

Strangers in New Homelands

Strangers in New Homelands:
The Social Deconstruction and Reconstruction
of “Home” among Immigrants in the Diaspora

Edited by

Michael Baffoe
with Maria Cheung,
Lewis Asimeng-Boahene
and Buster Ogbuagu

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Strangers in New Homelands:
The Social Deconstruction and Reconstruction of “Home” among Immigrants in the Diaspora,
Edited by Michael Baffoe with Maria Cheung, Lewis Asimeng-Boahene and Buster Ogbuagu

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2012 by Michael Baffoe with Maria Cheung, Lewis Asimeng-Boahene
and Buster Ogbuagu and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or
otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4136-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4136-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	viii
----------------	------

Acknowledgements	x
------------------------	---

A. On the Concepts of “Home”

Chapter One.....	2
------------------	---

The Stranger: Finding New Homes, Networks, Identities
Leo Driedger

Chapter Two	13
-------------------	----

Latino Presence in the US South: An (Un)Wanted Exchange
Carlos Parra

Chapter Three	25
---------------------	----

Human Rights Education and Newcomers: Constructing and Owning
a Feeling of Home
Stephanie Yamniuk

Chapter Four	39
--------------------	----

Where is “Home”? Reconstruction of Immigrant Oases
Leo Driedger

B. Immigrant Adaptation Challenges

Chapter Five	50
--------------------	----

Differential Acculturation and Adaptation of Immigrant and Refugee
Youth to “New Homes” in the Diaspora
Patience Togo

Chapter Six	63
-------------------	----

The African Extended Family Network as an Inhibitor to the Reconstruction
of “Home” Among Ghanaian African Immigrants in the Diaspora
Michael Baffoe and Lewis Asimeng-Boahene

Chapter Seven.....	78
The Making of a “Home”: Exploring the Space of Bangladeshi Diasporic Restaurants in Toronto	
Nafisa Tanjeem	
Chapter Eight.....	91
Impact of Sending Remittances on the Lives of Filipino and Iranian Immigrants to Winnipeg: “Sending Money Back Home Helps us Feel Better”	
Evelyn Ferguson, Tuula Heinonen, Shahin Shooshtari, and Carol D. H. Harvey	
C: Access to Service/Labour Market Integration Issues	
Chapter Nine.....	104
Removing the Barriers to New Canadians Health Disparity:	
New Canadians Health Network	
Patrick Kereyo and David Flomo,	
Chapter Ten	121
Newcomers’ Experience of Practitioner Stance in Social Work Practice with Immigrants and Refugees: A Call for Not-Knowing	
Jan DeFehr, Omar Adan, Carmen Barros, Susan Rodriguez, and Sally B. Wai	
Chapter Eleven	131
Navigating Cross Cultural Exchanges in an IET Bridging Program	
Lee Anne Block	
Chapter Twelve	140
Elder Abuse and Immigration Status: Is There a Connection?	
Vulnerability and Recourse	
Sigalit Gal and Jill Hanley	
Chapter Thirteen.....	152
Labor Market Experiences of Korean Immigrants in Manitoba and the Current Policy Responses of the Republic of Korea vis-à-vis Rapid Globalization	
Bong-Hwan Kim	
Chapter Fourteen	161
Beloved Countries: Reflections of a Mothers’ Memories of “Home”	
Patricia Marton	

Chapter Fifteen	174
Perceptions of Canada by Nigerian Youths	
Charles T. Adeyanju and Temitope B. Oriola	
Chapter Sixteen	190
“Are We There Yet?” Articulating the Social Construction of Home, and the Politics of Integration amongst Quebec-Resident Nigerian Immigrants: Nirvana or Perpetual Limbo?	
Buster C. Ogbuagu	
Chapter Seventeen	200
“Invisible Minorities” of the Falun Gong Community: Challenge to Social Inclusion and Integration in Canada	
Maria Cheung	
Chapter Eighteen	210
Searching Historical Identity in Strange Homelands: The Case of the Marātha Community of Southern Tamilnādu with Special Reference to Thanjāvur, circa 1675 – 2010	
Dr. Usha R. Vijailakshmi	
Contributors.....	220
Editors	224

FOREWORD

It has been a great honour and privilege to have been part of the planning of the Conferences on the concept of “home” and its deconstruction and reconstruction by immigrants or new comers in the diaspora that has led to this publication. It has also been a sense of pride to see this conference grow from its modest genesis in 2008 to its current form. The conferences have been for the sharing and learning of ideas among academics, researchers, policy makers in government and practitioners in the field of social services who are providing services to the new comers in host societies. I am therefore deeply honoured to also have the opportunity to provide the Foreword to this publication.

Having been part of the preparations and planning of these conferences since their inception, I have been impressed with the quality of the presentations and discussions that have taken place. Many conference participants have reported that they enjoyed the proceedings at the conferences immensely. They have also added that they learned many lessons as well as made new friends and developed useful networks that will assist them in their research, field work/practice and even in policy making.

The concept of “home” around which this conference has revolved is an important concept to continuously examine in the lives of new comers to new societies. The concept, for many immigrants in the diaspora, evokes confusion, fear, hopes, and aspirations. It is also very important for researchers and people in academia to constantly examine and seek to learn more, about what this concept means for many people who have uprooted themselves from their familiar environments and settled or seek to make new homes out of strange and unfamiliar environments.

The papers that are presented in this first publication coming out of some of the presentations of the 2nd and 3rd editions of this conference throw a lot of light and some understanding of this simple but complex concept in the lives of new settlers in new societies.

As this conference grows bigger, it is my hope that more of such publications will come out of the proceedings of subsequent conferences which will be good material for all those whose lives are impacted by migration as well as those that do research in that domain or formulate policies to deal with the management of settlement and integration issues of this population group.

Scholars from all over the world have contributed to these proceedings. These collections , in a nutshell, provides a comprehensive resource to assist educators, practitioners and policy makers in understanding the concept of HOME as it pertains to the 21st century.

I extend my gratitude to all of those whose efforts have contributed in making these conferences and subsequent publication possible.

Lewis Asimeng Boahene, Ph.D
Associate Professor
School of Behavioral Sciences and Education
Penn State University-Harrisburg, Middletown, PA, USA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication is the outcome of proceedings of the 2nd and 3rd editions of the Annual International Conferences on the Social Reconstruction of the concept of 'home' among immigrants in the diaspora. These conferences dubbed 'Strangers in New Homelands' started in November 2008 and are hosted by the Faculty of Social Work, University of Manitoba.

The publication consists of research papers, panel discussions and other presentations selected from the 2009 and 2010 Conferences. It also includes a few papers selected from the proceedings of the premier conference of 2008.

The input from the presenters have been valuable and well appreciated. They include academic scholars, government representatives and front-line immigration and refugee settlement workers who work with new immigrants and refugees in the field. Without their input, this conferences and this publication would not have been possible.

The success of these conferences have been due mainly to the untiring efforts and hard work of members of the Conference Planning Committee from the University of Manitoba and other institutions in the United States: Penn State University, Harrisburg, PA, St. Cloud State, University, St. Cloud, MN, and University of St. Francis, Joliet, ILL.

We are thankful to the Dean and Faculty members of the Faculty of Social Work, University of Manitoba and the Office of the President, University of Manitoba for their strong support for the conference.

We are also thankful to Cambridge Scholars Publishing for providing us with the opportunity to publish the proceedings of these conferences.

Michael Baffoe, Ph.D, Editor
Faculty of Social Work
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg-Canada

SECTION A:
ON THE CONCEPTS OF “HOME”

CHAPTER ONE

THE STRANGER: FINDING NEW HOMES, NETWORKS, IDENTITIES

LEO DRIEDGER

PROFESSOR EMERITUS

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA, WINNIPEG, CANADA

In Canada everyone is a migrant and/or an immigrant, leaving secure homes to find new identities and social networks in changing environments. All are, have been, or will be “strangers.” Will these new Canadians therefore find new homes, and how will they join postmodern networks? As middlemen and women, will they be able to reshape their identities and manage problems of social distance as they meet Canadians who have been resident for some time?

Finding New Homes

Georg Simmel’s theory of “The Stranger” unifies the two characteristics of fixity and transience (1950, 402). Simmel thought that the stranger could retain a separate identity by controlling their behaviour with others, often by being physically near them to perform economic functions, for example, but distant with respect to their values. On the other hand, the stranger could often be far away from their reference in-group when performing duties in urban society, but could still retain a symbolic feeling of nearness and belonging to the in-group.

Simmel’s stranger is a rich concept because it raises major questions, such as how a person can retain a “ground” of identification, as Lewin (1948) would put it, within their own social psychological world and at the same time relate securely to others? We would expect that when the stranger enters the new environment of others, they are secure only if they

are grounded in a family or reference group or if they are socially and psychologically motivated by the norms and networks of such a group. This raises many related questions; what is the nature of such a reference group; how often and how much must an individual contact the reference group to sustain their separate identity; what must the quality of such sustenance be; and can an individual make only occasional forays into the strange world on business or can they consistently work outside their group, with occasional refresher periods through telephone, mail and modern communication networks? How important is spatial proximity for ongoing ties, or can *gemeinschaft* ties be maintained through modern communication networks?

It must be remembered, of course, that these images of the ethnic individual are all ideal types. As Max Weber (1946) pointed out, the degree to which they are reflected in any society may be partial and never complete. The task then is to examine Canadian society to find which of these ideal types may be most applicable. Indeed, depending on which ethnic group we examine, it may well be that each of the ideal types is applicable to some of the groups within Canada. Our analysis suggests that the rural Québécois habitant and the Prairie Hutterite are represented best by the tradition-directed ethnic type. On the other hand, the urban Jew in Montreal and Toronto seems to be typical of the middleman or stranger type. Visible minorities can often be seen as marginal when they find it more difficult to compete in the industrial marketplace, where status and prestige are important to finding acceptance and jobs.

Recently, some scholars contend that postmodern changes need to be dealt with, which is a very different emphasis. Postmodernists see life in much more fluid ways, and are often impatient with being boxed into unnecessary structures and overly focused goals.

Vaclav Havel, the playwright and president of the Czech Republic, gave a speech at the Independence Hall in Philadelphia in 1994 titled "The Need for Transcendence in the Postmodern World" (Driedger 2000). He began by saying: "If the modern age began with the discovery of America, it also ended in America." Starting from the sixteenth century, the development of technology led to the discovery of land and the printing press, the reformation, and the beginnings of capitalism that helped launch the modern age. Havel continued:

The modern age has ended ... we are going through a transitional period, when it seems that something is on the way out and something else is

painfully being born. It is as if something were crumbling, decaying, and exhausting itself, while new forms emerge.

Levin et al. (1976), when discussing Simmel, suggest that his work spawned new queries into such areas as the marginal man, the sojourner, the newly arrived, and social distance. These concepts appear similar to such religious concepts as “pilgrims and strangers” and “in this world but not of this world” (p. 839). In our research, we extend Simmel’s concept of the stranger types to communities of strangers of religious and ethnic varieties (Driedger and Peters 1977). This suggests the need to study the relationship between the factors of identification within an in-group and their potential hostile perception of out-groups as a result of in-group identification.

“Simmel’s utilization of the metaphor distances was by no means restricted to his pages on ‘the stranger’; it constitutes a pervasive and distinctive feature of his sociology as a whole” (Levine et al. 1976). Recent work on social distance has attempted to sort out the many meanings of the concept and to devise ways of measuring it (Laumann 1965; Driedger and Peters 1977). Bogardus (1959) expanded Park’s personal dimension of social distance and chose to use the degree of sympathetic understanding that functions between person and person, between person and group, and between group and group.

The Hutterites have effectively contained themselves within the boundaries of a rural, agricultural, communal colony. These boundaries are controlled by a distinctive religion, customs and social institutions. They perceive themselves as being “pilgrims and strangers,” different from outsiders, and most aspire to seclusion away from non-Hutterites. Their system occasionally links with the larger society in the economic and educational spheres, but these links are well controlled. They are strangers in a unique religious communal way, supported by their successful economic and educational integration that acts as a support system for the continuity of their norms and values.

Jews in the city were also segregated in the East European *shtetls*, which to some extent were transferred to voluntarily-segregated Jewish communities. They, too, have a long history of being “strangers” and have experienced social distance created by persecution, pogroms, ghettos, holocausts, prejudice and discrimination. The Jews are a very small religious minority in a predominantly Christian environment. Conflict in the past appears to have functioned as a social distance mechanism, which

in turn provided greater need for Jewish nomos-building (Driedger and Peters 1977).

Joining Postmodern Networks

Wellman's and Leighton's (1979, 363–90) discussion of “lost,” “saved” and “liberated” communities propose that as society becomes increasingly industrial, basic human needs such as affective ties and primary experiences will need to be nurtured not only within traditional rural, isolated, segregated, closed community boundaries, but within social networks developed by more accessible space, increased communication velocity and through transactional density and links to multiple social circles. They begin with a network analytic perspective of the community as their starting point in a search for social linkages and flows of resources. This approach frees the community study from spatial and normative bases. While the rural “traditional” community is more spatially bound, the “liberated” community is freed from spatial boundaries. The “saved” community lies between the two, with some spatial boundedness and primary concerns, but branching out into new urban multiple social networks, both rural and urban.

The saved argument contends that urbanites continue to organize safe communal havens, with neighbourhood, kinship and work solidarities mediating and coping with bureaucratic institutions (Wellman and Leighton 1979, 373). We expect that it will be easier to find leaders in religious and ethnic communities who commit themselves to fighting threatening consummatory issues, and that it will be possible, through informal networks, to rally a cohesive opposition to their community's invasion, especially if it threatens their ideology. As Granovetter suggests, “whether a person trusts a given leader depends heavily on whether there exist intermediary personal contacts ... Trust in leaders is integrally related to the capacity to predict and affect their behaviour” (1973, 1374).

The problem with closed traditional rural communities is that their boundaries tend to stifle new ways and means of creating networks outside the segregated community (Tilly 1970). Thus, Native Indian reserves, Hutterite colonies, or many rural communities are easy prey for industrial bureaucracies whose invasion involves a network of corporate political, economic and educational powers. It is here that Wellman's (1979, 1206–7) “liberated” community has additional advantages: cheap, effective transportation independent of local-area proximity and widespread facilities

for interaction that create possible access to multiple loosely-bound social circles. Many traditional rural communities are changing in this direction.

The “saved” community argument does not accept the urban social disorganization assertion of the “lost” community advocates, but documents the persistence of changed community in the city. Some of the most interesting saved arguments have been made by Janowitz (1952), Greer (1962), Suttles (1972) and Hunter (1975), who have focussed on external linkage from a bounded communal base, often a small-scale territory or neighbourhood. They have clearly demonstrated that city community solidarity exists in bounded population aggregates, often with ethnic or religious cores.

We expect that when “saved” opponents of a proposed invasion of a community have the combined advantages of the “traditional” and “liberated” communities, they will have both the will and commitment to fight, as well as the social networks and skills to do so successfully. Like Granovetter (1973, 1373), we wish to discover “why some communities organize for common goals easily and effectively whereas others seem unable to mobilize resources, even against dire threats.” Gans (1962, 229–304) suggested that working-class residents could not effectively defend themselves, while middle-class residents could. We expect that this may be a factor, but success depends on more.

Granovetter (1973, 1374) suggests that “studies of diffusion and mass communication have shown that people rarely act on mass-media information unless it is also transmitted through personal ties.” This opens the door for important (sometimes charismatic), brokers or middlemen, who deeply understand their community and its aspirations, are respected and accepted as its legitimate leaders, and at the same time are also involved in important social networks and contacts outside their community. Usually, these brokers are more educated and occupationally upwardly mobile. Thus, brokers can take advantage of both the trust placed in them by members of their community, as well as reach other communities which can be rallied for added strength. Many rural communities do not have such a resource of sophisticated in-group brokers, but those that do have an added advantage over invader bureaucracies. Industrial bureaucracies may have specialized expertise and secondary political contacts, but they will find it harder to compete with educated, charismatic, upwardly mobile “saved” leadership based on a solid local primary community, which also has “liberated” access and influence in both the regional and the national arenas.

Reshaping Middleman Identities

A broker or middleman is one who enters the industrial fray from their secure traditional home and also links meaningfully to the larger community. The Jews are the best example in North America. Pierre van den Berghe claims that every country has its middlemen: “Turkey has Armenians and Greeks; West Africa has Lebanese; East Africa has Indians and Pakistanis; Egypt has Copts; Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam and Thailand have the Chinese” (van den Berghe 1981, 137). These are minorities who compete well economically and therefore are also fairly well-to-do socio-economically. When they compete in the melting pot economically, they seem to be able to separate their economic and social lives and retain their separate ethnic identity.

Van den Berghe (1981, 138) suggests that there is a cluster of characteristics of middlemen minorities (MM) which are remarkably uniform from society to society. He discusses the ideal type in three categories: the characteristics of these groups themselves, the nature of the larger society in which they live, and the particular economic niche they fill. According to van den Berghe, MMs arise from voluntary immigrants who enter a country not from slavery, but are rather propelled by difficult economic or political situations in their previous homeland, pursuing brighter economic prospects in the country of destination. MMs usually maintain strong extended families, perpetuate endogamy, and try to perpetuate their own cultural, institutional and spatial identity so they acculturate slower than most other groups.

Van den Berghe (1981, 138) classified MMs as an urban “petty bourgeoisie” social class, better off than the majority of the population but often far from wealthy. This better-than-average socio-economic status often provides them with many advantages in competition with their neighbours. MMs often hold ethnic values such as thrift, frugality, lack of ostentation and postponement of gratification. Jews, Chinese, Japanese, East Indians and Mennonites come readily to mind, and most of these can be recognized by their distinctive religion or visibility.

Van den Berghe (1981, 139) makes it clear that the host societies in which MMs survive are often complex stratified agrarian societies with mercantile capitalist economies. Existing and potential markets, trade and supporting agencies provide opportunities for exchange and expansion for those who have the skills and drive to exploit them. The special characteristics of MMs are usually visibly successful; they tend

also to become the targets of discrimination when economic times are difficult.

Georg Simmel's "The Stranger" theory is similar to the middleman, unifying the two characteristics of fixity and transience (Simmel 1950, 402). Simmel thought that the stranger could retain a separate identity by controlling their behaviour with others, often by being physically near to them to perform economic functions, for example, but distant with respect to their values. On the other hand, the stranger could often be far from their reference in-group when performing their duties in urban society, but could still retain a symbolic feeling of nearness and belonging to it.

It is important to see identity and distance in the total context of Simmel's view of social phenomena, as Levine et al. suggest:

Simmel's foundation that the stranger represents a combination of nearness and distance, far from being a logical flaw, aptly illustrates his more general assumption that all social phenomena reflect a combination of opposed tendencies.

(Levine et al. 1976, 839)

As Max Weber (1946) pointed out, the degree to which they are reflected in any society may be partial and never complete. The task is therefore to examine Canadian society to find which of these ideal types may be most applicable. Indeed, depending on which ethnic group we examine, it may well be that each of the ideal types is applicable to some of the groups within Canada. Our analysis suggests that the rural Québécois habitant and the Prairie Hutterite are represented best by the tradition-directed ethnic type. On the other hand, the urban Jew in Montreal and Toronto seems to be typical of the middleman or stranger type. Visible minorities can often be seen as marginals when they find it more difficult to compete in the industrial marketplace, where status and prestige are important to finding acceptance and jobs.

Managing Social Distance

Our discussion so far suggests that some Canadians place themselves closer to some groups than others. The Anglo Celts, for instance, express a sense of nearness to the French and a sense of distance from the Doukhobors and Hutterites. This suggests that we could order ethnic groups along a nearness-farness continuum, or a social distance scale, with the farness end of the scale representing racism.

According to Levine et al. (1976), Simmel's utilization of the metaphor distance constitutes a pervasive feature of his sociology as a whole. They summarize Simmel's meanings as (1) ecological attachment and mobility, (2) emotional involvement and detachment, and (3) the extent to which persons share similar qualities and sentiments. Simmel himself thought that distance could be expressed in many ways. Work on social distance has attempted to sort out the many meanings of the concept and to devise ways of measuring it (Driedger and Peters 1977, 161).

Bogardus (1959) expands Park's personal dimension of social distance and chooses to use "the degree of sympathetic understanding that functions between person and person, between person and group, and between group and group" as his measure of social distance. Sympathy refers to reactions of a favourable responsive type, and understanding involves that knowledge of a person which also leads to favourably responsive behaviour. While the Bogardus social distance scale has been used in scores of studies in countries around the world, very little use has been made of the scale for social distance research in Canada.

However, Driedger and Peters (1977) made a revealing study of students in nine Winnipeg high schools, wherein a sample of 2,328 students showed a large part of them were more willing to marry persons of European origin than of non-European origin. They appear to make racial distinctions between whites and non-whites in their marriage preferences (Driedger and Mezoff 1981, 7). It is also clear that nearness differentiations made within the European category are great. Three times as many high school students are willing to marry Americans as Jews. In fact, the Jews are classified more like non-Europeans; only one-fourth to one-fifth of the sample was willing to consider them as eligible partners.

Bogardus's instrument is a seven-point scale indicating nearness at the low end and farness at the top. Looking at the farness (6 and 7) end of the scale, they found that a small proportion of the students wished to debar certain groups and permit only visits to Canada. About fifty students (2%) were in favour of excluding the Dutch and the Blacks (the least restricted group), while two hundred students (11%) wished to restrict the Jews.

Angus Reid (1991) made a national multicultural attitude study and found that respondents in Canada felt varying degrees of comfort around a variety of recent immigrants. They developed a seven point scale that measured the degrees of comfort respondents felt in being around immigrants which ranged from "not comfortable" (1, 2), to "very

comfortable” (6, 7), shown in Table 1.1 below. The data show half a dozen trends. First, Canadians felt most comfortable around white European immigrants ranging from 83% who were very comfortable around British immigrants, to 70% around Portuguese immigrants. In contrast, only one half or less were comfortable around Arabs, Muslims, Indo-Pakistani and Sikh immigrants (43% to 52%). Thus, the range of comfort varied from almost all (83%), who were very comfortable around British immigrants, to less than half (43%) who felt very comfortable around “Sikhs.”

Reid’s study shows that factors such as race, religion, visibility and geography seem to be operating as to how much social distance is involved. These and more are all factors which influence “comfort with” or degrees of social distance which are involved in what feeds into immigrants feeling that they are “strangers,” accepted and valued, compared to others who are not. Immigrants from Middle Eastern areas, who are not “Christian” may be less valued, or seen as potential “strangers.”

Table 1.1 Degree (Percentages) of Comfort Canadians Feel Around a Variety of Recent Immigrants in Canada, 1991

Feel Comfortable Around:	Not Comfortable 1, 2	3, 4, 5	Very Comfortable 6, 7
British	3	14	83
Italians	2	11	77
French	5	11	74
Ukrainians	3	14	73
Germans	4	14	72
Portuguese	3	17	70
Chinese	5	16	69
Jews	4	22	64
West Indian	8	31	61
Blacks			
Arabs	11	37	52
Muslims	11	40	50
Indo-Pakistanis	13	39	48
Sikhs	17	40	43

Source: Angus Reid Group, "Multiculturalism and Canadians: National Attitude Study 1991," 7–8.

Conclusions

Georg Simmel was one of the first classical sociologists to introduced the concept of "*Der Fremde*," showing some of the many rich social psychological conceptual dimensions of "The Stranger," blending both fixity found in homes and identities, and transience which has led to new insights into social networks, and social distance. It is a complex concept, and this chapter has explored the depth and diversity of its dimensions and meanings. Homes, networks, identities and social distance are changing in

our fast-moving, urban, industrial, electronic post-industrial societies. Many other chapters in this volume will probe and enlarge the complexity of it all.

References

- Berger, Peter. (1967). *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Bogardus, Emory S. (1959). *Social Distance*. Los Angeles: Antioch Press.
- Driedger, Leo. (2000). "Postmodern Experiments: Blips or New Revolution?" In Susan and Gerald Biesecker-Mast (Eds.), *Anabaptists and Postmodernity*. Telford, PA: Pandora Press.
- Driedger, Leo and Jacob Peters. (1977). "Identity and Social Distance: Toward Understanding Simmel's 'The Stranger'," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 14, 158–173.
- . (1976). "Ethnic Identity of Students of Mennonite Heritage." In Stewart Crysdale and Les Wheatcraft (Eds.), *Religion in Canadian Society*, 446–49. Toronto: McMillan of Canada.
- Granovetter, Mark, S. (1973). "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:13-73.
- Laumann, E.O. (1965). 'Subjective Social Distance and Urban Occupational Stratification'. *American Journal of Sociology* 71:26-36.
- Levine, Donald N., Ellwood B. Carter and Eleanor Miller Gorman (1976) 'Simmel's Influence on American Sociology'. *American Journal of Sociology* 81:813-45.
- Lewin, Kurt (1948). *Resolving Social Conflicts*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Reid, Angus (1991) *Multiculturalism and Canadians: Attitude Study, A National Report*. Ottawa: Ministry of Multiculturalism.
- Simmel, Georg (1950). *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, Kurt Wolff (Ed.). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- van den Berghe, Pierre L (1981). *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York: Elsevier.
- Weber, Max (1958). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Scribner.
- Wellman, Barry, Peter Carrington, and Alan Hall (1983). "Networks as Personal Communities." Research Paper No. 28. Toronto: Centre for Urban Studies. University of Toronto.

CHAPTER TWO

LATINO PRESENCE IN THE US SOUTH: AN (UN)WANTED EXCHANGE

CARLOS PARRA

SOUTHERN ADVENTIST UNIVERSITY

Introduction and Historical perspectives

Within the U.S. territory, what is considered the geographical South (i.e. Alabama, Kentucky, North and South Carolina, Tennessee etc.) has, for the past two decades, experienced a tremendous influx of immigrants from all latitudes. Most of those immigrants, however, are from Spanish-speaking countries, as expressed in “Under Siege,” a report by the Southern Poverty Law Centre (SPLC) in April 2009. Granted, immigration to this geographical location is not a new phenomenon. However, the current increased number of immigrants, especially from so-called developing countries, is a present concern and worry for the government and citizens alike. Regardless of such concern, immigrants begin, immediately upon arrival, to reformat and reshape their perception of “home.” I will address this perception of first-generation Spanish-speaking-immigrants and the application of the notion of “home” within the borders of a modern nation-state like the U.S., as many of them negotiate this notion with the support of religious organizations. In addition, I will suggest that second-generation-Latino-immigrants seem to rely on virtual media and social networking as two of many factors to mediate the absence of a notion of “homeland.”

Generally, Spanish-speaking-immigrants arrive in the U.S. South mainly in response to job offers and possibilities of employment in their search for financial stability and personal security (Ramos 2004, 52–4). Most of these immigrants look “different” due to their racial/ethnic backgrounds, in the eyes of a more self-proclaimed “homogeneous” majority that expects (stereotypes), and enforces (legal policing), “sameness” for the

sake of preserving its position of power, legal or not, over long-term and newly arrived immigrants alike.

Since the nineteenth century, the social structure of the U.S. South has generally been expressed as a literal black & white dichotomy. Under this configuration, only two groups exist at odds with each other, within a structure of power. Such power organization was established early on, mostly by and for the benefit of a racially white and ideologically European society. Since then, this region of the U.S. has been able to persistently promote a discourse according to which being white is identified, perceived and enforced as the ideal norm and a pattern to follow for all of those within the U.S. political borders (Huntington 2004, 39). This is not to say that the racially black segment of the population has not challenged such notions. On the contrary, this tension has been a source of major confrontations and struggles in the past, many ending tragically. For our purpose, it is enough to say that the “ideal norm” was imposed from the beginning of this socio-political exchange. Under such conditions, power in the U.S. is held (unnaturally captured by a white minority) in a perpetual motion, as an assumed right, stemming from the formation of this great nation since the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

More recently, in the last two decades, a steady increase of racially and ethnically diverse communities of immigrants has become an inevitable part of the socioeconomic fabric within the Southern society. The varieties of locations that these immigrants come from have heightened the emphasis on difference at many levels. Furthermore, the emphasis placed on the notion of diversity is now challenging a social structure that, in the past, was simply understood and perceived as only black and white. It is safe to say that for many in the South witnessing the huge influx of immigrants, the notion of what it means to be “American” is being challenged by every newcomer in their midst. Many issues, such as the process of assimilation, initiatives for social integration, general understanding of “legal” status, law enforcement for control of “illegal” presence in the U.S., and the national struggle for confirmation of an official language are expressed from a diversity of perceptions according to religious, philosophical, political and partisan inclination. As these issues contribute to create a tense social atmosphere, they also add to a general emphasis on differences by assigning specific labels to all members of society.

Current Issues

Today, in the U.S., the label of “immigrant” is generally perceived as a derogatory term, especially if such immigrants come from what are categorized as developing countries in the world. In other words, a process of demonization of these communities is already taking place, mainly at the expense of much of the recent immigrant population (Buchanan 2002, 125).

In addition to the derogatory “immigrant” label, there is the term “illegal,” being more pervasive. These terms are generated and reinforced by government institutions, and visualized as reasonably beneficial in terms of population accountability within the nation’s borders in order to preserve stability and promote social development. However, immigrant communities, many of which are forced to leave their countries to come into the U.S., do not benefit from such labels or the mechanisms of socio-economic and political repression created by them.

It is important at this point, since immigrants fit many different governmental categories of immigration, to clarify that those who are understood as holding a “legal” immigrant status are not necessarily exempt, and many are mistakenly still grouped with those who do not hold such status. Thus, state or government institutions, as they seek national security at all levels, also contribute to deleting available paths for Spanish-speaking immigrants to perceive, accept and embrace a legitimate sense of “home,” regardless of legal or illegal status (Huntington 2004, 181).

Navigating the system

A clear process of negotiation takes place as immigrants navigate a national system that, in many cases, rejects them from the onset. However, their reliance on government programs of welfare and social integration do satisfy the needs of a good number. On the other hand, for many immigrants such programs are inaccessible and impossible to navigate due to the language barrier, the lack of necessary documentation, and the fear of being caught and deported. The worst threat is being placed in a detention centre without a clear possibility of positive resolution on their behalf as immigrants in the U.S. (Bernstein 2009). Law enforcement measures of this nature only contribute to worsening citizen accountability,

damage community relations, and increase a sense of mistrust of government institutions.

It is important to clarify that, regardless of the labels first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants and second-generation-Latino-immigrants share, they do possess significant differences. While first-generation immigrants may project a linguistic challenge, a level of difficulty adapting to different ways of living, and sometimes a degree of resistance to adapting as they are faced with adoption of new values and social expectations, second-generation immigrants feel at “home” speaking English as they simply create and live their own sets of values and expectations. There are clear challenges between these two generations. After all, they are a product of different societies, often at odds in their sense of values and expectations. However, in the eyes of an “American” audience, both are perceived as, if not equal, then alike in just about every way. This assumption is the source of many social discrepancies, language misunderstandings and enforcement of erroneous application of the law when dealing with both generations in the U.S., based on biased opinions and stereotypes. The conditions created by these phenomena leave both generations with a heightened sense of general mistrust as they try to adopt a to “home” of their own.

Integration Challenges

For first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants, “legal” or not, a sense of home is more accurately projected under the wings of another institution—the church. Immigrants of all backgrounds in the U.S. understand upon arrival in “America” that a division between church and state exists. However, the experience of many is soured very quickly by an institutionalized government policing system, generally in pursuit of their deportation. Since a great majority of Spanish-speaking immigrants profess a Catholic faith, and some to other religious denominations, a number of immigrants will rely on organized religious groups upon arrival in the U.S. as they seek to embrace, or perhaps recover, various levels of the notion of “home.”

It is important to highlight that for second-generation-Latino-immigrants a notion of belonging within this national space is currently affected by the subjective interpretation of a very objective fact already expressed within the constitution of the U.S. in reference to being born on American territory (Wydra 2009). In addition, immigrants (regardless of

whether they are first or second generation), as they attempt to integrate within the “American” socioeconomic fabric, will also experience various levels of discrimination due to perceived racial or ethnic differences (Fernandez-Kelly and Curran 2001, 127–55; Lopez and Stanton-Salazar 2001, 57–90).

For first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants, the knowledge of the “great divide” between church and state, coupled with a general feeling of rejection due to perceived racial or ethnic differences, raises a defence mechanism of cultural survival. The fact that the same government they embrace, willingly or not, as they arrive on U.S. territory enacts and enforces anti-immigrant laws, and actively detains and deports, impresses in the mind of many a sense of mistrust in government institutions. The truth is that many first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants already arrive in the U.S. with this negative feeling, which in a real sense is an extension of mistrust and sometimes fear of their own governments from which some have escaped. Back “home,” the “great north” where they are heading is perceived with a powerful “land-of-milk-and-honey-across-the-river” connotation. This “promised land” could refer to either the U.S. or Canada, since both are part of this equation. However, upon arrival, such a notion of “home” is immediately negotiated in a variety of ways within the survival continuum.

Many first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants will hold on to a notion of “home,” sometimes for many years, that is never present or simultaneous to where they are currently living. In other words, “home” becomes an imagined space of nostalgia imbedded in their memory with the hope of someday returning to find and continue where they left off. This, in itself, is generally perceived by the U.S. majority as economically counterproductive and a hurdle for integration and assimilation since immigrants are “here” yet thinking of “there,” never completely in either location. This sense of displacement is worsened as they try to navigate a society that is foreign to them. A level of “foreignness” is commonly expected prior to arrival, but the level of difficulty experienced as they become socially and economically essential within U.S. society pushes them to choose various avenues to cope with feelings of isolation as they adapt to various ways of living in the United States.

Accessing the System

Immigrants can access organizations of all kinds that already have initiatives in place ranging from social networking, religious and spiritual support, economic advice, and free educational programs. Such visits generally take place with the intention of adapting to the new society while adopting key elements into their personal experience, allowing them to function at the basic level as productive authorized or unauthorized members of any given community. Organized religious groups play a very important role at this stage for first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants. For example, the Catholic Charities of East Tennessee offer not only spiritual guidance and family counselling, but also economic and legal advising, citizenship and naturalization guidance. Spanish-speaking immigrants learn English as a second language (ESL), which is a necessary step to function at the basic level in the U.S. Furthermore, the Episcopal Church in Chattanooga, TN also provides a comprehensive program through the *Episcopal Metropolitan Ministries* which serve immigrants and refugees alike.

Second-generation Latino Migrants

In reference to the second-generation-Latino-immigrants, religious organizations already understand that it is beneficial to provide support not only to them, but also to their parents. To this end, such organizations have also established a whole network of social programs from childcare to youth camps with the intention of maintaining and promoting the needed family structure many immigrants seek but lack. It is important to note that such programs function with the direct support of a great deal of volunteers from the same faith and/or the community at large. However, many of these programs may receive monetary support from the federal government under a non-profit banner since they are truly instrumental in the support of immigrant communities as they thrive and grow within the “American” socioeconomic fabric.

Providing immigrants with these mechanisms of support permits them to seek and expect protection as they negotiate their own sense of “home” within their communities. Of course, we must highlight individual the collective emotional tension stemming from various sources and numerous threats to immigrants by those who assure us that “immigrants should go back to wherever they come from,” and are “taking advantage of this great American system,” at the expense of “true Americans.”

Some of the social programs already in place provide a platform for dialogue that helps to rebuild trust in institutions and offer guidance as immigrants seek “legal” status, if this is necessary, on the path to U.S. citizenship. One example of a current comprehensive immigrant program run by a non-profit organization is La Paz de Dios in tandem with community initiatives of the Methodist, Episcopal and Catholic churches at the Saint Andrews Centre, in Chattanooga, TN. La Paz provides a welfare system for immigrants ranging from document translations, legal advice, support for job hunting, ESL, and computing literacy through La Plaza Comunitaria as a partnership between Chattanooga State Technical Community College (CSTCC) and the Mexican Consulate in Atlanta. They also offer banking operations, health care through Lifespring Community Health Clinic, and even cultural development of young talented Latino immigrant girls through the Chattanooga Girls Choir. Additionally, La Paz manages to provide family support between Spanish-speaking immigrants and their children through after-school programs with the East Side Elementary School, a school that is currently consisting of 60% immigrants and minorities, mainly from Mexico and Central America.

These organizations work together for local immigrants and manage to provide a structure, a framework of the basic components geared toward potential “homebuilding” or at least temporary settlement free-of-charge. First, they raise awareness as they provide legal advising by local attorneys who regularly volunteer, solely for this purpose. Second, they enhance community relations by providing a platform of dialogue between local minority groups in order to lower mutual urban social discomfort. Third, they offer English as a second language (ESL) in connection with the local community college to enhance living conditions and upward mobility for immigrants. Finally, they seek to empower those who have recently arrived to the local area, legally or not, by providing the services every citizen needs to become an active member of the local community in Chattanooga, TN. In other words, for a number of first-generation immigrants, religious organizations are indeed a non-demonizing, non-criminalizing, validating space necessary to function within a process of social integration. Organizations for immigrant support must identify key elements that provide a path for first and second generation immigrants to gradually integrate within any given community, be it rural or urban.

First-generation-Spanish-speaking immigrants who are provided with the opportunities already described will seek and exhibit a mirrored sense of “home” as a result of interaction and intentional support by non-profit

organizations such as those clustered at The Saint Andrews Centre in Chattanooga TN. For first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants, the lower the levels of threat and fear experienced, the stronger the notion of “home” is embraced and fixed in their mind. In addition, they experienced a greater level of personal security and social acceptance within their communities. Otherwise, the higher mobility factor increases the lack of a sense of place and belonging for first-generation-Spanish-speaking immigrants. This surely projects a powerful sense of displacement not conducive to building a strong and healthy notion of “home.” Generally, first-generation-Spanish-speaking-immigrants will remain attached to the imagined sense of “home” they left behind. I refer to an “imagined” sense of home because no matter what they do or try to achieve as foreigners in a foreign country, the “home” they left no longer exists, but the notion manages to survive in their mind as they remember it with nostalgia..

Concurrently, the second-generation-Latino-immigrants seemingly deal with a distorted sense of “homeland” since most unfairly experience prejudice exerted by those Americans who feel that this generation of “newcomers” must “go back home,” when the reality is that “home” for them, by literal birth, is the U.S. Those who are labelled as “second generation immigrants” are American citizens, possessing equal constitutional rights and with the privilege of enjoying health, education, welfare and government support as those who have been in U.S. territory for generations. This generation communicates in English as their first language, rudimentary and faulty Spanish at best, and often in “Spanglish” as a generational default (Portes and Hao 1998; Alba et al. 2002).

Generally, they do not have the clear historical panorama of their parents’ countries of origin, nor the relationship those nations have had with the United States. The majority are a product of the U.S. public educational system and can only express what this system has offered them, and not only to them, but to their generation regardless of ethnic origin. In other words, they feel American, but have to deal with generational prejudice and bias stemming from a number of factors placed on them as labels, necessary for keeping them apart, different from the rest of society. They must deal with accusations of educational incompetence and assertions of emotional and psychological unfitness to function in an American society as productive citizens, and must hold on to a sense of legitimacy that escapes them as they are perceived as “foreigners” in their own land. This generation must wrestle to access and foster a sense of validation within the borders of their own country that children of