Bodies of Evidence:

Representation and Recognition on the Mexican Border

John McKiernan-Gonzalez

Interpreting Latino Cultures:

A Smithsonian Symposium

11/21/2002
On the morning of August 17, 1916, Jose Montelongo, his wife Dominga Urrutia, and her brother Francisco Urrutia chose to brave the Rio Bravo north of the bridge connecting both Laredos. As they arrived at the north bank of the river, the Texas quarantine guard placed them under guard and marched them to the United States Public Health Service office at the beginning of the bridge.

Dr. H.C. Hall, the Texas state health officer ordered that the guards escort Dominga and her daughter over the bridge to Nuevo Laredo and that Mr. Montelongo and Mr. Urrutia be “sent back the way they came over.” Dr. Hall and three quarantine guards brought Jose and his brother-in-law Francisco Urrutia back to the riverbank. After a short scuffle, the guards forced “the two Mexicans back into the river.” Jose Montelongo drowned in plain view of both urban Laredos, floating underneath the bridge and coming to rest on the south bank of the river.

---

1 http://www.byhisgrace.com/borderlands/cities/NLaredo/History.htm
This public death sparked the question of representation: what body was available to advocate and redress the damages to the Montelongo/Urrutia family. In this case, the recently appointed consul, Eliseo Arredondo, moved the Montelongo case into the diplomatic arena. He added medical and legal witnesses in Nuevo Laredo to add professional authority to the public memory of Jose Montelongo’s death. Dr. Adolfo Salinas Puig and Francisco Serrans testified to the presence of two severe head wounds. Judge H.C. Ramirez included the eyewitness testimony of Francisco Urrutia and Dominga Urrutia. In his complaint to Robert Lansing, Consul Arredondo emphasized that many bridge-crossers witnessed the scuffle and watched Jose Montelongo float past the bridge.

The delicate negotiation between Carranza’s and Wilson’ representatives over the question of diplomatic recognition provided a new forum for the inclusion of this evidence. Within two months, the solicitor general of the United States requested that the state of Texas prosecute Dr. Hall for excusable homicide. The terms of this inclusion implied an accompanying recognition of U.S. prerogatives in Mexico: “the Department is called upon not infrequently to insist that the Mexican authorities shall take legal measures against persons charged with crimes committed against American citizens.”

---

2 Perspective map of the city of Laredo, Texas, the Gateway to and from Mexico. Presented with the compliments of the Laredo Real Estate & Abstract Co., http://memory.loc.gov/
District Attorney John Valls convened a grand jury for November 20, 1916, to establish a bill of indictment against Dr. Hall. However, “after so very thorough investigation of all the witnesses and all the circumstances the grand jury did not find any bill of indictment in the case.” The jury refused to recognize “Mexican” evidence against state medical authority in the court of law. This decision was framed by the representation of Mexicans in Texas. This essay will examine the problems posed to Mexican representation by Mexican demands for recognition by American medical authorities; I will use vaccination – “the scar of citizenship” - as an arena where the recognition of modern Mexican bodies troubled the distinctions between diplomatic, constitutional and common law.

Jose Montelongo’s beating illustrates the problem of consent under the question of medical recognition; Jose Montelongo’s death illustrates the problem of evidence within the realm of conflicting representations. The trajectory of the case is an extreme example of the re-presentation of physical and eyewitness evidence to a public event witnessed by multiple parties. The abuse suffered by Jose Montelongo during a time of heightened medical policing of the border highlights the role of state violence in the delineation of stark national boundaries across recognized traffic routes. Moreover, the rerouting and abuse suffered by Dominga Urrutia, Jose Montelongo and Francisco Urrutia highlights the loss of control imposed on the boundaries of their person by the medical agents of this modern border. Because of the place of medical authorities as perpetrators, witnesses and defendants in the Montelongo case, I will place the struggle for recognition on the border within the history of informed consent in the United States.

As ethnic Mexicans stepped into the medical gaze, they confronted a tension in the overlapping jurisdiction of common law and constitutional law. The Supreme Court decision in Henning Jacobson v. the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decision marked a precedent for the legal reception for these claims-making processes. Henning Jacobson challenged the argument that, if an adult endangered the wider community by refusing to allow his or her child to be vaccinated so as to allow the child to attend public school, the legal advocates for the state of Massachusetts argued, a municipal authority had the obligation to fine, jail or adopt other means to compel the adult to consent to the vaccination procedure. In Jacobson, the Court agreed that the state had a moral obligation
to value collective safety over individual liberty, because “[it] was the duty of the constituted authorities primarily to keep in view the welfare, comfort and safety of the many, and not permit the interests of the many to be subordinated to the wishes of convenience of the few. [The] rights of the individual in respect of his liberty may… under the pressure of great dangers, be subjected to such restraint… as the safety of the general public may demand.” The decision rested, as well, on the detentions written in the 1893 immigration act to justify a compelling state interest in collective safety over individual liberty.

The various consular demands for the recognition of individual autonomy filed with the State Department asked that local courts recognize common law principles that highlighted the importance of individual autonomy. In *Schloendorff v. Society of New York Hospital*, Ms. Schloendorff consented to exploratory surgery to determine whether she had a tumor; she explicitly demanded that the surgeon leave the tumor alone. The surgeon operated and removed her tumor. In this decision, Judge Benjamin Cardozo articulated this common law principle when he stated, “every human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his body… [And] a surgeon who performs an operation without his patient’s consent commits an assault.”

In their complaints against quarantine, ethnic Mexicans used consular channels to oblige USPHS officers to recognize the presence of their consent to inspection and vaccination. Miguel Barrera, a long term resident of Sam Fordyce, filed a complaint against Acting Assistant Surgeon John Hunter with Leoncio Revelas, the recently appointed consul in Rio Grande City after this policy had been implemented. Miguel Barrera claimed that Surgeon John Hunter, “appear[ed] insensible to the just reasons that may be exposed to him by persons like myself are used to deal with the TRUTH.” Surgeon Hunter ignored the evidence that “[Barrera] was vaccinated at the age usually done in Mexico, said vaccination having taken” and the supplementary arguments he provided. Barrera claimed immunity from vaccination because he had already been vaccinated and was therefore at a lower risk for infection; he was a long-term resident of Sam Fordyce, Texas and, furthermore, he was only returning from a short trip to Camargo, Tamaulipas. Despite Barrera’s claims not to be an incoming Mexican, Surgeon Hunter considered him to be “an incoming Mexican.” As Barrera stated in his
deposition, Hunter “refused to hear my arguments and vaccinated me.” This was a clear case of lack of consent.

Despite Barrera’s layered disavowal of the stigmas associated with the Revolution in Northern Mexico, he was still forced to initiate his redress with the official representative of the de facto Mexican government. Re-vaccination and redress against American officials were new and potentially temporary features of the bi-national politics of the Mexican Revolution. What was not new was the manner Mexican residents of Texas were directly affected by policies and informal attitudes directed at Mexico. 

In response to this complaint, John Hunter argued that he followed the surgeon general’s instructions: “My instructions are to vaccinate all who do not clearly show recent vaccination scars or clearly evident marks of smallpox. I follow my instructions. Most Mexicans male or female will deceive me if they can, in any way they can, so great is their prejudice to vaccination and submission to our laws.” These federal vaccination practices transformed any discussion of vaccination policies by Mexican nationals into additional evidence of their untrustworthiness. The evidence of Miguel Barrera’s experience was not relevant, because, in Dr. Hunter’s experience, “[Mexicans] claim every little scar to be smallpox and if one has had chickenpox his whole family will swear he has had smallpox.” Dr. Hunter used the unreliability of Mexican families to frame his interpretation of Miguel Barrera’s scars. This is the doubled bind that tied individual men and women to the medical representation of the evidence provided by Mexican bodies.

Montelongo and Barrera were not the first boundary conflicts sparked by forcible American vaccination practices and challenged by ethnic Mexicans. In my larger project, I argue that the relatively early and frequently extensive presence of the USMHS in municipal affairs on the border meant that Mexicans, both American and Mexican engaged federal medical authority on an everyday basis. Beginning with the National Board of Health and the Texas-Mexican epidemic of 1882, under-examined USMHS and State Department documents for the larger Mexican borderlands demonstrate the well-traveled connections Mexican and American immigrants made between citizenship and health care. The records highlight three significant themes in the legal culture of public health on the Mexican border. Claimants demanded recognition of their individual rights
due to their participation in a shared understanding of democratic and scientific progress. 
*(ie I did not consent to this inspection)*. The claims placed great faith in expatriate 
nationality for the advocacy of common-law privileges in a foreign land. xv
*(ie I know my rights).* They also highlighted their membership in a larger community that shared their 
experience of legal abjection *(why are you doing that to other Mexicans)*, previous 
vaccination *(I was vaccinated)*, a shared modernity *(we were vaccinated)* and nationalist 
sentiment *(you don’t like Mexicans, do you)*. xvi

In the United States and England, official chroniclers drew connections between 
inspection, vaccination and citizenship. The 1882 portrait, *vaccinating the urban poor*, 
highlights how vaccination focused the chaotic diversity of urban residents in England to 
a shared public ritual.

![Vaccinating the Poor](http://wwwihm.nlm.nih.gov/)

**Vaccinating the Poor**

In the 1886 Immigration Inspection Service folio, the willingness of the 
immigrant mother to present the little boy’s arms indicates an additional embrace of 
American policies by the varied immigrants.

---

The 1895 drawing of a compulsory vaccine campaign in Jersey City presents a fascination around the intermingling of consent and compulsion in the creation of a citizen’s scar.

---

Compulsory Vaccination in Jersey City\textsuperscript{5}

This mixture of consent, compulsion and citizenship moved northward to Nuevo Leon before it moved south to Texas. Vaccination was a crucial technology to the appearance of modernity in Northern Mexico.\textsuperscript{xvii} In the Porfiriato, vaccination was both an industrial reform and an individual passport to modernity.\textsuperscript{xviii} The Mexican Central Railroad required vaccination among all its employees.\textsuperscript{xix} The American Smelting and Refining Corporation required vaccination as a condition of employment.\textsuperscript{xx} This commitment was recognized by the United States Public Health Service, when Surgeon Alexander claimed that “ninety-eight percent of the population in both cities [El Paso and Ciudad Juarez] are thoroughly vaccinated, which is certainly a very satisfactory of the

\textsuperscript{5} Compulsory Vaccination in Jersey City, http://wwwihm.nlm.nih.gov/
value of vaccination… and most cases of smallpox here come from the lower parts of Texas and New Mexico.\textsuperscript{xxxi}

The very prevalence of vaccination led authorities to require certified vaccinations for access to the emerging basket of goods and services. In Monterrey, NL, urban residents had to have proper vaccination scars and proof of certified vaccination to receive city services.\textsuperscript{xxii} An increasing number of self-styled modern work sites required vaccination as a condition of employment. In Nuevo Leon, state health authorities recommended a return to arm-to-arm vaccination and outlawed the Parke-Davis calf-lymph vaccine points in 1908.\textsuperscript{xxiii} Two years later, the Mexican federal government mandated the same policy.\textsuperscript{xxiv} Northern Mexican authorities subjected vaccination to critical scrutiny, partly because vaccination scars demonstrated a lasting commitment to the new rhythms of industrial Mexico.
Of course, the appearance of modernity in Mexico encompassed more than compulsory vaccination. The use of store-bought clothing, a derby hat, suit and tie marked the full entrance of a man into urban life:

---

Pablo Ramirez⁷

Placing yourself in front of your husband’s camera also indicated another claim for public space:
This claim extended as well to a presence in the armed defense of reform movements in Porfirian Mexico.

Nurses.  

Although modern dress did not make a científico, “modern” dress displayed a shared commitment to the national transition toward a more modern Mexico. Displaying a vaccination scar to questioning public authorities provided an affirmative response to the challenge, are you also modern?

The sense of this challenge to a public place provides my basis for the following observation. The places on the Mexican border where United States federal vaccination practices met the most formal resistance adjoined the regions with the highest levels of vaccination coverage in Mexico. Mapping the complaints over the historical geography of Mexican revolutionary factions point to a negative link between Mexican political incorporation and violent Mexican dissent. By incorporation, I mean incorporation into governing national coalition. By violent dissent, I refer to the smallpox riot of 1899 in

---
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Laredo and the two-day long El Paso Typhus Bath Riots in 1916 and 1917. By lack of incorporation, I point to the active conflict over military control of Ciudad Juarez between El Paso, 1912-1919, the armed insurgencies at the turn of the century in Nuevo Leon.

The connection between political incorporation in Laredo and Nuevo Laredo and the appearance of consular claims against quarantine practices is even clearer. The people who filed the complaints knew vaccination, appreciated vaccination and even embraced vaccination as a technology to prevent disease. Their vaccination scars were clear evidence of their commitment to modern medicine. When federal health officers refused to recognize their vaccination scars, especially when the USPHS adopted unreliable medical technology, these plaintiffs used recently arrived Carrancista consuls to represent their demand for recognition.xxvi

The conflict over vaccination in the eastern railroad corridor on the Mexican border was between representatives of modern Mexico and the modern United States.
Venustiano Carranza and Colonel Folsom on International Bridge.⁹

The claimants demanded the recognition of their commitment to modernity. The

---

⁹ [http://runyon.lib.utexas.edu/r/RUN00000/RUN00000/RUN00003.JPG](http://runyon.lib.utexas.edu/r/RUN00000/RUN00000/RUN00003.JPG)
wide commitment to a Mexican version of modernity, in this case vaccination, led to a
critique of American vaccination practices and an embrace of official diplomatic
channels. As consuls moved to test cases that adequately challenged the “anti-Mexican
feelings” among USPHS officers, they embraced cases with plaintiffs that reflected
changing terms of inclusion.\textsuperscript{xxvii}

Recently appointed Mexican authorities considered the quarantine guard’s use of
force authorized by the grand jury’s decision in \textit{re: death of Jesus Montelongo} to be
abusive.\textsuperscript{xxviii} The quarantine authority’s use of violence against specific bodies was in
contention in the next consular challenge to Dr. Hall’s authority. Mexican officials in
Nuevo Laredo used the presence of specifically abused Mexican individuals to authorize
physical evidence. In another exceptional case, I. Juarez, immigration inspector told
Severiano Valle to present himself and a letter of introduction at Melquiades Garces’
consular office in Laredo. The letter of introduction made reference to the clear evidence
of abuse that Severiano Valle had recently suffered. The translated body of the letter
follows:

“Yesterday several persons came to me, to complain that an employee of the
sanitary department of that republic, Charles Ramsay, treats Mexicans with the
utmost brutality. As proof of facts and that the consulate in your charge may
take up the matter energetically to avoid such ruthlessness, I am sending you
with bearer of this note, Mr. Severiano Valle, one of the five victims yesterday
afternoon of said sanitation employee. At the customs house of this port is to be
found another of the persons who has suffered at the hands of said employee. I
regret to personally have to add that the conduct of some of the quarantine
department employees of this state has really become intolerable, and they are
going the length of frequently physically beating our fellow-citizens, and of
these, ourselves can cite very many cases.”\textsuperscript{xxix}

Inspector Juarez assumed that Melquiades Garces (and anyone else) could see the
traces of violence on Severiano Valle. The physical presence of Mr. Valle as a body of
evidence was very different from the body of evidence available in Dr. Hall’s trial.
Severiano Valle was alive and his body could provide witness to the violence that was
done to him and four other people a day earlier. Instead of relying on paper writing, Melquiades Garces used the traces of the beatings on Mr. Valle as the key piece of evidence. Inspector Juarez used Valle’s body as the evidence to ground a legal story that stood in for all five incidents. These five stories would then provide representative evidence of the extent to which quarantine guards were “frequently beating our fellow citizens.”

This case never reached the docket in Laredo, because Dr. Hall and Dr. Hamilton demanded that consuls use the local courts like they had in Montelongo (I would be glad to speak to the response in Q & A).

On September 4, 1916, Juana Garza took the ferry from Camargo, Tamaulipas, to Rio Grande City, Texas, to meet up with her sister Juliana Solis. As she expected, she submitted to the inquiries made to her by the inspector and a doctor. She was bathed and she and her two daughters, Epimenia and Ofelia, were all vaccinated. At the end of the process, she was brought to a room where the doctor, the inspector and a clerk asked her to take an oath and answer a set of questions thoroughly. The inspector translated the questions the doctor asked into Spanish and then communicated her response back to the doctor. She told the inspector that she was from Los Aldamas, Nuevo Leon, that Amado Garza, the father of her daughter Epimenia, paid for her passage to Rio Grande City. She reported that she was going to stay with her sister Juliana Solis. They pointedly asked if she was the sole means of support of her two children. Despite the passage paid by Amado, Juana claimed responsibility for her two children. At this point, Dr. Hunter read the statement that Juana Garza, as the sole support of Epimenia Solis and Ofelia Solis, was to be excluded because both children suffered from afflicted conjunctivitis, a “loathsome and contagious disease.” Edward Flannery told her that she had to return to Mexico because her children were sick. On the ferry back to Camargo, she broke down exclaiming that she and her children went through the bath, underwent the vaccination and the doctor still prevented her from meeting her sister in Rio Grande City. An older Mexican gentleman encouraged her, telling her that in Roma, there were no inspectors, no doctors and no border stations. She gathered her two kids, made her way to Roma, crossed the river and, within five days, made her way to Rio Grande City.

This small exchange between Leoncio Revelas, the Mexican consul in Rio Grande City and Juana Garza, points to the breaches in hierarchies and forced solidarities created
by disturbances during the Mexican Revolution. Revelas, as someone who crossed the border regularly, was very aware of how Mexican nationals were treated by the recent medical arrivals in the USPHS station. Revelas may have been happy to inform Juana Garza that her whole family could meet if they crossed through Roma. Within two weeks, Leoncio Revelas filed the first of three complaints against the practices adopted by Flannery and Hunter in Rio Grande City. In the letter that accompanied Miguel Barrera’s complaint, Revelas mentioned the cavalier way Flannery and Hunter treated women like Juana Garza. In exchange for his kindness, Consul Leoncio Revelas assumed she would approve the use of her experience as a key supplementary example of the disrespect Dr. Hunter held for all classes in Mexico. For Revelas, the insistence on vaccination regardless of immigration status demonstrated the immense disdain held by Dr. Hunter and Inspector Flannery. In response, Leoncio Revelas considered it necessary to defend the interests of a large number of border-crossing residents.

In the ensuing investigation, Inspector Reynolds told Consul Revelas that Juana Garza’s children had “a loathsome and contagious disease,” and that the absence of her husband made Juana Garza likely to become a public charge and that either of these situations was grounds for deportation in any version of American immigration law. Revelas responded with an apology. Juana Garza’s potential situation as a test case against vaccination policies for the consular disappeared with the appearance of stains on her respectability. This relatively weak representation of working-class claims by consuls was frequently repeated over the following 15 years. Still, the struggle for authority between Revolutionary factions led the relatively visible consul in Rio Grande City to use her case as a vehicle for local authority. The translation of Juana Garza’s story into a deposition in 1917 dramatized the sudden window of opportunity for Mexican anti-vaccination claims on United States authorities.

The window was small. Consul Frezieres exerted diplomatic pressure to force the medical inspectors to recognize the extent to which their inspection practices were considered to be illegitimate by members of the Mexican elite. On June 5, 1918, Mexican Consul Teodoro Frezieres made arrangements with the immigration inspectors at Eagle Pass to allow the Peraldi sisters, the sisters of the commanding general of the Piedras Negras military district and nieces of General Carranza, a medical inspection-free
passage into the United States. The inspectors agreed to expedite the paper work. Three
days later, when the two sisters presented themselves at the immigration station, the
immigration inspectors allowed them into the United States and forwarded them to the
quarantine office in the same building.\textsuperscript{xxxvii} The two sisters were inspected for lice, their
arms were examined by a “medical inspectress” to ascertain whether they were
vaccinated and whether those vaccination scars were sufficient evidence of immunity to
smallpox.\textsuperscript{xxxviii} As they left the medical inspection room, Consul Frezieres witnessed their
exit from their same room. As this was clear evidence that Inspector Ostrom broke with
his informal promise, Frezieres created a “totally unnecessary and unjustifiable
scene.”\textsuperscript{xxxix} According to Inspector Parker, Frezieres used so many words to inform
Ostrom that he “was no gentleman,” that Parker did “not have sufficient command of the
English language to state how insulting Consul Frezieres had been.”\textsuperscript{xli} In the subsequent
investigation, all three inspectors maintained that Mexican Consul Freziere’s threatened to
force any “Immigration man, going to Mexico” to a bath, “even if he had to do it
himself.”\textsuperscript{xlii} In this case, the Mexican foreign office exerted diplomatic pressure;
however, the immigration office initiated an investigation into Consul Freziere’s willful
misconduct in this incident. After 1918 the consular office never officially filed claims
against American vaccination practices.\textsuperscript{xlii}

After 1923, Mexican consuls did not use prior vaccination or obvious
respectability to challenge American vaccination and inspection practices. For many
border residents, the spectacle of compulsion associated with vaccination and Mexican
bodies was part of the urban border landscape.
Contract Laborers Awaiting Inspection, 1943.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{10} http://wwwihm.nlm.nih.gov/ihm/images/A/18/017.jpg
The presence of scenes like these in USPHS border offices provided the working precedent to establish compulsory vaccination in municipalities across the state of Texas. Justice Holmes used a perceived unanimity between state legislatures and medical authorities to expand the legal authority provided to medical authorities in public institutions. As he stated in *Buck v. Bell*, “the principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the fallopian tubes.”

In 1932, when Dr. Allen vaccinated 20% of the Mexican Olympic team who did not provide satisfactory evidence of a successful vaccination, he followed the tracks of his previous surgeons. When the consul declined to file a complaint regarding this treatment, he too raced the physical evidence provided by Mexican working-class bodies.

After 1928, Supreme Court decisions sanctioned the detention, compulsion or punishment of people who allegedly threatened the survival and interests of an imagined national community. The Urrutia family, Miguel Barrera and Juana Garza outlined arguments for their recognition against the legal precedent that provided scaffolding for compulsory sterilization laws. That they made these arguments is noteworthy; that the cases were filed with consuls and not in local municipal courts dramatizes the extent to

---

which even the form of legal representation shaped a distinctive, form of racialization based upon their presumed "foreignness." Thus, a key contribution of these challenges lay in the demand for recognition in the face of representations that transformed “the inhabitants of the borderlands [into] transgressors, aliens – whether they possess documents or not.”

![Mexican Family Awaiting Medicine by Dispensary](http://wwwihm.nlm.nih.gov/ihm/images/A/19/247.jpg)

---
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