Transnational Dialogues on Globalization and the Intersections of Latina/o-Chicana/o-Latin American(s) Studies

by Juan Poblete | University of California Santa Cruz | jpoblete@ucsc.edu

The short pieces featured below have been written in response to the following convocation:

What are the benefits and risks of national/transnational/cross-border frameworks in the analysis of Hemispheric issues? Are there Hemispheric issues?

Which of those perspectives—including Latin America-based analysis of globalization and regional configurations and U.S.-based dialogues on the intersections of Latina/o-Chicana/o-Latin American(s) Studies—have been most fruitful conceptually and theoretically and why? What additional conceptual leverage can we gain from promoting these perspectives and conversations? In what particular thematic/issue areas might that leverage be most useful?

Which perspectives/dialogues have been less productive and why? Are there areas/issues where they can be counter-productive?

This convocation is itself a revised version of collective work developed at the University of California, Santa Cruz by a group of colleagues including Sonia Alvarez, Jonathan Fox, Manuel Pastor, Juan Poblete and Patricia Zavella, in the context of the Hemispheric Dialogues project <http://lals.ucsc.edu/hemispheric_dialogues>.

The comments by Manuel Antonio Garretón (Universidad de Chile), Marcelo Suárez-Orozco (New York University), Lynn Stephen (University of Oregon), José Manuel Valenzuela (Colegio de la Frontera Norte) and George Yúdice (New York University) represent first approaches to what we hope will be a productive conversation in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in the context of a Plenary Session at LASA. The panel will focus on the impact of globalization on, and the emergence of transnational perspectives for, the analysis of Latin/o American issues.

In my view, these short pieces also represent the emergence of a more complex framework for the analysis of contemporary Latin/o American issues. In this perspective, there is a serious effort at confronting the multiple angles created by the differential acceleration of the flows of people, discourses, goods and capital across the continent. Those angles must include, more often than not, the intersectionality of the sub-national regional, national, supra-national regional and global dimensions. In those intersections, some questions are paramount: how is the nation as a social and cultural imaginary being transformed by transnational processes; how is it reacting to those developments; are we witnessing the emergence of trans-national, bi-national, trans-border, trans-local, inter-national, micro or macro-regional social and cultural imaginaries? The answer to some of those questions is being written by multiple actors across the hemisphere, from migrant workers to business leaders, from town councils to Mercosur. This is what Arjun Appadurai and others have called an expansion of the social imagination which must be met by an expansion of the research imagination of the social and human sciences. These disciplines can and must also perform a role in making new and old invisible dynamics, visible, and in understanding how exactly those already visible are being visibilized by the current paradigms, methods and approaches to Latin/o American issues.

TRANSNATIONAL DIALOGUES ON GLOBALIZATION CONTINUED...

América Latina como unidad analítica: del desarrollo a la globalización

by MANUEL ANTONIO GARRETÓN M.
Universidad de Chile
magarret@uchile.cl

Los estudios latinoamericanos centrados en la región como una unidad socio-histórica abordaron como problemática central sucesivamente, el desarrollo, la revolución, la democracia. La derrota de muchos de los proyectos de cambio, la globalización, las reformas neo-liberales, han significado que desaparece una problemática propiamente latinoamericana, quedando reducida ésta a dinámicas y estrategias de países aislados pero que tampoco, por efectos de la globalización, tienen fuerza y autonomía. ¿Es posible redefinir una unidad de la problemática latinoamericana? Hay quienes afirman que América Latina como unidad de análisis y proyecto ya no existe y que, a lo más, hay ciertos polos que se desprenden de la región. La ponencia intenta mostrar cuáles serían los posibles ejes de reconstitución de una problemática latinoamericana desde una perspectiva que no puede sino ser interdisciplinaria.

En términos más específicos, es posible mostrar dos enfoques que el autor junto a otros intelectuales, ha elaborado y que rescatan esta unidad de problemática en la región como lo hicieron los estudios de los períodos anteriores centrados en el desarrollo, la dependencia, la revolución o la democracia.

El primero es el de la matriz socio-política, que estudia la descomposición e intentos de recomposición de las relaciones entre Estado, sistema de representación, base socio-económica y orientaciones culturales, mediadas por el régimen político. Aquí la pregunta básica es hasta qué punto los procesos de globalización permiten hablar de modelos de sociedad que tienen su base en los Estados nacionales y si hay, como hubo en la época estatal-nacional-popular, una matriz propia de América Latina con sus variaciones, o si, fuera de la vigencia de democracias formales, cada país ha desarrollado su propia matriz, con lo que deja de haber una problemática común.

El segundo es el enfoque del espacio cultural, donde más que una problemática común, como la del primer enfoque, de lo que se trata es de ver si en las dinámicas de globalización América Latina puede presentarse como un bloque. Partiendo de la base que el mundo se constituirá a partir de principios geo-culturales, lo que cabe es preguntarse si América Latina puede constituir un espacio cultural propio, lo que lleva a la cuestión de la capacidad de constituir modelos de modernidad con sus propias variaciones internas.

Si el primer enfoque apunta a si América Latina es una unidad de problemática socio-política, el segundo apunta a la dimensión socio-cultural. En todo caso la unidad problemática y de proyecto histórico para la región ya no radicaría en la cuestión del desarrollo, como lo fue durante largas décadas, sino en el lugar de América Latina como unidad en el mundo globalizado.

Some Thoughts on Concepts to Cut Across Latino/Latin American/ Chicano Studies

by LYNN STEPHEN
University of Oregon
Stephen@uorengon.edu

I want to suggest that we work with the concept of "The Américas" to incorporate areas that have been geographically divided into North America, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean. Within the area we can call "The Américas" I will put forward some ideas for how to conceptualize flows of people, capital, and culture. On the one hand, my suggestions question the container of the nation-state as our primary focal lens by considering transborder processes, identities, and institutions. On the other hand, I will also suggest ways in which we still have to consider the "nation" in our discussions because of the strong historical presence of nationalism in creating categories that have powerful roles in defining how people are inserted into relations of power as well as states which still have a great deal of power to define who does and who does not have access to the formal rights associated with citizenship and legal residency.

In my own work on the west coast of the United States I have thought long and hard about how to conceptualize the Mexican spaces in Oregon and California (Stephen in press). One possibility would be to follow Nick De Genova's suggestion that cities with significant populations of immigrants from Latin America be considered a part of Latin America. He suggests the specific concept of "Mexican

Chicago" in relation to the large number of Mexican immigrants there (De Genova 1998: 89-90, 2005). Offered as a corrective to perspectives that sees Latin America as "outside the United States," and assimilation as the logical and desirable outcome of migration, De Genova suggests that "rather than an outpost or extension of Mexico, therefore, the 'Mexican'-ness of Mexican Chicago signifies a permanent disruption of the space of the U.S. nation-state and embodies the possibility of something truly new, a radically different social formation" (2005:190). Others have used the words "transnational" community to characterize this kind of space (Besserer 2002, 2004; Kearney 1990, 1995a, 1995b 2000; Rouse 1992, 1995; Levitt 2001, Glick-Schiller 1995, 2003). Another characterization, particularly when referring to grassroots organizations is "binational civil society," suggesting parts of transnational communities that participate in their national country of origin, in their country of settlement as well as creating unique third spaces that can be called "transnational" (Fox 2005).

One positive contribution of work on transnational communities is that it has encouraged scholars to work outside the container of the nation/state and the kinds of binary divisions which have permeated so much of social analysis such as global/local, national/transnational. It is certainly important to consider the "national" in the "trans" part of migrant and immigrant histories and experience—particularly when it comes to the recognition or lack thereof of basic human and labor rights often connected to their positions in relation to the legal frameworks of the nations they are moving between. I want to suggest, however, that we have to look beyond "the national" in order to understand the complete nature of what people are moving or "transing" between. In the cases of the indigenous Mixtec and Zapotec migrants I study, the borders they have crossed and continue to cross are much more than national.

In many communities such as the Mixtec community of San Agustín Atenango and the Zapotec community of Teotitlán where migration to and from other places has become a norm that spans three, four, and now five generations, the borders people cross are ethnic, cultural, colonial, state borders within Mexico as well as the U.S.-Mexico border. When Mixtecos and Zapotecos come into the United States, they are crossing a new set of regional borders that are often different than those in Mexico, but may also overlap with those of Mexico (for example the racial/ethnic hierarchy of Mexico which lives on in Mexican communities in the United States). These include ethnic, cultural, and regional borders within the United States. For these reasons, it makes more sense to speak of "transborder" migration in the case I am describing here, rather than simply "transnational." The transnational becomes a subset of the "transborder" experience. I believe the concept of transborder can be applied elsewhere in the Américas as well to processes of immigration and migration.

In major cities, such as Los Angeles, and other places where many transborder migrants are concentrated, Saskia Sassen argues that not only do such cities emerge as strategic sites for globalized economic processes and the concentration of capital, but also for new types of potential actors. While Sassen concentrates her analysis on global cities such as Los Angeles, New York, Tokyo, Paris, London, Brasilia, Mexico City, and others, some of the characteristics she attributes to global cities—denationalized platforms for global capital and sites for the coming together of increasingly diverse mixes of people to produce a strategic cross-border geography that partly bypasses national states—can also be found to some degree outside of global cities in many parts of the Américas (Sassen 2004:649). Woodburn, Oregon is such a place. By the year 2000, Woodburn was 50 percent Latino and 44.5 percent of the population was of Mexican origin as discussed above.

In these cross-border geographies, Sassen suggests that it is important to capture the difference between powerlessness and "the condition of being an actor even though one is initially lacking in political power" (2002:22). She uses the term "presence" to name this condition. She suggests that in the context of the strategic space of the global city, that people like transborder indigenous Mexican migrants can "acquire a presence in the broader political process that escapes the boundaries of the formal polity. Their presence signals the possibility of a politics" (2002:22). The specific context will determine what kind of politics. In Los Angeles, for example, a wide range of non-formal political participation has emerged from Mexican immigrant presence, from federated

home-town associations and transborder organization that negotiate directly with U.S. and Mexican public officials (See Fox and Rivera 2004), to major participation in unions like UNITE-HERE (see Milkman 2005). Participation in these forms of non-party politics has also led to groups such as UNITE-HERE having influence in mayoral races in Los Angeles.

The ever-increasing numbers of Mexican immigrants and most recently of indigenous migrants in the western United States (and elsewhere) can have similar results in terms of those actors developing a "presence" that can exist as a precursor to more organized political participation.

Bibliography

Besserer, José Federico. (2002).*Contesting community: Cultural Struggles of a Mixtec Transnational Community*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Department of Cultural and Social Anthropology, Stanford University.

_____(2004). *Topografías transnacionales: Hacia una geografía de la vida transnacional*. México, D.F.; Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Ixtapalapa, División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades.

De Genova, Nicholas. (1998). "Race, Space, and the Reinvention of Latin America in Mexican Chicago." *Latin American Perspectives* 25(5):87-116.

_____(2005). *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Fox, Jonathan. (2005). "Mapping Mexican Civil Society. Paper prepared for Mexican Migrant Civic and Political Participation", November 4-5, 2005, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington D.C. <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/migrantparticipation>.

Fox, Jonathan and Gaspar Rivera Salgado. (2004). "Building Civil Society among Indigenous Migrants." In *Indigenous Mexican Migrants in the United States*, Jonathan Fox and Gaspar Rivera-Salgado (eds.), pp. 1-68. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies. University of California, San Diego.

Glick Schiller, Nina. (1995) Editor's Foreword: The Dialectics of Race and Culture. *Identities* 1(4): iii-iv.

_____(2002). "The Centrality of Ethnography in the Study of Transnational Migration: Seeing the Wetland Instead of the Swamp." In *American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the New Immigration*, Nancy Foner (ed.), pp. 99-128. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Kearney, Michael. (1989). "Borders and Boundaries of State and Self at the End of Empire." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 4(1):52-74.

_____(1995a). "The Effects of Transnational Culture, Economy, and Migration on Mixtec Identity in Oaxacalifornia." In *The Bubbling Cauldron: Race, Ethnicity, and the Urban Crisis*, Michael Peter Smith and Joe R. Feagin (eds.), pp. 226-243. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

_____(1995b). "The Local and the Global: the Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:547-565.

_____(1998). "Transnationalism in California and Mexico at the End of Empire." In *Border Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers*, Thomas W. Wilson and Hastings Connan (eds.), pp. 117-141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____(2000) "Transnational Oaxaca Indigenous Identity: The Case of Mixtecs and Zapotecs." *Identities* 7, no. 2.:173-95.

Levitt, Peggy. (2000). *Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Milkman, Ruth. (2004). "Latino Immigrant Mobilization and Organized Labor: California's Transformation in the 1990s." Paper presented at conference titled "Immigrant Political Incorporation." Educational programs, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts, April 22-23, 2005.

Rouse, Roger. (1992). "Making Sense of Settlement: Class Transformation, Cultural Struggle, and Transnationalism among Mexican Migrants in the United States." In *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration*, Nina Glick Schiller (ed.), pp. 25-52. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 645.

_____(1995). "Thinking through Transnationalism: Notes on the Cultural Politics of Class Relations in Contemporary United States." *Public Culture* 7(2):353-402.

Sassen, Saskia. (2002) "The Repositioning of Citizenship: Emergent Subjects and Spaces for Politics." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 46: 4-25.

_____(2004). "Local Actors in Global Politics." *Current Sociology* 52(4): 649-670.

Some Thoughts on Migration Studies and the Latin American Exodo

by **Marcelo Suárez-Orozco**
New York University
ms03@nyu.edu

The last decade of the Latin American twentieth century closed a circle in a great migratory chain that had built and gained powerful momentum in the second half of the 19th century. From roughly the mid-19th century into the first two decades of the 20th century over 6.5 million immigrants, largely European peasants, arrived in Argentina, over 4 million in Brazil, over 1 million in Cuba—and hundreds of thousands more arrived in Uruguay, Mexico, Chile, Venezuela, Puerto Rico, Peru and Paraguay. Indeed, more than 20 percent of the over 55 million Europeans who left the continent in the 19th century and first decades of the 20th century settled in the River Plate Basin—including Argentina, Uruguay and Southern Brazil (Moya, 1998: 46). By the beginning of the new Millennium, Latin American finds itself in the middle of the largest wave of emigration in history. Virtually every one of the traditional regions of Latin America is "on the move": Mexico and Central America, the Caribbean, the Andean region, and the Southern Cone countries. According to recent UN Population Division data from 1995 to 2000 the Caribbean, Mexico, Central America, and South America had a net migration of rate of approximately -916,000 persons per annum. During the same time Europe was gaining roughly 769,000 new immigrants per year and the United States was gaining some 1.2 million new immigrants per annum (UN Population Division, 2003: p. 1). Latin Americans are on the move—leaving in unprecedented numbers for the United States, Europe and, to a lesser extent, Asia.

The power and ubiquity of the new global flows structuring the Latin American *Exodo* are now acknowledged by almost everyone—scholars, policy makers, and the public at large in both sending and receiving countries. While there is a general consensus that migration from Latin America is changing the Americas and the world beyond, there is little systematic empirical, conceptual, and theoretical work examining the *Exodo* in an interdisciplinary, comparative, and regional framework. My reflections in this brief essay hope to begin a much-needed discussion among scholars of migration about the great Latin American *Exodo* and its Aftermath.

Background: The world is now witnessing the largest migratory flow in human history. There are well over 185 million transnational immigrants and refugees worldwide. This is only a fraction of the total number of migrants, as the majority stay within the confines of individual regions or nation states (China, for example, has in excess of 150 million internal migrants). Immigration today is generating epochal transformations in both immigrant-sending and immigrant-receiving countries. Immigrant languages are now ubiquitous in most advanced post-industrial cities. Immigrants organize themselves in transnational webs of social, cultural and political relationships that make international borders porous and in some ways redundant. Globalization's Latin American ecotype has left a legacy of frustrated ambitions, declining quality of life, and growing poverty and inequality. Under globalization's regime, large numbers of Latin Americans have developed new appetites that simply cannot be satiated by local economies.

Immigration today seems to be structured by three distinct but related currents: 1) the globalization of capital and the post nationalization of production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services increasingly linking immigrant-dependent economies to transnational labor recruiting networks; 2) transnational wage (and access to credit) differentials generating powerful incentives for migration; and 3) new information, communication, media, and transportation technologies that instantly connect individuals and communities, generate new structures of desire and appetites, and tend to lower the costs of human movement across space and over time. The very same factors structuring migration today also are at the root of why large numbers of immigrants remain powerful actors, in economic, cultural and social terms, in the societies they leave behind. Many immigrants today are social actors "here" and "there" at once transforming their countries of birth and their countries of choice.

Bibliography

Moya, José. C. *Cousins and Strangers: Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850-1930*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

TRANSNATIONAL DIALOGUES ON GLOBALIZATION CONTINUED...

Globalización, fronteras y procesos transnacionales

by José Manuel Valenzuela Arce
Colegio de la Frontera Norte
jmvalen@colef.edu

Uno de los rasgos claves del mundo contemporáneo consiste en la prevalencia de una paradójica centralidad de las fronteras culturales. Los crecientes procesos de globalización han difuminado algunas fronteras nacionales, pero también han potenciado la visibilidad y sentido estratégico de otras fronteras socioculturales, como ocurre con la frontera entre México y Estados Unidos, que es también la frontera latinoamericana con "el norte". Al mismo tiempo, observamos un incremento de la polarización social y el crecimiento de los procesos migratorios, especialmente hacia Estados Unidos, con lo cual la migración y las diásporas contemporáneas juegan un papel importante en la definición de los vínculos interculturales.

Las metáforas y conceptos para definir los procesos fronterizos son múltiples: mutilación, herida, cicatriz, pozo del mundo, tierra de nadie, trinchera, umbrales, intersticios o rizomas. La frontera entre México y Estados Unidos ha sido escenario de múltiples procesos de refracción sociocultural, de cambios y persistencias, de permanencia y transformación, pero, a partir del 11 de Septiembre de 2001, se han presentado de manera más clara nuevos mecanismos de control fronterizo y se ha incrementado el peso geopolítico de la frontera. Esta situación se solapa con los fenómenos culturales transfronterizos y proyectos artísticos definidos desde ambos lados de la frontera. La producción cultural fronteriza ha estado definida por procesos intensos de transculturaciones, recreaciones, préstamos, resistencias y disputas culturales. La intensa vida de la frontera también ha conformado procesos socioculturales transfronterizos, como ha ocurrido con las culturas juveniles de los pachuchos, los *cholos*, las *maras* y *los colombianos*, y ha sido escenario para la producción de expresiones musicales, como la música norteña y de banda, el *Tex-Mex*, un estilo rockero identificable y una expresión electrónica reconocible como *Nortec*.

La frontera ha sido motivo recurrente en la producción plástica, literaria y visual. Junto a las miradas estéticas vinculadas al movimiento chicano, y las posiciones muchas veces estereotípicas de ambos lados de la frontera elaboradas durante los años setenta y ochenta, emergen perspectivas diferentes donde cobran fuerza posicionamientos como los proyectos de artistas de ambos lados de la frontera y propuestas de carácter transfronterizo.

Sin lugar a dudas, la frontera ha tenido un papel central en el debate nacional sobre la definición y cambios en las identidades nacionales, así como en la definición de nuevos proyectos y estéticas transfronterizas. Gran parte de estas discusiones estuvieron marcadas por la incomprensión, pues consideraban que en la frontera la población sufría una importante desnacionalización y pérdida de identidad.

Sin embargo, las investigaciones disponibles indican que los procesos culturales e identitarios fronterizos son mucho más complejos y no corresponden a los vaticinios de la desnacionalización o del apochamiento.

El conjunto de temas arriba señalados, configuran ejes imprescindibles para la comprensión y (re)creación del arte, la cultura y las representaciones de la frontera México-Estados Unidos.

Linking Cultural Citizenship and Transnationalism to the Movement for an Equitable Global Economy

by GEORGE YÚDICE
New York University
gy2@nyu.edu

The charge presented to us by Juan Poblete involves assessing the conceptual and political effectiveness of "national/transnational/cross-border, etc., frameworks in the analysis of Hemispheric issues" and the dialogues on that basis in the "intersections of Latina/o-Chicana/o-Latin American(s) Studies." Two frameworks come to mind: cultural citizenship, which can be conceived of as the extension of T.H. Marshall's paradigm of civic, political and social rights and obligations, and transnationalism, "the processes by which immigrants build [multiple and extensive] social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement" (Glick-Schiller et al. 1992: 1). Historically, cultural citizenship, as it refers to Latin@s in the United States, refers to "the various processes by which groups define themselves, form a community, and claim space and social rights" (Flores 2003: 297). These claims were framed by the more general struggle, from the civil rights era of 1960s on, to empower ethnoracial minorities, women, gays and lesbians, the disabled and other marginalized and excluded groups. Against *de facto* and sometimes *de jure* exclusion from citizen rights, they sought to legitimize the adjudication and legislation of rights on the basis of group need rather than the possessive-individualist terms that traditionally define rights discourse in the largely "difference blind" republican democratic tradition. In other words, the differential cultural identity of the "nonnormative," provided the ground for a politics based on the interpretability of needs that required extension of universal rights via bilingual education, maternity leave, gay marriage and rent-controlled apartment inheritance, and the like. (The inclusion of maternity leave, gay marriage and apartment inheritance as "cultural" rights makes it evident that culture is not circumscribed in this view to ethnicity. Culture has to do with performative force of the social and cultural narratives that define inclusion and exclusion, in this case to the category of rights-bearing subjects.)

Transnationalism both extends and challenges this more traditional approach to rights. The continued migration of Latin Americans to the United States bolsters cultural claims, especially to language rights for Latin@s, and forces onto the political agenda the extension of guestworker labor and certain social rights for the non-citizen undocumented, at the same time that some "normative" citizens become increasingly anxious and seek to marginalize them (and in some cases all Latin@s, as in Huntington [2004]), even to the point of denying all rights and monitoring and fencing in the U.S. MexicoBorder. The past decade has seen an explosion in research on transnationalism, making the case that rights need to be extended beyond a national framework, that new immigrants belong culturally to and are active in more than one nation-state, and most importantly that the new circumstances of migration— putatively wrought by globalization processes, especially in communications, transportation, and finance—have an impact on the sending countries. Until very recently, the focus on the "new" post-1965 migrations had been on the effects in the United States, and on the extensions and complications of political, social, and cultural pan-ethnic formations. Juan Flores (2000), for example, discerned a tension between Nuyoricans, who maintained connections with African Americans, and newer migrants who increasingly wielded a double strategy of integration as specific nationalities (e.g., Colombians) and Latin@s. For Flores, panethnicization tends to defuse the kinds of claims that Nuyoricans had made in the post-civil rights context. On the other hand, Salvadorans, who fled warfare and political witchhunts in the 1980s and established migrants' rights organizations such as CARECEN for Salvadorans have reconverted those organizations more recently to offer "community support services and empowerment activities to the greater Latino community" (CARECEN home page). There is some measure of legitimacy to be gained by entering Latin@ politics and the vibrant world of voluntary social institutions that have considerable uptake in the United States (and which counter stereotypes that Latin@s do not have robust civil societies).

One critique of these two frameworks that I have voiced elsewhere is that as important as cultural citizenship and transnationalism are in recognizing and providing a space for minority and immigrant communities, it should also be acknowledged that they can also become

instruments of governmentality or the management of populations (Yúdice 2003). As one scholar of the impact of globalization on citizenship observes, in multicultural societies, particularly, "culture and identity [as] particular forms of agency...have to be somehow managed" (Delanty 2002: 61). Management cuts two ways: it relativizes agency but at the same time enables some of its force. Hence caution should lead activists to take state, foundation and NGO absorption into consideration but should not paralyze the efforts of expanding rights.

The other, and my major critique, is that both cultural citizenship and transnationalism have focused mostly on the situation in the receiving country, and in this context have limited to a degree the horizon of expectations to that of people moving from developing to developed countries and expanding citizenship there. It should be obvious that migration will not solve its own root causes. Moreover, migration can exacerbate problems in the sending country, about which current scholarship has little to say. While there is abundant work on such pull and push factors as migration from low-wage/labor-rich states to higher-wage/labor-poor states, global integration and structural adjustment that erode traditional family economies, particularly in agriculture, the attraction of dual labor markets in receiving countries, and cumulative causation frameworks for explaining the pull of established transborder networks, there is relatively little with regard to social (Levitt 2001) and cultural (Flores 2005) remittances, such as the ideas, behaviors, identities, social capital, and values, on the social side, and narratives, musics, cuisines, styles of dress, forms of consumption, etc. that circulate back to the sending countries. The literature on hometown associations (Andrade-Eekhoff and Silva Avalos 2004) and on youth gangs, such as the Salvadoran *maras* (Garland 2004), has made up for this lack, often pointing to the pathologies that ensue when the United States deports criminalized youth (Yúdice forthcoming).

While social and cultural remittances and related phenomena are not difficult to integrate into some of the transnational consumption and identity frameworks, such as subcultural studies in the case of *maras*, developed within Cultural Studies, other issues such as brain drain, the impoverishment of education and healthcare systems in the wake of migrations, etc. are much more difficult to integrate into any of the frameworks considered above. What are the Latin@-Latin American migrant circuits for dealing with labor and remittances in the context of government incentives for their most lucrative export: migrants? (Salvadoran government officials refer to migrants as an export and are lobbying intensively to maintain the dual "pipeline" of migrant export and remittance repatriation, which also functions as collateral for multilateral development bank loans. See Yúdice, Forthcoming.) The ideal remedy for this would be a more equitable global economy, which is far from view. While it is crucial to ratchet up the citizen rights of Latin@s and other minoritized groups in the United States, that in itself will not provide a solution for the need to migrate. Hence, it is necessary for Latin@ politics in the United States to make common cause with movements not only for labor equity (as was the case with anti-sweatshop movement in the 1990s) but also those that challenge trade agreements and intellectual property arrangements whose unfavorable terms will further erode economic viability in Latin America. The moment is ripe for such coalitions, at least as far as Latin American activists are concerned. This is evident from Mexico to Argentina, where Bush's bid for the Free Trade Area of the Americas was trashed. It is, after all, inequality in the global economy that not only generates migrations but which also makes local cultural production difficult to maintain.

Bibliography

Andrade-Eekhoff, K. y C. Silva Avalos (2004) "La globalización de la periferia: flujos transnacionales migratorios y el tejido socio-productivo local en América Central." *Revista Centroamericana de Ciencias Sociales*, Vol. 1, No. 1.

Banks, Gabrielle. (2000). "The Tattooed Generation: Salvadoran Children Bring Home American Gang Culture." *Dissent*, Winter.

CARECEN (Central American Resource Center of Washington) home page <http://www.dccarecen.org/About%20us.htm>.

Delanty, Gerard. (2002). "Two Conceptions of Cultural Citizenship: A Review of Recent Literature on Culture and Citizenship." *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*. 1:3 (March): 60-66.

Flores, Juan. (2000). "Pan-Latino/Trans-Latino: Puerto Ricans in the 'New Nueva York'." In *From Bomba to Hip Hop: Puerto Rican Culture and Latino Identity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Flores, Juan. (2005). "The Diaspora Strikes Back: Reflection on Cultural Remittances." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 39:3 (November/December).

Flores, William V. (2003). "New Citizens, New Rights Undocumented Immigrants and Latino Cultural Citizenship." *Latin American Perspectives* 30:2 (March): 295-308.

Garland, Sarah. (2004). "*Local Contexts/Global Gangs:* The Transnational Networks of Central American *Maras*." M.A. thesis, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, New York University.

Glick-Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Stanton. (1992). "Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration." *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, 645: 1-24.

Huntington, Samuel P. (2004). *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's Identity.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Levitt, Peggy. (2001). *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yúdice, George. (2003). *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in a Global Era*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Yúdice, George. Forthcoming. "Cultura, globalización y migraciones." *Nueva Sociedad*. ■