

Migration Networks and Processes of Community Transformation: Arvin, California and Woodburn, Oregon ¹

**Edward Kissam
Senior Researcher,
Aguirre Division, JBS International**

Introduction

Biologists, sociologists, anthropologists, economists, and communication theorists alike have, over the past four decades given increasing attention to network phenomena, developed greater understanding of their functioning, and created powerful analytic tools for describing the configuration of networks and the consequences of that configuration for social life (Newman, Barabasi, and Watts 2006; Gladwell 2000; Buchanan 2002). There is widespread acknowledgment of the very important role played by social networks in facilitating migration (Mines 1981; Massey et al. 1987; Massey and Garcia-España 1987; Alarcon 1988; Kearny and Nagengast 1989), in structuring social and economic transactions (Lomnitz 1961; Hagan 1994; Hagan 2004; Portes and Bach 1985; Portes 1995), and mediating individual interactions (Menjivar 2000), personal life strategies (Wilson 1998), and communication behavior.

However, despite widespread interest, and strong ethnographic research, most notably Lynn Stephen's research on transnational Oaxacan networks in Oregon (Stephen 2007) as well as important work by other researchers focusing on transnational indigenous communities migration to and settlement in rural U.S. communities (Anderson 2004; Burns 1993; Kearny and Nagengast 1989), there is the need for further focused attention of the role of Mexican and Guatemalan migration networks in shaping community civic life and community change—especially in the context of rural U.S. communities and transnational migration.² Such research holds promise, both theoretically--by generating a deeper conceptualization of the complex notion of “community” and, in practical terms, by enhancing visualization regarding proactive strategies to facilitate immigrant social, civic, and political integration with or without the impetus of comprehensive immigration reform legislation. A crucial requirement is that social policy development not be based entirely on macro-level analyses of social and economic trends but incorporate, also, careful examination of the “micro-dynamics” of immigrant social integration at the individual, family, neighborhood, community, and transnational village network level.

I do not propose to undertake such a daunting task in the current paper. What I do examine are two crucial aspects of migration network functioning in the civic life of rural, predominantly Mexican, immigrant settlement communities in the western U.S. studies in the New Pluralism project.³ The first facet of immigrants' migration/social network functioning relates to the evolution of these networks over time and their role in shaping community civic life and supplying community leadership over multiple generations.⁴ The second facet has to do with interactions among multiple Mexican migration networks, which facilitate immigration to the migrant-receiving communities in the rural United States and how these affect the dynamics of community life. I conclude with a discussion of the implications these have for sound social policy to integrate immigrants into U.S. community life.⁵

Why is it important to give attention to the apparently arcane mathematics of network theory and the apparent fuzziness of ethnographic research as part of social policy deliberation regarding the prospects and strategies for immigrant integration? One important reason is that

the “default model” of immigrant integration which underlies current policy analysis is dangerously simplified into a “model” of community which includes two bundles of community residents—the “native-born population” and the “immigrant population”. Then, presumably, by reliance on analyses of important characteristics (e.g. educational attainment, age, earnings) of each population such as those put forward by George Borjas and other economists committed to risky reductionism, it is argued that it will be possible to rationally shape sound immigration policy and sound immigrant social policy. Despite their seductiveness, such analyses are deeply flawed, due in part to uneven quality of the datasets used by such ivory tower analysts and due in part to modeling strategy. Consequently, in many real-world policy debates (such as that which surrounded California’s Proposition 187 and current debate surrounding passage of comprehensive immigration reform legislation) discussion has consisted primarily of macro-level economic analyses without adequately examining the diversity and the social dynamics within immigrant communities. Most problematically, these reductionist analyses do not provide a sound conceptual framework for understanding the natural dynamic processes through which communities evolve and, therefore, inevitably postulate “problems” where there actually are none or misconstrue the endemic problems there are.

Leading researchers on migration and immigrant social integration such as Portes, Rumbaut, and their colleagues have developed valuable insights into the social dynamics among successive immigrant cohorts (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). In addition, the groundbreaking research of the Changing Relations Project (Bach et al 1993) very cogently articulates the importance of understanding that social integration is a process of mutual adaptation, but, given the diversity of migration flows and local communities, further research is needed to understand the full spectrum of contexts for immigration-driven community change. A practical implication is that the first step in newly-pluralistic communities’ efforts to find common ground must be to explore and “discover” their own complex identity—not as distinct and separate “populations” but as small social universes criss-crossed by different sorts of individual social ties and interactions—within the community at large, within neighborhoods, workplaces, schools, civic organizations, and even within households.

A related conclusion is that it is not useful to examine immigrants’ resources of social capital which emerge within migration networks without giving careful attention at the same time to distinctions between “bonding” and “bridging” social capital (Putnam 2000) and the recognition that stores of social capital can be both a resource and an impediment to immigrant social integration (Portes and Landolt 1996) and that what matters is what is done to deploy social capital in addressing quality of community life, in “translating” social capital into civic capital. Ultimately, planning efforts to facilitate accumulation of civic capital as a resource for community-building and enhancing quality of community life will need to take into account the ways in which the internal diversity of immigrant communities in the rural U.S. affects civic processes and ongoing effort to “find common ground”.⁶

Understanding the differences and similarities among immigrant settlement communities is a particularly pressing challenge with respect to the transformation of rural communities in the United States. This is because, in these rural communities with small populations and fragile economies, change takes place rapidly and inflows of migrants have greater impact than in larger, urban communities. At the same time, there are extraordinary opportunities; because rural communities are smaller, they can, in principle at least, recognize and respond more rapidly to community change. As such, they provide valuable insights into the “micro-dynamics” of immigrant social integration in U.S. civic life at the state and national level as well and can provide examples of particularly promising practices for immigrant social and civic integration.

Drawing on findings from the New Pluralism study of immigration to rural U.S.

communities, this paper briefly describes the processes through which two Western immigrant settlement communities, Woodburn, Oregon and Arvin, California—both of them important migrant destinations for Mexican immigrants in the rural U.S.—have been transformed by immigration over the past half century. As in most other rural immigrant settlement communities in the U.S., the majority of immigrants are of Mexican origin, but as in other communities, each also has smaller minority groups of immigrants (in the case of these communities, Yemenis, Filipinos, and Russians) who have played important roles in giving rise to the particular character of the community.

Macro-Level Context of Immigration to Rural Areas of the Pacific Seaboard

The contribution of immigration to demographic change in rural America is dramatic. Mexicans make up by far the largest group among these immigrants to rural states. Recently, Micah Bump from the Institute for the Study of International Migration (Bump 2005) identified 19 rural “new settlement” states where the immigrant population grew by 159% during the decade and another “moderate-growth” three rural settlement states with over 90% growth in immigrant population during the same period.

Oregon, where Woodburn is located is one of these “new settlement” states with a 108% growth in immigrant population from 1990-2000. California, where Arvin is located, is like other traditional settlement states, in that there is now slower growth in its immigrant population—37% during the decade. Although the state’s relative importance as a migrant destination has declined as a result of “rural-rural” migration from Mexico diffusing throughout the U.S (Mines, Gabbard, and Samardick 1993; Bump 2005; Card and Lewis 2005; Fox 2005; Fox 2006), it remains the primary destination for Mexican migrants coming to the United States.⁷

Arvin, California—Convergence of Migrant Streams from the Dust Bowl, the Bajio, and the Sierra Mixteca

The town of Arvin, at the southern end of California’s San Joaquin Valley, one of the most labor-intensive agricultural regions in the world, has existed for almost one century now. During almost all of its history, the community’s identity has been shaped by migration. Since Arvin first existed, there has been an ongoing stream of newcomers arriving there and an exodus of youth born in the community. The community’s social universe has consistently been shaped by diverse waves of migrants, cultures, and languages—within a remarkably unchanging framework of economic dynamics.⁸ Our research in Arvin and other rural U.S. communities underscores the need to visualize “community” as a standing wave, simply a locus for human social interactions, not as a solid, tangible entity, which is buffeted by change.

Because it has always been a town of migrants, Arvin community case study provides a particularly good opportunity to explore the consequences of successive waves of migration in shaping the evolving “character” of a community. Such an analysis is important because there are practical dangers in public policy analyses and program planning which incorrectly assume, either tacitly or explicitly, that immigration is a “one-time thing”—an impact, a shock on a pre-existing already-defined entity. Our view is that immigration and community transformation must be seen as a continuous, ongoing multi-faceted evolutionary process and recognizing that most of rural America is now experiencing an extraordinary demographic, cultural, and sociopolitical transformation similar to the one that has always been underway in Arvin.

Historical and Economic Context of Arvin

Historically, Arvin has been at the center of farm labor history—as it was an important

destination for Dust Bowl migrants (John Steinbeck did the background research for **Grapes of Wrath** in the area in 1936). In a famous sociological study of the relationship between production patterns and rural community life, **As You Sow: Three Studies in the Social Consequences of Agribusiness** Walter Goldschmidt's analysis was based in part on a survey of Arvin in 1944 (the large agribusiness community which was contrasted with Dinuba, the small cropping area). In the 1960's the town was at the center of the United Farmworkers movement in Kern County. While the U.S. farm labor market is diverse, Arvin is a community as close as any in the United States to being representative of the communities which grow up next to the "factories in the fields".

Kern County where Arvin is located is one of the top three agricultural counties in the United States—depending on the specific indicator used. Although the town has an official population of 12,956 according to Census 2000, the actual population swells to probably 14,000 or more during the peak summer harvest season. Census 2000 data show that the overwhelming majority (88%) of the population is of Hispanic, primarily Mexican, origin; another 9% are White Non-Hispanics while the remaining 2% is Asian (primarily Yemenis and Filipinos); and less than 1% are Black. Within the spectrum of U.S. rural communities impacted by immigration, Arvin is clearly one of the most extreme cases of communities transformed by migration—both in terms of the proportion of immigrants in the community (82% of the heads of household) and its long history of migration (since the 1930's).

Arvin's Long History as a Migrant-Receiving Community

The first agricultural activity in the Arvin area was wheat farming, begun about in 1888. The first settlers, however, were two families who migrated there from the San Bernardino area in 1908 and planted 10 acres of fruit trees. Within the next decade, after construction of the East Side Canal brought water to the area, 90 acres of walnut trees had been planted, a dairy had been started, a school district formed, and a post office established. As water made intensive agricultural production possible, crops diversified to include peaches, apricots pears, figs, and grapes.

During the post-World War I period, Joseph DiGiorgio, an Italian immigrant, established the DiGiorgio Fruit Company in Kern County and began growing grapes and plums; the DiGiorgio empire grew rapidly and the company owned more than 20,000 acres of San Joaquin Valley land by 1921—about one-third of it (6,000 acres) in the Arvin area.⁹ By the mid 1920's Arvin and its neighboring communities each had small general stores, churches, and small equipment and auto repairs shops. The town appears to have been prosperous and growing rapidly during this period. During the 1920's there was even a hotel on the main street of town (now Bear Mountain Boulevard).¹⁰

Although the history of Arvin-Weedpatch-Lamont area is generally thought of almost exclusively in terms of dust bowl migrants, it is likely that local companies such as Di Giorgio were recruiting Mexican labor in the decade from 1925-1935 even before the Bracero program started up in the 1940's. The Fowler Ensign published on June 14, 1923 an article headlined "Labor of Valley now Mexicans". In the article, E.E. Wray of the Valley Fruit Growers was quoted as follows,

"...this valley is now dependent on alien labor. Formerly the Japanese laborers could be depended upon to man our vineyards but these in recent years have, as a rule, declined to hire out, preferring to work for themselves. The Hindus are drifting back to their own lands, and the Indians are decreasing in numbers....the Mexicans are independent, lazy, and disloyal...but must be depended upon for

60% of our labor”.

Our New Pluralism interviews with elderly Arvin residents indicate that by the late 1930's even as the Bracero program was gearing up to develop an “official” solution to labor-intensive agribusiness's need for cheap labor, there were already some Yemenis, Filipinos, Mexicans, and Anglos working at Di Giorgio.

Arvin around World War II and the Arrival of the First Mexican Immigrants¹¹

An Okie informant we interviewed, J.R. Horlacher described Arvin as having only two or three families of “Spanish people”, eight buildings, and one restaurant when he arrived in 1936 (the year Sunset Migrant Labor Camp was built and eight years before Goldschmidt's study). Soon there were more; as we discovered in an interview with an early Mexican immigrant to Arvin, Roberto (Beto) Felix, now 78 years old, Mexican farmworkers were already migrating to work in Arvin before the Bracero program began. Beto was born in 1925 in Mexicali but his family very soon moved across the border to work and live in Calexico and Brawley in the Imperial Valley. He first arrived in Arvin in 1941 as a 16-year-old farmworker with his family. He says, “We showed up like Okies to work in the harvest”.¹² The family came north with a female labor contractor, named Escalera who also took crews to work in the Huron melon harvest and in cotton (a major labor-intensive crop until mechanization in the early 1960's). When they arrived in Arvin, the Felix family crew included the parents and four teenage workers. They picked cotton, melons, and watermelon. At that point, there was a pool hall where Beto would play pool and a bar called “Tu Solo Tu” catering to migrants. Another older Arvin resident, Connie Mediano, who came to live in the area in 1948, remembers a number of bars which sprung up because of the influx of Braceros—workers at DiGiorgio Farm Camp #8 and #10.

Arvin in the Post World-War II Era—1950's and 1960's

In the aftermath of World War II, Arvin continued to thrive. One informant recalls that in the 1950's the main street of town was so crowded with cars that they parked parallel. In the late 1950's Tejano/a migrants, many of whom had been born in northeastern Mexico but raised in “El Valle” in South Texas, began to settle out of “the migrant stream” in various places along the long-haul family migrant circuit (Briody 1986; Griffith, Kissam, Garcia et al 1995).¹³ Arvin was one of these places—attractive because it had a long growing season and a great variety of crop-tasks and, thus, migrants could, then (as today) work for more months than in other areas with had less variety of seasonal farmwork.

An interview with a 75 year-old Mexican former Bracero, Servando Rivera Juarez, provides a good summary of the important role played by labor intermediaries in shaping the composition of Arvin in the era immediately after World War II.¹⁴ Servando, who had moved to Tijuana after his time as a Bracero, as a baker in the border town of Nuevo Laredo, and as a Texas-Michigan migrant farmworker, was recruited to work at a DiGiorgio farm by a well-known local labor contractor, Jesus (Jesse) Marquez, a Mexican-American who had been born in Bakersfield in 1928. While Jesse was a labor market intermediary with closer ties to the grower who employed him than to the workers he supervised, Servando still remembered him as a good-hearted, helpful employer, much in the tradition of other Tejano/a crew leaders, the *troqueros*, who felt bound by the norms of mutual reciprocity and who typically “earned” workers' loyalty by being available to help them when they had emergencies or special problems.

This historical context of the of this *Tejano/a* cohort's settlement in Arvin emerges clearly in the account of a civic activist and community role model, Adalia Luevanos, now a bilingual program supervisor and the first Latina to serve on the Arvin City Council (beginning

in 1992). She and her husband, Jesus, a retired farmworker and school maintenance worker, remember the town vividly from the days when Texas migrant family crews first began settling there.

Adalia was born in General Teran, in Nuevo Leon but then first came to Donna, Texas in 1956 as a young girl after her father, who had gone to Texas earlier, sent for his wife and children who he was able to immigrate legally. Adalia remembers several family members being naturalized the same day. As a migrant teenager, Adalia worked in places as diverse as Immokalee, Florida, in south Texas itself, and California, with her family working sometimes as part of a famous female troquera (crewleader) “La Guera Maggie.”¹⁵ She met her husband, Jesus who was part of the same crew she and her family traveled with and they came to California together with her family. Jesus, who had been born in Sombrerete, Zacatecas came to live in Donna, Texas when he was 5 years old where he worked in the fields as a child but also went to school.

The young couple worked in grapes, peaches, training grapevines, harvesting corn and onions when they first settled in Arvin in 1961 and then, in 1962, in harvesting oranges and nectarines. They had to share a small house with Adalia’s parents, and her sisters. Jesus remembers complaining to a *mayordomo* (field supervisor) from Jalisco for whom he worked about needing to get living quarters with more space. The *mayordomo* offered to let them live with him and his family in their house which had a bit more room although they still shared the bathroom with the . The young couple soon moved into a small house near the railroad tracks (which they eventually sold to a Mixteco civic activist who now lives there with his family). Arvin was then, and remains, a nexus where different migrant streams converge—a type community we refer to as an “upstream migrant node.”¹⁶

Adalia still recalls vividly that when she first arrived in Arvin, people had the time to help each other, people trusted each other, and there were no fears of crime, even though families were just as poor then as they are now. Adalia reminisced about how Texas migrant farmworkers’ networks shaped Arvin life. Her recollections highlight how civic engagement grew out of the bonding experiences of this first cohort of immigrants to Arvin:

“We all knew each other because we worked together in the big crews—up to 100 people sometimes (picking cotton, grapes, peaches, green beans, corn). We didn’t know anyone in town when we arrived...But you’d go out in the morning and you’d smell Mexican food...People cared more about each other, were more friendly...in the evenings when people sat outside you’d hear Spanish. We could both maintain our culture and participate in community life.”¹⁷

Adalia’s husband, Jesus echoed her recollection saying, “We were like a family. We helped each other”. Jesus, like other farmworkers from the era, remembers how closely-knit the crews were and how these social relationships infused community life in Arvin. He mused, “There was more camaraderie, more friendship, more happiness. We visited each other”.

The stores of social capital inherent in the Texas-based migrant farmworker networks seem to have stemmed from the density of the networks, bonding social capital from extended family relationships and from living in the same small *colonia* or neighborhood but, also, from relationships established in the work crews—“bridging” social capital. Adalia and Jesus’ contrast of the texture of Mexican immigrants’ social life in the 1960’s in Arvin with contemporary life provides a powerful reminder that social capital does not always accumulate in social networks unless a particular set of social conditions emerges so that relationships create

ties that bind instead of chronic conflicts. Mexican migration to “El Valle” (the lower Rio Grande Valley) of Texas can be seen as a form of stage migration where the Texas *colonias* served more or less as an incubator for social integration and nurturing civic participation—in part because immigration policy in this era allowed Mexican immigrants to easily achieve legal permanent resident status and citizenship.

Migration Network Diversity and the Dynamics of Community Change in Arvin

Migration from Mexico to Arvin remains strong—due to the magnet of easy access to employment in farmwork and the very well established migration networks linking Arvin to migrant-sending communities in Mexico. One out of six Arvin heads of household (17%) came to the U.S. less than 6 years ago and two-thirds came to the U.S. within the past two decades.¹⁸ At the same time, the patterns of migration to Arvin shift (more like meandering watercourse than community-to-community pipelines). In this regard, Arvin is typical. The dominant position of a particular Guanajuato-based network in Arvin life emphasizes not only the fact that home village/social networks play a role in many different facets of migration and social integration but, also, that the interaction between these different “pressure points” is important.

The Yuriria-Xoconoxtle-Palo Alto-Rancho del Tigre Migration Network

The importance of the Yuriria-area network, which includes slightly less than one-fourth (23%) of all Mexican immigrant households in Arvin, stems not only from its absolute size but also from the fact that the other potentially competing village networks are so dispersed. Not surprisingly, three-quarters of the Guanajuato-born heads of household said that lots of their fellow villagers already lived in Arvin when they first arrived in town.¹⁹ Arriving Guanajuatenses from this area already had important stores of social capital to draw down on even when they were newly arrived in Arvin. Mutual reciprocity is not, of course, either instantaneous, or perfectly implemented—but social networks at least exert powerful forces in shaping social and economic interactions and community evolution.

Membership in the village-based migration networks of the Yuriria-area sending villages can be drawn upon by farm labor contractors in recruiting and managing farm labor crews and, through this very specific mechanism, further increase network dominance of the community. A well-know local farm labor contractor, “Beto” Garza, originally from the hamlet of Xoconoxtle which is part of the Yuriria-area network probably played a significant role in the growth of that network in Arvin.²⁰ An informant who has been friendly with Beto over the years says that he first came to Arvin in the late 1950’s working as a farmworker himself. He soon formed his own crew and went into the farm labor contracting business. Like most new farm labor contractors he apparently began by recruiting workers from his own extended family network—but soon his business grew large enough to outgrow this social network. Using earnings from farm labor contracting he acquired real estate and began to engage directly in agricultural production. Like most immigrant entrepreneurs, one of the first ranches he bought was purchased from the seller without access to formal credit and the mortgage was secured by a personal note. He continued to purchase real estate with the proceeds from his labor contracting business; he tells us, for example, that he bought one 160-acre ranch with the proceeds from money made in the plum harvest one year. We do not know the size of his labor contracting business but it must be very large as he says he now owns 28,000 acres of land and 20,000 head of cattle and he is famous among Arvin residents. Several of the farmworkers in our random sample of Arvin households work for him. He functions partially within the framework of traditional mores—feeling obligated to be a visible contributor when collections are made to send the bodies of migrants who have died in the U.S. back to Xoconotle. Beto and his wife are also generally believed to

donate substantial sums of money to the Catholic church.

At the same time, review of Yuriria-area immigrants' accounts of coming to Arvin show the familial and social factors which nudge the decisions of migrants in established migrant-sending villages to come north—a father who was a Bracero, neighbors returning to Mexico with good clothes and boom boxes, brothers with a house to stay at while getting on one's feet, rides to work, help from family members in figuring out how to apply for legalization or naturalization. A female farmworker from Yuriria, Elena Calderon, explains what she knows of her village's evolution into a community, which sends so many migrants north,

In the 1960's many men from my village came to Arvin. Back then, they would come on their own [implying that now they don't, that there is a "town coyote"]. They would eventually bring the rest of the family members...My husband's relatives lived here and invited him to come and work and I also had aunts who were already settled here in Arvin. This made it easy to move..."²¹

This is a straightforward description of the phenomenon referred to as *nortenzacion* by Alarcon—the stage of evolving migration at which social networks don't simply provide a single way to access a migration destination, but, rather, a multitude of possible pathways. Another Yuriria migrant referred to Arvin as “a home away from home”, again a direct way of describing a transnational “network community”.

Elena Calderon's neighbor, Dolores Acevedo, a middle-aged woman who joined her husband in Arvin in 1994 after remaining in Xoconoxtle in the Yuriria area for some years while her husband came and went as a shuttle migrant, explained

"I had always been curious about the U.S....but my husband said I shouldn't come north until he got me and the children a mica" [i.e. a green card]; he did and they all came together legally."²²

The presence of a dense support network makes social integration more a “one stop shopping” experience than a painful gauntlet of dealing with unfamiliar institutions. Dolores went on to summarize her integration into Arvin social life as follows,

"I feel I had a very warm transition because many of our good friends were already living here. My husband already had a sister in Arvin and she was very helpful. She gave me rides to the store and showed me where the health clinic was".

Dolores is definitively settled in Arvin; she says

"I'm going to stay here. All my friends and family are here. I have no more relatives in Mexico. Everyone is in the San Joaquin Valley, here and in Planada, so this has become home."²³

Countervailing Forces-- Competing Home Village Networks and Mainstream Integration of 2nd Generation Immigrants

Although the overwhelming majority of immigration to Arvin continues to consist of Mexican farmworkers who left rural communities in Mexico for rural life in the U.S., the diversity of Mexican immigrants has increased greatly in the past two decades as the Guanajuato-based and

closely-allied ones in the adjacent areas of Michoacán have been joined by influxes of indigenous Mexican migrants from the Sierra Mixteca of Oaxaca, many of whom migrated via Baja California. This difference in migration history (as well as ethnicity and language) appears to be a significant factor in distinguishing the collective experience of these “Oaxacalifornios” from migrants from the Bajío, the Guanajuatenses and Michoacanos and the earlier waves of Tejanos (most of whom were actually Mexican migrants from Tamaulipas, Nuevo Leon, and San Luis Potosí).

While migration networks, once established, facilitate the immigration of new arrivals from sending villages by assuring a supply of trusted, reliable coyotes and by “inviting” relatives and friends north and assuring them access to work.²⁴ At the same time, the 2nd and 3rd generation U.S.-born children of immigrants establish new personal identities, modes of social interaction, political perspectives, career aspirations, and career trajectories as they grow up in the U.S.²⁵ These countervailing processes, one leading toward diversity and one leading toward cultural homogeneity, maintain a constantly-changing equilibrium. Given the current high rates of Mexico-U.S. immigration, it is inevitable that communities such as Arvin will become more diverse and that civic and political life must become pluralistic.²⁶

The old conceptual model of immigrants being “incorporated into” the presumably static cultural and political social fabric of “American” life which dominates the real-world policy discussion (almost two decades after the Changing Relations research) is no longer a useful schematic representation of social reality or community change. Because the process is really one of mutual adaptation, constant co-evolution there is a feedback loop throughout the migrant circuit.

One result is that migrant home community social life is heavily impacted by social change in the U.S. as recognized by Levitt, Alarcon, Mines and other researchers looking at transnational migrant circuits as is civic life as described by Kearney, Besserer, Fox and others. But still more importantly in the domestic social policy context, recognition of the process of co-evolution focuses attention on the need to pay attention to migrant-receiving community response—by individuals, community leaders, and institutions. The urgency of such attention is underscored also by the inevitability of strengthening of transnational linkages and acceleration of migration flows—given improvements in 21st century communications technology, transportation, and how ubiquitous transnational labor markets have become.

Arvin appears to be an extreme case of constantly-changing identity in that the community’s entire history has been one of successive waves of newly-arriving migrants settling in the community—first the small family farmers from the Los Angeles basin who founded the town, subsequently the Dust Bowl domestic migrants, then the Texas long-haul migrant family crews and the migrants from core sending areas of Mexico traveling north into the San Joaquin Valley, and most recently, the Oaxacan indigenous migrants. Yet, at the same time, this is a microcosm of the history of virtually all rural communities in the United States, although the particular ethnic groups and transnational migration networks vary tremendously from one area to another.

Transformation of Woodburn, Oregon—From Farming Hamlet to Regional Capital of “La Mixteca del Norte”

Like rural communities throughout much of the United States, the central part of Woodburn has small, 19th century Victorian-style houses, green lawns, and beautiful gardens. The outskirts of town, along the old business Highway 99 and at the exit from the newer I-5 interstate freeway, have a proliferation of fast-food franchises, a Wal-Mart Super-Store, industrial “parks”, small shopping centers. The northern edge of town has several very large senior housing complexes

whose retired residents make up perhaps one-fifth the community's population of 20,000 but Woodburn is in transition—transformed in part by immigration but, also, by macro-level forces as the urban Portland sphere of influence balloons outward and as U.S. agriculture struggles, with little success, to hold its own in the global economy.²⁷

What was once the town movie theatre is now an appliance store catering primarily to Mexicans. In a neighborhood which was once “the wrong side of the tracks” a new Chemeketa Community College campus affords easy access to both native-born and immigrant students and an old church has been transformed into headquarters for the Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noroeste (PCUN), a local immigrant rights and labor organization which came to prominence in the late 1980's helping Woodburn's Mexican farmworker immigrants complete their immigration applications and start on the road toward citizenship.

Agriculture's Role in Woodburn Community Transformation

The Willamette Valley was recognized by the earliest pioneers as a promising and fertile area in the early 1800's. This was an accurate assessment. In 1990, although farmland in the Willamette Valley comprised 10% of the total agricultural acreage in the state it accounted for 43% of Oregon's total agricultural production. However, the Willamette Valley differs from other farming areas of the U.S. in that it has a much higher proportion of small farmers than other major agricultural states such as California. The average farm size in Marion County where Woodburn is located was 106 acres in 2002. This is quite small by current agribusiness standards.

As in most of the U.S., World War II was a watershed in rural life in Woodburn. An elderly farmer, Jeremy Hansen, born in 1921, remembers Woodburn as being a town of only 100 or so households in the 1930's when he was growing up. He recalls that when his parents married, his father's farm was 69 acres and his mother's farm was also 69 acres.²⁸ In this pre-Depression area, people grew field crops such as oats and potatoes and worked their own land. He recalled,

“In the 1920's things were tough. People here couldn't pay their taxes. They planted a field of oats to pay their taxes. They also planted potatoes. They had chickens, pigs, mil. Everyone had a few rows of berries and potatoes. We dug them by hand...at the time, 120 acres was considered large”

Farming grew even more precarious during the Depression. But then, agricultural production grew rapidly in the late 1930's as farmers began to irrigate and canneries began to process strawberries, pears, prunes, and pole beans. This elderly farmer sold his last farm horse in 1946 (for \$25) and remembers that by the 1950's “Woodburn had come to be considered “The Berry Capital of the World”.

Another local farmer, Steve Dolan, remembers that major Willamette Valley producers (Tankersley, Townsend) began recruiting farmworkers in Oaxaca when there was a shift from vegetable production toward berries. This is consistent with the accounts of early Oaxacan migrants who worked for Tankersley themselves. Berry production has probably been the primary driver of migration to Woodburn and the entire northern Willamette Valley region—because the harvest season is short, only 3 months.

However, although it remains the largest single employment sector locally, farm employment is now declining—as global competition buffets the frozen berry sector and agricultural production shifts from traditional crops to nursery production. The Woodburn Chamber of Commerce estimates that agriculture now accounts for slightly less than 20% of

business payrolls in the local area.

Historical Roots of Migration to Woodburn

Woodburn does not have quite as long a history of migration as Arvin, California. Yet it shares with Arvin one important historical strand; it is one of the communities to which Texas-based “long-haul” migrant family crews traveled in the 1950’s. And it is one of the communities in which they began to settle—due to affordable housing and ample work—even before the viability of the long-haul migrant circuit was destroyed by mechanization of sugar beet production and cotton harvesting in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s (Griffith and Kissam 1995).

Where Woodburn differs from many rural communities in labor-intensive agricultural areas is that the immigrant settlers include a wave of Russian refugees who settled in town in the late 1960’s and 1970’s just as the flow of Mexican immigrant farmworkers migrating to Willamette Valley berry and vegetable production began to increase. Because of their history as agricultural workers and as global migrants whose travels had taken them to South America, some of these Spanish-speaking Russian refugees moved rapidly from doing farmwork themselves, into farm labor contracting, and then into running farms themselves. Consequently, there are, in Woodburn, extraordinary linguistic and cultural interactions unique to the community. Russian packing plant workers up until recently worked efficiently side-by-side with Mexican workers because some had been born and grown up in Argentina and, thus, speak Spanish fluently.²⁹

Adding to the diversity of migration flows bringing settlers to Woodburn, passage of IRCA permitted formerly unauthorized Mexican migrant farmworkers to adjust their legal status in the late 1980’s. Mixtec farmworkers from Oaxaca who had originally come to the Willamette Valley in the summer to harvest strawberries, berries, and cucumbers began to settle out of the migrant stream in the area (in the adjacent hamlets of Gervais and Hubbard as well as Woodburn).³⁰ They settled because—like the wave of Texas migrants a generation earlier—they found housing and ample work.

There was still more diversity within the migrant labor force settling in Woodburn—Purepecha-speaking migrants from the central highlands of Michoacán. By the mid-1990’s, the diversity of Mexican indigenous migrants increased still more as Zapotec and Triqui migrants from the state of Oaxaca settled in the area. Our Woodburn Community Survey suggests that about 17% of Woodburn’s immigrant head of households belong to an indigenous Mexican minority ethnic group. A survey of indigenous minority languages conducted by the Oregon Law Center the same year found that, in addition to these language minorities, the Willamette Valley migrant labor force includes speakers of Yucatec Maya, Nahuatl, Chinanteco, and Mixe.³¹

Settlement of Texas Migrant Workers in Woodburn beginning in the 1950’s

After World War II, family crews of Mexican origin who had settled in the lower Rio Grande Valley, led by *troqueros* (crew leaders/labor contractors) had begun to travel the “long-haul” migrant circuit which provided them a long working year working in cotton, sugar beets, row crops, and orchard harvests throughout the country, including Oregon and Washington.

The migration experience of the first generation of Mexicans in Oregon, the Tejanos, is similar to that of migrant farmworkers throughout the country. And, in many respects, the experiences of migrants coming to Woodburn today echo some the experiences of those early migrants half a century ago. However, it is clear that settling in to a new community was easier for this first generation of migrants than it is now. Interviews with the earliest migrants to Woodburn provide us detailed picture of the historical roots of the current transformation of Woodburn into a diverse community of immigrants and native-born families. These interviews

suggest that the predominance of small family farmers in the Willamette Valley (as contrasted to the “factories in the fields” of California epitomized by DiGiorgio’s role in Kern County) played an important role in immigrants’ social integration into Woodburn in the 1950’s and 1960’s.

One of the earliest of the Tejano migrants (referred to locally as the “pioneros”) to settle in the Woodburn area who we interviewed is Natividad Gonzalez. Natividad, born in 1931 was 72 years old when we interviewed him.³² His father, Baltazar was born in Armadillo, San Luis Potosi in 1900, living through the Mexican revolution of 1910 as a child and the subsequent period of turbulence from 1910-1920. Natividad and his oldest siblings were born in Armadillo also. Natividad’s father first migrated to Texas in 1943, taking his oldest brother, Bernardino, with him. Natividad describes his father’s migration as “simply disappearing” from home; for several years, Baltazar’s wife and his children heard nothing from him. Finally, a letter came with some money to help support the family; Natividad thinks his father had sent 8 or 10 dollars in the letter. Five years later, in 1948, his father sent for Natividad, who was then 17 years old, and the rest of the family to come join him in Progreso, TX.

After they had spent 3 or 4 years working happily for a local rancher, the family was deported to Mexico as part of Operation Wetback in 1951, although their employer had begun the process of regularizing their immigration status. But then, finally, after two years back in Mexico their immigration papers were finally processed in 1953. This allowed them to migrate to the Pacific Northwest. They first worked in Washington, in the Yakima Valley where they worked in hops, near Toppenish but also traveled to Bellingham in coastal Washington to pick strawberries—following a migration loop, which continues, to the present. Having married and begun to raise a family in Progreso, Natividad finally decided to bring his wife and two young children with him and join his parents and siblings in Oregon in 1957. He thinks of 1958 as the year in which the cultural shift happened. He remembers it was then that there started to be Mexican movies in the theatres in the area. Having come on his own he lived on a different ranch, owned by John Moore, working in the summer on the ranch and in the winter at the Northview Nursery. Eventually, the nursery owner, “Don Bernardo Smith”, helped him to find his own house to rent.

We learned more of this extended family’s migration story from Natividad’s older brother, Jose Honorio Gonzalez Tristan who was born in 1929 and his wife Matilde Saldano de Gonzalez, who is two years younger than he is.³³ He explained how he and the family had first come to Gervais, Oregon (a hamlet about 5 miles from Woodburn). He came in 1955 as a migrant worker picking strawberries, a southward extension of the migration circuit which made it convenient to combine work in berries with work later in the season in hops (August) and apples (September-October).

This seems to have been a common strategy for residents of the Progreso *colonia*, many of whom were *Potosinos* (i.e. hailing from San Luis Potosi state and part of those village networks). Honorio’s wife, Matilde, also came to Oregon at that time as a migrant with her family. Matilde and her family had come to Oregon with the same farm labor contractor who had originally brought Honorio’s father to Washington--Porfirio Garcia. She remembers that in 1955 when her family had first come to Gervais, there were only two Mexican families in town. However, Honorio remembers that, in addition to the local American students who worked in strawberries, there were also many Mexican farmworkers. After settling in Oregon, however, her family had continued to migrate; she remembers going to Corcoran, on the west side of California’s San Joaquin Valley to pick cotton.

Matilde recalls that by 1957, there were already about 10-15 Mexican families in the Woodburn area but that it was only in 1958 when Texas migrants really started coming in large numbers to St. Paul, Gervais, and Woodburn. Local growers, such as Fred Wishwell (who

employed Honorio and Matilde's families) would provide housing for the migrants and are generally spoken of in very positive terms by the migrants who formerly worked for them. Another of the growers who was said to have several farm labor recruiter/contractors was Joe Seers and his labor contractor "Chon", Concepcion Olivera. According to Matilde other Tejano migrants began arriving in their own vehicles by the late 1950's.

In the case of the Tejanos, national and cultural identity blended--an important factor in Texas' colonias' role as "incubators" of immigrant social, civic, and political integration. Another of the early Tejano migrants we interviewed, Silverio Zarate, was a "2nd generation" immigrant, the U.S.-born child of Mexican migrants to Texas. He was born in 1914 in Stockdale, TX (near the border town of Eagle Pass) and first migrated to Woodburn in 1961.³⁴ After his mother died in 1960, Silverio and his wife Luz (who had worked as a flagger as part of the house-moving business) migrated to Saint Paul, Oregon (about 10 miles from Woodburn) with a *troquero* (i.e. a migrant crew leader). Silverio, too, recalls that farm labor crews included both Mexican-Americans from Texas and Mexican workers. He recalled that social life was different when he first arrived in the area, "When we arrived, everyone helped everyone else"—a memory similar to that of Adalia Luevanos in Arvin.

Silverio remembers several of the early *troqueros* who did farm labor contracting. From their nicknames, it is clear they were Mexicans or Tejanos: "El Punky", "La Bigotona", as well as Jose Villareal, with whom he had come. Many of them, like the growers, provided housing for their workers.³⁵ Silverio remembers that Jose Villareal had four or five labor camps where he housed workers. He also recalls Joe Seers, as one of the well-known local growers, for whom he picked blueberries and strawberries, as being a good employer. He says, "I had lots of friends I knew from farmwork days". But he goes on to observe, that some of his friends from the early days no longer want to be reminded they once did farmwork, "They even get angry when you remind them [of the kind of work we did]".

For the Tejanos as for newly arriving migrants today, farmwork is the springboard for moving on to other employment—at least for farmworkers who speak adequate English. This first generation of Texas migrant farmworkers settling in Woodburn rapidly moved on to other employment—for employment stability, because they were aging, and because wages and working conditions in farmwork were stagnating or deteriorating. Honorio and Matilde, then in their 30's, moved out of field work into nursery work in 1961. Honorio soon moved on to railroad work, which then paid \$2.25 and provided benefits. Silverio, after quitting railroad work, moved on to work as a janitor. When Silverio went to work on the railroads his wife Matilde returned to work with her original farm employer, Joe Seers where she eventually worked for 20 years—mostly in hops. Her brother-in-law, Natividad, also remained in nursery work. After he briefly left the nursery where he was working to earn more working at a brickyard, the nursery owner's son asked him to return. He agreed—on the condition, they'd increase his pay to \$2.75, the same amount he was earning at the brickyard. He remained at the nursery, moving upward in the business, getting vacation and sick pay, a company vehicle, and becoming a manager and working there until he retired in 1979.

Migrant-receiving communities such as Woodburn and Arvin are also the nexus for linkages between migration networks, which, in turn, shape family, neighborhood, and civic life. One Woodburn resident, Juana Montez, now a middle-aged woman, more a *Tejana* than a *Mexicana*, although she was born in Laredo, Nuevo Leon, came to the U.S. as a 12 year-old girl, when her Mexican-born mother grew tired to staying in Laredo while her U.S.-born father migrated to work around Texas. Juana, like so many of this generation, is a perfectly bilingual and bicultural individual, speaking both Spanish and English perfectly. She began to work in the fields as a 15 year-old and soon left Texas to come to Oregon as a teenage migrant farmworker

with her aunt. Eventually, she married a Mexican immigrant from Nayarit and they raised a family in Woodburn. She is now the mother of two teenagers and three primary school age children, all born in Oregon. Like so many of the migrant settlers from her generation, she settled into the community easily and loves life in Woodburn.

Juana's remembrance of the first years settling into Woodburn was that Mexican-Americans tended to discriminate more against Mexicanos than non-Mexicans but that settling in was generally easy because farmworkers were in the habit of helping each other. These experiences shaped her values and approach to community life to this day. She talks informally with friends and neighbors a good deal about civic issues, volunteers in a bilingual kindergarten, supports church activities, but believes that informal community support systems are more useful and valuable than government programs. While she herself participated in a GED program, attended a farmworker employment training program, community college, and a few years of state college as a young woman, she still thinks informal neighborhood networks represent a better approach. She criticizes local Mexican-owned businesses for not contributing enough to community causes although their donations are seen by many Mexican immigrants as impressive evidence of community commitment.

Direct Migration from Mexico (Via California) To Oregon in the 1970's and 1980's

As the influx of Texas migrants dwindled in the 1960's, direct migration from Mexico increased.³⁶ During this era, there was not as much direct migration to Oregon as later, since most migrants first came to California and then subsequently migrated to Oregon. Our interviews with former farmworkers who first came to Oregon during this period make it clear that both "push" and "pull" factors were involved in the growing influx of Mexican farmworkers since Willamette Valley growers were actively recruiting in Mexico by at least the mid-1970's. Researchers (e.g. Escobar Latapi 1993) point out that the economic crisis, which finally hit urban Mexico in the early 1980's had initially begun to affect the rural-urban domestic migration patterns within Mexico in the mid-1970's.

Lorenzo Lopez Gil, a former farmworker living in Woodburn (as well as his home community of Union Cardenas, Oaxaca), is one of Mexican migrants who first came to the Willamette Valley in the late 1970's as a result of the Tankersley's recruitment efforts.³⁷ Lorenzo is a Mixteco, born in Union Cardenas, in the Juxtlahuaca District of Oaxaca in 1936. He was a very good student and was sent away to secondary school in Huajuapam de Leon, a regional center (on the Pan-American highway). After graduating, he taught school for 3 years but then migrated to Mexico City where he worked in a tire factory for 4 years, hoping perhaps he could work and attend university also. According to Lorenzo, Tankersley's mayordomo, Lorenzo Sanchez, recruited a crew of about 40 workers from Union Cardenas, as well as from the nearby village of Santa Maria Asuncion, and the nearby Triqui village of Agua Fria. Lorenzo's work history is probably typical of Mixtecos from that era and many current Mixtec migrants, including work in "North County" San Diego near Vista, work in Madera, and work throughout the agricultural areas of the Willamette Valley—Sandy, Cornelius, Gresham, Hillsboro, as well as Woodburn.

Mexican Migration in the 1980's—SAWs Legalized under the Provisions of IRCA

When the IRCA legislation was passed in 1986, it initiated significant changes in the patterns of Mexican farmworkers' migration to Oregon. How the provisions of this law played out in the real world are an important part of understanding the current influx of immigrants to Woodburn.

Although many of the farmworkers who had begun to migrate to Oregon in the 1970's and early 1980's had worked in both California and Oregon, it appears that they found it easier to

legalize their status in Oregon than in California. This is probably because their Oregon employers were predominantly small farmers who had better-than-average relationships with their workers. We have heard from many now-legalized farmworkers, that, by and large, the Oregon employers were much more accommodating in providing the migrants who had worked with them the letters acknowledging their employment which were needed for status adjustment as a SAW than were growers they had worked for in California.³⁸ Because IRCA provided legal status to farmworkers themselves but was less generous in allowing their spouses and children to legalize, shuttle migration increased, and newly-legalized farmworkers, by the early 1990's (when their final "green cards" were issued) could return to their home villages or, in the case of Mixtecos, to Baja California where many had settled in *colonias* which had grown up around San Quintin and other labor-intensive tomato production areas. The legalized residents could adopt a highly-effective transnational economic strategy by leaving their families in Mexico and shuttling back-and-forth to relatively well-paid farmwork in the U.S. without having to pay coyotes to bring them across the border clandestinely.

This strengthened the Oaxacan Pacific Seaboard migration networks noticeably. Migrant farmwork in Oregon provides farmworkers an almost-ideal complement of crop-tasks to allow them to mix mid-season work in California or Washington with early season work in Oregon and, thereby, manage to secure a reasonable number of days of employment each year. One version of this migration strategy is, for example to work during the early season (April-May) in California's Central Coast strawberries in Santa Maria or Oxnard, for example, travel next to the Willamette Valley for strawberries in June and July, caneberries in July and early August, and then return to Madera in the San Joaquin Valley for the grape harvest and end the year with the raisin harvest in Fresno County. Other alternative versions of the strategy can include August work in pears, and September-October work in Yakima Valley apples, or work in north coast California pears followed by work in the wine grape harvest late in the season. In contrast to Arvin, where most immigrants had come directly to the community, almost half (47%) of the Mexican immigrants in Woodburn had first come to California.

One of the crucial issues that must be surfaced in consideration of the social and civic integration of diverse groups of Mexican immigrants settling in rural U.S. communities has to do with the way divisions of immigration status, language, and education differ within households as well as between households. Teodoro Diaz, a Mixtec farmworker who is now 49 years old, was born in a small village near San Juan Mixtepec (center of a major migration network) in the Tlaxiaco area of the Sierra Mixteca of Oaxaca.³⁹ His work history, which might be thought of as an almost random series of travels, has actually been one in which has taken him through a series of work destinations pioneered by Mixtec migrants over the past century—a transnational community's migrant circuit.⁴⁰

Teodoro left home about when he was 11 years old and first went to Tlaxiaco (a regional center about an hour from his village) and then to Mexico, DF where, as he grew up, he became a helper in the produce market, and then moved upward to become an itinerant vendor selling popsicles and shining shoes. For 5 years, he slept in doorways, in the garbage dump, and in abandoned houses. When he was 16 years old, he went to Veracruz, where he worked in the fish market. Then when he was 19 or 20, he went home to his home village. But it was a bitter disappointment. He remembers, "Things weren't the same. I was sad. I didn't have anyone. After a week I went to Culiacan with some of my paisanos from my village".

The next year Teodoro met his wife, got married, and returned to his hometown in Oaxaca. But the newly-married family couldn't make ends meet so they returned north to Ensenada, in Baja California. The next year, 1978, Teodoro began to migrate to work in northern San Diego County. He was one of the many migrants in this area who lived in an encampment

on a hillside, in a sleeping area covered with cardboard, which would fit two or three people. It too was difficult; he and his fellow migrants were frightened of the Border Patrol, and the local Mexican-American gang members (*cholos*) who would attack migrants and rob them because they knew they carried cash with them.

Although life was difficult, having worked in the U.S. early enough to qualify for status adjustment under IRCA (before Spring 1986), Teodoro could cross the border, allowing him to work in San Diego County and save money to build a house in Baja California. He might have settled happily into life as a transnational migrant working in tomatoes in northern Mexico (Sinaloa, Sonora, Baja California), as well as in Florida, California, Washington, and Oregon. However, in 1993 a hurricane destroyed the home he had built in the Mixtec settlement of San Vicente, Baja California. He decided to bring his family with him to settle in the U.S. because, without insurance, it was not possible to rebuild the destroyed dwelling. So, in 1996 he and his family moved to Madera, California, and then, subsequently, to Woodburn.

Although Teodoro has no formal education, he is a good example of the way in which immigrants can bring other resources of cultural capital to a community—as he has a wealth of knowledge about medicinal plants and traditional Mixtec healing. He dreams of setting up a small business growing and selling specialty vegetables.

Teodoro's extended family household now includes his wife and himself, his married son, daughter-in-law, and grandchildren, two teenage sons, a teenage daughter, and a younger son in elementary school. Two of his three teenage children speak English, Spanish, and Mixtec fluently, although, unfortunately, his youngest son speaks only Spanish and English.

Teodoro's and his family's lives are typical of the growing numbers of Oaxacan transnational migrants who live in "network communities", the social milieu of migration networks such as those of San Juan Mixtepec. Ironically, like many migrant farmworkers of the era, although Teodoro, whose English is limited and whose contacts with mainstream Woodburn life are minimal, is now a legal permanent resident eligible for citizenship (although he would be unlikely to qualify due to the stringent English language requirements). His children, who speak English well and belong to the younger generation who will be part of the "new pluralism" now emerging in Woodburn will not under current immigration law be eligible for legal status, much less for citizenship unless there is comprehensive immigration reform. Immigration policy, in his case and in the case of hundreds of thousands of other Mexican immigrants to rural U.S. communities, constitutes *de facto* social policy and, rather than facilitating integration of a household, which now straddles three cultures and three languages, hinders social integration and civic participation. Two-thirds of the foreign-born Mexican immigrant children in Woodburn, like Teodoro's children, are unauthorized and, under current law, due to the provisions of IIRIRA, cannot qualify for legal permanent resident status, much less citizenship.

The Census As A Mirror of the Community-A Demographic Awakening in Woodburn

In 2000, Woodburn learned from decennial census data that it was now a pluralistic minority-majority community. The Census 2000 report showing that 50.1% of the town's residents were of Hispanic origin accelerated what had, for some years previously, been civic reflection, discussion, and debate about "community identity". However, this reflection did not recognize the great diversity within the Hispanic population—a tremendous language and cultural divide between the "Tejanos"—Mexican-American families from Texas and their 2nd or 3rd generation immigrant children and the "Mexicanos", the 1st generation Mexican immigrants and their children or the cultural divisions between *mestizos* and indigenous-origin immigrants, between different indigenous populations, and between migrants from different sending villages.⁴¹

The fact that Woodburn had become, at the beginning of the 21st century, a “Latino majority” community was seen by many in town as more or less a historical milestone although the ethnic and cultural transformation of Woodburn’s demographic profile had been underway since at least the 1950’s. Although the growth of the town’s “Hispanic” population had been a recognized for many years and a 2nd generation of Oregon-born Latinos from Tejano families had played a significant role in the mainstream of community life since, at least, the early 1980’s, the 2000 census report was seen, as it is in many communities, as an occasion for communities to recognize and, simultaneously, celebrate, negotiate, and rebel in confronting their own identity.

Woodburn’s diversity, its identity as part of the wave of “new pluralism” transforming rural America, stems from each individual’s history being so distinct—because so many of the town’s residents, native-born and immigrant alike, were born and grew up elsewhere. Woodburn is not simply one with of diverse types of neighborhoods but, also, diversity within each household. The old concept of America as a “melting pot”, conveying the notion of homogeneity as the outcome of diverse migration streams converging at a single place is misleading, because the actual outcome is not a bland, uniform mixture, but a potpourri of personal histories, accents, world-views, and life trajectories.

In many respects, this diversity of migration/social networks converging in Woodburn has accentuated the socioeconomic tensions in Woodburn. These are not racial tensions but, rather, socioeconomic ones. They include tensions between blue-collar Anglo-American workers and immigrants, between retirees living on a fixed income and professional families who commute to Portland, and between farm labor contractors and migrant farmworkers. The tensions between Russian farm labor contractors and Mexican immigrants are very similar to those between Tejano and Mixtec farm labor contractors whose social/civic identity is now defined in socioeconomic terms and where making a living from markups on the labor of newly-arriving Mexican workers requires careful attention to weakening the traditional expectations of mutual reciprocity which characterized relationships between the Texas *troqueros* of the 1960’s and their crews.

Only one in five (19%) of Woodburn heads of household have actually been born and raised in Woodburn, reminding us once again that communities are not static, rigid, societal entities but that they are epiphenomena, arising out of the interactions of people who come, in the course of their lives, to live together.⁴² While extended family networks and Mexican village-based migration networks played a leading role in bringing Woodburn’s current residents (both senior citizens and immigrants) to the community, the potential resources of social capital in those networks is not necessarily available as a resource for civic life. Civic capital must be constructed; it is not a given consequence of there being well-developed social networks in the community. A good deal of Woodburn’s success in responding to immigration stems from local community leaders’ and institutions’ recognition that proactive efforts were required to “translate” stores of social capital into civic capital—of building bridging social capital to complement bonding social capital inherent in the networks which converged in the community.

Woodburn’s diversity, while potentially bringing extraordinary resources of social and cultural capital to the community remains confusing to many community residents. While Woodburn wisely and optimistically proclaims its identity as a pluralistic community and has made extraordinary progress in civic integration, it is has yet to fully understand the extent of pluralism in the community or the challenges inherent in actually finding common ground and collaborating effectively to improve community well-being. During the lifetimes of the oldest generation of Woodburn residents, the town’s population has increased by perhaps 5,000% (from perhaps 400 to 20,000 residents) and its economy and infrastructure have been transformed.

What was close to a monolingual community in 1930 is now one where there are at least four languages commonly spoken and perhaps a total of fifteen languages overall. These are daunting challenges and require the sort of proactive response Woodburn has undertaken. The most dramatic impacts of these efforts are likely to become more evident in a decade or so than they are now—despite early indications of positive outcomes.

The Catalytic Role of the Tejano Migrant/Social Network of Mexican-Americans

The fact that Woodburn's Mexican immigrant population stems from three major streams of Mexico-US migration: immigrants from central and Northeastern Mexico who eventually arrived in the Northwest via Texas, immigrants who came directly from core migrant-sending areas of Mexico, and the newest wave of migration of indigenous migrant farmworkers from Oaxaca, Guerrero, and Michoacán is an important consideration in examining dynamics of immigrant social integration. Rather than being a monolithic "Latino" community, Woodburn is an aggregate of distinct migration networks each of which has very substantial stores of "bonding" social capital, which both facilitate social relations within the group and present barriers to interactions with other groups of Mexican immigrants.

This village/migration network diversity and the social fragmentation which accompanies it puts the 2nd and 3rd generation Woodburn "Tejano" residents who were born in Mexico (but who grew up in Texas, along with 2nd generation Mexican-Americans raised in Oregon who are the children of this same group of Texas migrant farmworkers) into a special role of leadership in the difficult process of Woodburn's transformation—although only 6% of the households in town are affiliated with these networks.⁴³ The Tejanos in Woodburn play crucial roles in civic dynamics—as outspoken advocates and "troublemakers" who raise issues that others might wish to ignore, as mediators and conciliators, and also as leaders. They inevitably find themselves playing a pivotal role in community dialogue and in facilitating community change, since they have linkages both to the community's past as a smaller, more homogeneous community and its future, as a growing pluralistic society. They have already, and will continue, to find themselves thrust into roles of informal and formal leadership. Their access to stores of cultural capital acquired by growing up in immigrant families and local rural U.S. neighborhoods and schools will assist them greatly in functioning effectively in addressing the responsibilities thrust on them and confronting the challenges of community development in an increasingly diverse town.

The political implications of Woodburn's diversity in terms of nativity and immigration status are dramatic and also provide a sense of the pace of sociopolitical change. Currently, less than half of the community's heads of household (the 36% who are native-born and the 5% who are naturalized citizens) are eligible to vote. However, by about 2010 or 2015, if the immigrant heads of household who are currently legal permanent residents (one quarter of the heads of household in Woodburn) succeed in the naturalization process, the number of foreign-born and native-born adults eligible to vote will be roughly equal. Inevitably, by 2015, local political perspectives on immigrants and immigration will be determined less by voters' nativity than by the trajectories of social integration of the U.S.-born children of immigrants. Given the demographic calculus, the current de facto pluralism of Woodburn will be a firmly-established sociopolitical reality. This underscores how important it will be for Woodburn and communities like it to strive unwaveringly and intentionally toward an inclusive, flexible, and tolerant pluralism.

The Extent of Rural Community Diversity Stemming from Migration Networks

The previous two sections of this paper summarily describe ways in which the processes of migration—shaped primarily by agricultural labor demand but manipulated actively by labor

market intermediaries and modulated by home-country economic and social developments, leads to diversity within contemporary rural communities as well as differences between the rural communities in the U.S. where Mexican migrants settle.

In this concluding section, I provide a quantitative overview as to how these differences in community migration history and processes have led to cross-sectional differences in the composition of these communities—with respect to migration network affiliation and legal status. **Table 1A** and **Table 1B** below show the migration network affiliation of Mexican immigrant households in Arvin, California and in Woodburn, Oregon.⁴⁴

As can be seen in these tables, these are profound differences—in that the migration networks, which facilitate Mexican migrants' northward journeys to two agricultural communities in the same agricultural production region, are different. In Arvin, a single migration network has relatively greater "share" of the town (including access to and control of employment opportunities and housing) than in Woodburn. The broad panorama of rural America cannot be seen as one which is "changing color" from White to Brown, from small-farmers to factories in the fields worked by Mexican immigrants but, instead, as a variegated panorama in which network affiliation, as well as other dimensions of social experience (including individual, family, and community migration history) give rise to new types of interactions and new types of personal experiences and perspectives.

Table 1A Leading Mexico-Based Migration Networks in Arvin⁴⁵	
State and Community of Origin of Mexican-Born HH Heads	Mexican- Born (N=123)
Guanajuato	36%
Yuriria, Xoconoxtle, Rancho del Tigre, Rancho Palo Alto, Rancho de Mulas	23%
Urban GTO—Celaya, Leon	4%
Santiago del Valle	3%
Small Ranchos GTO—Rancho del Moro	3%
Jalisco	15%
Tepatitlan	3%
Degollado	2%
Other JAL—Nochixtlan, Totonilco, San Miguel, Sta. Anita, El Salto, Tlajomulco, Guadalajara	10%
Michoacan	13%
Cotija	3%
Ucacuaro	2%
Yurecuaro	2%
Other communities—e.g. Uruapan, Zamora, Zinapécuaro, Lázaro Cárdenas	6%
Baja California	7%
Mexicali	4%
Tijuana	3%
Sinaloa	7%
Mazatlan	2%
Other Sinaloa communities	5%
Oaxaca	5%
San Juan Mixtepec	3%
Other Oaxacan villages—e.g. Cd. De Oaxaca, Nochixtlan	2%
Guerrero	4%
Petatlan, Guayameo	4%
Nuevo Leon—Monterrey, Montemorelos	3%
Other-Northern Mexican States with <3% of HH heads	5%
Other-D.F. and Edo. De Mexico	6%

Source: Arvin Community Survey, Q. A (Where Born)

Table 1B Mexico-Based Migration Networks in Woodburn	
<i>State and Community of Origin of Mexican-Born HH Heads (N=67)</i>	<i>% Associated with Network</i>
Oaxaca —Sta. Maria Tindu, Cd. de Oaxaca, San Juan Mixtepec, San Mateo Tunuche, Ocotlan, Huajuapán, Sta. Maria Caxtlanhuaca, Zaachila	24%
Michoacán —Morelia, Quiroga, Jaripo, San Jeronimo, Chupicuaro various smaller ranchos	19%
Guanajuato —Penjamo, León, Silao, Guanajuato, Romita	13%
Guerrero —Acapulco, Coyuca, Tecpan de Galeana, Ometepec	6%
Mexico, D.F.	5%
Morelos —Cuernavaca, Totolapan	5%
Jalisco —Rancho la Canada, ranchos	5%
Veracruz —Poza Rica, Coyuca	5%
Puebla	3%
Sinaloa	3%
Nayarit	2%
Estado de Mexico	<2%
San Luis Potosi	<2%
Zacatecas	<2%
Tamaulipas	<2%
Durango	<2%
Colima	<2%
Tlaxcala	<2%

Source: Woodburn Community Survey, Q. A (Where Born.)

While it might be expected that a single migration network's dominance in an immigrant settlement community would almost automatically make it possible to transform stores of social capital into civic capital, the New Pluralism research suggests that this is not the case. While Woodburn is more fragmented in terms of migration networks bringing immigrants to the community, it has fared better than Arvin has in responding to the challenges of the new pluralism—possibly due the richness of its experience in accommodating newcomers. In both communities, it appears that collective experience in establishing bridging social capital plays an important role and that this explains, at least in part, why the Tejanos play such an important catalytic role in community problem-solving.

Also, because the rural communities are so small, the actions of civically active individuals and small groups can play major role in shaping civic and political life. Migration network affiliation, migration history, educational attainment, gender, legal status, time in the U.S., a broad panorama of societal factors modulate individual experience, outlook

and social interaction but do not deterministically guarantee outcomes or civic trajectory. Civic life is more buffeted, more turbulent, because idiosyncratic developments can significantly impact outcomes. This, in turn, implies the need for sound leadership in guiding pluralistic communities into the future. Proactive community leaders with a long-range vision of necessary conditions for building “civic capital” play a crucial role. The challenge in these diverse communities can be visualized primarily as strengthening bridging social capital, which makes it possible to mobilize social networks with distinct identity as the result of bonding social capital and cultural assumptions to join together in common efforts to maintain or enhance community life.

The New Pluralism research in Arvin and in Woodburn also suggests that there is need for great caution in choice of indicators for measuring “civic capital”. Woodburn’s response to the challenges of community transformation as a result of immigration has been exemplary—in part due to underlying patterns of social and economic relationships between small farmers and their farmworker employees. While Woodburn was clearly outstanding among the communities in the New Pluralism study in terms of “best practices” for immigrant social integration (Kissam and Griffith 2006), both Woodburn and Arvin, despite high rates of poverty, were rated very positively by local residents (both native and foreign-born) in terms of social environment. Even though Arvin municipal government has had a turbulent political history and, during our study, experienced political efforts to turn racial diversity into political conflict, there was at the same time a successful initiative to build common ground between immigrant and native-born heads of household organized around a common concern for children. Gauging quality of life based solely on municipal government’s role (which is heavily constrained in the realm of social policy) would be a mistake.

Although nativists assume that all Mexicans are “the same” and that “they” may well join together to “overthrow” Americans’ control of “their” communities, this assumption (the mythology of the Latino political sleeping giant) is false—in part because most of the emerging Latino leaders in rural communities such as Woodburn and Arvin have ties to both native-born and immigrant residents of their communities—rich stores of bridging social capital as well as stores of bonding social capital. Biculturalism is a resource of cultural capital, which translates directly into political capital. In these newly-pluralistic communities, there is decreasing likelihood that either native-born or immigrant community leaders will achieve local prominence without demonstrating a commitment to work with all groups and the experience to do this successfully.⁴⁶

Also, although migration network diversity contributes greatly to community cultural capital, it also makes community collaboration and political coordination more difficult than it might be if the Mexican immigrant population were less heterogeneous. In the case of Mexicanos, i.e. 1st generation Mexican immigrants, it is a serious mistake to confound the overlapping but distinct social indicators of national origin and ethnic identity. An important practical implication of migration network diversity among Mexican immigrants for the civic life of rural communities such as Arvin and Woodburn is that it will be crucial to find ways to continue to strengthen the “bridging” social capital which they accumulate in the course of day-to-day life in the U.S. communities where they settle—building new relationships both with Mexican immigrants from other migration networks than their own and with native-born Americans. Such bridging social capital is not a mysterious abstraction. It represents a skills set for effective communication, negotiating differences, understanding commonalities, and deploying the newly-created social capital to nurture collective problem-solving. Latino and non-Latino political leaders in both Arvin and Woodburn implicitly and explicitly recognize the pressing need to bring pluralistic communities together, not to divide them.

What becomes clear in Arvin and in Woodburn alike is that a wide range of community institutions can do a great deal to facilitate accrual of “bridging” social capital and assist the residents of newly pluralistic communities in coming together to address the challenges they face in maintaining and enhancing quality of community life. This process will require not only bridging barriers, which separate native-born, and immigrant residents of communities, but also the barriers, which separate immigrants within these communities.

Our research in communities such as Arvin and Woodburn also shows that workplace interactions where diverse ethnic groups work together can strengthen immigrants’ resources of “bridging” social capital. By the same token, the process through which earlier cohorts of immigrants “move up in the system” to become labor market intermediaries and what Ernesto Galarza first aptly called “merchants of labor” show that “bonding” social capital can be dissipated by socioeconomic tensions arising in the agricultural labor market where the borderline between assistance to and exploitation of new migrants is a faintly-drawn one.⁴⁷

Community Evolution Over Time: Social Integration Begins at Home and Takes Time

Immigrant social integration cannot take place instantaneously. It is a process, which is driven by and built upon day to day experience. It is, therefore, inherently a multi-generational phenomenon—the outcome of regional, national, community, and personal history. What becomes evident when we look at the character of social and civic life of rural communities such as Arvin and Woodburn where Mexican migrants have been settling for more than half a century, is that another crucial dimension of community diversity relates to immigration status and nativity and generational status within households. **Tables 2A** and **2B** show similarities and differences between Arvin and Woodburn in this regard.

Table 2A Origin and Immigration Status of Arvin Heads of Households, Overall Population, and Minors: 2003			
Citizenship/Immigration Status	% of Heads of Household (N=160)	% of All Persons in Households (N=673)⁴⁸	% of Minors 0-18 years of age (N=287)
U.S.-Born	18%	33%	68%
US-born—non-immigrant family	9%	7%	4%
US-born--2 nd -3 rd gen. immigrant	9%	26%	64%
Foreign-Born	82%	66%	32%
Naturalized Citizen	10%	5%	1%
Legal Permanent Resident	42%	27%	11%
PRUCOL/Qualified	4%	5%	7%
Unauthorized	26%	22%	13%

Source: Arvin Community Survey, Q. 9 (Household Grid)

Table 2B			
Origin and Immigration Status			
of Woodburn Heads of Households, Overall Population, and Minors: 2003			
Citizenship/Immigration Status	% of Heads of Household (N=128)	% of All Persons in Households⁴⁹ (N=524)	% of Minors 0-18 years of age (N=256)
U.S.-Born	38%	49%	72%
US-born—non-immigrant family	32%	16%	6%
US-born--2 nd -3 rd gen. immigrant	6%	33%	66%
Foreign-Born	62%	51%	29%
Naturalized Citizen	5%	2%	---
Legal Permanent Resident	26%	21%	9%
PRUCOL/Qualified	---	---	---
Unauthorized	31%	28%	20%

Source: Woodburn Community Survey, Q. 9 (Household Grid--weighted)

Wisely, the communities of Arvin, recognizing the same inevitable demographic realities as can be seen in Tables 2A and 2B turned to education as an area where it was possible to find common ground. It has been widely understood that the children who were growing up in the community, irrespective of immigration status, would be the citizens who lived in and eventually guided the local community. Native-born and immigrant families alike, Mixtecos and Michoacanos, recent immigrants and settled long-time residents, bilingual Chicanos and Chicanas and limited-English families in these communities share a common concern with their children's education as a genuine priority where there is little disagreement. The result is that despite very high rates of poverty community residents in both communities rate the local community social environment quite positively as being family-friendly, *tranquilo*, and calm.

Looking at the differences in immigration status and nativity of heads of households, the community population as a whole, and minors (18 and younger) shows, on the one hand, the extraordinary diversity within households and, on the other hand how different the political profile of these communities will be in less than a decade as 2nd generation immigrants reach adulthood and begin to assume roles as community and political leaders.

While I do not include them here, tabulations of language competencies in Arvin and Woodburn show clearly that both communities are moving over time toward becoming bilingual communities where English and Spanish are both spoken. Contrary to the concerns of nativists, English is not an endangered language; unfortunately, minority languages (e.g. Russian in Woodburn, Mixtec in both Woodburn and Arvin, Arabic in Arvin) are endangered languages as schools successfully carry out their traditional social function as acculturating institutions. The 2nd and 3rd generation immigrant children of Mexican settlers in Arvin and Woodburn will not face language barriers in civic life. Fortunately, some may take the initiative to re-establish continuity with their cultural tradition but, unfortunately, language maintenance will probably be very difficult.⁵⁰

Although these 2nd and 3rd generation children of the earliest Mexican immigrants to the rural U.S., the “Tejanos”, but also the “Californianos” and “Oregonenses”, face other barriers than language in moving into leadership positions in civic and political life, this group now play key roles in both Arvin and Woodburn. In some cases, these roles as official ones, in other cases unofficial ones, but these relatively small sub-groups in the community can best be visualized as powerful catalysts of broader social, civic, and political processes.

Summary Conclusion

Rural U.S. communities with high concentrations of Mexican immigrants are extremely diverse as a result of being “upstream migrant nodes” where distinct transnational migration networks converge. This diversity presents both challenges and opportunities in terms of crafting wise social policies to promote immigrant social integration, civic engagement, and successful mobilization of social capital as a resource for enhancing community life in towns where poverty is endemic.

Immigration reform will be a crucial component in assuring that the transition from communities of households headed by disenfranchised immigrant minorities to newly pluralistic American rural communities will be a smooth and evolutionary one. However, the change is inevitably underway whether or not immigration reform legislation is passed at the federal level. It is a tragedy that national politics have taken so long to understand and move to address the social issues, which arise in a political system where inequity is official policy. Rural communities like Arvin and Woodburn, which have been so profoundly transformed by immigration are now well ahead of the federal government in understanding the issues and challenges relating to immigrant social integration. There is now some possibility that the vision of “community citizenship” (irrespective of legal immigration status) which underlies civic efforts to improve community life in towns such as Arvin and Woodburn will be transformed into a national vision of citizenship.

Hopefully, federal policy will in the very near future catch up with de facto local policy in accepting the inevitability of pluralism in 21st century America, in making a commitment to proactive policies to foster immigrant social integration, and to facilitating the pathway to citizenship so as to promote civic involvement, not to hinder it. One of the promising legislative developments in current efforts toward comprehensive immigration reform is that some bills such as H.R. 1645 very wisely include provisions for proactive efforts to foster social integration and civic involvement (e.g. English and civics classes).

References

- Alarcón, Rafael. 1988. El Proceso de Norteñización: Impacto de la migración internacional en Chavinda, Michoacán. in T. Calvo and G. López Castro, *Movimientos de Población en el Occidente de México*. Zamora, MICH: El Colegio de Michoacán.
- Anderson, Warren. 2004. P'urepecha Migration into the U.S. Rural Midwest: History and Current Trends in J. Fox and G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.), *Indigenous Mexican Migrants in the United States*. San Diego, CA: Center for U.S. Mexican Studies, University of California.
- Bach, Robert. 1993. *Changing Relations: Newcomers and Established Residents in U.S. Communities*, Ford Foundation.
- Briody, Elizabeth. 1987. Patterns of Household Immigration into South Texas. *International Migration Review*.
- Buchanan, Mark. 2002. *Nexus: Small Worlds and the Groundbreaking Science of Networks*. NY: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Burns, Alan. 1993. *Maya in Exile*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Flora, Cornelia. 1997. Building Social Capital: The Importance of Entrepreneurial Social Infrastructure. North Central Regional Center for Rural Development: <http://www.ncrcrd.iastate.edu/newsletter/june97/build-soc-capital.html>
- Flora, Cornelia Butler and Jan L. Flora with Susan Fey, 2003. *Rural Communities: Legacy and Change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gabbard, Susan, Richard Mines, and Ruth Samardick. 1993. U.S. Farmworkers in the Post-IRCA Period. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, U.S. Department of Labor.
- Garcia y Griego, Manuel and Phillip Martin. 2000. Immigration and Immigrant Integration in California: Seeking A New Consensus. Berkeley, CA: California Policy Research Program, University of California,
- Gladwell, Malcolm. 2000. *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*, NY: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Goldschmidt, Walter, 1978. *As You Sow: Three Studies in the Social Consequences of Agribusiness*. NJ: Allanheld Osmun and Co.
- Gordon, Jennifer, 2005. *Suburban Sweatshop: The Fight for Immigrant Rights*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, Jennifer 2007. Transnational Labor Citizenship. *Southern California Law Review*, March.
- Gozdziak, Elzbieta and Susan Martin, 2005. *Beyond The Gateway: Immigrants in a Changing America*, MD: Lexington Books.
- Griffith, David and E. Kissam. 1995. *Working Poor: Farmworkers in the United States*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Hagan, Jacqueline. 1998. Social Networks, Gender, and Immigrant Incorporation: Resources and Constraints. *American Sociological Review* 53:55-67.
- Levitt, Peggy, 2001. *Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Massey, Douglas, Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand, and Humberto Gonzalez. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Massey, Douglas, and Felipe Garcia España. 1987. The Social Process of International Migration. *Science*.

- McGarvey, Craig, 2004. *Civic Participation and the Promise of Democracy*. Center for Religion and Civic Culture. LA, CA: University of Southern California.
- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2000. *Fragmented Ties*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kissam, Edward, Anna Garcia, and Nancy Mullenax, 2000. *No Longer Children: Case Studies of the Living and Working Conditions of the Youth Who Harvest America's Crops*. Final Report to Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, U.S. Department of Labor, October.
- Kissam, Edward and David Griffith. 2006. *Local Community Strategies for Immigrant Integration: Summary Findings from The New Pluralism Project*. Aguirre Division, JBS International, September.
- Little Hoover Commission, 2002. *We The People: Helping Newcomers Become Californians*. June, 2002.
- Mines, Richard. 1981. *Developing A Community Tradition of Migration: A Field Study in Rural Zacatecas, Mexico, and California Settlement Areas*. Monographs in U.S.-Mexican Studies. La Jolla: Program in United States-Mexican Studies, San Diego, CA: University of California.
- Newman, Mark, Albert-Laszlo Barabasi, and Duncan J. Watts (Eds.) 2006. *The Structure and Dynamics of Networks*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Nodin Valdes, Dennis. 1991. *Al Norte: Agricultural Workers in the Great Lakes Region, 1917-1970*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Portes, Alejandro and Robert Bach, 1985. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro & Landolt, Patricia. 1996. The downside of social capital. *The American Prospect Online*: <http://www.prospect.org/cs/home>
- Portes, Alejandro and Rumbaut, Rubén G. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Sensenbrenner, J. 1993. Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology* 98, 1320 – 1350
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and Revival of American Community*. NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rubel, Arthur J., 1961. *Across The Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Stephen, Lynn. 2007. *Transborder Lives*. NC: Duke University Press.
- Stepick, Alex, and Stepick, Carol Dutton. 2002. Becoming American, Constructing Ethnicity: Immigrant Youth and Civic Engagement. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 246-257.
- Wilson, Tamar Diana. 1998. Weak Ties, Strong Ties: Network Principles in Mexican Migration. *Human Organization* 57(4), 394-403.

Endnotes

¹ The perspectives presented in this paper are the author's. However, the New Pluralism community case study research in Arvin and Woodburn reported here draws heavily on the extraordinary field research, particularly the in-depth interviews with key informants, carried out by Anna Garcia and Aline Doignon in Arvin and by Lynn Stephen, Anna Garcia, and Tami Hoag in Woodburn.

² Peggy Levitt's research (Levitt 2001) provides valuable insights as does Cecilia Menjivar's (Menjivar 2000) but both focus on urban migrant-receiving communities. Analyses of some very specific aspects of the relationships between migration networks, community membership, civic, and political participation in rural communities also make extremely valuable contributions. Trumpbour and Elaine Bernard's writing on Latinos and unions and, the work of activist-researchers such as Jennifer Gordon (Gordon 2005; Gordon 2007) and Paul Johnston (Johnston 2004).

³ The information presented in this paper is based on collaborative research on the impacts of immigration in two of the six community case studies conducted as part of the New Pluralism study, a project funded by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture under Agreement No. 2001-36201-11286. Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

⁴ One of the most valuable resources providing a general understanding of the role of Mexican/Tejano migration networks in the evolution of rural immigrant settlement communities in the U.S. is Dennis Nodin Valdes' excellent historical work on Mexican migration to the Midwest (Nodin Valdes 1991). My research in the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas with Anna Garcia for the Farm Labor Supply Study relied on Arthur Rubel's classic community study of Weslaco, TX (Rubel 1966) conducted 25 years before we began our field research as well as Elizabeth Briody's field research on migration from northeastern Mexico.

⁵ Some very practical policy-related research, analyses, and recommendations have already been put forward in recent years. California state government (Little Hoover Commission 2002) and the University of California Policy Researcher Center, under Andres Jimenez's leadership have supported forward-looking analyses (Garcia y Griego and Martin 2000) respectively of community-based local strategies for immigrant social and civic integration and state-based immigrant social integration. Of particular relevance to rural communities is Mark Grey's work in Iowa, which provides practical guidance for community-based approaches. The Institute for the Study of International Migration research (Gozdziak and Martin 2005) also provides valuable insights, well-grounded in community-level research in rural areas. Based on extensive experience as a funder, Craig McGarvey also addresses both theory and practice in a set of case studies of project-based civic initiatives based on his recognition of communities as "places of learning" (McGarvey 2004). Cornelia Flora's leadership at the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development and analytic writing with Jan Flora has provided a range of strategies for rural community development.

⁶ The work of Cornelia Flora and Jan Flora, which relies on their articulation of forms of "capital" beyond the traditional distinctions of human, financial, and social capital, namely "civic capital" and "cultural capital", has both theoretical and practical relevance here.

⁷ See Jonathan Fox, Introduction in "Invisible No More: Mexican Migrant Civic Participation in the United States", Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC, 2006. Fox's Table 1.1 notes that in 1990 almost two-thirds (62.9%) of recent Mexican migrants lived in California but that by 2000 the state's share of Mexican migrants had declined to one-third of the nation's total (35.4%).

⁸ The proportion of Arvin households employed in agriculture in 2003 was slightly greater than in 1944 when Walter Goldschmidt first surveyed the community—82% vs. 76%. The shift from relying primarily on domestic migrants to Mexican immigrants for low-wage labor has resulted in increasing occupational segregation—not so much due to legal status as to language barriers to occupational mobility.

⁹ http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/5views/5views4h46.htm "A History of Japanese Americans in California".

¹⁰ Aline Doignon, discussion with Wernli family, August 7, 2002.

¹¹ Information from field researchers' in-depth interviews with key informants among Arvin residents regarding community history identify the informant, treating this as part of an oral history of the community. In contrast, quotes from the Arvin community survey respondents in randomly-selected households are reported under a pseudonym as these respondents were assured that no information gathered would be reported in an identifiable fashion.

¹² Anna Garcia interview with Beto Felix, March 19, 2002.

¹³ These networks, built by Texas troqueros (crewleaders) spanned the nation. For example, a Texas migrant who settled in Arvin and eventually married a well-known local grower is closely related to an extended family network

of Belle Glade, Florida farmworkers because they originally lived in the same colonias and the same local crewleaders took them to places as diverse as Yakima, Washington, Fresno, California, and Immokalee, Florida.

¹⁴ Anna Garcia interview with Servando Rivera Juarez, March 20, 2002.

¹⁵ Although it is unlikely to happen, “La Guera Maggie” might well have a statue erected to her as a founding matron of Immokalee, Florida, since it is she who first brought crews, including the well-known Ayala family to the town.

¹⁶ Perhaps 50-80 agricultural communities in the rural United States are established migrant destinations where migrants from Mexican sending villages first come when they arrive in the U.S. —usually because their extended family or village network (or their spouses’ as in Jesus’ case) are already established there and can facilitate access to work, housing, and provide other assistance. We refer to these as “upstream migrant nodes” because they are the point of origination for secondary migration within the U.S. Our community case study of Woodburn, Oregon, for example, shows that most of the Mexican migrants who have settled in Woodburn came from California communities, which are upstream migrant nodes, including in addition to Arvin, Madera, Fresno, Selma, and Vista.

¹⁷ Ed Kissam New Pluralism Project field notes, 2002.

¹⁸ New Pluralism Arvin Community Survey, Table 2, Arvin Monograph.

¹⁹ Cross-tabulation of Question 28 (How Many Here) by MX state of origin.

²⁰ A pseudonym, Ed Kissam and Anna Garcia discussions with a key informant and with “Beto” himself, February, 2003.

²¹ A pseudonym, Anna Nunez interview #40

²² A pseudonym, Anna Nunez interview #42. Dolores’ husband came before 1986 so he easily qualified for legalization and apparently understood the immigration system well enough to undertake the process of filing a petition for his wife and children.

²³ Planada is an agricultural community in Stanislaus County in the northern San Joaquin Valley, apparently another one of the immigrant-receiving communities linked to the Yuriria-Xoconotle area.

²⁴ This process has been well-documented by Mines and other farm labor researchers—although there has been more attention to and study of the role of labor market intermediaries than of the “quality” of coyotes. I discuss the issues of “coyote quality” at some length based on our in-depth interviews in our study of transnational migrant teenagers for the Department of Labor (Kissam and Garcia 2000).

²⁵ The situation of the “Generation 1.5” immigrants, that is, the foreign-born children of immigrants who, however, grow up during all or most of their childhood or youth is complex, as their personal identity is shaped by both cultures—but during different critical periods of personal development and definition of their individual and social identity.

²⁶ One out of every six farmworkers in the U.S. farm labor force only arrived in the U.S. in the previous year. See Daniel Carroll et al, “Findings from the National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS) 2001-2002”, Research Report No. 9, U.S. Department of Labor, March, 2005. A dynamic factor of some importance in determining community composition which we did not examine but which deserves attention in the future is that 2nd generation immigrant young adults, like native-born ones are migrating to urban centers to find better jobs.

²⁷ Because Woodburn is on a major north-south Interstate Highway I-5, a large outlet mall was developed across the freeway from the main part of town.

²⁸ A pseudonym. Lynn Stephen interview September 17, 2003.

²⁹ I say “until recently” because major berry processing plants have been closing causing extensive dislocation in local employment—an important factor in Woodburn’s transformation but beyond the scope of this current paper.

³⁰ Actually, Mexican migrants’ settlement has taken place throughout the northern Willamette Valley—in communities such as Sandy, Oregon City, Hillsboro, and Canby, and Salem as well as the sub-area where the New Pluralism research focused. We reported details on farm labor camps in the northern Willamette Valley in the Department of Labor study (Kissam and Garcia 2000).

³¹ Julie Sample and Santiago Ventura, personal communications, September 18, 2003.

³² Lynn Stephen interview with Natividad Gonzalez March 3, 2003.

³³ Lynn Stephen interview with Jose Honorio Gonzalez Tristan and Matilde Saldano de Gonzalez, February 14, 2003.

³⁴ Anna Garcia interview, June 26, 2002

³⁵ Many farm labor contractors and agricultural employers in the Willamette Valley continue to provide housing for their workers to this day. In 2000, as part of our study of teenage transnational farmworkers, we described many of the camps in the region (Kissam et al 2000). Many of them, for example, El Campo Azul, have long histories as migrant destinations as families return year after year to live in them and work in the berry harvest.

³⁶ An example of the consequences of ignoring the micro-dynamics of immigrant integration is that for two decades from 1970 through 1990, a broad spectrum of programs serving migrant and seasonal farmworkers developed

program designs and service delivery systems based on the incorrect assumption that the majority of the U.S. farm labor force consisted of Texas migrants. Actually, as research by Elizabeth Briody shows and as we confirmed subsequently in the Farm Labor Supply Study in 1990, the proportion of colonia residents who worked in farmwork began to decline sharply in the 1960's well before the development of the MSFW programs and the volume of rural Mexico-rural U.S. "direct" migration increased greatly.

³⁷ Anna Garcia notes, June 5, 2000, "Conditions of Minors in Agriculture" study.

³⁸ This can be seen as an example of the consequence of Mexican migrants accumulating "bridging" social capital and deploying it as an important resource in improving their life situation. Goldschmidt did not address this aspect of the relationship between agricultural production and civic life but, in a sense, the small Willamette Valley growers' willing assistance to SAW's wishing to legalize constitutes civic action to support immigrant social integration.

³⁹ Interview 716 (Lynn Stephen). Teodoro is a pseudonym

⁴⁰ San Juan Mixtepec has a very long migration history and a very extensive migration network, which has been documented by Mexican anthropologist Federico Besserer. This community's network is very strong in the Arvin-Lamont-Weedpatch area and is one of the important links between the two New Pluralism Pacific Seaboard case study communities. The ways in which single individuals or small groups of individuals can affect civic life in rural communities is underscored by the fact that Arvin has now celebrated San Juan Mixtepec's patron saint's day for 4 years as a result of efforts headed by two Mixtecos working in a single community-based organization.

⁴¹ It should be noted, in passing, that there is also great diversity within Woodburn's Russian community. Although virtually all are joined together by religion, the different migration paths of refugee families fleeing Russia in the early 20th century took them to China, Turkey, Brazil and Argentina giving rise to sub-groups within even a single ethnic group.

⁴² Woodburn Community Survey Q. 14 (Year Came to Town)

⁴³ Much of this leadership is within informal and semi-formal affiliational networks but two of Woodburn's City Council members are part of the Tejano networks—one from the older generation of Texas migrants, one from the generation of children of Texas migrant farmworkers who grew up in Oregon.

⁴⁴ In the New Pluralism study, network affiliation was assigned based on the nativity of the head of household. This coding is less than ideal because, in actuality, households can be visualized as having dual network affiliations—to each spouse's village network, i.e. the strong ties and weak ties Wilson correctly emphasizes. This limitation will be addressed in future analyses but is less serious than it might be because so many Mexican immigrants in the period from 1950-2000 married within their own village network. This pattern, however, seems to be decreasing and will possibly give rise to increasing complexity in the social structure of these communities.

⁴⁵ The Arvin Community Survey also interviewed Yemeni, Puerto Rican, and Salvadoran heads of households but there were too few of these non-Mexican immigrant households to permit reliable quantitative analysis.

⁴⁶ It is instructive to note that, after a period of divisiveness and recurring political scandals, the town's African-American mayor was elected with overwhelming community support and has a lifelong friendship from growing up in a family, which was very friendly with the family of a Mexican-American council member who is the daughter of the Tejano-era migrants and political ally.

⁴⁷ I have previously written at some length about the ways in which farm labor contractors, many of them Mexican immigrants themselves, create "artificial support networks" which mimic many of the processes of mutual reciprocity, which play such an important role in Mexican social networks (Lomnitz 1961) as a means of recruiting, managing, manipulating, and exploiting workers. One exposition is in Ed Kissam, "From Mutualism to Merchandising", presentation to American Anthropology Association, 1993.

⁴⁸ Immigration status cannot be determined for 14 household members.

⁴⁹ Legal status could not be determined for 57 persons, 6% of the total household members in surveyed households.

⁵⁰ A young Mixteco community leader from Arvin who grew up in the U.S., Hector Hernandez, has, for example, used his 21st century skills to set up a website for the San Juan Mixtepec village/migration network. The website includes posts in both English and Spanish.