.0

city, and 8.5 percent of all occupied people. Moreover, it seems likely that if those Spaniards of low status, i.e, those not awarded the don or doña, were separated from the don españoles, the former would indeed resemble the *castas* and even the *Indios* more than they resembled their better-off español "cousins".

In order to test this hypothesis further, I have separated the non-don/doña Spainards from those awarded the title, and compared them both to the other racial groups by residence, family size and type, and the number of servants as a surrrogate for wealth. In order to see more clearly the comparisons, the following discussions are based on a full count of all individuals listed in the census for whom a racial designation was given.

Servants. Of the 1156 households headed by male Spaniards in the full count, 299 employed a total of 612 servants. However, when this figure is broken down into don and no-don households, we find that 285 of the 617 don households (46.2 percent) employed servants, but only 14 of the 539 no-don Spanish households were able to afford help (2.6 percent). This is hardly better than the three Indio and two casta households which also employed servants (0.5 percent).

Size of household. The size of households in Guadalajara varied positively by social standing and race. Español-headed households averaged 5.7 persons, while casta and Indio households averaged 5.0 with little difference between them. However, when the Spaniards are separated into don or no-don groups, the don households average just over six persons while the non-don households are closer to five (5.2), just slightly larger than the Indio (5.1) or casta (4.9). Simply put, neither the poorer Spaniards nor the Indian or other racial groups could afford to support as many household members as could the better off don or doña Spaniards. Household size is therefore a function of economics rather than race.

Household type. The type of household was also affected directly by socio-economic indicators. Don-headed households were larger because they were more complex. Not only did they employ more servants, but they were also more likely than their no-don Spanish counterparts to have relatives staying with them, to be three-generational, and to have boarders. In almost every aspect, the non-don Spaniards more closely resembled the other racial groups, a conclusion supported by studies of other Latin American countries.[29] Such studies indicate, for example, that the development of a market-oriented economy tends to encourage larger, more complex elite families while non-elite households decline in numbers of nuclear family members.[30]

Residence. In what way did one's residence in a particular section of the city affect one's social status, that is, the likelihood of bearing the title don/doña? The correlation here is clear. The higher the proportion of non-españoles in any particular cuartel, the more likely it was that the españoles residing there would not be awarded the don or doña (Table 6). Yet while the correlation is clear, the meaning is not. Exactly what is measured in Table 6? Is it residential segregation by wealth, in which large numbers of poor Indios, castas, and criollos lived and worked side by side in the same neighborhoods, and were considered of roughly equal status? If so, then not race but economic circumstance determined residential patterns.

On the other hand, an equally plausible interpretation is that the figures show precisely that race was a significant factor in allocating status. To live in a neighborhood predominatly Indian or casta carried with it a stigma, a social penalty: one lost the right to the don or doña. Perhaps the reverse was also true, so that for a Spaniard of modest means who lived in a better-class neighborhood the don or doña may have come much easier despite the lack of wealth. If so, then obviously the process of social mobility for a criollo was a process of spatial-residential mobility as well.

A third interpretation has to be considered. Perhaps the poor criollos were not really Spaniards fallen on hard times but the latest generation of upwardly mobile Indians,

[29]See similar conclusions in Katz, *The People of Hamilton*, p. 235; Michael Anderson, *Approaches to the History of the Western Family, 1500-1914* (London, 1980), pp. 32-33.

[30]Ann Hagerman Johnson, "The Impact of Market Agriculture on Family and Household Structure in Nineteenth-Century Chile," *Hisparic American Historical Review*, 58 (1978), p. 648; and Elizabeth Anne Kuznesof, "Household Composition and Headship as Related to Changes in Mode of Production: São Paulo, 1765 to 1846," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 22 (1980), p. 80.

mestizos, or mulattoes, whose "race" had been determined by social criteria not readily obvious from the census data. While at first glance it might seem unlikely that a time of political and economic turmoil would favor such upward mobility, the fact remains that the census of 1793 shows 39.5 percent of the population as español, while the padrones of 1821 show 46.4 percent español. The proportion of the increase which came from migration remains to be determined, but it is not likely that the Spanish fertility rates accounted for the increase in that racial category between 1793 and 1821. In fact the españoles tended to be single in greater proportions than either Indios or the castas.[31] Perhaps, therefore, the increase in the Spanish presence in the poorer cuarteles did not represent social mobility so much as the liberalization of the definition of race with the coming of independence. Since the lower estates no longer were required to pay tribute, the economic incentive on the part of the state to define race (*calidad*) no longer existed as strongly as it once had.[32]

In conclusion, at least in Guadalajara by 1821 the estate system had been seriously eroded if not precisely replaced. Although the census data cannot explain why or how this situation came to be, its impact nonetheless seems clear. While race remained associated with social position and status, it no longer guaranteed either, if it ever had. Moreover, the fact that those españoles without the don or doña affixed to their names so closely resembled the non-españoles in terms of their poverty, their jobs, their place of residence, and the size and composition of their households, strongly suggests that at least for criollos economic factors were more important than race in determining one's life chances. In other words, the creoles' life expectations depended no more on their good fortune to be born "español" that it did on their less than good fortune to be born poor.

Race, of course, was still considered important by the residents of the city. Had contemporary social scientists polled the population on such matters, almost certainly a higher status would have been assigned to the designation "español" as compared to "Indio" or "casta". The fact that so few Indios or castas were awarded the don and doña confirms this. Yet the association of such large numbers of creoles with an equally large number of Indios, mestizos, and mulattoes in almost all matters of everyday life suggests that racial privileges in urban Mexico were giving way to more "modern" determinants of opportunity and prospect.

Table 6

Cuarteles Ranked in Order of Highest Percentage of Indio/Casta Residents (column 3) Compared to the Percentage of Españoles Without the Don/Doña (column 5).

CUARTEL NUMBER	POPULATION no. (1)	INDIOS no. (2)	CASTAS % (3)	ESPAÑOLES no. (4)	WITHOUT DON/DOÑA % of All Españoles (5)
22	539	432	80.2	105	98.1
20	1 534	1 062	69.2	365	76.8
9	2 930[1]	2 005	68.4	657	72.8
18	1 597	961	60.2	363	57.1
14	1 465	728	49.7	418	56.7
5	833[2]	363	43.6	289	61.9
3	1 422	591	41.6	328	39.5
23	2 279	587	25.8	644	39.2
15	1 195	334	23.5	38	04.4

[1]No race given for 22 individuals
[2]No race given for 3 individuals

[31]Anderson, *Guadalajara a la consumación de la Independencia*, pp. 142-43.
[32]On this point see Patricia Seed's excellent discussion of "social race," in Seed, "Social Dimensions of Race," pp. 573-74, 591-92, 601-02.