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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

BEING A MAN IN KENTUCKY: PERSPECTIVES
OF RURAL MIGRANT WORKERS

This thesis concerns identity constructions among rural migrant workers in Kentucky in relation to experiences and articulations of transnational spaces, networks, and identities. It was conducted through semi-structured interviews of migrant laborers on two rural Kentucky horse farms with 13 men. In this project, the men’s identities could be seen to have access to and utilize social, economic, cultural, and familial connections across national borders. These aspects of transnational identities were contrasted and compared to aspects of these men’s masculine identities to problematize popular representations of masculinities. This thesis shows how traditional notions of masculinities are questioned, reinforced, discarded, touted and ignored as these migrant laborers construct and navigate their identities.
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Chapter 1

An Introduction: Transnationalism and Masculinities, and the Context of Rural Migrants on Two Farms near Lexington, KY.

Introduction: Migrants and Identities in Lexington, KY

Immigration is a significant socio-political issue manifest at various scales, networks, spaces and places across the globe. In the U.S., political discourse frequently focuses on labor migration from Latin America – México in particular. However, these flows of people originating at and crossing to each side of the border, usually to the U.S., are informed by deeper connections, connections that a focus on labor issues often times disregards. In an attempt to characterize these connections, Gomez (2003) posits that immigration between the U.S. and México is “an integrated social system based on an accumulation of experiences and understandings, the by-product of an admittedly diverse national culture that has reproduced itself on both sides of the border” (66). This accumulation, for Gomez, is based on job opportunities, “modes of socialization, political culture, language, traditions, customs, habits, family structures, and so forth” that constitute much of the work of the transnational aspects of these migratory flows (66). Cities such as Lexington, KY are experiencing a brisk increase in the Hispanic population, which not only adds to this accumulation, locally and at the level of the body, but also expands the labor and job markets, decentralizes migrant settlement patterns, and creates and influences local government laws, ordinances, and policy. These effects can be seen as part and parcel of what has been described as the “new geography of immigration” (Durand et. al 2005).

Migrants from Latin America are entering into and are participating in U.S. social and spatial contexts mentioned above. Each migrant has their own history and motivation for migration and is changing the socio-cultural as well as economic and physical landscapes. Often these individual histories are ignored or silenced as they are mobilized in public policy debates about immigration, brought before the materialization of the U.S.’s due process of law\(^1\), or interpreted in or by quotidian practices. The stories and histories of migrants’ lives allow migrants to construct new identities as well as reinforce previous ones. It is imperative, however, to keep in mind that they are at the same time confined or oppressed by different aspects of those identities as well. Migrants also interact with narratives circulating in their new home, transition location or place, creating new hybrid identity formations. The effects that such narratives have on identity constructions among the migrant population are myriad, as well as are the effects on the host societies, communities, and cultures.

This thesis is concerned with the construction of gender identities, especially masculinities, among migrants in Lexington, KY. It focuses on how masculinities are performed through transnational and diasporic spaces. I examine constructions of masculinities through an interrogation of work/employment, local/transnational relations,

---

\(^1\) Due process of law is defined in the Magna Carta of 1215 CE., Chapter 39, and specifically in the U.S. in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
and individual/group relations within a research participant population of Mexican migrants. The places at which I conducted this project were two horse farms in rural Kentucky, but the scale of social relations and networks migrants maintain range greatly from the body to the sending country and back again. These networks or relations range from local relations realized through community organizations to transnational linkages constituted through remittances and regular contact with those remaining at “home”. The aim of this project is to contribute to the research on gender and migrant populations by expanding upon research on the constructions of masculine identities, especially in regard to transnational literature, and the ways that masculinities are involved in the navigation of new or extended social networks. This project will explicitly build on research that has explored the social constructions of identities, gender and transnationalism (mostly constructions of femininity), and transnational migrants (Connell 1995; Donato et al. 2006; Huang and Yeoh 2000; Johnson 2005; Berg and Longhurst 2003; Napolitano Quayson 2005; Pratt and Yeoh 2003).

More specifically, the research will answer these sets of questions:

- **Local identity** – How are identities constructed and in relation to whom? When considering theories of power, it is worthwhile to consider that “[r]ecognizing the role of complicity in perpetuating subjugation does not mean forfeiting the ability to distinguish greater and lesser powers” (Gutmann 1996:20). This theoretical perspective allows a nuanced understanding of the flows of power between the laborers, the interviewer, the farm owners and the families (both here and ‘at home’) and multiple other social networks/spaces. What do notions such as these diverse flows of power, the networks and nodes, accomplish when considering identity constructions on these horse farms, enmeshed and embodied in ‘local’ space?

- **Transnational space and identity**: Primarily, it is important to ascertain whether or not these men participate, have access to, propagate, or enact transnational space. If so, what types of transnational community(ies) do these workers have access to, create, or participate in? What types of support networks do migrants rely on, and what types of do they create and exert power in within transnational spaces? What are characteristics of their identities in transnational spaces? Do they perceive of these relationships as ‘transnational’? Do Mexican migrant men participate in or create transnational spaces/identities?

- **Masculinities and identity**: Do these men envision themselves as masculine? If so, how? Is it through such ‘traditional’ notions of macho or have the terms changed along with meanings of masculinities? If these men do construct masculine identities, how are they performed in everyday life, and how do they claim them? How do local and transnational practices influence migrant masculinities? What can these constructions of masculinities say about the conceptions of masculine identities in gender studies and identity within transnational literature?

In this first chapter I will first introduce the concepts that I will employ in the theoretical aspects of this thesis project which I discuss in more detail in the following chapter. I will then trace the relevant characteristics of the places of employment, the local and
national political issues facing migrants, as well as current migratory regimes in the U.S. context. Following this discussion will be a thorough discussion of the methodologies used in collecting data for this project. The following chapter will contain a literature review of the concepts introduced immediately after this broad summary. The third and fourth chapters contain empirical analyses of the data collected during the project through the framework developed in the literature review. The first of these chapters answers the questions posed above concerning identities and transnational spaces, while the second takes as its concern the constructions of masculinities as related to the questions posed above. The fifth chapter is composed of brief concluding remarks, illustrating the successes and failures of the project, as well as the contribution to the literatures that were engaged for the project. It will also give a brief synopsis of some possible directions for research agendas involved with these issues.

Key Theoretical Concepts

Transnationalism

Transnationalism is a fluid and complex concept to employ in a study on migrant populations. The complexity of its formulation and use is indicated by the contentious nature and different articulations in academic literature. A very simple conceptualization of the term would mention the increased mobility of people, capital, ideas and information, paired with the weakening or loosening of national borders and regulations. People can be said to be living transnational lives. Economic processes, especially neoliberal globalization can be seen to be rapidly increasing worldwide numbers of transnational linkages, political entities, and flows of capital, ideas and people. Unlike globalization, transnationalism does not connote an eventual coalescence of a single global society. It also differs from the term international, which emphasizes the importance of the state in relations across national boundaries. Nina Glick Schiller et al., (1992) define transnationalism as an emerging social process in which migrants “establish social fields that cross geographic cultural, and political borders,” and transmigrants as those who develop and maintain multiple relations – familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political – that span borders” (ibid., ix, my emphasis). Bauböck (2003, 701) reformulates this definition to incorporate the effects that migration has on “institutions of the polity and its conception of membership,” as well as how migrant transnationalism “affects both the institutions of the country of origin and the receiving state.” Migrant transnationalism then is not a passive structure but an active network that is involved in complex consumption, production, and rearticulation of politics, culture, individual, society, and institutional norms both ‘here’ and ‘there’. For this project I interrogate relations that might constitute the transnational spaces these Mexican migrant men construct. I do so by considering how identities are constructed through and by these spaces.

Beyond this definition of migrant transnationalism, the effects of transnationalism writ broadly are widely contested. Academic literature has lauded the aspects of transnationalism that challenge the boundaries of the nation state through remittances or cultural exchange. Yet this viewpoint has in turn been critiqued for ignoring the reification of the nation and its sovereignty that occur as an effect of forward and
backward linkages that exchange political ideologies and agendas crossing national boundaries through individual migrants, political organizations, or government policy. Transnational aspects of identities also enable increased political visibility of marginalized communities, networks and individuals through linkages with foreign governments or NGO’s (Guarnizo 2003). However, geographers such as Pratt and Yeoh et al. have pointed out that “‘[g]oing transnational’ has done little to trouble the gendered division of household labour, or destabilize the gendered inequalities of the patriarchal state” (2003:162).

Spaces, places, networks and identities contain aspects that can be considered through the analytic lens of transnationalism. There is no one defining feature or subject of transnationalism. Its manifestations can be liberatory, oppressive, novel, frightening or invigorating, much like the myriad articulations of masculinities.

**Gender and Masculinities**

**Gender**

Gender is not a noun, but neither is it a set of free-floating attributes, for we have seen that the substantive effect of gender is performatively produced and compelled by the regulatory practice of gender coherence... There is no gender identity behind the expression of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very “expression” that are said to be its results.

(Butler 1990)

Any attempt to engage the ‘why’ and the ‘how’ of masculinities must first establish the role that gender plays in studies on socially constructed identities. Judith Butler’s quote above is an excellent point from which to begin because it makes apparent the performative character of gender. The most obvious example for Butler is the mockery or parody of a true gender identity through the performance of drag. However, Butler also approaches gender and its complexity through issues of social constructivism and psychoanalytical dimensions – hence the complexities of “doing” gender. Berger et al. state that performativity “inevitably unfolds as a series of “performed” operations that render complex meanings about the normative standards that we cannot escape, the choices we can make, and the means by which we represent both” (1995, 3). For Foucault “a fundamental way to challenge conventional social position is to challenge the way modern societies organize and control the knowledge claim of the human sciences” (Berger et al. 1995, 6). Destabilizing gender roles can open up new spaces in which to inhabit less oppressive gender roles that are less informed by essentialist categorization that inscribes bodies and identities with a limited set of potentially oppressive, dominating, and/or violent set of gender attributes. One way of “doing” this destabilization is through notions of performativity. Identity understood through performativity can be reevaluated and changed. A central question is, “can masculinity be performed so as to render it less repressive, less tyrannical?” (ibid., 5). If we take

---

2 Social construction theory in studies on sexuality posits at its most extreme that there is no essential quality to human sexuality based in physiological or sensational functions (Berger et. al 1995).
gender to be constructed, it is done so through “specific corporeal acts”, but also can be transformed through such acts (Butler 1988, 521).

Masculinities

Which groups are most active in the making of masculinist sexual ideology? It is true that the New Right and fascism are vigorously constructing aggressive, dominant, and violent models of masculinity. But generally, the most influential agents are considered to be: priests, journalists, advertisers, politicians, psychiatrists, designers, playwrights, film makers, actors, novelists, musicians, activists, academics, coaches, and sportsmen. They are the “weavers of the fabric of hegemony”. (Donaldson 1993)

Masculinities is a term that contains a wide, perhaps infinite spectrum of identities. Connell defines ‘masculinity’ as “simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture” (Connell 1995, 71) There are multiple factors that contribute to the construction of masculinities, and there is no one true ‘masculinity’ anywhere. Differences in masculinities are articulated both across societies and within them. They are also articulated in relation to notions of hierarchy and hegemony differently. Some masculinities “are dominant while others are subordinated or marginalized” (Connell 2000, 10). Some masculine identities are built upon an understanding that masculine ideologies are oppressive and confining, and openly confront the power and privilege of masculinities through interrogating the patterns of masculinities (Ramirez 1999). Hence a study involving masculinities will not only broaden the conceptions of these diverse forms of masculinities but will add complexity to the ways that those identities influence and are influenced by both structures (through culture) and agency.

This thesis, which has to do broadly with gender and specifically with masculinities of Mexican migrants, will look at conceptual frameworks of masculinities alongside identities that are historically connected to Mexican masculinities. The conceptual categories of masculinities Connell (1995) puts forward are hegemonic, subordinated, complicit, and marginalized (to which I would add subversive, which it seems Connell may want to cite as included in marginalized) (ibid.). McDowell (2002) engages the complexity and variability of the attitudes and behavior of white working-class youth to assess the extents to which these identities may be subversive or work to counter the hegemonic masculinities encountered in previous studies of “hard laddishness”. Engaging the ways that masculinities are constructed in relation to spatial context, Lysaght (2002) analyses the performative character of ‘dominant’ and ‘subordinate’ masculinities in Belfast. These masculinities are both seen to be ‘ideal roles’ as well as performed in constrained gender roles. George (2006) contributes to this literature by focusing on the relationships between men and women’s use of sexual control and understanding to influence hegemonic forms of masculinities that create more autonomous spaces for women.
In terms of specificity, Mexican identities such as the *macho* or *machistas*, *mandillones*, and *mujeres abnegadas* have a relatively short etymological history, yet their mythical incorporation into everyday life as well as theoretical works is quite astounding. For Octavio Paz, whose work was foremost in the production of “essential Mexican attributes like machismo, loneliness, and mother worship”, there was a definite desire not to observe *mexicanidad* but to produce or regain the consciousness of a Mexican identity (Gutmann 1996). Today, the effects of this production of masculine identities are far reaching. However, it is the subject who produces his or her own identity, but it is formed in a dialectical relationship with other identities and communities. “Identities make sense only in relation to other identities, and they are never firmly established for individuals or groups... He will probably think of himself as a man in a variety of ways, none of which necessarily coincides with the views of his family and friends” (Gutmann 1996, 238). It is here that Donaldson’s quote is most apposite. There is no one producer or interpreter of masculinities. Feminist geographers contend that theorizing masculinities will continue to disrupt constructions of hegemonic male genders (Berg and Longhurst 2003; Campbell and Bell 2000; Domosh 1997; Jackson 1991; Longhurst 2000). Its authors are everyone and everywhere. It is reinterpreted and performed daily, and each iteration is a potential sight of liberation or domination, of the upholding of the status quo or a challenge of the “the fabric of hegemony”.

**Transnationalism and Masculinities**

I have joined the two concepts, transnationalism and masculinities because transnational aspects of identities, spaces, places and networks might inform more fluid or dynamic identity formations and therefore indicate new articulations of masculinities that are less hegemonic or oppressive. On the other hand, this increased potential in transnational identities may cause greater or renewed reliance upon older hegemonic forms. The opportunities that transnational lives present by apparent contrasts between home and host ‘cultures’, the constant rearticulation of identities across space, as well as a possibility of the desire to reify older identities in times of crisis complicate constructions of identities in transnational spaces. As men and women cross the border between the U.S. and México, how they reinterpret their identity, how they might adapt to a new community, and what aspects of identity they retain might allow an opportunity to gain insights into contemporary masculinities as well as gender construction more broadly. Transnational identity constructions are important to incorporate into any study on gender particularly because a transnational identity is one that can be understood to be in fluctuation across borders caused by a displacement and loss of familiar referents and practices. It is also an identity that is renegotiated as the person interprets, is interpreted by and navigates host communities and the ‘cultures’ and practices that they encounter. These relations will be considered through de Certeau’s theorizations on stories as spatial practice. For de Certeau, these practices “concern everyday tactics, from the alphabet of spatial indication... to the daily “news”... legends... and stories that are told (memories and fiction of foreign lands or more or less distant times in the past)” (de Certeau 1984; 115-116). To include all such categories, and assuredly many more, allows a moment to conceive of the stories told in these interviews as both concrete and abstract spatial
practice; not only a relation of information to the researcher but an active production of space\(^3\).

**Contemporary Immigration in the United States**

**National, Regional and State Numbers**

According to the US Census, the current total population of the United States is around 303,400,000. Of the total population, 15% or 44,250,000 identify as Hispanic\(^4\) or Latino\(^5\) in the US Census\(^6\). Of these 44,250,000 around 28,400,000 identify themselves as Mexican. Of the total population of the U.S., about 12% is foreign born, for a total of about 37,500,000, or one in eight people. The actual population of Latinos in the U.S. and the U.S. south is estimated to be larger because of undocumented persons, though the estimations vary widely. What the above overview does not show however is the increased concentration of Latinos in the U.S. south. The state of Kentucky had a total population of around 4,200,000 in 2006 and a Hispanic population of approaching or exceeding 100,000\(^7\) (U.S. Census 2006). While Kentucky is at the edge of a few different regional demarcations, the PEW Hispanic Center’s study, “The New Latino South” mentions Kentucky and indicates the state’s relevance to discussions involving Latinos in the U.S.

“The New Latino South” surveys the changing demographics in the southern states of the U.S in relation to the Latino population. While not as large as some of the surrounding states, between the years of 1990 and 2000 Kentucky experienced a Hispanic population growth rate of the of 173% (Kochar et. al 2005, 1) that increased the Hispanic population from 22,000 to 60,000. The study found that as the southern states have become increasingly economically active, there has been a corollary increase in the increase of specifically “young, male, foreign-born Latinos migrating in search of economic opportunities” (ibid., i). This new geography of Latino migration in the U.S. indicates a shift away from the U.S. urban centers as the most likely place of settlement.

---

\(^3\) For de Certeau, space is conceived of as “a practiced place” (de Certeau 1984; 117). I.e., a space is a place where one takes into consideration “vectors of direction, velocities, and time variables” (de Certeau; 117).

\(^4\) Hispanic, a term which has its roots in Roman antiquity as the name of the Iberian Peninsula is used to define those who speak the Spanish language. This can refer to those who live anywhere who speaks the Spanish language. There is no indication of race under the term Hispanic. “Hispanic” can be seen as colonial as it was imposed by the United States in the census in 1970’s to try to demarcate a specific population.

\(^5\) The term Latino can refer to two different demographic groups. One is a person who speaks Spanish, and refers to the Spanish language as being a romance language, originating from the Latin language group. The second refers to a person from Latin America, which is itself problematic. For instance, predominantly English speaking countries, such as Jamaica or the Bahamas are also often thought of as Latin America. Both terms can also blur the identities of marginalized or indigenous populations, further complicating the use of the terms. For this paper, I will use the term Latino as it focuses slightly more critically on place of as Central and South America. However, all of the men in the study were from México, hence much of the debate can be left aside for the purposes of this thesis.

\(^6\) This number does not include the 3.9 million residents of Puerto Rico.

\(^7\) The 2006 estimate for persons of Hispanic or Latino origins living in Kentucky is 84,000. This number, while being two years old and expected to increase is also probably an underestimate giving the probable presence of a large undocumented population living in the state.
for migrants. Most of the Latinos in these areas of the U.S. south are foreign born, and their migration is the “product of a great many different policies and circumstances in the United States and their home countries” (ibid., i). Along with these attendant “push and pull” factors of migration are the responses that the destinations of these communities are having. With the increase in migration to the U.S. and an increase in migrant populations of smaller urban centers and more rural locations come juridical responses from the state as well as other visible manifestations of the communities’ varied responses to growth fueled by migration. As these communities perceive the rapid increase of a Latino population, local and state policy are making attempts to mediate and control aspects of this rapid increase that specifically target the Latino population. Heated debates about the positive and negative aspects of this migration are also defining features of the local political climates.

**Lexington-Fayette Horse Farms**

Migrants to the city of Lexington find jobs in the service industry, in construction, on agricultural farms, as well as a host of others. The Bluegrass Region\(^8\) (Figure 1.1) of Kentucky, noted for its verdant pastures, rock fences and gated drives is the location of a concentration of farms that breed and train thoroughbred race horses. These farms are becoming more connected with the thoroughbred horse racing industry worldwide, enjoying patronage from clients from countries such as Dubai and Japan. The region is also hosting the World Equestrian Games which will have large impacts on employment in the industry, increase economic activities across a range of actors and networks, as well as intensify capital in the local infrastructure and economy. In the U.S. the thoroughbred industry is a large agribusiness, generating around $34 billion in revenue and supporting around 470,000 jobs through a network of farms, training centers and race tracks (Berube et al. 2003). In Kentucky, to give an idea of the revenue that is being dealt with, horse sales alone generate about 1 billion dollars annually (Lamarra 2005).\(^9\) According to Lee Todd, the president of the University of Kentucky, "[h]orses represent Kentucky's number one agricultural enterprise... As the state's flagship, land-grant research institution, we [the University of Kentucky] have a responsibility to do everything we can to protect this industry that is so important economically and to our Commonwealth's very identity" (Lamarra 2005). Not only does the industry have economic aspects in the area, but it has ramifications in the identity and imaginary of the places and people that are employed, live, and relax in the area. The horse farms which were visited for interviews in this project are located in this Inner Bluegrass Region in Kentucky.

There are generally two different types of farms which together supply this industry with thoroughbred horses in the Lexington Bluegrass;

---

\(^8\) The Bluegrass Region in Kentucky refers to a region in northern Kentucky. The inner Bluegrass Region is composed of Franklin, Scott, Harrison, Woodford, Fayette, Bourbon, and Jessamine counties. See Figure 1.1)

\(^9\) The 2010 World Equestrian Games will surely raise this amount. The numbers involved in private investment, commercial advertisement, infrastructure investment, adjacent industry incomes and other various kinds of capital inflow will and are currently increasing the numbers involved in the horse industry in an exponential manner.
• a foaling farm where mares, or female horses are kept, bred, and foals are birthed and raised, and
• farms where the horses are ‘broken’ – i.e., trained to race, be harnessed and carry a jockey.

This project is produced with the help of migrant workers on two foaling farms, Douglass Farms and Kearney Stables in the hinterland of Lexington, KY. The names and some qualitative data concerning the individual men that were interviewed in this project can be found in appendix 1.1. The total population of migrant workers for this project was about 12 men, as well as one of the administrative employees, Brenda, on the farm.

Figure 1.1: Regions of Kentucky. The Inner Bluegrass Region contains the field sites (Cranston 2008).

The foaling farms as well as the breaking farms have produced a job market that incorporates a range of different skills sets of the labor population. Unskilled labor is incorporated at all levels of the horse industry, but skilled labor of many sorts is needed to maintain the farms and take care of the horses. The different areas of production involved in the horse industry have a large range of social visibility as well. The apogee of this visibility is probably the labor employed during the horse races at various tracks such as Churchill Downs in Louisville, and Keeneland Race Track or The Red Mile in Lexington. The farms are located well outside of the city, but these workers also participate in foal sales that occur frequently at the major racetracks such as Keeneland.

On “breaking farms” many of those involved with the industry cited the probability for their workers to have better job mobility/security, the increased ability to live off-site, as well as the ability to aid a family to move from the ‘sending country’, or to establish a family in the host country than at foaling farms. This was due to an increased expectation for necessary skills associated with the farm work as well as increased pay. On horse breeding farms there is limited job mobility, workers more often

---

10 The names of the farms and people in this study have been changed to protect their anonymity.
live on-site, and have very little job mobility/security. It is on two breeding farms that this project will be conducted. These farms’ labor forces are composed primarily of male migrants, many of whom had familial relations with one another.

**Research Design: Methods**

This project engages the construction of gender identities in a transnational field through an integration of data obtained, for the most part, through qualitative methods. These include semi-structured interviews, participant observation and documentary data from secondary sources. Quantitative data were obtained through sources that employ data gathering techniques such as surveys and statistical analysis, such as the U.S. Census Bureau. The data I have gathered using qualitative data collecting techniques are not to be taken to be statistically significant or representative of a population that could be defined, limited or bounded by from a statistically significant standpoint. Rather, these methods were chosen to look at more in-depth characteristics of the participants in the research study.

In this section I will first define and highlight some of the critiques and advantages of a qualitative methodology in a project such as this. I will then engage critiques of my own positionality in the research project. Next I will describe the data sources which fall into two main categories – primary and secondary data sources. The processes that I used to obtain access to the field sites and describe the interview processes themselves will be addressed in this section. In conclusion, I briefly discuss the shortfalls of my methods.

**Qualitative Data Methodology: Strength and Weaknesses**

**Positionality**

In this project I employ a feminist methodology to use as a guide to conducting the research. The adoption of a feminist methodology will have the “potential to minimize the hierarchical relationship between research and interviewees and to avoid exploiting less powerful people as mere sources of data” (England 2006). Silvey and Lawson (1999) warn that despite focus on postcolonial and feminist theorizations of migrants, that migrants and their decisions remain “objects of theorization rather than interpretive subjects” (126). While I tried to avoid some of the pitfalls of this type of research by incorporating such methods as participant-observation, and include the participants as equals in the project who are “interpretive subjects of their own mobility, rather than as economically driven laborers responding to larger forces” (Silvey and Lawson 1999:126), the reality of an unequal relationship is something that I have to contend with. During the interviews I did not try to conceal my research questions, and often asked the participants if they had any questions for me. These were often rewarding exchanges, while for the most part there was little asked of me. I also continuously stressed that the men should want to participate, and feel no pressure to do so. I feel that this was actually communicated well, because a large number of men chose not to participate in the interviews. Reflexivity of the researcher within a feminist project entails an effort to be more conscious of power relations between the researcher and the
researched, as well as an admission that ‘pure’ reflexivity is impossible, because of the inability of the researched to fully comprehend her/his position within the webs of power through which the research is located. Still, keeping these assumptions in the background while I conducted the interviews and went to the farm for participant observation, I feel that the attempt to form less exploitative relationships was a partial success.

Data Sources

Secondary Data

Census was obviously of some import, even while there are multiple reasons to be skeptical of its accuracy, usefulness and precision. This is also true for the Center for Immigration Studies, which offers more specific data on many facets of the demographics of the Mexican population in the US. Demographic and economic data from an array of states from the ‘sending countries’, also contextualizes some aspects of the movements of populations from the sending countries.

Primary Data Collection

This research utilizes semi-structured interviews and participant-observation. The research takes into consideration the work obligations of migrant men, as well as the calendars that dictate periods of busier and less busy work schedules on horse farms. I commenced with the interviews after an informal meeting and held multiple interviews with a total of nine employees on each farm thereafter. I also went to Douglass Farms for two days of participant observation that consisted of hours of work with a group of about four men, one of which I had not interviewed, as he was the newest employee of the farm. The days on which I participated in farm work were chosen by the employers and workers to best suit their needs. I also conducted one interview with Brenda on Douglass Farms. During an hour or so after lunch we talked about various issues that the farm faced considering employment and the workplace.

Notes on Feasibility and Limitations of the Study

While some of the issues involved in the feasibility of this project have been addressed, it will not hurt to compile them into one section, as well as to state some others. First, while sensitive data was protected to the highest ability of the researcher, there is the possibility of accidental leakage, as well as the release of data that was seen to be benign. This was addressed however by my vigilance to keep the data in a singular place and secure it through encryption of my flashdrive. I will also destroy sensitive documents after a brief interval after the acceptance of the thesis.

While I do have some Spanish language ability, another obvious hindrance to the research project was the language barrier. However, by using questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, multiple interviews within which to correct bias in transcription, I tried to address distortions and misrepresentations.

The feminist methodology also raises important issues within research. It is very easy to say that one will be observant and mindful of power relations between the
interviewer and the interviewee, to understand the positionality of both, to resist explicit or implicit exploitation, and that one will work to achieve a more egalitarian relationship, it is much different and difficult to exercise these ways of understanding and avoid those that you may be unaware of. A blatant exposure of either identity or ‘invisible practices’ in this project could result in oppressive maneuvers by the state, the farm itself, or others within the community, hence this type occurrence was minimized at every opportunity. While all these apparent dangers lie in the storage, analysis, and interpretation of the research (the finished product and afterwards), the method of data collection leaves room for a feminist approach as well. The semi-structured interview was used in conjunction with quantitative data analysis and questionnaires in the hope that the researcher’s ability to listen, empathize and validate personal experiences “allows the development of a less exploitative and more egalitarian relationship between [the] researcher and participants” (McDowell 1992).
Chapter 2

Transnationalism and Masculinities: Theoretical Approaches and Intersections

Since the early decades of the 20th century theories of migration had many articulations that waxed and waned in intellectual popularity and popular consciousness. These different approaches included such theories as assimilation theory, cultural pluralism and transnationalism. In this chapter, I discuss the conceptual debates around transnationalism to provide a background for, and place from which to proceed for this study. As a caveat, this is not proposed as a comprehensive framework in which to embed all migration. Even within a similar space, “[d]ifferent migrants can experience very unequal oppressive disciplinary frameworks,” and circumscriptions of space (Huang and Yeoh cited in Pratt and Yeoh 2003; 162). I look at some of the emergent scholarship that engages or critiques transnational studies. Stepping back from this work, I give a brief account of work on gender and gender identities. I then consider recent scholarship that approaches notions of belonging, citizenship and the state, ‘translocal’ identifications, and the intersectionality with race, class, age etc.

Transnationalism and migration: Recent Theoretical Approaches

Transnational studies approach questions of multiple identities, complex articulations of these identities in multiple overlapping spaces that include incorporations and resistances to globalizing effects of neoliberal economies, urban progress and national belonging (Silvey and Lawson 1999). Kivisto’s review (2001) presents a helpful outline of three different approaches to transnational studies that highlight some of the controversies and advantages of using the term as a theoretical framework. These approaches are the perspective of cultural anthropology as forwarded by Glick Schiller et al. (1992), Portes et al’s (1999) ‘middle-range theory’ of transnationalism of the mid-to-late 1990’s, and Thomas Faist’s (2000) efforts to refine transnationalism which added complexity to its formulation by incorporating more refined notions of space and transnational spaces.

The Transnationalism of Cultural Anthropology

Nina Glick-Schiller et al., define transnationalism as an emerging social process in which migrants “establish social fields that cross geographic cultural, and political borders,” and transmigrants as those who “develop and maintain multiple relations – familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political – that span borders” (my emphasis) (1992, ix). This approach to migration studies emphasizes the productive roles and capacities of migrants that span “geographic, cultural, and political borders”, but also stresses a dialectical approach that combines studies of articulations of globalization as well as structure, cultural process, and human agency (Basch et al 1994, 10). Thus transmigrants access, communicate, produce connections and are limited by the structures and power relations that are entangled within local regional, national, and global scales (Mahler 1998). The flows of people, wealth, ideas, imaginaries, are said to
be novel to this period of globalization, and in effect are retooling and producing new constellations of power and identities (ibid.). For Glick Schiller et al. (1992) while these new types of migrant experiences are predicated upon a “global capitalist system” that has its roots in the Reagan – Thatcher era economic policies of the 1980’s, while authors such as Kivisto (2001) have questioned the apparent lack of substantive evidence for establishing the novelty of transmigrants and transnational fields. In addition to this, the failure of Glick Schiller et al.’s work for Kivisto is their inability to engage with other theories of migration, such as multiculturalism or assimilation theory (more below). Their account therefore is to attribute to transnationalism apparently novel formations and fields of migrant experience. This may be an unfair reading of Glick Schiller et al.’s work. They position their framework not only to analyze migration in terms of transmigrants effect and are shaped by the “encompassing global capitalist system,” but as a research agenda that is employed to analyze the approaches of these previous categories of migration (Glick Schiller et al. 1992, x). They also posit that “transnational migrants… live a complex existence that forces them to confront, draw upon, and rework different identity constructs – national, ethnic and racial” (ibid., 5). It doesn’t necessarily disengage from other theorizations of migrants.

*Middle-Range Theory: A Path between Skeptics and Believers*

Portes et al.’s contribution (1999) to the literature on transnationalism broadens and refines the definition and boundaries of the concept. In this formulation the authors assert that while not a wholly novel form of migration, transnationalism is indeed a new social field because of the intensity and complexity of the movements of migrants. These migrants increasingly “live dual lives; speaking two languages, having homes in two countries, and making a living through continuous regular contact across national borders” (ibid, 217). Thus, it is the intensity, complexity, embeddedness and new forms of citizenship that is really novel – specifically the fact of personal interest in two or more countries. This interest can be maintained through contact within familial networks, economical choices that include travel and remittances11, or political awareness and participation across national borders.

Portes et al. (1999) established three criteria that were to connote the aspects of a transnational field. They are:

a) the process involves a significant proportion of persons in the relevant universe (in this case, immigrants and their home country counterparts);
b) the activities of interest are not fleeting or exceptional, but possess certain stability and resilience over time;
c) the content of these activities is not captured by some pre-existing concept, making the invention of a new term redundant. (ibid., 218)

---

11 I follow Guarnizo’s definition of a monetary remittance as an exchange that “represent[s] long-distance social ties of solidarity, reciprocity, and obligation that bind migrants to their kin and friends across state-controlled national borders” (2003, 671).
These criteria limit the definition that Glick Schiller et al (1992) forwarded, thus excluding such practices that can be understood under the umbrella of previous terminology, such as one time purchases or occasional gifts shipped across borders. In this conceptualization it is hard to know where to place the boundary, and the fuzziness of the definition can lead to arguments about whether something is transnational or not, and by how much – surely an argument worth avoiding. For example, how novel can a new form of transnational relation be before gaining "stability or resilience over time"; what is a significant proportion of persons?

In Portes et al.’s work, transnational fields are informed through three distinct areas – the economic, the political, and the socio-cultural. It is within through the entangled intersections of these fields which this study takes place, as it is often difficult to discern where the economic, the political and the socio-cultural are not embedded within one another. The third category – the most diverse say Portes et al., is the sociopolitical group of activities that reify national identities or the “collective enjoyment of cultural events and goods” (ibid. 221). By ‘economic field’, Portes et al. (1999) denotes a class of transnational entrepreneurs that can incorporate and mobilize networks across national borders that would allow them to expand their access to suppliers, capital and markets. This oppositional relationship is often cast in an oppositional or antagonistic relationship to the political transnational field (Levitt 2004). The political transnational field is that composed of the activities of “party officials, government functionaries, or community leaders whose main goals are the achievement of political power and influence in the sending or receiving countries” (ibid. 221). As Kivisto (2001) has pointed out however, the first two groups do not seem to be composed of migrants, and the third is indistinguishable from early forms of migration (561). Levitt argues that “[e]xploring mutually reinforcing activities and the kinds of institutional arrangements that allow them to emerge is important” (2004), which is often a result of the intersections of the political, social-cultural, and the economic fields.

Portes et al.’s framework does blur the boundaries between transnationalism “from above” and transnationalism “from below” – a boundary they hoped to make clearer. The nation-state is weakened “from above” by transnational capital, global media, and emergent supra-national political institutions. ’From below’ it faces the decentering “local” resistances of the informal economy, ethnic nationalism, and grassroots activism,” (Guarnizo and Smith 1998, 3). Guarnizo (2003) forwards the claim that “migrants’ social, cultural, political, and economic relations with their homelands…[have] significant influence and transforming effects not only on the development of their localities and countries of origin, but also on global macroeconomic processes (667). This distinction is important in realizing the agency of transnational migrant actors in all three of Portes et al.’s categories of economic, political, and socio-cultural structures and networks. I would add the role of ‘sending countries’ in active encouragement of migration to assure remittances, enhance human capital upgrading,12 increase political lobby through citizens from the ‘sending’ country to the ‘receiving’ country, (connected to the relaxation of laws regarding dual citizenship in ‘sending countries’) and reductions of border controls and labor codes (Bauböck 2003; 709) (Portes et al. 1999). Smith

---

12 “Human capital upgrading is a development strategy of sending countries that supports not only emigration as a safety valve against poverty and social protest but must also sponsor return migration that imports useful skills and accumulated savings,” (Bauböck 2003, 709).
(2005) forwards that carefully historicizing, “contingency and agency underlying the changing practices of states, migrants and transnational institutional networks vis-à-vis questions of transnational citizenship” will forward scholarship that focuses on the transnational political field, through delineations such as Bauböck’s, above. As Kivisto’s interpretations of Portes et al.’s categories show, their analysis seems to be unduly technologically deterministic. Only those with repetitive access to faster and better transportation/communication seem to be able to enter into the spaces of transnationalism – the jet-setters and government officials of the post-modern era.

**Transnationalism: Migrants as Active Translators of Culture**

Faist (2000) to clarify and articulate the idea of social fields that harbor and are mobilized by transnational relations through his articulation of the ‘social spaces of transnationalism’. Faist uproots the restrictions of place-based or bounded analysis to include the spaces of “opportunity structures, the social life and the subjective images, values, and meanings that the specific and limited place represents to migrants” (Faist 2000, 45). Faist’s transnational spaces are composed of kinship ties which include instrumental or emotional exchanges, transnational circuits which are composed of trading networks that are composed of more instrumental exchanges, and transnational communities which are “predicated on the solidarity derived from a shared conception of collective identity” (Faist 2000; Kivisto 2001). Transnational migrants in Faist’s analysis are those who translate between two cultures. That is to say they are not just assimilating and by implication giving up or losing some part of their identity; nor can they be interpreted through cultural pluralist frameworks for they do not adhere or maintain unique cultural identities that are not informed of some element or translated along with their host society. Transnational spaces are formed when communities that are located across national borders “link through exchange, reciprocity, and solidarity to achieve a high degree of social cohesion, and a common repertoire of symbolic and collective representations” (Morokvasić 2003, 115). Work in Geography that address the constructions of these spaces includes work that gives attentions to everyday practices and the social constructions of spaces, complicating notions of actors who are disembedded and effortlessly move in these spaces (Conradson and Latham 2005). Narratives of ‘middling transnationalism’ are explored where actors negotiate between transnationalism from ‘above’ and ‘below’ (Smith 2005). Yeoh and Willis explore the spaces of ‘contact zones’ where subjects intersect in time and space and participate in “frontiers of difference”, which is constantly encountered and negotiated (2005, 271). Ehrkamp looks at the ways place is produced through transnational ties to create places of belonging within a city (2005). This study is interested in the ways that transnational spaces are mobilized by migrants, the characteristics of access to transnational space, and what effects these ties have on their identity construction.

**Limitations and Misplaced Hopes: How to Proceed**

A central issue to such theorizations on transnationalism is what practices within those spaces do; i.e., what practices are created in these spaces and what are the effects of those practices. Levitt (2001) takes stock of some of these debates, saying that they
“argue that transnational practices will allow marginalized groups to circumvent mobility barriers…, they merely reorder or reproduce long-standing inequalities…[while] others argue that long-term transnational involvement and incorporation can coexist and, in some cases, mutually reinforce each other” (211). Levitt sidesteps either/or questions regarding the existence or inherent abilities of transnationalism to ask four sets of questions regarding the spaces of transnationalism. The first set looks at how the different types of transnational identities build upon one another, increasing access and mobility to and within transnational spaces, or exclude migrants from participating in those spaces. The second interrogates the specificity of transnational communities, encouraging work that broadens the understanding of the various ways that these communities are constructed, formed, enacted, engaged, exclusionary, and relational. The third set of questions incorporates work that articulates how the spaces of transnationalism are mediated by stronger and weaker states, and for what purposes. The fourth and final set of questions engages the extents to which “transnational practices remain salient for the second generation” (ibid. 2001). The implications of this set of questions are quite immediate through notions such as compadrazgo, a cultural form that has many parallels to those of godparents in the U.S. Sidelining such debates regarding the expectations of transnationalism’s liberatory potential or political cohesion, Levitt encourages qualitative approaches that engage notions of mobility, citizenship, belonging, human rights, and economic expressions of transnational migrants’ identities, communities, networks, and social relations. It is within this context that this study is placed, engaging Levitt’s recommendations to critically examine the articulations of transnational identities.

These qualitative analyses of transnational spaces have been outlined by Vertovec (1999), and have been distilled into six conceptual premises – each containing intersecting meanings, processes, scales and methods, that describe the spaces, studies and analysis of transnationalism. The first is that of the social morphologies of transnational communities and networks. Through a brief analysis of Castells’ contribution regarding the Information Age (1996) which does not make an argument of creating new social patterns but for the reinforcement or alteration of preexisting ones – Vertovec highlights a recent shift of the “diasporas of old” to be thought of as today’s transnational communities and networks. Along with these new networks come new opportunities for communication, exchange, social change, violence, and illegal activities (ibid. 449-450). Type of consciousness, the next category of analysis outlined by Vertovec, relates the experience of migrations which influence the cultivation of multiple identities, identifications, and subjectivities within and through an increased number of locations and places/nations (ibid.). The entanglement of diasporas and transnationalism, above, recalls Safran’s (1991) definitional apparatus here, that has as its focus a

---

13 While not clear from his text, I believe Vertovec to be referencing communities that were once theorized under diasporic studies, but may now be better understood through transnationalism.

14 Diaporic theories tend to focus on the movement and sociological implications of the forced, coerced or voluntary movement of people, while transnationalism focuses on a connective and entangled viewpoint of flows that comprise various relations, networks and scales.
coherence of multiple identities for migrants across space, national borders, and temporal locations. Diasporas are connoted by:

expatriate minority communities” (1) that are dispersed from an original "center" to at least two "peripheral" places; (2) that maintain a "memory, vision, or myth about their original homeland"; (3) that "believe they are not and perhaps cannot be fully accepted by their host country”; (4) that see the ancestral home as a place of eventual return, when the time is right; (5) that are committed to the maintenance or restoration of this homeland; and (6) of which the group's consciousness and solidarity are "importantly defined" by this continuing relationship with the homeland. (Safran 1991:83-84)

It is worth mentioning the danger here, outlined by Anthias (1998) of using this framework of diasporas in an evaluative manner which can reinforce notions of absolute origins or belonging. This draws attention away from other dimensions of these types of consciousness, or sub-consciousness as the case may be, of gender, race, class, generational, and inter or intra-group divisions that are more pertinent for interrogating inequality and issues involving power.

Vertovec’s next category, *modes of cultural representation*, is a bricolage or syncretism of “constructed styles, social institutions and everyday practices (ibid. 451). In this instance, Vertovec’s transnational communities are much akin to a confluence of Faist’s transnational spaces and transnational communities, where the individuals and groups are represented and construct representations through globalized networks, media and communication (ibid. 451). As an *avenue of capital*, transnational spaces are informed by a number of actors at different scales that invoke Guarnizo and Smith’s work regarding transnationalism “from above” and “from below”. They can be conceived of as actors “from above” such as transnational corporations, or executives, and those “from below” which Vertovec sees the bulk of the transnational community. Vertovec also makes the assertion that these groups which comprise transnationalism “from below” as creating larger impacts than those actors considered to be “from above” – the total amount of remittances worldwide total $75 billion while for some governments, “remittances represent the quickest and surest source of foreign exchange” (ibid 452). However this relation should not only be conceived of as only consisting of money or capital from one country to another. They can also be conceived of as “ideas, behaviors, identities, and social capital” (Levitt 1998). This flow across borders is not wholly a positive attribute of transnational relations, and can be the cause and effect of a host of positive and negative effects on the community in which they are introduced to (Conway and Cohen 1998). Not only does this relation connote a person earning the currency in one country, a receiving person or group of persons in another country, but national governments as well implicated in the production and management of the two currencies. While first generation migrants are often seen as moving for economic reasons, soon thereafter these activities and processes coalesce with other spaces and practices such as those that fall within the political and socio-cultural categories of analysis outlined by Portes et al.
The next category of analysis addresses sites of political engagement. While giving a brief account of international non-governmental organizations [INGOs] and Transnational Social Movement Organizations [TSMOs], Vertovec’s analysis of the category is most applicable to this study in areas that concern social groups, often couched within diasporic communities, which have a host of implications in the Portes et al.’s three categories of analysis. Far from degrading the viability of the nation-state, these movements often reify the state in both ‘sending’ and ‘receiving’ countries. Political parties now often establish offices abroad in order to canvass migrants, while migrants themselves organize to lobby the home government (ibid. 455). There are many other areas of political engagement that can be mobilized by migrant communities such as in voting and citizenship, (as evidenced by dual citizenships or dual-nationalities) property rights, or the changing characteristics of access and mobility (illustrated by welfare, health benefits, and cross border travel) (ibid. 455). McDowell deconstructs citizenship in a motion that allows it to negotiate access to the public sphere, hence how migration is linked to the creation and meaning of political identities is central to a project of social justice (McDowell 1999. 150). Tambini (2001) interrogates the notion of these new “post-national” articulations of citizenship. In this article, the possibility of civic participation through citizenship, achieved through affiliations enabled by the existence and viability of the nation-state as the socio-cultural and political unit of analysis and socio-cultural expression, is undermined by new form of post-national citizenship. This new form of citizenship is both lauded as weakening the power and viability of the nation-state in light of new forms of participation and globalizing processes, as well as maligned for its dissolution of important avenues of participation, namely citizenship, identity, culture and the national project (ibid.). Tambini’s article does not take sides wholly with either approach, but instead appraises how new expressions of post-national citizenship affect the nation-state’s abilities regarding securitization of values, and new forms of the nation-state’s institutions and organization (ibid., 211-212).

The final category of analysis outlined by Vertovec is that of (re)constructions of ‘place’ or locality, which is the result of transplanted and translocal forms of practices communication and meanings (Vertovec 1999, 455). ‘Translocality’, a term borrowed from Appadurai (1996), connotes the complex interwoven nature of the production of locality through such ties as marriage, work, business, and leisure. These ties are constituted, created, produced and maintained by various circulating actors and populations. These ties are produced for Lawson through the dialectical play of “desires, identities and [subjectivities] subjectives in multiple sites”, lending insight into processes of “belonging, exclusion and affiliation…produced through migration” (Lawson 2000, 174). Particular expressions of locality include those that are bounded by the nation-state, but also translocalities, or identities that are embedded within other places – by definition those within other nation-states (ibid.). Translocality is “a state of mind as well as a geographic territory, neglecting borders, having roots on both sides while navigating mentally as well as physically through the space in between” (Mandaville 2000). It is in the recognition of these transnational identities as being socially constructed, as active agents of the transformation and translation of the socio-political, economic and cultural landscapes that informs them of their most radical potential. However, identities constructed through transnational spaces can reify and reinforce hegemonic or oppressive
aspects of both communities, nation-states, and those actors engaged with these transnational spaces in novel ways. This reinforcement or dissolution of previous tendencies occurs across and concurrently through analytical categories such as age, race/ethnicity, gender, social class, religion, disability, and sexual orientation. While these categories are highly interconnected and mutually reinforcing, the next section will specifically interrogate gender as the category of analysis. By quickly clarifying its use as a broadly employed analytic, I then survey the confluences of gender and transnational studies to gain insight into how and what exactly these studies can best interpret.

**Gender and Masculinities: Representation and Performativity**

*Gender and Sex*

Any inquiry into representations and/or performativity of masculinities or masculinities studies must first acknowledge gender theory’s foundations. The establishment in critical thought of a subject area that addresses masculine identities did not occur in a vacuum; it is definitely not a category that can claim any kind of *a priori* status or place within gender studies writ broadly. Its genesis is too large and multifaceted to cover in detail here, but a brief description of the theoretical underpinnings of masculinities studies based in gender theory is necessary to understand some of the problems and possibilities attendant with this area analysis.

For feminist theorists, such as Simone de Beauvoir (1979), gender is a socially constructed category, and more specifically, one women are assigned, subjected to, dominated and “Othered” by. This differentiated *gender* from *sex* in first wave feminism, intoning that while sex was a scientific verity, gender was socially constructed and culturally contingent, plastic, and therefore, alterable. Delphy states that this enabled three things:

1. All the differences between the sexes which appeared to be social and arbitrary…were gathered into one concept.
2. The use of the singular (‘gender’ as opposed to ‘genders’) allowed the accent to be moved from the two divided parts to the principle partition itself.
3. The idea of hierarchy was firmly anchored in the concept. (1993, 3)

Judith Butler reconceptualized sex through the ideas of Foucault’s “regulatory ideals” in which sex functions as a norm, and is part of a “regulatory practice that produces the bodies it governs… [S]ex is an ideal construct which is forcibly materialized through time (Price and Shildrick 1999, 235-6). Thus from Beauvoir’s theories that began to disentangle gender from sex, Butler made a successful effort to disentangle sex from essential notions of identity. “Indeed, sex, by definition, will be shown to have been

---

15 “Masculinities” refers to a diverse set of gender affiliations that can be projected or incorporated into a diverse set of masculine gender identities. “Masculinity studies” refers to the recent establishment of an area of gender studies that takes the constructions of masculinities as its central theoretical concern.

16 Social construction refers to an artifact of society, such as gender that is a product of interacting social relations that produce the artifact and imbue it with a sense of being natural or obvious (Wikipedia).
gender all along” (Butler 1990, 12). What she means by this is the “sex” is as much a social production as gender. Butler’s account of gender and sex does is to expose a *cum hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy in scientific discourse in the areas of sex and gender. In other words, science has produced a ‘normal’ sexuality, established a correlation between a normalized sex and gender, reproduced them and by doing so led to the assumptions by many of a causal relationship between sex, gender, and biology.

Connell defines gender as “the structure of social relations that centres on the reproductive arena, and the set of practices (governed by this structure) that bring reproductive distinctions between bodies into social process” (Connell 2002, 10). This definition allows for a large variation of gender across cultures, but also presents a theory for why gender appears to be a static or normative category. It is the practices and discourses that reproduce and contest “hierarchies of power and privilege,” but also the reality of structures embedded within notions of gender that render studies of gender as both those that engage individual narrative as well as interrogation of power at scales other than the individual (Pessar and Mahler 2003, 813). “Geographers’ work on the mutual constitution of international, national and local policy and broader processes in shaping diverse women’s agency and resources in various hierarchies contributes centrally to these feminist debates” (Radcliffe 2006). Through notions of scale, space, and hierarchy, this approach can present a more nuanced understanding of how gender relates to multi-scaled social structures, practices, and places.

Within studies on sexuality, desire, gender and sex there are many approaches that engage ideas of the social construction of gender identities. Such approaches include, but are not limited to psychoanalytic approaches (Illouz 2007), Marxist class-based approaches (Ferree and Roth 1998), those that engage gender through Foucauldian notions of power, regulation, and repetition (Butler 1990), or postmodern approaches demonstrated by such works as Donna Haraway’s, *A Cyborg Manifesto* (1985). While not completely relevant to the task at hand, the inclusion of these different approaches to interpreting gender instead point to its complexity, as well as the options available when conceptualizing an approach to its theorization. In what follows, I highlight an approach popularized by Judith Butler – namely the performativ aspects of gender.

To return to a “genealogy of gender studies”, one can see that second and third wave feminism began refining and recasting the definition of gender to be both a symbolic construction and as a social relationship (McDowell 1999). This definition highlights the nature gender as both a thing that is navigated, (re)produced and interpreted by individuals through “reiterative power of discourse to produce the phenomena that it regulates and constrains” (the symbolic construction) (Butler 1993, 95). It is also mediated through other people, institutions and space/time (as a social relationship). Gender, as well as age, race, class, and sexuality create embodied spaces and places which gendered bodies then inhabit and are reconstituted by. These embodied spaces are limited in regard to mobility, demeanor, speech, fields of action, appearance, and other countless criteria. These places are also inscribed with meaning and interpreted by gendered subjects, which inform the subject with information regarding access to and jurisdiction over those spaces.

---

17 Correlation does not imply causation.
So, a summary of the previous discussion of gender would point out a few related points to a study involved in gender theory.

- Gender is a socially constructed category
- The categories of gender are embedded with hierarchical relationships and within power relations
- Gender is both a symbolic construction and a social relationship
- Certain genders are hegemonic as a result of the unequal nature of gender relations through power
- The boundaries of gender identities are not rigid, and it is from here that we can assail the gendered relations of power that are oppressive, dominating, violent, or (dis)empower(ed/ing). Likewise, people can reinforce those identities within gender identities that are liberatory, constructive, tolerant, and democratic.

The above outline of gender in theoretical works is incorporated into a framework that aids in the theorization of the relationship between “structures of male domination and the intersubjective experiences of women” and, I would include, men (McCall 1992, 837). This framework destabilizes notions of a “masculinity” performed by “men”, instead articulating an idea of the social constructedness and performativity of gender, sex, and the possibilities of liberatory, non-hierarchical, apatriarchal aspects of all gender identities.

**Thinking through Gender**

Following McCall (1992) I propose three categories of analysis concerning gender relations that are helpful in this research agenda: gender symbolism, gender organization, and gender identity. Gender symbolism refers to the “persistence of hegemonic binary oppositions” that mark male/female, masculine/feminine gender roles, while at the same time these roles are “illusive, contradictory, exclusive of most women,” (McCall 1992) and also imaginary/representation, constantly being renegotiated as well as reinforced. Gender organization, (forms of social organization) denotes the role that gender plays in the “ongoing construction of social institutions” such as the household division of labor, occupational sex segregation, mobility, or gender roles (1992, 837). The last category of analysis is that of gender identity, which McCall says “refers to the multiple and often contradictory experiences of femininities and masculinities which rarely conform to the hegemonic images of gender symbolism, both across and over time within individuals” (1992, 838). McCall notes that at all three of the analytical levels the multiplicity of gender relations as well as binaries are functioning, but that binary relations were prevalent at the level of symbolism and structure, while the “unaccounted for multiplicity of gendered practice” was what informed the dynamic and contested level of experience and identity. It is thus here at the level of the gender identity where one would most likely encounter characteristics of masculinities that are liberatory or oppressive than those associated with the symbolic or organizational categories of gender relations. To conceptualize this category of ‘identity’ we need to pay close attention to
the work of binary oppositions and gendered structures of organization that occur under
the signifier of masculinism, masculinities, and men.

**Masculinities and Geography**

Gillian Rose’s (1993) work not only began a stringent appraisal of masculinity
and masculinism inherent in the work of geographers and Geography, it also paved the
way for future geographers to critically engage masculinities as a site from which to
approach these notions – formerly the bailiwick of social, cultural and feminist
geographers:

[The study of] Masculinity was extending its reach into urban
geography..., economic geography..., geographies of employment...,
geographies of illness, impairment and disability..., and post-colonial
geographies... No longer was geographical work on masculinities being
produced solely under the rubric of social, cultural, sexuality and feminist
geographies. (Berg and Longhurst 2003)

The future of masculinities studies for Berg and Longhurst lay in a focus on the
“mutually constitutive relationships between masculinities and other axes of
identity…class, disability, sexuality and ‘race’ (357).

The geographies of masculinities have been the focus of critical research for the
last fifteen years and have been approached through wide-ranging concerns about “men’s
everyday lives, masculine identities and gendered performances” (Hopkins 2006, 337).
They are performed by individuals and throughout ethnocommunal groups and are
represented through cultural norms, values, media, and practices. Masculinities are
“actively produced, using the resources and strategies available in a given setting”
(Connell 2000). Following Berg and Longhurst (2003) who think it is best to think of
masculinities as a “relational characteristic of gender (re)construction”, (351) I forward
Connell’s definition of masculinity as both “a place in gender relations, the practices
through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these
practices in bodily experience, personality and culture” (Connell 1995, 71). This
implicitly invokes the geographic specificity of masculinities both temporally and
spatially, leading Berg and Longhurst to forward the pronouncement of the necessity to
speak of masculinities rather than masculinity, which notes its contingent, relational and
context specific articulations that are “highly contingent, unstable, [and] contested spaces
within gender relations” (2003, 352). To theorize masculinities in this manner is
imperative in a project such as this to realize the potential for masculine identities, or
aspects of them, to be counter-hegemonic, liberatory, loving, caring, anti-authoritarian, or
ahierarchical. To do this, Berg and Longhurst (ibid.) propose a careful understanding of
the ‘spatial construction of identity’ and the ‘spatial constructions of (geographic)
understandings’ of those masculinities. This project, while implicitly focusing on the
former will briefly address the latter point as well through an analysis using Jose Limón’s
work concerning Bakhtin’s notions of the carnivalesque as it relates to alternate
discourses on masculinities.
In his anthropological survey of machismo, *The Meanings of Macho*, Gutmann describes some recent articulations of Mexican masculinities and gives a useful account of the terms with which they are connoted. Gutmann’s different types of being a *macho* are a helpful starting point for examining these masculine identities among Mexican farm workers in Lexington that I interviewed for this thesis. In Gutmann’s account the term machismo, as opposed to *mandilón*,\(^{18}\) is one greatly contested among those interviewed in the *colonia* “Santa Domingo”\(^{19}\). These multiple interpretations of macho masculinities can include:

- “a man who is responsible for providing financially and otherwise for his family” (221)
- a man whose “ideology is very closed…[who] focuses on the present, on satisfaction, on pleasure, on desire” (221)
- *Un hombre de honor* (221)
- a man who frequently beats his wife (221)
- a man who does not participate in “woman’s work” around the house such as cleaning/washing dishes/child care (233)

In fact these masculine identities are not only constructed along with the *mujer abnegada* but also with the *mandilón*. A *macho* is someone who is the opposite of those that are dominated by a woman\(^{20}\). Interestingly enough a *macho* and a *mandilón* are almost always used by Mexican people in a negative sense in Gutmann’s account. In response to Gutmann’s probing on being a *mandilón*, one man replied “No soy *mandilón*… [i]t doesn’t bother me at all to help my wife. I share everything with her” (Gutmann 1996, 233). The denial of the label *mandilón* was forcefully put. Most men that Gutmann interviewed also rejected being referred to as *un macho*. Locating identities in these liminal spaces, the men interviewed would usually reject associating themselves with one identity specifically while also rejecting the idea that these identities could be emancipatory or indeed, even desirable to be associated with.

[C]onsensus will rarely be found as to whether a particular man deserves a label such as neither-macho-nor-*mandilón*. He will probably think of himself as a man in a variety of ways, none of which necessarily coincides with the views of his family and friends. (Gutmann 1996, 238)

Gutmann’s account highlights how important it is to recognize that the place, space, and time are all relevant to the performance of identity, and that, as a further caveat, the relative location in which identities are consumed and interpreted can cause immense variation in the interpretation of any identity.

---

\(^{18}\) *A mandilón* here is a female-dominated man.

\(^{19}\) The fictitious *colonia* Santo Domingo is where Gutmann conducted his research.

\(^{20}\) Though a very brief mention, Gutmann notes how even a *macho* attitude can be constructed as the exact opposite of what is traditionally thought of as *macho*.
While the anthropological work in the book was done in a relatively small colonia, the explanation of the term macho is quite extensive. The term does not originate in reference to valor during battle, folklore, or other sources that one might expect. Macho as a specific (though highly contested) term is linked in Gutmann’s account to the mid-20th century project of creating a national identity. This is achieved through a “consolidation of the Mexican nation, ideologically and materially… not only in the voting rituals of presidential politics but also in the imagining and inventing of lo mexicano and mexicanidad in the national cinema” (Gutmann 1996, 228). These representations cast the production of a national identity as primarily a masculine patriarchal function which marginalizes the production of feminine identities to be a “reflection of masculine will and desire” (ibid., 229). In the United States, macho is usually mobilized in a racist context which places the macho identity outside the purview of Mexican identity production (ibid., 227). The application of the appellation macho usually connotes a tactic to marginalize Mexican masculine identities along ‘inherent’ national and racial characteristics (ibid., 227). What are the expressions and practices of a Mexican macho identity? How are masculine identities expressed?

Gutmann also gives an historical account of the implications of varied sources. In a western context Gutmann first integrates the writings of Ivan Ramos, Oscar Lewis, Octavio Paz and Juan Rulfo into the production of Mexican machismo.

The growing consciousness of the inability to make a pure and distinct separation between virility and effeminacy, between homosocial and homosexual relations, particularly in a national context was kindled by the psychoanalysis of the national character initiated by Ramos and made world famous by Paz… (Irwin 2003, 223)

These authors wrote of simplistic univocal conceptualization of machismo. For Octavio Paz, whose work was foremost in the production of “essential Mexican attributes like machismo, loneliness, and mother worship”, there was a definite desire not to observe mexicanidad but to produce or regain the consciousness of a Mexican identity (Gutmann 1996). This work has been most influential especially in regard to macho identity among a much larger social constituent than Mexican nationals who would subsequently use the work to reify the notions therein of the norms and social values of the Mexican macho, and therefore man. “[T]he fact is,” says Paz, “that the essential attribute of the macho-power almost always reveals itself as a capacity for wounding, humiliating, annihilating” (Paz 1961; in Limon 1989, 474). Limon rejects this essentializing definition of the Mexican macho, asserting that these representations have gotten it all wrong. While it is not to say that humiliation, aggression, etc. are not present in Mexican macho identities, to read all interactions this way is to “ignore the way in which the aggressive meaning of the literal language, such as it is, is transformed into its exact opposite through the intercession of interactional speech play and art” (Limon 1989, 477). Limon does this through a Bakhtinian analysis that incorporates degradation[^21], the carnivalesque and laughter.

[^21]: “To degrade also means to concern oneself with the lower stratum of the body, the life of the belly and the reproductive organs; it therefore relates to acts of defecation and copulation, conception, pregnancy, and birth. Degradation digs a bodily grave for a new birth; it has not only a destructive, negative aspect, but
Paz and Ramos’s representations, as well as the identities that have been embraced in what is thought of as Mexican culture have strong implications of not only the production of masculine identities but have also influenced and abetted the construction of the identities of the effective “Other” – namely that of the “vulnerable, submissive, self-sacrificing women”, *los mujeres abnegadas* (Gutmann 1996: 229). Lucidly, Gutmann states in relation to masculinities and their relation to the construction of femininities of Santo Domingo, that:

> [T]ransformations among women have had a profound impact on men in direct and indirect ways. Recent changes in gender identities among men may indeed often be traced to the conscious or unconscious initiative of women and to the tensions that at first affect women more than men in the *colonia*. (Gutmann 1996: 92)

As can be seen through this account as others, women have a definite and material role in shaping masculine as well as feminine identities effected in part by entering into the public sphere, distributing feminist literature and ideas, organizing community services, and entering into different areas that are instrumental in championing issues of human rights.

**Intersections: Transnationalism and Masculinities**

While much of the “research on transnationalism is implicitly masculinist” (Silvey 2004b), within the intersections of transnational and masculinities literatures Yeoh and Willis discern an apparent lack in the articulation of the subjectivities and status of men (2004). Pessar and Mahler (2001; 2003) give excellent appraisals of recent work done through the analytics of gender and transnationalism. They do so by reviewing “how and why gender relations are negotiated in transnational contexts and also how gender organizes them,” (ibid. 2001, 441) and later, intensifying their analysis by the role of the state and the social imaginary in gendering transnational processes and experiences” (ibid. 2003, 813). Pessar and Mahler (2003) provide a brief account of the masculinism and biased focus on men in migrant literature until the late 70’s, at which point there was a corrective that simply swung the focus to women migrants. This signaled the shortcoming of such approaches, which was a result of the confusion and subsequent substitution of gender for sex (ibid., 814). The corrective applied to this approach would focus on how “gender relations are negotiated across national borders among migrant women and men and how gender articulates transnationally with other modes of identity as well” (ibid., 815). To do this, Pessar and Mahler forward a framework dubbed “Gendered Geographies of Power” (2001, 2003). By ‘geographies’ Pessar and Mahler hope to stress the multiple social and spatial scales as well as the

---

22 While I agree with some of the theoretical implications of Marston et al.’s (2005) recent work on doing away with scale, the concept is not devoid of political opportunity, nor unrecoverably tarnished by its hierarchical nature. While reifying the global, scale also creates the local as a recognizable site of
spaces and relations between them in which these gendered relations and identities are performed (ibid. 2003, 815). By ‘social spaces’ the authors mean to connote individuals’ “positions within interconnected power hierarchies created through historical, political, economic, geographic, kinship-based and other socially stratifying factors” (ibid., 816). Marx said of history, “Men [sic] make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past” (Marx 1999). This is a close parallel for Pessar and Mahler, though unlike them I hesitate to imagine a ‘social location continuum from most disadvantaged to most privileged and locate people in different sites along it” (2003 ibid., 816). Rather, I think it more fitting to imagine a rhizomic or intersectional approach in which people’s identities are not only imagined as being more or less disadvantaged, but placed by their accounts of how they feel. They assert meaning and influence upon the larger continuum instead of being ’placed on it’, and evaluated from some point apparently outside of it. I think their next point offers a good corrective to this alteration of their model, as it highlights, as Marx does, the fact that sometimes circumstances choose us.

For the third piece of their conceptual apparatus, Pessar and Mahler invoke Massey’s definition of “power geometry” which aids in a more coherent understanding of how spatial locations affect individual and group control and access to these spaces and scales, as well as how this correlates to articulations of agency. As Massey states:

[D]ifferent social groups, and different individuals, are placed in very distinct ways in relation to these flows and interconnections. This point concerns not merely the issue of who moves and who doesn’t, although that is an important element of it; it is also about power in relation to the flows and the movement. Different social groups have distinct relationships to this anyway differentiated mobility: some people are more in charge of it than others; some initiate flows and movement, others don’t; some are more on the receiving-end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it. (1993, 61)

This is a call to recognize not only those who “do” things or initiate flows or exchanges, but those who “receive” things, and are influenced by them. It is also a call to recognize and interrogate the organizing principles of spaces and places. The final two parts of Pessar and Mahler’s framework are composed of their conceptions of agency, and, working through Appadurai (1990), the attendant cognitive processes such as imaging, planning and strategizing that yield insights into the substantive articulations of agency (Pessar and Mahler 2003). Even though admittedly hard to assess, these ways of thinking resistance and power. However, the argument is interesting and raises many questions about the nature of the use of “scale” as a concept in geographical discourse. Arturo Escobar’s response is most suitable, striking a balance between throwing ‘scale’ out prematurely, and in doing so, creating unknown, possibly terrible consequences in relation to local movements. “What happens to the logic of control, to minoritarian logics, to the enabling and open-ended character of dispersed network formation dreamt up by some contemporary movements if gains cannot be thought about in terms of scalar effect?” (Escobar 2007). For now, along with Escobar, the question of whether we should seek to abandon scale is best considered an open-ended question.
about agency can lead to new understandings of how individuals and groups access and utilize spaces, relationships, and power.

Pessar and Mahler (2003) interrogate the gendered geographic scales of the state, which “call upon us to bring gender and the state fully into our analysis of transnational migration” (819) to gain understandings of the dominance of the state and gender identities, and how they can be mutually reinforcing; the social locations and their effects on agency which states that “people’s ability to physically migrate is constrained by their social location” (823); and the gendered social imaginary which “leads us particularly into matters of fidelity, sexuality and alternative masculinities and femininities” (828) across gender, generational, and cultural division, but may also imprint themselves on the social imaginary of both the receiving and host communities.

It is important here to survey some articulations of the gender symbols, organizations and identities that masculinities are engaged in (re)constructing and (re)producing, through intersectional approaches of transnationalism, gender, and specifically, masculinities. Silvey (2004a, 2004b) adds to the feminist literature on transnational migration by conducting research with Indonesian domestic workers in Saudi Arabia. Here Silvey interrogates the “gendered hierarchies of scale” in Saudi Arabia in an attempt to uncover the structures/agencies that contribute to “women’s race, ethnicity- and nation-specific subordinations across space,” (Silvey 2004a:145; emphasis in original). Yeoh and Huang, (2000) look at how different aspects of a critical theory of gender construction, representation, and navigation interrelate in transnational flows of women migrants at their respective homes and those they (re)create in Singapore. Yeoh and Willis (2004) incorporate “elite” transnational women migrants into the discourse of gender constructions in transnational space. Boehme’s recent contribution analyses how notions of appropriate gender roles that are mediated by “transnational movements, cultural ideologies, the workings of global capital, and the persistence of the nation-state” create new gendered subjectivities (2008, 28). In turn these carry with them new forms of patriarchal and oppressive controls but also “creative strategies through which women assert themselves and [articulate] novel ways of performing both masculinities and femininities” complicating normative assertions of transborder migration as a “path toward gender equity” (ibid., 28). These studies, among a host of others, have contributed to an understanding of women’s management of agency in a transnational migrant/diasporic space.

Works that explicitly engage masculinities as a analytical focus include Hopkins’ (2006) “Youthful Muslim Masculinities” which surveys the two dominant discourses regarding Muslim youths – “[O]ne emphasizing patriarchy and aggression, the other effeminacy and academicism” (ibid. 337). Through gender relations, markers of social difference, theories of place and generational relations, Hopkins asserts individuals have a range of masculinities. Men are seen to have a repertoire of masculinities that are engaged in relation to context-specific temporal and spatial locations. Goldring’s (2001) analysis of gender in the context of the state and citizenship found that masculine citizenship dominates transnational social spaces, and that states and transmigrant

---

23 While not specifically engaging transnational literature, the subtitle to the study, “Gender and generational relations”, paired with the participants perception of their heritage as outlined in Hopkins methods section reveals specific affinities with this project, and hence will be included to highlight possible intersections of transnationalism and masculinities.
organizations limit the “opportunities and incentives for women’s participation which in turn may determine the gender and location of citizenship in transnational spaces” (525). Levitt’s analysis of the representations and identities associated with transnational masculinities may influence local imaginaries and constrain those men whose lives are not articulated through transnational spaces (2001). Malkin (2004) analyzes how experiences of “modernity” for male migrants are translated into social and symbolic capital mobilized through social relations and discourses that are often denied to those who do not migrate (2004). Napolitano Quayson’s research on Mexican migrant men in California contributes an ethnography to transnationalism and gender studies that concerns the changing characteristics of masculinities through notions of ‘lonely migrations’, belonging, exclusion, gendered subjectivities and embodiment (2005). It is here, concurrently with Napolitano Quayson’s work and others like it, that I provide an ethnography of men in rural Kentucky to enrich the ‘spatial constructions of identity’ and the ‘spatial constructions of (geographic) understandings’ of these men’s entangled identities. I will do this through issues engaged in the literature above such as citizenship, (be)longing, dominant discourses of masculinities, emotional and spatial relations, and imaginaries.
Chapter 3

Identities Interpreted through Notions of Transnational Spaces

Rafael sat in the chair in the room, thoughtfully providing me some insights into his life. Above us in the rafters were myriad little plastic American flags, and the wood paneling and red tiles beneath our metal chairs and gave off a sense of warmth despite the chill in the room. We had been talking for around 50 minutes in the room where most of the people who worked on the farm gathered for lunch, but today it was only occupied by Rafael and me. He was very engaged with the interview, seemingly out of a desire to communicate ideas he had been thinking about to someone who would listen. I say this because they were well-formed, and insightful in my view, as well as readily at hand, issuing from Rafael with barely a moment’s hesitation.

Over the course of two interviews with Rafael we talked about his home in Michoacán, his life in the United States for the previous five years, his wife who he met in the U.S., and his family – both here and in Michoacán. These were issues that many of the interview participants would be asked to comment on, and together they weave a complex story of migrations, homes, families, losses, loves, and sometimes return. Rafael expanded on ideas without prompting, and showed an intense desire to interpret his own life – recalling impressions, stories and insights at ease. Though this enthusiasm was not shared by everyone, I felt there was an attitude of mutual respect, connection and consideration during the interviews. Listening to how Rafael and the other men in my study discussed their identities allows me to engage and question the conceptualizations of ‘the local’ and translocalities (Appadurai 1996), transnational spaces, and diasporic identities (Safran 1991). It must be stressed that the goal of this project is not to establish whether or by how much these men’s identities are transnational, or diasporic, or whether they are formed in ‘the local’. Rather, I only use these concepts to understand more clearly the fields and aspects of my research subjects’ identities that may or may not be best evaluated according to these concepts. That is, these criteria are not ontologically given, and I recognize that other categories may be even more important to this project when establishing criteria that may illustrate different aspects of identities. However, migration, as one of the most ancient features of human populations, will certainly lead us to interesting insights into conditions that inform and help to shape identity constructions of both those who actively migrate and those whose lives are effected by migration – namely everyone.

I listened to and interpreted the men’s conversations involving social and economic relations, social networks, their interpretations and thoughts on citizenship, as well as the law. What resulted were multiple viewpoints and subjectivities that demonstrate how these migrant men’s identities were shaped through the fields, spaces, and places listed above, and what aspects of these inform and are informed by their identities. I establish that these men’s identities are articulated through notions of cross-border travel, communication, and imaginaries. First, to ascertain some of the more common attributes of a transnational field, I survey some of the remittance relations that my research participants are engaged in, and from there proceed to assess whether social and/or imaginary transnational spaces play a role in their identity constructions. I then
discuss how citizenship and identities articulated through transnational space by recalling Appadurai’s notion of ‘translocal’ identities. This entails looking both ‘here’ and ‘there’, at identities embodied within both local contexts and how identities may extend outward across borders. These extensions could be embodied, as through a voice or in writing. They may also consist of intangible connections, such as memory, meaning and emotions. I also highlight how these identity constructions are translators of places and spaces, as well as agents of transformation.

**Economic and Social Flows through Transnational Spaces**

**Economic Remittances**

One of the basic and often cited criteria that establish a transnational relation is that of remittances (Levitt 1998). I start with remittances to establish that these relations do exist, and that the men in my study actually engage transnational spaces as defined above. Most of the men in this study responded that they were engaged in some form of remittance relation. If the participant planned a return to his home country in the future or contemplated a possible return, remittances were often, if not always, implicated. If the interviewee did not plan on returning to México, remittances were often sent to remaining (usually immediate) family members.

Jorge: …I still help mom and dad you know. Every couple months I send them some money.
Mitch: Do you rely on them for any kind of support? You know, like emotionally obviously.
J: Yeah, just emotionally. No, uh, they're old and, you know, I wanna help them as much I can because they’ve done a lot for me. So I'm trying to give them some back. And my wife you know, she's never been opposed, because I work, she works.

Jorge’s remittance relations here entwine economic and social aspects of his practices and experiences in both transnational and local spaces. Remittances and emotional support are given across borders in Jorge’s case, which are a continuation of past exchanges. Antonio broadened this type of social exchange to include a variety of social services and other needs.

Mitch: …Do you ask people in your country of origin for help?
Antonio: Yes. Them too.
M: And them with you?
E: Yes.
M: What type of help?
E: What type of help? Like medical insurance. Yeah, medical insurance, or also sometimes money, or work too.
M: Work?
E: Yeah, if they don’t have work, they [the farm] can give them jobs.
In Antonio’s case, not only is money a type of social/economic relation that can be conceived of as a remittance, but also social capital in the form of job opportunities, medical insurance to those across borders, as well money. The character of these remittances is apparently dynamic, entering into different relations of exchange that include not only classic remittance relations comprised of monetary exchanges, but also other types of exchanges such as social or emotional support. While these examples may incorporate economic components, the primary attributes are not purely conceived of in economic terms, nor do they necessarily have money as a primary focus of the exchange.

**Social Relations and Networks: Flows and Imaginaries**

A broader understanding of remittances than those above are comprised of transnational social exchanges that may not directly implicate monetary exchanges at all. I look at the ‘local’ both ‘here’ and ‘there’, as well as articulations of transnational identities to problematize the simple distinctions that are connoted by such designations as ‘here’ or ‘there’, and indeed, ‘transnational’.

I suggest that transnational spaces can be traversed through both embodied and disembodied means. Embodied actions would connote physical migration as well as imaginary or emotional and imaginary identifications that travel with people and are expressed where the body is physically located. Disembodied actions include those that rely on symbols that cross borders, such as currency, or physical objects that rely on different transnational networks or infrastructures to be transferred but don’t occur as an embodied movement of the subject across national borders. The most obvious example of disembodied relation is that which requires telecommunicative connections, whether they are conducted through the telephone, or the internet. While a voice can be considered to be embodied, I think that as it is transferred electronically it becomes disembodied.

A couple of men replied that they used the internet to call family or friends back home, but every worker said that they had some amount of communication with family back home via telephone conversations. The amount of communication by telephone varied widely across the group. Even though communication by phone is certainly not an obvious emergent social process, (like the increased and varied way people are engaging the internet) technologies such as the internet and heightened abilities of communication infrastructures increase the ways and methods in which these technologies are mobilized to create connections and establish and maintain relations across national borders. For example while none of the conversations in the interviews mentioned the use of Skype,

> **Skype** is a computer program that can place calls across the internet to other computers or to ordinary telephones. It is remarkably cheaper than many other telephone-telephone based calling techniques, such as long-distance or telephone cards.

Rafael said outside a formal interview that he had used it to communicate with people in México. While the person ‘here’ could use the internet to call cheaply, this did not necessitate that those he talked to at ‘home’ have access to a computer. From this one can see that, while not an emergent social process, the ways that transnational spaces are...
accessed, and who has access to them, are constantly changing. Thus it presents new
barriers while others are negotiated or bypassed in novel ways.\(^{25}\)

Transnational/Social relations also seem to be carried over from interactions
constituted from previous but continuous relationships. For example, Jorge’s statement,
“I wanna help them as much I can because they’ve done a lot for me,” connects these
newer or altered modes of communication (for example, the establishment of a routinized
schedule of telephone calls) to a continuance of past relations, but through new avenues.
Though these avenues are not necessarily novel modes of expression and connection they
are able to be upheld more distantly. However, this often implies a matter of access in
either location. While acknowledging the resilience of these activities through broader
social networks and changing technologies, they are novel as well – migrants were
probably not making weekly phone calls to families in the early 20\(^{th}\) century. Novelty in
this sense is a matter of temporal scale.

*Embodied imaginaries and movements*

For Jorge, identification with the ‘here’, the ‘local’, is the result of a large
accumulation of years spent in this local context. His sixteen years here in relation to
many of the other men I talked may seem like a lifetime. Manuel, Hector and Ivan had
been on the farm for less than one year. I was only able to interview these three men
once as they departed for México during the winter break, and had not returned to the
farm for work at the end of my interview sessions. Ignacio, Rafael, Juan, Roberto,
Alberto, Gabriel, Roman, Felix, and Antonio had been employed by the farm for one or
more years. Their plans ranged from leaving the farm to find other work in the area,
staying on for an indeterminate time, or returning to México in the distant (30 years) or
near future. Hector, who I interviewed immediately before the New Year, said “I will
stay for a few years I think”, but when I returned after the New Year he was gone. When
I asked the coordinator of the employees of the farm, she said “they [some employees]
originally said they weren’t going to go back and then the day after one [Hector] said,
“Well, I'm decided, I'm goin’”. The imaginaries of these men played a large role in
whether they would return or not, and they were also highly malleable, changing at what
seemed a moment’s notice.

If social, economic and other ties ‘here’ could be severed within a matter of a few
days, it also highlights identities that do not necessarily have strong ties to the local
‘here’. It does not mean that one does not have strong transnational affiliations. These
may aid in these men’s abilities to relocate. As demonstrated by Antonio’s statement
above, having access to people ‘here’ can provide work. I assert that having connections
outside of the ‘local’ may have an as an effect an increased ability to remain connected to
the “local” context. There are also aspects of these men’s lives that denied them this
access to the local, which I demonstrate in the next chapter which especially concerns
Rafael.

Hector’s rapid oscillation between ‘staying’ and ‘going’\(^{26}\) paired with his
conversation about remaining ‘here’ for a while indicates that while migrants can be seen

\(^{25}\) Here I am referencing notions of the accelerated perception of time along with the decreasing importance
of distance forwarded by David Harvey in *The Condition of Postmodernity* (1990).
as being in a state of flux and indeterminacy, their imaginaries and desires can be extremely static or dynamic, but both can change rapidly. As the plans of Gabriel at Kearney Farms exemplified, identity and desires are also articulated as extremely rooted, established, and can extend well into the future:

Mitch: Do you plan to return to your country of origin in the future?
Gabriel: Of course. It’s my country. It’s my people. I came here to work. Only work, but I didn’t come here to live for my entire life. I only came to work for a time, and then when I leave for there, I go back there.
M: How many years do you think?
G: That I’ll be here? I would say at best another thirty years.

Paired with the 12 years he had already lived here, the total amount of time he would have effectively spent in the U.S., not counting return trips, would be 42 years. This viewpoint held by Gabriel both illustrates Malkin’s analysis of México as a “site of ‘life,’ of family and of meaning, the United States is a space for (wages) work” (2004, 77). Taken to the limits by living here his whole life, Gabriel constructs his relationship to “home” through these notions of life, “his” people, and to “here” through the somehow separate activity of work. The juxtaposition of these two stories presents two very different faces of migration and transnational identities.

While Hector may have not returned to his home in México, Gabriel’s extremely rooted identification with the ‘here’ as a site of work contrasts markedly against Hector’s departure. As Jorge said, most of the men here don’t last too long, because they aren’t serious enough about having a good job. The “desire for eventual return” expressed by Gabriel connotes diasporic characteristics of identities (Safran 1991). It can also be thought to illustrate the changing nature of the diasporic qualities of his identity since some of the factors must surely wax and/or wane during the course of a lifetime. Different men of course had different stories, and the unfolding of events and hires at the farm certainly illustrated the presence of different desires and imaginaries held by the men. Contributing to this desire for ‘eventual’ return articulated by Gabriel ‘here’ is that of his ‘ethnocommunal consciousness’ or identification with his country and ‘people’. As Gabriel illustrated, “It’s my country. It’s my people.” No ties ‘here’ seemed to be as important as the one that connected him to his ‘home country’. The return, “when conditions are appropriate,” and feeling “partly alienated and insulated from” the host society are also criteria of Safran’s (1991) that are invoked by this brief exchange. To earn enough to return ‘home’ and the impossibility of establishing a ‘home’ here, as evidenced by Gabriel’ statement, leaves no recourse to Gabriel but a distant, though inevitable return – if all goes as planned.

**Emotion and memory and social networks**

Memories and emotions, two intangible aspects of identities and identifications, unless associated with a material object, are ‘things’ in an unconventional sense. We take

---

26 This is not to produce a binary relationship between ‘staying’ or ‘going’. A huge number of possibilities exist within these two choices as well as between them. For example, returning, or oscillating may be an option that these two choices elides.
them with us, to and from, across and over borders that have definite effects in both locations. We share them in a disembodied sense if we invoke memories we have shared with another person through a phone call or a letter. Family ties, advice and encounters, all have very strong memories and emotions associated with them for most these men. In this section I recount some of the different ways emotions are expressed and remembered, both in a local sense as well as those that may have effects or be constituted through transnational space.

Rafael and his American partner, whom he travelled to México with, met his extended family. As Rafael recounted the trip, it seemed to be a time of distress, if not then, then now as he reflected on his thoughts about the encounter. He described some of the events, and was brooding over some of the advice he received in relation to his choice of partner.

Rafael: You know, like they say, “How you want to get married to an American girl?” Oh, it’s the same. You know, you try to go American. That’s a big part.

Mitch: What do they think of American women? What are things that they say?

Juan: They can’t cook…

R: Oh they say a lot of things. They say a lot of things. A lot of things. Like, they’re lazy. They’re lazy. They like to have the power, and everything. You know, like…you know it’s what the culture teaches them. My grandma says, “No. You’re Mexican, don’t get married to them.”

M: So she doesn’t like it that you’re…

R: No. Even like, they’ve been and everything. They met in México; they met her a couple times when they came here. And they say, “Do you love her?” And I say “Yes. Yes, I do.” “Ok. When do you go back?” I don’t know.

His choice had drawn rancor from his family on a few levels, expressed by such exchanges as the last. Rafael’s opinion of his family members seemed to be one that judged them for not being able to understand that people from different countries were basically the same. By citing “the culture” as something that has informed this narrow viewpoint in Rafael’s opinion, he also demonstrates that somehow, being outside this culture he has gained insight into its character. For Rafael, ‘culture’, embodied by his grandmother and father, invokes national boundaries as the boundary for appropriate social relations, especially as they relate to a potential partner.27 The reification of the cultural and national borders as the same line of demarcation border in this story is produced by many actors in different ways. Significantly, Rafael was the one in his story who did not rely on the idea of a nation as the entity that defined the possibilities of relations. He saw himself as the rational actor who could evaluate individuals by their merits instead of arbitrary notions like national boundaries. Through this conversation Rafael constructs his masculinities in relation to not only family members, the state,

27 For an analysis of the ways in which transnational identity constructions affect social relationships such as marriage and the perceptions of potential partners see Goldring (2001).
culture, and individual social relations, but also generationally, with the invocation of his grandmother’s forbiddance. His first response also holds a notion as to how he constructs his masculinities. If by, “You know, you try to go American. That’s a big part,” Rafael meant that to get an American wife was a means to legitimating his self, it seems he has fallen into the same mode of thought for which he criticized his father and grandmother.

Several of the men in this study lived here with family members – some migrants, others citizens. Of men who had married women from the United States, none thought they would return home “for good”, clearly an indication of establishing roots in their new “home” through their new families. Many did not seem to want to return to their home country permanently, wanted to visit but return to the U.S., or were generally ambivalent about the idea. Roman stated that even though he did want to return home he found himself here, continually deferring his return to continue to try to accumulate wealth, even though this was proving hard to do. We can see again here how “the local”, broadly written, is both formed by and forms the people who live there. Each story is informed by a plan or tactic, an imaginary future, even though this tactic may have to have been retooled to continue to allow a functional existence in the ‘local’ or to maximize the benefits that the move here was intended to create. This is not to use an economically deterministic argument, but instead to say that economically informed intentions of these men’s lives, along with those related to family, emotion, desires, and imaginaries seem to play a major part as indicators for future decisions.

With three exceptions, the men on these farms said they didn’t participate in any local social organizations. The three that did went to the church or participated in an occasional sports team. As far as emotions and memory in the local, ‘here’ in Lexington, some had ties involving social organizations such as the Church that constituted some form of connection with their communities in México.

Mitch: Do you participate in any community organizations?
Antonio: Like, the church sometimes.
M: Catholic church?
E: Yes. Catholic.
M: Do you go with people?
E: No, not really.
M: Do you confide in any of these organizations for help?
E: Yes, them too.
M: For business? Social assistance?
E: Yes, social. Or well, also if I have a problem, I go there for help.
M: Do you look to other people in the church, or the priest, or just people in the congregation?
E: Yes, them too. And the father.

It is of interest here that Antonio claimed that he not only relied on members of the congregation but also the father for help, a figure that could be interpreted as an omni-local symbol of assistance or help. Of course, Antonio could also have a personal relationship with the father, therefore bypassing the symbolic significance of the father. It could also be a combination of the two. While Antonio didn’t claim to have friends on the farm, or socialize outside the workplace with his coworkers, he did participate in
other social networks. The church for Rafael, while not very important in a religious sense, also represented a support network. It was in effect a tie to his home community across the México-U.S. border.

Mitch: Is religion very important to you?
Rafael: Well, you know, it isn’t really important. My wife, she’s another religion. I’m Catholic and she’s not.
R: Yeah, Protestant. It’s all like Christians. I say Christians and other Catholics. She’s Christian, and I’m Catholic. So, we cannot go two places. Sometimes I go with my father-in-law ’cause he’s Catholic. [It’s] [i]n English, I don’t understand it at all, but it’s all the same.
M: Pretty much.
R: Like “the peace”, you guys…
M: Shake hands…
R. It’s already done. I feel, like, more in my culture, you know?

While the church does not seem to supply Rafael with any spiritual services, the congregation, symbols and highly ritualized services of the Catholic Church could be some of the things Rafael sees as establishing a tie with his “culture”. While the Church’s position, especially concerning the Americas, is questionable, “on the ground” it is practiced by members of communities and interpreted, translated, and shared. It establishes ties and common grounds that apparently, in Rafael’s case, are large parts of constructions of identities. The Catholic Church can be seen as a government of its own, but the articulation between México and the U.S. through embodied practices can be read differently. In these brief dialogues, the religion is a transnational network that can be accessed to connect across borders, with personal “cultures”. While ‘local’ in terms of support networks, services, and social ties, it could also be seen to be a ‘translocal’ site that is produced and maintained from a circulating population, each with their various definitions of the ‘local’ and connections to transnational spaces. Out of the 13 or so men interviewed, only four said they had attended a church here. Only two of these men said he relied on the church for any kind of assistance.

This absence of participation in these organizations could be indicative of an attitude Napolitano – Quayson (2005, 356) articulated of a group of migrant men from México living in California. This article purported that the use of these services was perceived through notions of “dependence” that “nurture[d] an area of weakness, conformity, and feminization of male subjectivity”, something to be avoided in an unfamiliar location. This attitude towards dependence can be seen out of an interview with Roberto and his son Ivan.

Mitch: Are there problems [in your community]?
Roberto: Only economical. The economy.
M: The economical problems don’t cause other problems?
R: No, no. Well, yes, economically, that is to say if you don’t have money, you don’t have a house… Here, it’s a little more about not having money, and there, no. There you don’t have anything.
M: Those people with economic problems, do they use organizations for social assistance, or no? Are there programs, or no?
R: No, no. There isn’t anything.
Ivan: Everyone is independent.
R: Every person is.

In México, Roberto and his son, Ivan, stressed people’s independence. There was a certain sense of pride in the words of Ivan, the son of Roberto – independence seemed to be a sign of strength or ability. Roberto, his father, seemed to be a little less sure about the way to interpret this independence. Of course, Ivan’s statement, which seemed to amend his father’s previous admission as to why people from his community didn’t use social services, was said to me, a white, university student, asking about the use of social services. It also is formative of their identities ‘here’ – a portrayal of their identities to a stranger interviewing them about their identities. Asserting the possibility of living ‘independently’ from social services constructs not only Ivan’s identity, but the community from which he came. While I asked vaguely about their community, for them, “their community” was the one in Veracruz. It is telling that Roberto has been here around five years, yet what he imagines as his community firmly rooted in his home, the city of Veracruz. He and his son said they will stay another two and three years, respectively, so again, along with Gabriel, the move here is considered temporary. Safran’s (1991) diasporic characteristic of “eventual return” is a strong feeling here, tangible and in the near future. Family ties, advice and encounters, all have very strong memories and emotions associated with them for most these men. These can be seen to access memories and emotions that were experienced in the case of Rafael, or transferred to an object or network here as exemplified by the relationships Rafael and Antonio had with the church.

Transnationalism from above: Identities in Relation to states

While a helpful delimitation of a unit of analysis, I depart here from Portes et al.’s call for it to be performed at the levels of individual, their social relations, networks and communities. I do so to incorporate some evidence of the “broader institutionalized structures” to give embodied accounts of the effects of some of the articulations of ‘transnationalism from above’ (Guarnizo and Smith 1998). Transnational space is not articulated, mobilized and mediated through the grounded everyday practice of individuals within social networks but other by actors such as the state through practices of governance and economic activities. While ‘transnationalism from below’ can “transcend the territorial and political boundaries of states,” Itzigsohn sounds a pertinent call to recognize “new forms of intervention by the states of origin in the politics of the country of reception” (2000, 1127); I would argue to watch for the reverse as well.

Through the conceptualization of transnationalism from above (Guarnizo and Smith 1998), these migrants’ transnational identities are mediated through the states of both the ‘sending’ and ‘home’ countries. According to the farm manager at Douglass farms the men who obtained some form of authorization28 had to produce evidence of specific amounts and certain forms of property in their home country. Manuel’s efforts

28 The type of authorization that the worker had was not discussed at the time of the interview.
to gain a work visa embody these expectations made by the state. “[H]e showed that he had a house and was paying bills so that, you know, he would have a reason to go back. So that's why he got one [work authorization]. But if they couldn't show that they owned property or had a reason to go back... You know family's not good enough.” According to immigration-law.com, “proof of unabandoned foreign residence or intent to return to the home country” (Oh 2008) is required for many types of visas. Here we can see that the United States makes demands on both migrants and the countries of origins for migrants forcing those contemplating work or a visit in the U.S. to comply with its demands. These demands include property regulation, ownership, documentation, and maintenance along with the establishment of information delivery mechanisms and protocols between states which indicate the reification and reiteration of a ‘global neoliberal economic regime’ signaled by Guarnizo and Smith (1998, 7). At the local, the body, it forces the family or individual to enter into a legal relationship with the Mexican state so as to attain some arbitrary level of legitimacy in relation to the U.S. state as a person who can cross borders. That is, the transnational spaces between the U.S. and México shapes and limits access to transnational spaces for the individual embodied person. It also, by definition, describes the ways in which that space is to be transgressed.

Another approach to thinking about the embodied effects of ‘transnationalism from above’ and how it is articulated through identity constructions of these men comes from (re)interpretations a few of these men had concerning “driving under the influence”, or drunk driving, as it occurs and is confronted in both their ‘sending country’ and in Lexington, KY. As was evidenced by an interview with both Rafael and Juan, the existence of drunk driving in his home community was so prevalent as to achieve the status of doxa, or norm. Rafael. In México, talking about the law, you know it’s…even if we’re close to the United States, it’s really, really different. For one the government. At best, the type of life. Not saying that the culture, because the culture has nothing to do with it there. It doesn’t, you know like, the culture, [has] nothing to do with it. Nothing. The culture is different. Sometimes, in México, you go to a bar, you drink and you drive and everything is ok. You can drink in the streets. Mitch: So is it the laws, say, are tighter here? R: But at the same time, I think it’s better, ok. M: Because of the safety? R: It’s much safer. M: In what way? R: Well, you avoid lots of accidents. That’s what’s good. Ivan: There’s much more protection for one, walking there’s more safety for one. R: Like, I don’t think here is, like it’s wrong. We’re wrong over there. M: Morally wrong? R: Yeah. M: Why? Why is it an issue? Why is it a question of morality?
R: I think it’s because of the government. The government there. They don’t listen to anyone.
M: In México? And here it’s different?
R: Here it’s different. Like, you know the same thing. Here it’s the same as in México. You work, you live, you work. It’s the SAME thing, it’s the same thing.

If there were laws against drunk driving Rafael seemed to believe that they were not enforced. The orthodoxy in the U.S. (legislation prohibiting driving under the influence) was contrasted with the socially accepted norm in México and then interpreted by Rafael and Juan. Their interpretations through the embodied experience of living in two nations with different laws and different attitudes towards enforcement are articulated through living in transnational space. The influences of these interpretations on these men’s identities have definite effects in their embodied locations. Rafael’s and Juan’s comments show that laws play a role these men’s dynamic identities, and acts as a force or actor in these men’s reinterpetations of their morals and norms. While it can be argued that the U.S. government’s legislation against drunk driving is not necessarily a morally informed instance of the legal culture of the U.S., it is interpreted as such by the interview with Rafael and Juan.

Of course, this change in Rafael’s attitude could be conceptualized otherwise. The construction of masculinities that is here outlined by Rafael is conceptualized through his interpretation of the juridical bodies of two states, effected by his transnational subjectivity. This aspect of his masculinities identity construction could also be approached through notions of a renegotiation with femininity and space as a result of his changing subjectivity in the reality of transnational life. Many aspects of migrant life “obliges men to adopt several practices that are usually associated with the construction of femininity, such as being tied to the house, [or] perceiving the street as a threat…” (Malkin 2004, 79). Hence, Rafael, as he negotiates his identity ‘here’, is compelled to reinterpret such issues as driving under the influence, or drinking in the streets. Both the laws that parallel this negotiated identity, and the subject position of Rafael, in my argument, are created or experienced as the effects of processes understood by the concept “transnationalism from above”.

**Identities and Citizenship**

Following Leitner and Ehrkamp (2006), I read the interviews conducted at the farms to see what the participants had to say concerning identities and citizenship. I take identities to be ways in which people “conceive of themselves and are characterised by others” (Vertovec 2001, 573). This accentuates the “meaning and value they assign” to these notions of belonging, their interpretations of citizenship demonstrated through their practices and performances in both their local and transnational lives (Leitner and Ehrkamp 2006), as well as the effects that others impose on the participants identities (Vertovec 2001).

---

29 I wish to highlight that drinking and driving, while a choice for those who do drink and drive coerces an acceptance from those who do not.
Jorge has lived here for sixteen years, though he has visited his home of Torreón multiple times. He married an American woman and is also a citizen of the U.S., though he had almost received his citizenship prior to and separate from his marriage. His preliminary response was to the following question was extraordinarily elaborate, invoking ideas of transition and fluctuation, belonging and citizenship, as well as insecurity and desire.

Mitch: What do you think of when I say ‘your home’?
Jorge: This place. This is home to me. This is home to me. And I look at it like, with my mom and daddy, you know I'm lucky to still have them around. So I have to go spend Christmas over there. And my wife, you know, she's American, and my kids, they all love it over there. They love it… And I can't wait to, to get away from this, you know, cuz, here, in America, it's good. It's good and this is home to me.

In this short quotation, Jorge invokes notions of belonging, family, travel, place, and social ties. He constructs his identity out of these relations, effectively creating a multi-site identity. His parents are ‘there’, at his previous home. He visits them; he takes his wife and children to Torreón to see them. He can’t wait to get away from the U.S. Yet, this place, Lexington, Kentucky, his family, the U.S., is now home to him. His ties to his parents remain strong enough to warrant an expensive journey to Torreón, and to journey there with his wife and children. To further disambiguate his feelings and identity, as well as notions of citizenship, I return to a later excerpt.

Jorge: …So, you know, I had to study hard to pass the test so I went over there [México] and [did] it… I'm proud because I don't have to mess with that stuff anymore. I told my wife that, "I know you all look at me like I'm different, but I feel like one of you guys." You know, I love this country, you know, I say, I told people, this country has done more for me than México did when I was there, so I love this country. And this is home to me.

Where is a good point at which to begin to unpack this sort of constellation of personal identifications as well as identifications actively interpreted by Jorge as those made by ‘the community’ or the State? Clearly Jorge identifies the family and the location of it as primary identifications, but he also adheres to the U.S. as a primary source of identification. All of the affiliations are not internal or actively produced by the self. Jorge alludes to sharing his feelings of estrangement with his wife, feeling disconnected from being completely ‘here’ by the interpretations of those he comes into contact with. Their apparent demarcation of him as the Other not only partially forms his identity but sets up mental and physical boundaries which he is inhibited from crossing without the dissolution or alteration of this relationship of the self and the Other. So even while

---

30 This affiliation with the U.S. government is an interesting one. Obviously the legal status of Jorge informs part of his identity, but it is also dependent upon his relation to it.
31 These boundaries can be dissolved, constituted and reified by multiple actors and networks, giving Jorge a range within a limit of possibilities of challenging such constructions.
Jorge says he feels that he is “one of you guys [an American]” his previous statement marks him as not quite being able to feel like “one of you guys”. This quote highlights how ‘here’ or ‘the local’ is constructed by those who are not from the community that are already ‘here’. Massey (1993) has shown that the local ‘scale’ is imbricated in a host of other scales, networks, and processes, and informs how, even though Jorge identifies with the ‘here’, at the same time he is connected, sometimes willingly, sometimes unwillingly, to other networks, scales, and the Mexican state. Hence, the local for is not an autonomous construction, but is a construction of others at that place, and those through which we relate at a distance. Jorge’s insistence that he feels as though “one of you guys” implicates those in the host community to come to terms with himself, who he feels is Othered, but who is legally and in very real physical, mental, and social senses of the concept of citizenship, “one of [us]”.

Translocal Identities

The following two examples demonstrate more clearly the overlap of local and transnational identities. The first example is simply a brief account of his and his family visiting his hometown of Torreón. The second is a more complicated story of how he and his compadres utilize his role as compadre to increase the mobility of those in their social network.

Jorge of Douglass farms has taken many trips to his home in México. “I take my family – it’s a vacation for them. They look forward to going there, and I do too... I’ve lived here for 16 years, am married to an American, have [three children], I’ve been a U.S. citizen for 8 years.” A vacation, in contrast to the rest of the year, is usually a time of respite, indulgence, escape observance, or otherwise. Vacations are saved up for, and one unequally exchanges capital for enjoyment, while during the rest of the year the opposite is usually true. Jorge and I often talked about his vacations to Torreón, eating with the family, being overfed, tipping the scales, visiting friends and relatives, and relaxing at his parents’ house. The increased mobility, for Jorge, to travel to and from México is linked through the obtainment of legal citizenship in the U.S. This allows him increased embodied “access” to his family en el otro lado. In turn, this strengthens the connections between the two “families” – the one ‘here’ and the one ‘there’. This relationship that Jorge shares with his family on both sides of the border does not indicate a ‘stronger’ social field than that that was experienced by Rafael and his partner above, only one articulated differently.

Jorge: [Y]ou have to have your vacation. And that's what I do. I go back about three weeks in December, to Torreón. It's about six hours from Laredo Texas, so I'm not that far away.

These types of relationships evade any sort of quantitative analysis, often consisting of nuances and shades of emotion and associative aspects of experiences rather than quantity of visits or phone conversations. Even the distance to the destination is perceived very differently case by case. For Jorge, he’s “not that far away”, while for other it may seem an incredibly difficult or impossible trip at the moment. The yearly trip by Jorge across the México-United States border and the yearly encounters of the
individuals ‘from’ ‘here’ and ‘there’ within his family produce an inestimable number of influences that occur effectively across and sometimes as an effect of the boundaries of nations. This relationship entails, just as Levitt and Glick-Schiller have held to be evident of the social field, “interlocking networks of social relationship through which ideas, practices, and resources are unequally exchanged, organized and transformed” (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004). However, Jorge discussed another example of his identity which strategically accessed transnational spaces to aid those that did not have his amount of access. This example incorporates ideas of compadrazgo into the field of social relations that constitute the transnational spaces and identities that are discussed above. *Compadrazgo is a social relation established through baptism between the child’s parents and two compadres who have special duties and responsibilities regarding the child’s spiritual and moral development.*

Bloch and Guggenheim (1981) make an excellent contribution to the analysis of *compadrazgo* in the areas of both its function as a social institution as well as a concept worthy of analysis in its own right. My analysis will only focus on the function of *compadrazgo* as the conceptualization was not explored in the interviews conducted at the farms. The article begins with a brief summary of two earlier works that expanded the understanding of *compadrazgo* in two important ways. First, Mintz and Wolf (1950) focused primarily on the capacity of the ties created by compadrazgo to “further social solidarity, both within and between social classes” (in Bloch and Guggenheim 1981, 377) and second, Eisenstadt (1956) saw compadrazgo as a social relation that “served to create or solidify social relationships” (in Bloch and Guggenheim 1956, 90). Returning to the analysis of Jorge’s cross border travel to visit his loved ones we encounter a relationship he has defined as one of compadrazgo. Jorge has two friends from México, now living here, who asked him to be the compadre their children. The children are U.S. citizens, being born in the U.S. Jorge, through consultation with his wife, has taken on the role of a compadre to two children which allows them to visit their grandparents in México. Thus Jorge’s identity and access to transnational space, allows him to mobilize this space for the benefit of others that may not have such access to or physical access across transnational space. His mobility in this field allows him to create and solidify relationships with those here, while at the same time it highlights evidence of his transnational identity as one that is socially functional and mobile. This example also illustrates how Vertovec’s (2001) call to examine how “[p]rocesses and patterns conditioning the intergenerational succession and reproduction of transnational ties” might be approached. By interviewing the children of migrants who, with their parents and compadres, strategically use the social networks created through relations of *compadrazgo*, a form of strategic transnationalism may be incorporated into the studies of transnationalism. It also would expand this study’s sparse engagement with these men’s or others family lives and the identifications associated within those relations. The implications of this project could be far reaching in terms of social networks, emotional and familial ties across borders, as well as travel and connections that may be relied upon in the future.
Conclusion

The men in my study were active propagators of transnational spaces. Transnational spaces were reiterated through such actions as visiting families, vacationing, or temporary migration for employment. They were also created and sustained through imaginaries, communication, and social networks that created social and economic capital. The characteristics of these transnational spaces varied by individual, often represented by an imagined space of belonging, return or morality. The characteristics of their identities in transnational space were articulated as fluid, detached, more complex, and (dis)empowering. Some men, Jorge specifically, explicitly invoked features of a disambiguous transnational identity, with regular travel across borders, a partner from the U.S., and his compadres here, whom he aided through his empowering characteristics of this identity – namely dual citizenship.

While there are certainly other frameworks for interpreting identities among migrants, such as assimilationist approaches or multiculturalism, I forward that transnationalism as demonstrated here avoids many of the deficiencies of these approaches. Transnationalism does not indicate that migrants necessarily adopt the ‘host’ culture, nor does it assume that the ‘host’ culture does not have effects on migrant identities, or identities of the ‘host’ – it also rejects the notion of a coherent or unified ‘host’ population. It is a wide framework for understanding the seemingly contradictory ways that people articulate identities, in these cases, across national borders. Transnationalism is also applicable at multiple scales, in different networks, and is omni-directional in terms of social transformation. In summary, it is a complex and multifaceted framework for understanding the novel ways in which social life is articulated, the decreasing space between imagined nations, and the roles that each have imbricated in the other.
Chapter 4

Constructing Masculinities: Perspective of ‘Home’, Citizenship, and Belonging in Transnational Spaces

This thesis takes masculinities to be socially constructed. They are at the same time informed by and inform relations of power and social relations. As theoretical and empirical work has demonstrated, these power and social relations are not static and do not “fix” identities in place, but can be fluid, complex, resistant, and negotiable (Conell 2000, 22-23). They are also mutually constituted by other variables, such as race and class (McDowell 1999, 21; Kobayashi and Peake 1994). Within gender studies, those concerning a detailed engagement with theories of masculinities have been gaining focus as issues concerning hegemonic or oppressive masculinities to more liberatory aspects of masculinities are gaining critical attention. The intersection of the fields of transnationalism/diasporic spaces and gender/masculinities contributes to work that recognizes potential for these identities to be molded and transformed anew, as well as relying on or engaging less progressive identities to be relied on in times of crisis or transition. This is to state that not all of these narratives of transition will be liberatory, but articulations of masculinities across local or transnational space will be attended by both positive and negative aspects regarding the potential for social, political or economic reform.

This chapter will focus on three experiential spaces that, when taken together, trace an idea about the elastic and malleable nature of masculinities and gender identities more broadly. The two ‘scales’ of analysis will be the local and the transnational spaces. By asking the men about the locations both ‘here’ and ‘there’ and in transition it is possible to extrapolate a more complex theory of how masculinities and other constructions of gender identities influence and are influenced and constituted in part by transnational spaces and journeys.

Where I’m from – “Home” and social life

Where I come from tryin' to make a livin'
Workin' hard to get to heaven
Where I come from
Yeah where I come from
A lotta front porch sitiin'
Starin' up at heaven
Where I come from  

(Alan Jackson 2003)

32 By using “the local” I do not wish to pit this spatial referent against the global or transnational as a hierarchically determined location or term. The local for me also incorporates many different scales and networks, and cannot be bounded by such concepts as the city, or the body. It includes many manifestations of scale and positionality.

33 This quote from Alan Jackson’s, Where I’m From, was cited by one of the respondents when asked about his favorite songs. It highlights notions of movement, (be)longing, the law, ‘home’, and struggle. I incorporate a verse to begin each section to try to evoke some of these notions.
Most of the conversations that comprise this section began by asking questions about what “home” meant to the respondents, as well as from conversations about the differences between communities ‘here’, and in their ‘home’ cities or communities. The interviews contain ideas about growing up, family life, and other social relations. Growing up in the city of Michoacán, Rafael alleged that his father was the undisputed head of the household:

Like, the man works, and the wife just stays at home… [M]y father has all the education. He was an engineer in México. He went through college, my dad, and my mom didn’t. [M]y mom always said, ‘No, your father is the provider.’ It’s like, ‘He can do it…and I cannot.’ I think this is the problem. Some women, they don’t know.

This exchange highlights some of the more ‘traditional’ constructions of gender roles. In the area of gender symbolism it is marks the devaluation of women’s work as “not really work” – “[T]he man works, and the wife just stays at home,” said Rafael. This statement thought through gender organization (McCall 1992) can highlight the hierarchical division of employment or that the job market could inform this family’s gender order.

In the analytical category of gender identity there is an interesting manifestation of the intersections between power and hegemony. Rafael characterizes his mother as not only compliant with the gender organization but as an active agent of buttressing the power and position of the patriarch, the power of the father over the family. This is not to say that the mother had no influence in family matters, including the management of money or influencing decisions concerning familial or more general social roles, but that the father was recognized by Rafael to be ultimate authority – the one who does. The work of the mother was not recognized as a position of authority or power. To offset this unfair univocal view of his family structure it is notable that he mentioned that the only person to graduate from the group of his siblings was one of his sisters. How this result was achieved, and from what intersections of his sister’s own agency with the influence exerted from one of his parents (and which one) would be an interesting issue to discuss with the Rafael or his family members.

The “traditional” gender roles held by women were also constructed by the men throughout the interviews by way of the division of labor within the households as well as in issues concerning general mobility within the community. When asked about the differences between women in México and here, in the U.S., Ignacio responded that women here were ‘freer’. “[In my hometown] [t]hey have to have permission [to leave the house], or if not they have to take their fathers or brothers hand-in-hand at their side.” Later, when describing some of the differences between women “here” and in their hometowns, Felix commented women’s responsibilities were generally to have the food ready and the clothes ironed. Ignacio responded to Felix’s comments that that was, “[g]ood, but you know…The Mexican woman… I mean, usually the Mexican woman don’t work in my hometown. She’s just waiting for… her husband to provide.” The circumscription of women, both physically (by occupation, work, or constructions/representations of public space) and mentally (through notions of gender

34 It is unknown here is Rafael meant that she had graduated high school or college. He stated that he had finished middle school and no more, so it could be either.
roles) reinforces hegemonic binary oppositions where they are performed. In Felix’s account, the Mexican woman becomes the symbol of the home and of the nurturer, a passive person who is there just waiting for the man to “do”. Ivan stated that “in México women can stay at home. And here they have to work.” So from Ivan’s viewpoint, men can also conversely construct their identities as those that provide – the person in the household who ‘does the work’ and is the guarantor of safety.

However, for these men this patriarchal and hierarchical gender organization does not translate neatly across national borders. Ivan said that, speaking of the situation here in the U.S., “economically speaking, it’s better if both work”. Framing it as an economic issue, Ivan cast doubt on the ability of a couple to “make it” without both partners working, thus jeopardizing constructions of masculinities that rely on ideas of benevolent patriarchs who provide. The intersections of the gendered nature of the family structure and work took on a new light through Rafael’s interpretation. Talking about the differences between women ‘here’ in the U.S. and ‘there’ in Michoacán, Rafael said that:

[H]ere, you know, she works too. Like, most of the time you feel like you’re living with a man too because it’s the same. Even in México, even if you are the same, but the man is a little bit above, you know?

This quote emphasizes three different aspects of the relationship Rafael interpreted between men and women in his experience. The first is the fact that Rafael readily perceived the relationship between men and women in his ‘home’ as a hierarchical one, noted by the man being “a little bit above”. The second is the emphasis placed on the equalizing tendencies of economic independence of women within a household. In this instance, it effectively makes women men. The other aspect of this relationship is the transnational untranslatability of this “naturalized” hierarchical difference. Rafael’s transnational gender identity can be seen in this instance to have incorporated the realization that this was naturalized inequality. What this changes in his home or across borders is a subject for another inquiry.

Respeto para todos – Masculinities in Lexington, KY

Well I was rollin’ wheels and shiftin’ gears
’Round that Jersey Turnpike
When Barney stopped me with his gun
ten minutes after midnight
Said sir you broke the limit in this rusty ol’ truck
I don’t know about that accent son
Just where did you come from? (Alan Jackson 2003)

Respect was a key component of the men’s constructions of their identities. Juan talked of respect, education, and the presence of a good home regarding the way in which to raise children to be “good people”. Rafael broadened this understanding of respect, saying that his parents “always [taught] us… everyone is equal. It doesn’t matter race, color, size, age, culture, tradition – everyone is equal… [Y]ou need to have respect for all people.” This notion of respect isn’t just thought of as one that was practiced before the
men arrived in this country, but the men stressed it as one of the prevailing attitudes here, now, and in this place – a universal. Tellingly, Ignacio expanded upon this notion of respect, saying that it crossed gender as well as age. I asked Ignacio, “For you, what is the difference...What is the significance of being a man... What do you do that makes...someone a man, actually?” He replied, “To have responsibility... In everything, every day... In work, economy, and respect...”. I asked him, if he had had children, what he would tell them that would make them a good woman or man. He replied, “If I have them? It's the same, to have respect.” This emphasis on respect is one key moral discourse by which these men construct their masculinities.

To return to Rafael’s statement however, his interpretation of respect as a social quality that a person must have if they are to be a good person has a glaring omission. Where is sex? Where is gender? What does its absence indicate? There is no gender binary here, there is no role for gender to play in the “ongoing construction of social institutions” (McCall 1992). I do not mean to ascribe to this a stable or fixed perception on Rafael’s part. Rafael’s statement of equality is an honest one – he seemed to really believe in his utopic vision, but it also is indicative of other possibilities. His omission can be thought of as emphasizing the ethnic/racial discrimination he has encountered here or indicative of issues of respect that might involve his experiences as a marginalized or Othered person. He positions himself within these categories, perhaps accentuating those categories that are most influential in relation to his identity construction. It is quite a complete list, ignoring his omission of gender and sex. Femininity and women in this statement are, in effect the Other that is not acknowledged. While possibly unfair to highlight this in the face of the spirit of equality and respect that Rafael was trying to bear, the omission is remarkable. Rafael’s account indicates that while his experiences involving equality were informative or formative, they do not seem to cross into inequalities that occur or are produced from gender relations.

**Reinterpreting masculinities: alternative perspectives**

While it is not helpful to look for “resistance everywhere”, nor to produce a normative framework for theorizing masculinities, a certain exchange during my fieldwork did present me with an opportunity to “develop a third narrative discourse” regarding the analysis of these men’s masculinities (Limon 1989, 472). The particular episode, in which the men performed an operation on a mare who was about to give birth, presents the possibility for a reinterpretation of the intersection of symbols, organization, and identities that provides an alternate perspective of some “masculinities” that are considered lacking or bereft of respect while also demonstrating the oppressive aspects of some masculine identities. To highlight the nature of these gender identities as contingent and relational processes renders them at one and the same time both liberatory and oppressive – informed by and able to be affected through the inequalities that inhere in power relations. Drawing on Bakhtin’s interpretations of degradation and the *carnivalesque* I interrogate more straightforward interpretations of masculinities to reinterpret these identities as part of a continuous dialogue considering oppressive and liberatory gender identities and interpretations. To do so is not to intone that these interpretations are the correct ones, but that more nuanced and sometimes difficult to
discern mechanisms might be at work in the articulations of masculinities than might be first guessed.

Bakhtin’s notions of degradation and the carnivalesque help to navigate the production of meaning here in relation to their masculinities. For Bakhtin the uncontrollable base emotion of laughter and its annunciation seem to perform the work of degradation.

To degrade… means to concern oneself with the lower stratum of the body, the life of the belly and the reproductive organs; it therefore relates to acts of defecation and copulation, conception, pregnancy, and birth. Degradation digs a bodily grave for a new birth; it has not only a destructive, negative aspect, but also a regenerating one. (Bakhtin 1984, 211 in Limon 1989, 480)

Hence, degradation needs to be understood as destructive and regenerative. The principal connection to Bakhtin’s conceptualization of degradation is that the operation and the men’s conversation (and laughter) concerned the reproductive organs of the mare.

In the few trips Jorge and I took in his truck, delivering hay, feed, or tools to each barn, conversation occurred rapidly across a wide range of topics. These ranged from problems he had with citizenship to the amount of food he ate while visiting his family in Torreón. One conversation began by me asking him about delivering horses. Jorge was the man in the crew who would be at every birth of a foal. He remarked that while most births proceeded without problems sometimes there would be problems at birth which would require special attention such as a foal emerging in an incorrect manner – a nerve-wracking experience. I asked if he enjoyed the work that he did on the farm. Jorge’s answer here became complicated. It turned into a conversation that involved issues of birth, care, capital on the farm, wages, and contradictory attitudes that involved the mares and foals. For Jorge, in certain regards, the job was very rewarding – delivering animals and caring for them, making sure they were healthy, and getting to know their personalities were things that he enjoyed. However, in addition to these feelings, Jorge perceived large inequalities between the relationships on the farm. This was expressed in a few exchanges that implicated the nature of the capital investment that was put into the horses, the amount of money that the foals sold for, and the wages of the workers on the farm. He stressed that while it was unfair, it was how the industry operated, and put no blame on the individual farm. It is in light of these conflicting notions of responsibility, care, and inequality (monetary, gender, and racial) that I forward the following analysis.

Later that same day we took samples of blood from several horses to determine how far along they were in their pregnancies. “We have to open up this mare” Jorge said as we walked back to the mess hall to gather some materials. Ignacio took a wooden pole about four feet tall with a length of rope looped through the top. The third person, Hector was the new man on the farm and this was his first day on the job. He was replacing one of the few workers who had left the farm around Christmas and hadn’t returned, opting instead to stay in México for the time being. We walked outside the room into the main stall, heading for the mare’s stall. They positioned her between the sides of the gate of her stall. Ignacio, inside the stall, took the wooden pole, pulled the loop around the horse’s nose and twisted it to establish a pinching grip on a tender part of the horse.
Jorge and I had talked earlier about delivering foals and some of the difficulties and procedures that attended the operations. I didn’t expect to see one of those that day, which frankly, I was not prepared for. What this entailed was a sterilization of the mare’s pubic region and then with surgical scissors cutting the area open to allow the horse to dilate properly for the birth of the foal. The entire procedure took less than five minutes which was enough for me to get nauseous two or three times. Surprisingly, the horse did not try to injure or fight the men during the operation, certainly aware of the loop tied around its nose.

The operation, if it is not obvious from the text, is not an easy one to watch, much less I’m sure, to perform. However the men involved seemed not to be bothered by it as much as I. They exchanged glances with me, Ignacio smirking self-consciously. Jorge was a man professionally intent on his job. Hector and I watched and nervously looked around, not knowing exactly what to make of the scene. There was an uncomfortable feeling between all of us in the room as well as expectation. Jorge made quick snips, ready at any moment to leave his position at the first sign of angering the mare. A conversation punctured the apprehensive air in the room, and occasionally there was a quick exchange of laughter in the room.

Only generally picking up what had been said during the operation, I asked Jorge about the conversation and laughter that had taken place. Jorge described the main instance of laughter during the operation. It was in reference to the genitals of the mare. One of the men made a joke about waking up with ‘that’ (the horse’s genitals) in the bed beside you, and the men shared a burst of laughter. The conversation concerning the grotesque body of the horse (for Bakhtin, the body that concerns reproduction, birth, death, and defecation) provides an example through which to interpret these men’s masculinities. Unfortunately, these conversations were not recorded, so the recollections of Jorge’s above and my meager grasp of our attitudes at the time must suffice.

Following Limon, this remark concerning the genitals of the horse, and by implication, penetration, “may... be symbolic expressions of an essentially political and economic concern with social domination, not from below,...but from above-from the upper levels of the structure of power in both countries” (Limon 1989). For the men, as intoned by the conversation with Jorge that began this section, the horse could represent or stand for a series of unequal exchanges between the farm and themselves, the laborers. Considering the amount of capital that mares, stallions and foals require, the amount of money that a foal can be sold for, together with the small degree of mobility in the vocational structure and attendant invisibility of the work performed on the farm, the horse itself may become the embodiment for much that is wrong with “the system”. The conversations with Jorge, above, indicated the perception of this unequal relationship. What is implied is that while the men did demean the aspects of reproduction and the grotesque body in the usual sense, their mockery of the horse could be (re)interpreted through the notion of degradation. In this instance, it is an act of renegotiation of their relationship to the farm, the farm owner, and employment.

However, Bakhtin’s notion degradation consists not only of degradation in the form of a humiliation or lowering, but also of a regenerative aspect that entails a conception and ‘new birth’ for the degraded object. How can take the men’s remarks at face value but also as an act that has not engorged itself on sexual innuendo? This labor may be a contradictory experience for these men. Jorge’s experience as a worker, on this
farm and another like it, were generally experiences of care and nurture in respect to these horses. The horses had personalities, and the men, through their work sometimes became emotionally attached to the horses. While these notions of care and nurture are usually not theorized from the viewpoint of masculinities, they were present for Jorge, and through our conversation, I think I can say that most of the other men felt these ties as well. Coupled with the actions of delivering foals, these men are directly engaged with aspects of life that are usually associated with femininities. This analysis shows that even in terms of the relationships and actions with and towards the horses on this farm, they are relationally constructed through issues involving gender and class, through unequal power relations between the laborers and the owners. Through these intersections, there are masculinities articulated that do not appear to be ‘traditionally’ masculine, or perhaps are hyper-masculinized. Considering relations with other co-workers, farm managers, and through relationships that were experienced outside of work, these men’s identities sometimes became more complex and fluid, while at others they seemed to withdraw into identities that offered more protection.

**Constructions of Masculinities in the Workplace**

The performative aspect of masculinities regarding the hierarchical organization of work on the farm was demonstrated at Kearney farms through a different kind of resistance. On Douglass Farms, the field boss was a man from México, who had obtained dual citizenship, lived in the U.S. for 16 years, and had only worked on the farm for eight months. I had very little contact with the man or woman (the duties seemed to be split on this farm) on Kearney farms who organized the work similar to Jorge.

On the day in question, Matthew, the field boss came into the room after I had talked with three of the men and they had shared some of their food with me. In English, Matthew told the men a list of things that they had to do for the period of work after lunch. The men seemed to understand, and Gabriel said softly but audibly, “Baquetón.” Rafael followed, “Baquetón.” Juan laughed through his nose, an outward gust, and Rafael cracked a smile. I looked at the manager, and it was evident he didn’t comprehend what had been exchanged. He basically said, “What does that mean?” Even though Rafael and Gabriel spoke English quite well they remained silent and looked at the floor, or the walls of the room. After the silence the manager, frustrated, said “Well, whatever. If you guys would just get to work, that would be good. See you later.” He left the room, and we all said our goodbyes.

Later I consulted a friend that studied at the university. As a native speaker she could lend insights into this exchange. As it happened there were two different interpretations of these responses which are quite specific. They both rely on the perception of the manager by the men through notions of hierarchy. If the manager was perceived as kind and/or asked them to do their work politely, *baquetón* would mean that the person is insolent, basically *perezoso* – lazy. If the manager was not liked, the translation would roughly be, “He’s lazy, but he *dares* to tell us to work!” The silence speaks about the limits and articulation of recourse to different types of subjectivity, hierarchies, and domination. While the men have no choice but to complete the work assigned to them at the risk of losing employment, they have mobilized one recourse – to create an uneasy relationship between themselves and the boss. These diminutive but
effective assertions of power inform another route to reclaiming some of the authority that these men acquiesce through the gulf of space that separates them from their home communities and familiar social networks. On Douglass farm there was a more relaxed atmosphere, and Jorge did similar work as the other men whom I interviewed. The relationship of the boss to the workers on each farm may have personal histories or other factors, but also might indicate places where the divisions of race, lived experience (through such connections as migration), and hierarchy overlap.

**Transnational spaces and the actor: Across the divide, through the divide, in the divide, and where is a divide? Are we in it?**

> Well I was south of Detroit City  
> I pulled in this country kitchen  
> To try their brand of barbecue  
> The sign said finger-lickin'  
> Well I paid the tab and the lady asked me  
> How'd you like my biscuit  
> I'll be honest with you ma'am  
> It ain't like mama fixed it  
> (Alan Jackson 2003)

The analysis hereafter demonstrates that transnationalism when paired with gender studies can generate insights concerning a project that has as one of its main focuses the challenge of hegemonic and/or oppressive masculinities as well as lauding and encouragement of liberatory or socially beneficial masculinities. Within studies on masculinities these insights indicate how gender is both articulated and performed through space, as well as dialectically intertwined with a host of identities and constraints that are absent, subdued, present or imperious in their host and home societies, cultures, neighborhoods, families, and state. To approach these manifestations of what are aspects of transnational masculinities within gender identities, I am going to invoke the scales of the State, the social and that of the person/body.

**Masculinities: The State and Home Reconsidered**

While not explicitly approached, through conversation the men delimited the state as that which had the ability to control entry into its territory, both physically and categorically through technologies of citizenship, employment, and enforcement. At the same time it was a provider of social services and propagator of law at multiple scales – the body, locally, nationally and transnationally.\(^{35}\)

While citizenship for many denotes the legal framework that surrounds identity to legitimate and legalize the body in the eyes of the state, other authors work to destabilize this notion. Staeheli and Nagel (2006) investigate the multiple meanings of citizenship in relation to notions of ‘home’. For Staeheli and Nagel, ‘home’ is:

> a bundle of contradictions. It conjures feelings of safety, belonging, and connection. It can be a site of violence, oppression and alienation. It is

\(^{35}\) See the discussion of property and labor migration above.
firmly rooted in place. It is an abstraction that extends beyond the walls of a house, linking people and relationships within the house with the external world. It is fixed and bounded. It is mobile and open. (ibid., 1599)

It is by focusing on the issues surrounding the notions of ‘home’ that Staeheli and Nagel try to understand the ways in which those in a certain community created places ‘here’, helped to maintain ties to multiple homes, and affected their “positioning as citizens within the United States” (ibid. 1600). Citizenship is also negotiated through ‘public space’, often through public displays, such as parades, or negotiations that occur through and (re)create that space (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2006). The men in this study replicated these ideas through the above notions of belonging, access, and ideas about the multiple locations of home.

Jorge is a U.S. citizen who migrated from México and received his legal citizenship through years of hard work, determination and tough decisions. He stated after reminiscing about the process, “I’m proud because I don’t have to mess with issues of citizenship anymore.” Jorge’s story is a complicated one, and one that bears witness to the dynamic juridical character of the national border between the U.S. and México, as well as personal crises involving issues of citizenship and identity. Jorge told me one day as we were moving feed to the horse barn that he once dated a woman from México. He continued, stating that helped to pay for her journey here, but had to end their relationship because his citizenship was coming up for review. “I couldn’t jeopardize that,” said Jorge. I didn’t press the issue much further, but the implication was, I believe, that he couldn’t be associated with someone who might not have been legal – it would have put his citizenship at risk. Hence, Jorge was in effect policing his own emotional borders while at the same time the national borders through a preemptive termination of a relationship – the main reasons for doing so being his precarious and dynamic relationship with the legal process of obtaining citizenship. Hence while Jorge was a citizen of México, he was involved in legal processes to become a citizen here, and forced to judge a relationship in an economical manner so as to protect his claim to citizenship.

Well before September 11th, 2001 Jorge always flew across the borders and never experienced problems entering or exiting the country. However, with recent border tightening measures he was forced to pay for his partner, mentioned above, to cross the border with the help of coyotes – people who are paid a sum in exchange to smuggle someone across a border. Often these journeys are dangerous and expensive, and according to Jorge, they require funding from someone who is sending money to the person from outside México. The above identities are also constructed out of the manner one must cross a border or bring a family member here. U.S. laws limit the mobility of both women and men in México and across the border, constituting the material reality with which people approach the subject of crossing the border into the U.S. The dangerous nature of the journey abetted by coyotes certainly does not stop women or men form crossing. However, men in my interviews portrayed it as a journey too dangerous to permit a woman to go on.

I asked about how September 11th affected the changes, but Jorge insisted that the major changes that restricted ease of travel were already taking place before September 11th.
Jorge: You know I think for women it’s even more dangerous than for guys. ‘Cause you know I heard a lot of girls they get raped on the way here. They can leave you somewhere, and you know… I knew two girls that got raped even with their husband[s] right there. And there’s nothing you can do. I can’t imagine you know if younger guy married in México, I would never leave my wife or try to bring her over.

The implication of Jorge’s passage indicates the relational character of his masculinities to the ‘home’, a partner, family, and the State. Without a family or wife he would consider crossing the border, but if he had them the journey would be too dangerous. He would not ‘bring her over’, but would not leave her either, though it is not known if he would not leave out of the fear of stability, loss or love. For many men on the farm though, this did seem to be much of a choice. Around half of the men had a wife and children in México that they were saving money to return to.

The men in this study also assume the role of provider, by choice or coercion, thus necessitating a journey to the U.S. to earn more money. It seems that some of these men were almost ‘cast out’ to accrue the capital that is needed for a livelihood before they can return home. At the same time they characterize the journey as being a way to secure a livelihood for their family or household their choices are limited, as Marx intoned, by their effectiveness to earn this livelihood. They are making their own history, exerting choices, but not entirely as they please or under conditions of their own choosing. Throughout the interviews, while admitting to a choice to come here, many also felt compelled by the economic position of México to migrate to find work for money. So while neither women, as solitary actors, nor the State forced a migration, the role these men played in their families, as well as the economic situation in México limits the realm of possibility when making a choice about how to earn a livelihood.

On a rancho, if men do not migrate for el norte, their masculinities may be called into question, but paradoxically this is where their masculinities may be stripped from them (Boehm 2008) The journey across the national borders, towards the U.S. is also interpreted as one of a ‘rite of passage’ providing an “accepted means of demonstrating their worthiness, ambition, and manhood” for many potential migrants, especially young males - jóvenes (quoted from Massey et. al 1994, see also Napolitano Quayson 2005). One of the participants was in-between the positions recalling notions of a “rite of passage” and one where he would be expected to play the role of provider. Ignacio’s only stated reason to be at the farm and in the U.S. was to earn a dower for his wife. What all of these relationships illustrate is a complex transnational space with, power, stories, emotion, money and imaginaries crisscrossing through and across, and sometimes mediated by those States. The men “here” of course articulate their masculinities in different ways. They can be the ‘hero’, they can fall prey to emotional distance from communities and social networks, and they can to some extent rewrite their national, racial, and gendered identities.

The Body and ‘Machistas’

During the interviews, if I felt comfortable with the participant, I would usually ask the men directly about machismo, or what was the significance of being un machista.
Roman responded that it was a word “[o]f a long time ago. It’s been a while since I’ve heard it. I haven’t heard that used for some time, that word.” The distance this statement evokes between Roman’s identity and those of a machista was quite pronounced. The quote accentuates Roman’s temporal distance from machista, which also invokes space. Jorge, on the other hand, didn’t imply that the word was obsolete, but one that he understood to be socially regressive. “Let’s say you're in México,” said Jorge, “you can like, make some decisions. Something like you take control.” The implication of “making decisions” for Jorge seemed to be that whatever decisions a macho made in México would be ones that were discouraged in his perception of the context of the U.S. Antonio had a more firm stance about the subject, saying, “[M]achismo, it’s something that isn’t good, that isn’t correct.” Sensing he was uncomfortable discussing the matter, it was quickly dropped. However it was defined, it seemed to be an identity that was held at arm’s length – something not correct which the men did not exercise or condone – everyone except Rafael. It seems Rafael had a nuanced and complicated relationship with the term.

We had talked a little about what the word machista meant for them, if it had any social validity or not, if it was still used as a way of describing a certain type of man. Juan and Rafael had answered earlier that a machista could be defined in different ways.

Juan: It means feeling with more rights than another being, or with more rights than a child, or you’re more pleasant than your children, you think more about yourself than them.
Rafael: I think machista isn’t an expression of education. Because there are people who have good studies, good schooling and are machistas... I think that, to me, the definition is an ignorant person. Not stupid – ignorant. That they understand, but don’t know.

By invoking rights in the discussion of identity it can be deduced that a machista identity may be specifically predicated or constructed upon the restrictions of rights of others, and both emotional or imaginary space and physical (rights to mobility/the ‘public’) space. Another important distinction here is between knowing and understanding – that is, the difference between being learned and being wise. What seems to be his intention is to implicate all social classes in the propagation of macho identities. However, this is what these men thought about machistas when they were asked about the word, what it meant. What would it mean when contemplating their identity?

I asked both men soon after if there were other words to describe men; for example, was there a word for an “honorable man”. The conversation quickly left this question, guided more by what Rafael apparently wanted to say on the subject. I quote at length.

Rafael: Well I think…well, let’s make one [word for a honorable man] up. ‘Cause I’m a machista, you know? I’m a machista. But in my case… No, I don’t feel safe. It’s without safety. First of all, I don’t have an education, I’m not legal here either, and she’s [his partner] legal. And I don’t have my family here with me. See how it is? You know a lot of
things, like, they don’t, a lot of things she has, I don’t have it. That’s why I feel like [makes a fist, shakes it in the air] you know?

Mitch: So you think that you act, or you are machista so that you can, almost like, defend.

R. Yeah, to defend. Here in my job, here in my house I have to be like that. I don’t know… But I don’t have a friend. Like, you know she has a lot of friends. Not a lot, but she has friends. I have friends, but they’re from my job. You know?

His remarks about why he thought he was un machista were mostly responses to situations and problems he faced ‘here’. For instance, Rafael’s family, living in México was seen as something which weakened his position ‘here’. He also felt that issues of citizenship emasculated his identity here, or better said, made him vulnerable and insecure. Access to social networks was also raised as a reason for his reliance upon a macho identity. This was not an identity that he viewed as being desirable, but one that he had little recourse but to accept or engage because of his perceived and demonstrable vulnerability, separated from the social, juridical and economic power that would, in effect, legitimate his identities as an independent person, a partner, or man. While not all of these feelings are based on the existence, establishment, or maintenance of the State or its boundaries, and while they have effects and are engaged at the level of the body, the separation, vulnerability, etc. are all predicated on the role of the State as arbiter or author of some of the boundaries within which Rafael constructs his identity. To emphasize this point, it is important to say that while Rafael’s education is cited as one source of vulnerability, his legal status is also a source of apprehension and confinement. It is Rafael’s identity articulated through and across national boundaries and in transition between them that has made him “vulnerable” and “solitary”.

One last remark of Rafael’s changes the understanding of this articulation of masculinities once again. It concerns the relations he has with his partner, and contradictory experiences and feelings concerning those attachments. After Rafael said the above passages, he interrupted my question to Juan, which concerned Juan’s interpretations of machismo and machistas.

R: Well you know, like, I feel I have my feelings for her. And I feel that… different you know? Being machista? And it’s hard to be like that, because if it wasn’t for her I wouldn’t be here.

Clearly his perception of his wife as a relation he should be thankful for was an important point to stress for Rafael, and so made because he probably perceived shrinking opportunity from which to make this claim, and to define some thoughts on his own masculinities. Thinking through Rafael’s articulation and interpretation of his masculinities through gender symbolism, organization and identity helps to parse out his these statements of experiences within a larger context.

It is evident from the quotation above that Rafael’s identity as a machista was something fairly recent, one that he was grappling to come to terms with and interpret for himself. His identity is one that has close parallels with femininities that are regulated by occupational sex segregation, mobility, education, etc., although these specific
articulations are closely related to class issues as well. His incorporation of identities that are more likely to be identified as ‘machista’ seems to be a response to constricted mobility, emotional attachments, and social opportunities. His reliance upon a ‘machista’ identity construction is one of the ways that masculinities are incorporated into the complex relations involving class, race/ethnicity, hierarchy, family, the home and citizenship.

Conclusion

This chapter, by recounting some of the conversations and interviews with these men on Douglass and Kearney farms demonstrates the complexity of relational identity constructions through ideas of transnational space. In effect it adds multiple layers of complexity across the board of social categories. These stories are attempts to “call into question dominant narratives” (Lawson 2000, 174) of the aforementioned categories, especially as they relate to masculinities.

Within the interviews above, I highlighted some of the effects and articulations of these identity constructions of masculinities among these migrant men. The men in these interviews related their masculinities to the constructions of femininities in roles that they constructed as marginalized, relegated to the “home”, or reliant upon women for their livelihoods and economic survival. However, they also articulated these identities in ways that are usually associated with their perceptions of femininities, namely through narratives of loneliness or social marginalization, economic reliance, and insecurity. The men also performed masculinities in their work that could be interpreted as those of care or nurturing, as evidenced through their interactions and duties involving the horses on these farms. They interpreted their identities through transnational spaces, whether mediated through transnationalism from “above” or “below”. It could be seen that the laws of each nation were interpreted by and informed their identity constructions, while another case could be made for the subjectivities experienced through migration and evidenced through practices and attitudes as having a large influences on their identity constructions. These masculinities not only undermine notions of masculinities as static and natural, but, as they are interpreted through transnational spaces, also reiterate their fluid, dynamic, and oftentimes contradictory practices.
Chapter 5

Contributions, Faults of the Project, and Future Directions

Contributions

Within the interviews at the farms, the men talked about a great number of variations of interpretations, practices and experiences. These variations often get grouped together in “popular” representations of migrant populations in the popular media or culture. For example, Kochar et al. state that many in these populations are likely “to have arrived recently (particularly from México), to be male, to be unmarried…to be young… have relatively little education, and many do not speak English well” (2005, ii). While this group of men did have some of these qualities, their interpretations and insights into the context and content of these indicators provided a different quality of information that those concerned with economic data often ignore or wholly disregard. This approach helps to see how individuals and groups access and utilize spaces, relationships, and power in multiple linkages and flows, while at the same time it is not overdetermined by economic influences or constrained by thinking through the legal landscape of the U.S. that directly or indirectly implicates migrants.

This research project took as its goal the interpretations of the articulations, nuances and complexities of migrants’ performances of gender in daily life, and the connections, decisions, subject position as well as interpretations of the spaces of transnationalism. Studies involving migrant labor usually focus on the city, but by engaging with local rural sites of employment, this project has contributed to theoretical and empirical inquiries into practices of everyday life, the construction of masculinities and the practices that create transnational spaces. More so, it has expanded the articulations of the subjectivities and status men in transnational literatures. This effort is not made to reify migration or migration studies as a masculinist discourses, but to add to the discussions of “gendered geographies of power”. This approach has as its focus the more nuanced and complex interpretations and understandings of how space and identities intersect to (re)produce gender relations (Pessar and Mahler 2003). To add to the small but rapidly growing literature on the constructions of masculinities in transnational spaces is surely one way to move toward this goal of interpreting the “work” of gender.

The practices that were related to me and interpreted by the workers and myself through concepts of transnationalism were those that might be encountered in many other migrant populations. These included remittance relations, phone conversations, and travels that occur across the national borders with some amount of regularity. While the participants did not seem to utilize many of the technological advancements that were made within the previous two decades, one participant used an internet-based phone service, while others have capitalized on telecommunications infrastructure to forge economic and emotional connections back “home”. Other technologies that decrease the perception of distance, such as airplanes, were also not utilized by the overwhelming
majority of the respondents. However, transnational identities were forged through other, equally important and novel ways. The flows of people, wealth, ideas, and imaginaries that Glick-Schiller outlined as indicators of transnational spaces were definitely present. They invoked stories and insights into the constructions of their identities through their understandings as interpretive subjects of their lives both ‘here’, ‘there’, in transition, and translated. Rafael invoked transnational spaces through his discussion of his relations with his family and the effects of their attitudes on him across borders. He also illustrated this his interpretations of the law and lawmaking bodies of the respective nations, drunk driving, and morality, effectively juxtaposing two national legal and local cultural discourses in conversation with each other. Jorge invoked strong connections with the tenets of a transnational identity as he utilized his political connections to two states to aid his compadres and their children by physically accompanying the children to visit their grandparents in México.

The identities of the men on these farms, specifically in reference to masculinities, highlighted the fluid, dynamic nature of their gendered identities. Not only were these identities constructed in relation to the femininities and masculinities of those at “home”, but in relation to the other men at work, notions of “home”, morality as confronted through interpretations of the law both ‘here’ and ‘there’, and other relationships that sometimes challenged their assumptions regarding their own masculinities. Rafael articulated his perception of the roles within his family in Michoacán, and summarily critiqued his masculinities ‘here’ as one he would prefer not to perform. This is not to say that the relations they encountered ‘here’ or ‘there’ were more or less hegemonic, but both identities related to both these ‘places’ facilitated an inquiry into the ways these identities constitute one another and are contextually specific. The men regarded themselves as performing “masculinities”, and as such invoked issues such as morality, providing, and the family outlined in other studies through notions of power and agency. However, they also implicated aspects of identities not usually associated with masculinities, such as practices of care, understanding, equality, and insecurity. These masculinities were oftentimes negotiated through identities that were concurrent with aspects of transnational identities as well. Often they were produced locally, as in the case of Rafael negotiating his identity with his partner through their relationship ‘here’.

While having neither an intrinsic positive or negative influence, the intersections of transnationalism and the constructions of identities is an important way of conceptualizing the dynamic and often contradictory practices, representations and organizing principles of social-cultural, political, or economic life. This project demonstrates that the confluences of these literatures is an important task, as identities, states, economic practices, imaginaries, emotions, and networks are conceived of comprising and being formed by the practices that produce them. This research concerns the specific articulations of these identities to broaden understandings of how individuals may perform or lay claim to these masculinities, which are sites of negotiations and struggle with femininities, masculinities, or other gender identities that are not the focus of this research project. The intersectional character of this project, occurring not only between transnationalism and gender but through all social categories, made this

---

37 One of the more interesting interviews dealt with the Jorge’s utilization of airplanes to cross the border illegally before 9.11.2001. Though now legal, I do not think Jorge travels by airplane to visit his family on his yearly trips.
undertaking a complex and multifaceted process. While I did not have room here to do contribute to better understandings of many of the social categories implicated in these intersections, this articulation of some of the intersections of gender and transnationalism makes this contribution applicable to broader or more focused projects involving the constructions of masculinities and transnational spaces. This project specifically contributes to the understanding of the complex and often contradictory constructions of identities among Mexican migrants to the U.S.

**Faults of the Project**

The largest misstep in this project was in the production of the questionnaire. Within this misstep there were multiple shortcomings. An initial interview with one or two bilingual individuals much earlier in the project would have contributed greatly to the questionnaire design. Some of the questions were rendered useless by my misunderstanding of the language. For example, during the first three interviews I used the term *lazos* which the men took to mean lassos, instead of my intended meaning of tie, or connection. This situation would have easily been remedied by using the term *lazos familiares*. This minute but important omission took a while to encounter, and so the data for this important question were not gathered for a few of the men.

Another fault was to not perform the participant-observation sooner. This part of the project was done towards the end of my time on the farm. The relationships forged and demeanor of the men after these two days changed significantly. They were more forthcoming with insights and more trusting of my presence on the farm. Hindsight being 20/20, I would have participated in the work on both farms much earlier and often.

An additional corrective or future of this study would be to go to these men’s home communities and try to interview their family members or other members in the community for a richer understanding of gender identity ‘here’, ‘there’ and articulated through transnational spaces. For instance, Rafael’s account of the power dynamics of his household between his mother and father might be important to hear from their perspectives. They might influence Rafael’s identity in ways that he did not disclose, did not perceive in the same way, or simply hadn’t mentioned.

**Future Directions for Research**

During this project some of the omissions that I made while interpreting the data now seem to be some of the most important when trying to understand the local places and identities created by these men. For instance, hardly any of the men participated in “social organizations” and few had friends from work; as a result, the daily life of these men outside of work was little understood or questioned. Antonio answered that he liked to go to a discothèque, and occasionally have a “glass of beer”, but my inexperience and anxiety regarding the interview process averted the obvious follow up questions. The questionnaires and my positionality also precluded the understanding of these men’s social lives outside the farm. While this study was conducted at the farm, these social aspects of migrants’ lives in Lexington, KY would surely be an informative avenue of inquiry.
Conclusions

While the project did have its attendant shortcomings and lacunas, the project as a whole contributes to the gaps within a larger body of literature concerning transnationalism and the construction of masculinities. It does so through the communication of stories, relationships, perspectives, hardships, and insights by the men on these farms. By articulating these stories through my experiences and interpretations, these men’s lived experiences will add to understandings of identities, transnational spaces, and masculinities as they change through space-time.
## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>FARM</th>
<th>TIME ON FARM</th>
<th>TIME IN U.S</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>FUTURE PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JORGE</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>8 MONTHS</td>
<td>16 YEARS</td>
<td>TORREON</td>
<td>CONTINUOUS, BUT RESIDING HERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADALENO</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4 YEARS</td>
<td>TLAXCALA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEAZAR</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>1 YEAR</td>
<td>5 YEARS CONT.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>INDETERMINATE PLANS TO RETURN HOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELIX</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6 YEARS</td>
<td>PUEBLA</td>
<td>DOES NOT PLAN TO LEAVE U.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUEL</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>&lt;1 YEAR</td>
<td>&lt;1 YEAR CONT.</td>
<td>ZACATECAS</td>
<td>RETURN HOME IN SHORT TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HECTOR</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>9 MONTHS</td>
<td>9 MONTHS CONT.</td>
<td>AGUAS CALIENTES</td>
<td>WORK HERE FOR A FEW YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMAN</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9 YEARS</td>
<td>TORREON</td>
<td>PLANS TO RETURN IN 2 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFAEL</td>
<td>KEARNYE</td>
<td>3 YEARS</td>
<td>4/5 YEARS NOT CONT.</td>
<td>MICHOACAN</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUAN</td>
<td>KEARNYE</td>
<td>8 MONTHS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>VERACRUZ</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTO</td>
<td>KEARNYE</td>
<td>2.5 YEARS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>VERACRUZ</td>
<td>LEAVING U.S IN 2 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVAN</td>
<td>KEARNYE</td>
<td>6 MONTHS</td>
<td>8 MONTHS</td>
<td>VERACRUZ</td>
<td>LEAVING U.S IN 3 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HECTOR</td>
<td>DOUGLASS</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIPPE</td>
<td>KEARNYE</td>
<td>12 YEARS</td>
<td>12 YEARS</td>
<td>MICHOACAN</td>
<td>LEAVE U.S IN 30 YEARS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCES


VITA

Mitchell Beam Snider
Born: Flaget Hospital, Bardstown, KY
July 16, 1980

Education


Service

(Dis)closure Editorial Collective, University of Kentucky, Fund-Raising and Promotions Director, submissions editor, advisory committee (January through December 2008).
Member of the Graduate Committee on Prospective Students, (Fall/Spring 2007-2008)
Undergraduate Member, Geography Department Undergraduate Committee, (Fall 2002)
Retreat leader, Bethlehem High School, (Spring 2000)

Employment History

Graduate Student Teaching Assistant, University of Kentucky. August 2007 – May 2008.
Image Management Specialist, KYVL Digital lab, Lexington KY.
Dean’s Assistant, University of Kentucky Department of Agriculture, Lexington, KY. Summer 2003.

Awards and Honors

Member, Phi Beta Kappa, Spring 2001
Magna Cum Laude
Member, Gamma Theta Upsilon, National Geography Honorary Society, Spring 2001
Charles Wethington Cultural Geography Award, Spring 2001
Graduate School Fellowship (2006-2007)
Social Theory Certificate (2008)

________ Mitchell Beam Snider________