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Education and Policy in the New Latino Diaspora

Edmund T. Hamann, Stanton Wortham, and Enrique G. Murillo Jr.

THE NEW LATINO DIASPORA

Increasing numbers of Latinos (many immigrant, and some from elsewhere in the United States) are settling both temporarily and permanently in areas of the United States that have not traditionally been home to Latinos—for example, North Carolina, Maine, Georgia, Indiana, Arkansas, rural Illinois, and near resort communities in Colorado. Enrique Murillo and Sofia Villenas have called this the New Latino Diaspora (Murillo and Villenas, 1997). Newcomer Latinos are confronted with novel challenges to their senses of identity, status, and community. Instead of arriving in settings, like the Southwest, where Latinos have lived for centuries, those in the New Latino Diaspora arrive in unfamiliar places where long-term residents have little experience with Latinos. In the New Diaspora, then, Latinos face more insistent questions about who they are, who they seek to be, and what accommodations they merit—questions that are asked both by themselves and by others.

These questions about identity often get addressed through formal and informal policies of mediating institutions (Lamphere, 1992; Levinson and Sutton, 2001)—notably schools (Goode et al., 1992)—which are key sites for the enactment of status hierarchies and other scripts for interethnic interaction. In these New Latino Diaspora sites, the scripts for interethnic interaction are contradictory, emergent, and very much in flux, but their consequences are often predictable. Anglo hosts are often suspicious of Latino newcomers, and few Latino Diaspora schools so far are able to help Latino schoolchildren overcome the economic and social barriers they face. The most common educational
accommodation to their needs is to pull them out of content classes for ESL work, a practice that often disrupts their acquisition of content knowledge.

Preliminary data on schooling in the New Latino diaspora—high school completion rates, representation in higher school tracks, etc.—are not encouraging. New Latino Diaspora students are often placed in less-preferred spaces—sometimes literally in closets. And they are often taught by less credentialed teachers, who are themselves stigmatized by peers through an academic "caste system" that looks down on bilingual/ESL education (Grey, 1991).

The emergent patterns in the New Latino Diaspora seem similar to the unsatisfactory Latino experiences in the Southwest and in cities such as Chicago and New York, but we do not have much data. We know a lot about the education of U.S. Latinos in such areas as the Southwest (e.g., Foley, 1990; Vasquez et al., 1994; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Romo and Falbo, 1996; and Valdés, 1996) and Chicago (e.g., Guerra, 1998). But, with the partial exception of some studies that emerged from the Changing Relations Project (e.g., Grey, 1991), the literature includes very little about the educational experiences of newcomers in the New Latino Diaspora. Nor are there any comparative analyses of the overlaps and dissimilarities in educational policies and experiences in New Latino Diaspora locales. This volume provides data on these issues.

The nine substantive chapters in this volume present ethnographic case studies from various New Latino Diaspora locations in order to explore how Diaspora Latinos find themselves constructed by members of the receiving communities and how they assert their identities in response. Because the authors of the chapters variously identify as Anglo, Chicano, Latino, and/or Mexican national (and differ along other key dimensions as well), the collection presents a polyvocal perspective on the New Latino Diaspora.

The New Latino Diaspora represents a unique sociohistorical location. Like most immigrants and many other U.S. Latinos, most New Diaspora Latinos regularly face racism and the burdens of being working class and speaking a minority language. They confront a segmented labor market that they are usually expected to enter only "from the bottom" (Spener, 1988). Unlike the majority of immigrants arriving in the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century, however, many of the Latino newcomers are coming directly to rural locations that are unaccustomed to outsiders of any type, or that have conceptualized difference only in dichotomous terms into which the newcomers do not readily fit (e.g., white and black). And in some cases, despite the challenges and obstacles that they face, members of the New Latino Diaspora do not face conditions where anti-Latino discrimination is deeply endemic—because the Latino presence is too new. Because of the unique conditions they
face, Diaspora Latinos do not easily fit most models of minority children in school. The chapters in this volume describe both familiar and unfamiliar predicaments and opportunities faced by Diaspora Latinos as they move into rural America outside the Southwest.

EDUCATION AND POLICY

The contributors to this volume focus on institutional settings, like schools, in which Latinos adopt identities and have identities imposed on them. But education and schooling are not seen as fully synonymous here (e.g., Hansen, 1990; Borofsky, 1987). As Levinson and Holland explain:

Anthropologists have long recognized the existence of culturally specific and relative definitions of the educated person. Although the degree to which cultural training is formalized, situated at a remove from the activities for which it is intended, and provided on a mass scale may vary, anthropologists recognize all societies as providing some kind of training and some set of criteria by which members can be identified as more, or less, knowledgeable. Distinct societies, as well as ethnic groups and microcultures within those societies, elaborate the cultural practices by which particular sets of skills, knowledges, and discourses come to define the truly “educated” person. (1996, 2)

In the cases presented here, what knowledge and skill are sought after varies according to one’s perspective. Host community members (typically Anglos) and newcomer Latinos often differ in their views of education. Both see schooling as a vehicle for education, and there is some overlap in their goals for schooling (e.g., English literacy skill acquisition, graduation). There are also some differences. Though few acknowledge it, host community members often distinguish between what constitutes an “educated” Latino and an “educated” Anglo. An “educated” Latino, for instance, may be constructed as one who knows how to work hard and not complain, whereas an educated Anglo may know how to shape a corporate vision and engineer profitable practices.

Latino newcomers also bring cultural identities, experiences, and ways of knowing to their new locations. Using these, they create models of what knowledges, skills, and dispositions are worthy of respect and have utility. As Villenas shows in her chapter, the resulting construction of what it means to be educated matches neither the construction of educated that was extant in the Mexican city or village of origin, nor the constructions of educated offered by the new host society.

Bringing their own dynamic, hybrid visions of education, Latino newcomers often confront a contradiction in their host communities. They encounter an ideology that values equal treatment and self-determination. On the other hand, the
practices through which host communities respond to newcomers often conflict with these values. Some members of host communities overtly denigrate the newcomers and fantasize about returning to a pre-Latino state; many do not. Even most of these, however, nonetheless participate in educational policies and practices that often label and constrain Latino students.

Borrowing from Levinson and Sutton (2001) and Shore and Wright (1997), we treat policy as more than just formal dictates and resource allocations sent from above. Policy also includes locally created and contested action. Four of Levinson and Sutton’s arguments inform this book:

- Policy serves as a legitimating charter for the techniques of administration and as an operating manual for everyday conduct; it is the symbolic expression of normative claims worked into a potentially viable institutional blueprint. Instead of separating them entirely, we examine policy formation and implementation as a dynamic, interrelated process. (2)
- In all the scholarly discourse around policy, there is little evidence of the sociocultural perspective: a locally informed, comparative account of how people make and engage with policy. (6)
- In the processes of policy formation, problems are constructed for solution and thus the needs of individuals and societies become subject to authoritative definition. (17)
- Among public policy arenas, educational policy is unique in its power to determine who has the right to become an “educated” person. (17)

Policies, both formal and improvised, start as the identification of problems. They embed constructions of the status quo, beliefs that the status quo is inadequate, and theoretical propositions about how specific actions will bring changes. A common element of the sites considered here is that the presence of Latino newcomers was constructed as a problem. Once policies are articulated, they start to delimit understandings of how the problem can be solved. Conceptualizing newcomers as problems in particular ways (e.g., they need to be Americanized, they have deficits which need to be remedied, they should be given little support because they are stealing our jobs, they need to learn English), host communities articulate views of who the Latinos are and what types of treatment they deserve.

Newcomers, too, engage in formal and informal policy formation. They construct views of themselves and Anglos, partly in response to Anglos’ constructions of them. Using Levinson and Sutton’s inclusive construction of the idea of policy, even such acts as dropping out or sending one’s children back to Latin America to be raised by relatives (e.g., Hagan, 1994; Trueba, 1999) are a type of educational policy. As they explain (2001, 5), “Even outright resistance to a policy can be seen as a kind of [appropriated version of policy] insofar as it incorporates a negative image of policy into schemes of action.” The chapters in this
volume describe various cases of the interplay between Latino and Anglo construals of “the problem” in New Latino Diaspora sites.

**SCHOOLING, THE POLITICAL ECONOMY, AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE**

Educational policy at the local level is always challenged by demographic change. In the New Latino Diaspora, these challenges almost always involve local businesses’ “externalization of indirect costs” (Hackenberg, 1995, 238) and the “Latinization of low-wage labor” (Griffith, 1995, 129). The businesses that lure newcomer labor to the Latino Diaspora have left it to the existing social service infrastructure—such as schools, health care providers, municipal offices, etc.—to negotiate the added costs and complications of serving new populations (González Baker et al., 1999, 99). Externalization of indirect costs can cause resentment on the part of service providers, though more often than not those sentiments are directed at the newcomers rather than at the businesses precipitating the changes. Along with this resentment often come overt acts of newcomer exploitation, such as landlords overpricing substandard housing because of housing shortages and employers’ use of fear to intimidate workers from seeking medical assistance or workman’s compensation for work-related injuries and illness. Most of the chapters describe, or at least hint at, such dynamics across the Latino Diaspora.

In the case of Latino newcomers, many who speak Spanish as a first and sometimes only language, an immediate necessity is communication. This might mean hiring bilingual paraprofessionals for the school setting. Typically, however, the changes and needed responses are much more profound, extending beyond school sites into the larger community and proving to be much more complex than just a need for language interpreters. San Miguel (1987, xv) has claimed that the acrimonious debates about bilingual education (perceived as accommodation to Latinos) need to be replaced by a focus on schools’ unwillingness or inability to meet the diverse needs of Mexican-descent children.

Latino students, parents, and laborers in the New Latino Diaspora bring to their encounter with established residents beliefs about their own identities, about the identities and beliefs of established residents, and about the political economy in which they are intertwined. Tied to these are cultural beliefs about child rearing, household responsibility, and family values. As Valdés (1996), Delgado-Gaitan (1990), Vásquez et al. (1994), Villenas (this volume), and others have noted, Latino parents frequently have different conceptualizations of parent and school responsibilities than the middle-class Anglos who set most U.S. public school policy. In general, schooling in traditional Latino Diaspora locations has not been responsive to Latinos and has not encouraged Latino parental input into
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schooling (e.g., San Miguel, 1987, 217). Nor have Latino newcomers' skills been consistently appreciated and used as building blocks for subsequent education.

In the Southwest and other areas with a higher density of Latinos, there have been important exceptions to the generally inadequate treatment educational institutions have given to Latinos. For example, the Latino parent involvement group described by Delgado-Gaitan (1990) provides newcomer parents with an opportunity for authentic input into the schooling of their children. The high schools described by Lucas et al. (1990) and some of the districts described by Dentler and Hafner (1997) are responsive to newcomer Latino student needs. The “funds of knowledge” work at the University of Arizona (Moll et al., 1992; González et al., 1995; Moll and González, 1997) has helped educators build on students' existing skills and knowledge. All these examples could be instructive for educational policies and policy implementation in the New Latino Diaspora, but so far they have not been adopted.

If “best practices” that lead to high achievement among Latinos are known (e.g., Lucas, 1997; Walqui, 1999), why is it that they are so inconsistently pursued? The answers are complex. Shor's (1986) cynical observation that schooling in a capitalist society is “successful” to the extent that it conveys to students stratified expectations would suggest that schools do not want to remedy inadequacies in the education available to Latino newcomers. A quite different explanation could claim that the problems of any inadequate current practice are ephemeral, that they will be remedied as soon as educators learn what is needed. Several chapters in this volume do describe how host schools struggled to find resources and knowledge as the process of demographic change unfolded, but this cannot suffice as an explanation. Something also seemed to interfere with educators' efforts to find the best practices noted earlier, or kept them from feeling that these were viable, in their communities. In many cases this interference came from host community stereotyping of Latinos.

Established residents in New Latino Diaspora locales are influenced by various large-scale projects for and against newcomers. For example, national debates about bilingual education and its purported implications for cultural identity are known to many host community residents, and inform their reactions to newcomers, even though their understanding of bilingual education is generally limited. Concerns about illegal immigration and job displacement also inform some host community responses to newcomers. As Suárez-Orozco summarizes: “Anti-immigrant sentiment—including the jealous rage that ‘illegals are getting benefits instead of citizens like my friend’—is intertwined with an unsettling sense of panic in witnessing the metamorphosis of ‘home’ into a world dominated by sinister aliens” (1998, 296–297).

Furthermore, ostensibly sympathetic responses to newcomers often do not lead to more favorable outcomes, because they can be less sympathetic than
they first appear. The proimmigration script described by Suárez-Orozco (1998) is common in New Latino Diaspora locales (e.g., Hamann, 1999). In that script Latino newcomers are constructed as hardworking, loyal, religious, family oriented, and willing to take work no one else wants. The script simultaneously reiterates the mythology of the United States being attractive and fair to immigrants, a view espoused by many host community members, and one that rationalizes assimilative projects. But the alleged virtues of immigrants also constrain, as they deny newcomers the prerogative to complain about working conditions, inadequate housing, and racism at school, and to seek work and opportunities that others do want (because to do so would be disloyal and confrontational).

THE PERSPECTIVES OF NEWCOMERS

Informed by the “funds of knowledge” (Moll et al., 1992; González et al., 1995, Moll and González, 1997) that they bring with them to their new contexts, as well as the habits and experiences of immigrants who have preceded them to the new site (Hagan, 1994), Latino newcomers adopt various beliefs and behaviors once they arrive in New Latino Diaspora communities. They may imagine themselves as part of their new community (Chavez, 1994; Anderson, 1983), or feel detached and tentative, or actively excluded from it. Schools can be key sites for the construction of community identity and inclusion (e.g., Pugach, 1998; Peshkin, 1994; Bissinger, 1991), but they can also be sites that exclude Latino newcomers through the persistence of nonresponsive policies and the failure to build on newcomers’ existing funds of knowledge.

Many newcomers resist both the virulent and “benevolent” forms of racism they encounter by affirming their own identities as immigrants or minority group members. (Benevolent racism refers to the policies and practices of those who allege good intentions but whose actions have discriminatory consequences [Villenas, 2001; see also the chapters by Villenas and Wortham, this volume].) For some newcomers, affirmation of identity involves a rejection of majority values and institutions, i.e., what Ogbu (1987) calls the cultural inversion model. At the school level, many “pushed-out” (Trueba, 1991) Latino students would fit in this category. Although rejecting majority values and institutions might be a healthy response to discrimination, with respect to identity development and cultural preservation such a stance often leaves minority students vulnerable to serious economic and social problems.

Some Latino newcomers manage to affirm their own cultures without overtly rejecting majority values and institutions. Pugach (1998) describes students in a New Mexico border town who create a Latino model of school success that is nonetheless accepted by the mainstream. In some cases, however, managing to
become bicultural means conforming to majority practices in school but affirming immigrant ones at home. This is akin to the strategy pursued by Sikh students in Britain documented by Hall (1995) and the strategy attempted by the Portuguese immigrant students studied by Becker (1990; cf. also Gibson, 1997).

Becker notes, however, that newcomers’ attempts at situational manipulation of ethnic identity—for example, attempting to have a mainstream rather than immigrant identity at school—were not always recognized by members of non-newcomer groups. Teachers and non-Portuguese students continued to compartmentalize the Portuguese newcomers as immigrants and to articulate negative stereotypes about them. Despite the immigrant students’ use of accentless English at school, their imitation of popular clothing styles, and other efforts to reject their stigmatized immigrant identity, they were identified as having limited potential and limited school aspirations. Grady’s chapter describes how students’ bids for acceptance can vary according to the topic of the class, with art, a subject that embraces self-expression, proving to be more receptive than others. Wortham’s chapter describes how gender can influence both the bids for acceptance that are attempted, as well as the way they are received.

Some newcomers react to racism by internalizing negative stereotypes of their home cultures. They try to assimilate to the mainstream culture, using a replacement orientation—with new cultural competencies permitting abandonment of their original culture (e.g., Keefe and Padilla, 1987).

Whatever strategy they adopt, newcomers’ identity maintenance and construction projects do not occur in isolation from Anglos’ attempts to uphold the “mainstream” cultural order. The majority often “racializes” immigrant groups. Historically, this racializing has often meant identifying immigrants as biologically distinct and inferior, but if such overtly racist ideologies have largely lost favor, the social construction of immigrants as less deserving and/or as missing knowledge, lacking skills, and being inferior remains powerful, if tacit. The application of a cultural deficit ideology to Latinos has been criticized in the research literature for at least 30 years (e.g., Carter, 1970; Erickson, 1987; Vasquez, et al., 1994), but according to Valdés (1996) and Valencia (1997), it still remains commonplace among many mainstream educators. In their chapter, Beck and Allexsaht-Snider note that a cultural deficit ideology is consistent with a colonialist ideology, with the colonizer assuming all their attributes are superior to those of the colonized. In accordance with the racializing process and the promulgation of cultural deficit ideologies, members of the mainstream, individually and through the institutions they lead, often exclude newcomers from positions of power in the workplace, the community, and the schools.

As migration streams feeding Diaspora locations mature (Massey et al., 1987; Tienda, 1989), newcomers attracted by employment often settle in and bring their families to Diaspora locations without feeling attached to their new loca-
tion (Anderson, 1983; Chavez, 1994). Political involvement and residential stability are more likely if newcomers imagine themselves as part of their new community, but that is difficult to accomplish and often resisted by local Anglos. Limited housing options, financial vulnerability, and (for some) the risk of deportation all contribute to residential mobility.

Meier and Stewart (1991) have found that Latino students’ performance at school correlates with both the community political power of Latinos and their presence as instructors and administrators. The implications of this finding for New Latino Diaspora locations are dramatic, as newness to community, lack of citizenship, and other factors inhibit Latino newcomers’ political participation. Because of Latinos’ recent arrival in the region and their lack of political power, nearby teacher-training institutions usually have developed few Latino-oriented recruiting initiatives and student support networks. This limits the regional supply of Latino educators and helps perpetuate the dynamic described by Meier and Stewart.

Unlike past generations of immigrants, members of the New Latino Diaspora are often close enough to home and connected enough to robust transnational labor movements that it is easy for them to retain strong ties to their home countries (Hagan, 1994). Guerra (1998) even suggests that many Latinos now live in “transnational communities”—communities that cannot be adequately defined using a single geographic reference, or even a single nation. In the case of Mexican newcomers, lingering sending-community ties are facilitated by the Mexican government’s formal attempts to remain salient to expatriates through programs like such as Mexicanos en el Extranjero (Mendez Lugo, 1997; Goldring, 1998). Those in migrant sending communities who depend on financial remittances also have a stake in keeping newcomers connected to their sending communities.

The circumstances of displacement from sending communities, the use of geographically diverse family and fictive kin networks as an economic risk-minimization strategy (Stark, 1991), and the uncertainty of economic and cultural opportunities in the receiving community further explain enduring ties to home communities (Ainslie, 1999; Gutiérrez, 1999). Such ties can influence newcomers’ educational aspirations and can compel natives of host communities to construct the newcomer population as temporary and in need of only minimal help. Thus a final dilemma faced by Latino newcomers in the New Latino Diaspora is the ambiguity of whether they are migrants or immigrants, an ambiguity that many newcomers themselves express.

The chapters in this book examine the construction of cultural identity in the New Latino Diaspora by examining educational policymaking, interpretation, and implementation. We focus on education in a broad sense—including not just school practice and school district management, but also popular education,
grassroots efforts, and the informal learning that comes from reading newspapers and participating in the public sphere. The chapters vary in their primary focus, with some considering gender, some focusing on families and households, others on K-12 schools, others on school districts and state departments of education, and still others on formal and informal public community life.

We use ethnography to focus on day-to-day interethnic interaction and to describe host community members' construction of a Latino “Other” (and Latinos' contributions to and resistance against this construction). Using such ethnographic descriptions, the chapters illuminate how policy mandates have consequences for Latinos and non-Latinos at the local level. The chapters describe the local processes by which official and de facto policies are created and responded to. Thus these chapters provide a basis for what Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1991) refer to as the ethnography of empowerment, where ethnographic data becomes the rationale for the reform of policy and practice.

The chapters differ on a number of dimensions, among them authors' identities. Although all the authors are now affiliated with institutes of higher education, several had other affiliations when they carried out their fieldwork or gained entry to the field sites. Beck worked for Georgia's Migrant Education program; Martinez assisted with a school district's Title VII grant; Brunn helped a school district create a language policy for newcomers; Zúñiga, Hernández, Shadduck, and Villareal all worked for the Mexican university partner that offered a range of services to two Georgia school districts; and Hamann made his first foray into his research site as a Title VII grant-writer.

Geography is another source of difference among the chapters. Three look at Georgia, two at North Carolina, one at northern New England, two at the rural Midwest, and one at the Rocky Mountains. Yet geography is also a source of similarity, as all the studies except Beck and Allexsahn-Snider's describe rural locations (their study describes a state department of education so it does not have fixed site). The largest site described in this volume is a city of 25,000.

The economies of the communities studied are superficially different, with Latino newcomers attracted to work opportunities in the resort industry in the Rockies; meatpacking in Illinois, Indiana, New England, and North Carolina; and a diversity of industries in Georgia, most notably carpet mills. Yet the economic niches in each of these sites are similar: The work is tedious, hazardous, and low-paying. An insufficient number of established community members are willing to take such work, so the work becomes ethnically typed or marked (Tienda, 1989) with the collective identity of the Latino newcomers tied to the low-status occupations most hold.

Deriving policy recommendations from her ethnographic work with Latino parents, in Chapter 2 Villenas describes Latina mothers' confusion and frustra-
tion with the public schools their children were attending, including the mismatch between values and ideologies at home versus at school. She describes how Latina mothers' views of parenting are changing, but through innovation and not assimilation. Her chapter then sketches how school policies and practices would need to change to be more accommodating to Latino parents and students.

In Chapter 3, Beck and Allexaht-Snider describe the Georgia Department of Education's statewide response to the growing presence of Latino newcomers in Georgia. Their chapter draws on Beck's five years of work with the federally funded but state-administered Georgia Migrant Education program, to give an account of how political changes in the Georgia Department of Education undermined many Latino students' chances at a full education.

Chapters 4 and 5 describe a partnership between two northwest Georgia school districts and a private university in Mexico, from very different perspectives. Edmund Hamann investigates the “window of policymaking opportunity” that opened when one of the Georgia districts conceded it was not sure how to respond to rapid demographic change. He describes how a binational partnership was created between the school district and a Mexican university. Hamann describes “alternative policymaking moments,” when stakeholders who usually are not positioned to influence schooling on a large scale suddenly have the chance to be policy makers.

Víctor Zúñiga, Rubén Hernández-León, María Olivia Villarreal, and Janna Shadduck-Hernández describe their experiences as Mexico-based university professors who were asked to help two Georgia school districts create educational policies for Latino newcomers. Their chapter chronicles their successes and struggles in facilitating a public forum for Latino newcomer families, so that those families could more readily represent their needs and interests to school personnel. Also considered is the prospect of Mexican universities assisting U.S. school districts in general, and in the Latino Diaspora in particular.

Wortham's contribution in Chapter 6 is the only chapter set in northern New England. After noting the frequent disparity between the individualistic orientation of most American schooling and the household/familial orientation of most Latino newcomers, Wortham considers the different ways male and female Latino adolescents construct personal identities and how these different gendered identities affect those students' school success. U.S. school policy and practice seem to provide a liberating opportunity for many female Latinas in Wortham's study, but it seems to limit the horizons of the males.

In Chapter 7 Martinez describes an atypical New Latino Diaspora site, one that is located in a state that has long been host to Latinos (Colorado), but in a community that has not. He describes some educators' attempt to implement an "ideal" transitional bilingual education program. In this case, district policies and unforeseen circumstances led to a less than ideal program that had negative
educational consequences for the Latino newcomers. His chapter illustrates well how the community context that Latino newcomers confront enables the creation of a separate and inadequate school experience for newcomer children.

Based on her ethnographic research with Latino immigrant students at a high school in rural Indiana, Grady describes in Chapter 8 how these students resisted the official assimilationist curriculum by acquiring an alternative text on Lowrider Arte (a magazine of art inspired by the longtime Chicano tradition of customizing “low-rider” automobiles, one that affirms a Chicano aesthetic). She then describes how this resistance was validated by the school when a mainstream art teacher embraced students’ involvement with lowrider art.

In Chapter 9 Brunn describes his experiences facilitating a rural Illinois district’s attempt to develop a language policy. His account of how Latino parents and students were integrated into a formal policy development process, and of the resistance put up by some educators who were skeptical of its recommendations, illustrates both the challenge and the promise of inclusive policy formation in the New Latino Diaspora.

Enrique G. Murillo Jr.’s Chapter 10 returns to several of the themes broached in this introduction—particularly the role of racialized political economy—by looking at the virulently anti-immigrant construction of Latino newcomers in a North Carolina community where the only accepted identity of immigrants was as labor. Murillo then describes how the local poultry industry’s quest to remain “globally competitive” and its dependence on immigrant labor for work “no one else wants” has dehumanized Latinos in this town. His conclusions draw together and contextualize many findings from the preceding chapters.

The volume ends with summative Chapter 11, which was prepared by Margaret Gibson.

NOTES

1. The term Latino can be defined expansively to include anyone of descent or origin from territories under the neocolonial (and sometimes overtly colonial) yoke of the Monroe Doctrine (Hayes-Bautista and Chapa, 1987)—that is, nearly all of Latin America and the Caribbean. We use that definition here. However, most members of the New Latino Diaspora were born in or trace their origins to Mexico and Central America. Newcomers from Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and South America seem mostly to be heading to locales with long-established Latino populations—e.g., Miami and New York—though there are exceptions to this trend (for example, Dominican immigrants in Rhode Island, Colombians in Georgia).

2. Prevalent as patronizing, colonial, and ultimately racist viewpoints may be, however, we must clarify that established members of host communities can act with grace and sincerity toward Latino newcomers. There are those who accept and promote an “additive view of acculturation” (Gibson, 1997, 441) and who thereby ameliorate the social and economic burdens of being a Latino newcomer without trying to convert or condescend
toward the newcomer community. It is just that the pool of those who do well by newcomers is smaller than those who mean well.
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