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Abstract

Over the past decades the US-Mexico migration introduces new arrangements regarding which preceded it. In order to observe this unprecedented mass migration is necessary to comprehensively address the macro-reality of both countries, the importance concatenated representing the migratory tradition, socialization, collective imaginary, social networks, the migration industry, among others, (mezzo and microstructural level). This article is supported on empirical data from a case study in Michoacan, focuses on proposing some concepts to highlight the importance of mezzo and microstructural analysis in contemporary migration.
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Introduction

The importance of the migration phenomenon is undeniable at the world level. According to data from the International Organization for Migration (2012) and the National Population Council (Consejo Nacional de Población) in Mexico (2013) there were 65 million international migrants reported in 1965, significantly increasing to 105 million by the year 1985, and 214 million (3.1% of world population) by 2010. If we were to get all these globetrotters together in one place they would constitute the 5th most populated country on the planet, with 49% women. There are also a significant number of an internally displaced people (27.5 million) in 2010, more than 6 million reported in the year 2000; and 15.4 million refugees.

The United States continues to be the country that receives the greatest number of immigrants. In the year 2010 the country reached 310 million inhabitants, of which 42 million were immigrants, meaning that the group constituted 13.8% of the total population of the nation, and 20% of world migrants, far above Russia in second place with 5.7% of international migrants (CONAPO, 2010).

In recent decades the proverbial migratory Mexico-United States pattern has changed in terms of its magnitude, intensity, modality, and characteristics, thus sealing a new cycle in this phenomenon (Borjas and Katz, 2005). This is how those well read in the migratory phenomenon to the United States attest, they also coincide in pointing out the characteristics of this new panorama that differ very notably to those recorded in previous periods.
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The sociocultural repercussions are no less significant, highlighting among them the expansion of transnational organizations, changes in community practices, and tensions in the processes of identity and socialization in present generations (Ariza and Portes, 2007).

It is little wonder. Mexico is the main human resource exporting country in the world, and 98% of its migrants reside in the United States.

The number of Mexicans in America surpassed 800,000 in 1970, 8.7 million in 2000, and reached 11.9 million in 2010 (10.62% of the 112 million inhabitants of Mexico reported by the Population and Housing Census by INEGI 2010), with a less dynamic migratory flow in the second half of this period, and a negative flow in 2008 of 326,000 people, but was positive again in both 2009 and 2010 (Cervantes, 2011). If we add this figure to the population of Mexican origin, the number increases to just over 33 million in 2010, 21.2 million born in the United States (11.2 million second generation, and 9.9 million third generation). These figures indicate that Mexico is one of the countries with the greatest immigration to the United States, more than large regions of the world such as Asia, Europe, and the rest of Latin America. Currently, 4% of the total population of the United States is Mexican, as is 30% of the migrant population (CONAPO, 2010). Clearly, as Borjas and Katz (2005) assert, the current level of Mexican immigration is unprecedented, and it was both numerically and proportionally the largest immigrant group throughout the 20th century in the United States.

Not surprisingly, an important sum of money flowed in terms of remittances, despite the economic difficulties of the last few years there are continued reports of considerable amounts. In 2010, according to data from the IOM (2012), the amount of remittances was estimated to be 440 billion dollars worldwide, far higher than the 132 billion USD that circulated in the year 2000. The main beneficiary countries in 2010 were India, China, Mexico, and the Philippines. Rich countries are the main sources of remittances, and the United States leads the way with 48.3 billion dollars registered in 2009. In other words, based on data from the BBVA/Research (2012), remittance growth worldwide between 1990 and 2010 increased 6.4 times, far above the 1.4 times that international migrant growth experienced in the same period.

For Cervantes (2011) Mexico’s income from remittances, although modest in comparison to the Mexican economy (equivalent in 2010 to 2.1% of GDP), has been significant in its absolute magnitude and very positive for soothing poverty levels for millions of recipient families. These resources from abroad have allowed said families to experience better levels of wellbeing and access to resources, education, health, housing, and some of them even family businesses. Therefore we see that the evolution of income by family remittances has increased at an accelerated pace in the past few years. In 1999, 5.9 billion USD was received, reaching a little more than 26 billion USD in 2007, and dropping to 21.2 billion USD in 2010.

Economic asymmetries may be observed, structural dependency on immigrant labor, the IRCA process of legalization (the Simpson-Rodino law), higher wages, more job options, transformations to economic structure that provoked a free expansion of the service and manufacturing sectors, an aging demographic, labor segmentation, transnational communities, and social networks are attractive factors in the United States.

Despite adverse economic conditions, lack of job opportunities, unemployment in the countryside and in cities, low income, processes of economic restructuring (FTA and neoliberalism that translate to an increase in inequalities and disparities within Mexico and when compared to the United States), economic precariousness of rural communities, elevated growth in the working age population, migrant networks, migratory culture, technological innovation, transport progress, strengthening of the collective imagination and migrant socialization, dependency on remittances, the migration industry (agents, institutions) are all elements of expulsion from the Mexican side.

---

5The Pew Hispanic Center (PHC) establishes that it seems that the factors that prevented and reversed the migratory flow from Mexico to the United States was the weakening of the labor market, and especially of housing construction in the United States; border containment and the increased danger, for that matter, for undocumented migrants to cross the border; the increase in Mexican deportations; the long term decrease in fertility in Mexico and wider economic conditions in Mexico. According to the PHC, Mexican immigration may resume when the United States economy recovers.
Without losing sight of the fact that in this new context there are a series of actors linked to migratory flows: multinational corporations, governments, international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund that stimulate and support the implementation of economic policies that promote migration and free trade agreements that reinforce capital, services, information, and labor flows.

These elements have formed the largest diaspora in the world. In this new context, migration is re-working social, cultural, economic, psychological, and local political relationships, at the same time it is generating transnational networks that question traditional means of migratory flow restrictions, as well as north-south relations at the global level (Ibarra, 2007).

From there, it is important to understand other interpretive keys in order to encapsulate the migratory phenomenon as a lattice with causes and diverse consequences. This research is a modest contribution to the field.

**Theoretical Framework**

Human migrations, understood as a process and not as the concatenation of isolated events, have been valued as the determinate analytical center in its conceptual framework. For Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller (2004), the concept of migratory process intricately synthesizes systems of factors and interactions that lead to international migration and influence its course. Migration is a process that affects all dimensions of social existence that develops a complex dynamic of its own.

Certainly, the study each of the factors that come in to play separately and unilaterally is important because it provides us with a set of important data. This procedure, nonetheless, is not enough because it runs the risk taking the conclusions derived from its examination as definitive and therefore loses sight of the whole of which it is a part. For Roberto Herrera (2006), the social reality in which migration is placed demands that researchers of the phenomenon take into consideration, not only isolated parcels of it, but all of its contradictory complexity and its constant evolution. Only in this way is it possible to conduct a plausible analysis of the heterogeneous peculiarities of migrations, such as their most commonly referred to generalizations.

That is to say, migration as a historical-social process should be understood as a phenomenon with economic, political, social, cultural, and psychological causes and consequences in permanent connection to their historical origins. As a process, it circumscribes this multi-faceted phenomenon, from a historic, multi-dimensional, and ever-changing perspective. For the historian in his or her diachronic search of the process, it is very important to maintain a comprehensive view of the diverse factors that migration is composed of.

Throughout the 20th century, the constants in the theory of migration were the reductionist and determinist approaches that saw the phenomenon in a unilateral way. Thus we have the neoclassic, Marxist, and functionalist approaches, etc. Over the last few decades we have witnessed a re-evaluation of the microstructures in the analysis of the historic-social.

History has expanded and fragmented at a dizzying speed (Burke, 1993), we recognize microhistory, grassroots history and the history of daily life, the history of the forgotten, the history of worldviews, oral history, women’s history, the history of reading, the history of images, cultural history, history of the body, etc. Sociology has occupied itself with the link between the micro and macro-social theories and the micro and macro levels of analysis (Rizter, 2005).

The micro-macro bond came about as a central problem in American sociological theory during the 1980s and had continued relevance in the nineties. In parallel to this concern, interest for action-structure integration developed in Europe. **Structuration Theory** by Anthony Giddens (1998) is one example of this. The essence of Giddens’ proposal is that it conceives of action and structure as a “duality”. That is to say, they cannot be separated: the action is involved in the structure and vice versa. This author emphasizes that the structure is not only a simple constriction, but it is also enabling.

The **Theory of Migratory Process** reflects these contemporary sociological worries and suggests a series of deserving epistemological elements that should be pointed out at the moment of theoretical discussion of this phenomenon. We are reminded that by the end of the 1990s, Alejandro Portes (1997) indicated that there are reasons to be optimistic about the theoretical progress in the field of migration. Part of this optimism is based on the fact that “an exploration of the determinant structures of contemporary migratory flows and microstructures that they sustain at all times has been achieved”. For Castles and Miller (2004):
“Migrations tend to happen due to the existence of prior bonds between the sending and receiving country based on colonization, political influence, exchange, investment of cultural links. Therefore migration from Mexico to the United States originated in the expansion towards the south and west by the United States in the 19th century and the deliberate recruitment of Mexican workers by American employers in the 20th century”.

In addition there is a trend of displacement towards ancient metropolis, which adds an interesting vein to the study of chain-reaction migrations and the idea of the existence of a migratory system with roots that lie much deeper than simple economic considerations.

This means that any migration may be seen as a consequence of the interaction between macro-structures, mezzo-structures, and micro-structures. The first are large-scale institutional factors and are made up of the political economy of the world market, relationships between states and laws, structures and practices established by countries of origin and destination in order to control human flows.

The second, microstructures, are informal social networks created by migrants to free themselves from the inherent obstacles of migration and its establishment. They include personal relationships, family and home organization patterns, friendship and community ties and solidarity in economic and social terms. Networks provide information, cultural, and social capital from knowledge of other countries that aid organizing the trip, finding work, and adapting to different environments. The same networks consolidate communities in international geographies constructing cultural, social, and economic infrastructure (churches, clubs, professional services, stores, supermarkets, bands, food, etc.). This process is concatenated with the situation of the migrants’ children that upon socializing in schools, and by dominating the English language, construct transnational identities, which makes it more difficult for parents to return to their places of origin.

Finally, macro-structures are the institutions and individuals that form part of the “migration industry”, which consists of recruitment agencies, travel agents, bureaux de change, lawyers, translators and transnational paperwork services, bankers, money transfer services, smugglers that play the role of mediators between migrants and political and economic institutions. It is in these agents’ interest that migration continues so that they may continue to organize it, even when governments try to restrict these movements.

These three structures, Castles and Miller (2004) considered, are interrelated in the migratory process and there are no clear dividing lines between them. No cause alone is sufficient to explain why individuals decide to go to another country.

This leads us to see migrations not as mere personal and collective decisions, but as an answer to a range of successive circumstances that converge. It deals with, then, a process in which a series of elements interact and determine the course, duration, time, and space of migration. This transcends holism and reductionism by indicating that you cannot understand a part without the whole, nor the whole without the part. The historical subject may be considered as a part, and also as a whole (Piastro, 2008).

For Castles (2006), these elements should not be considered as steps towards a new general theory of international migration. In the same way that Alejandro Portes (2007) suggests a group of “mid-level theories” that facilitate the explanation of empirical concrete results linked to adequate sets of historical and contemporary research. This merits leaving to one sided disciplinary interpretations of migration as a concept that contemplates diverse factors that feed back into specific contexts of economic, social, and political exchange. As Braudel (1999) stated: “All the sciences of man, across the span of history, have been contaminated by one another. They speak or can only speak the same language” (p. 75).

Method

Both primary and secondary sources of information were used in this research. Fieldwork was our primary source. This constitutes, generally, the most direct means for data collection. We used land observation and exploration, which is basically direct contact with the object of study (participant observation), the questionnaire, and interview that consisted of quantitative and qualitative collection of oral testimony.

3As, for example, migratory policies. Leticia Calderón (2006) tells us that the formation of migratory policy is perhaps one of the processes that has the most direct impact on the lives of migrants. Thus research into migratory policy is indispensable as an axis of this study, or as an obligatory reference of all analysis that considers the methodical approximation of the migratory processes from the policy perspective.
The aim was to capture the richness of experience of the interviewees, allowing them to describe different aspects and situations, vicissitudes that are not generally registered. Besides it allowed us greater contact with the reality of ex-migrants, migrants, wives, and children of migrants, returned migrants, their families, and neighbors, allowing us better opportunities to reflect on our object of study. As Edwina Pio (2007) rightly said, understanding the world through human experience may be increased when research is situated in the historical and cultural context.

Secondary sources used were books, journals, and censuses. Together they provided theoretical-methodological elements, the historical and contextual panorama of international migration Mexico-United States; besides having access to national, state, and local data and statistics which were not possible to obtain in the field.

**Consideration of Mezzo and Microstructures in Contemporary Migration**

**Proposed Concepts**

For Mark Bloch (2003) it is very important to describe how the overlaps of the components of human society immersed in history. Thus he states that “we have recognized that, in a society, whichever that may be, everything is connected and governed mutually: the social and policy structure, the economy, beliefs, elemental manifestations, such as the most subtle of mentality” (p.29-30). Life, and therefore, history are multiple in their structure, in their causes. Marc Bloch (2003) rejects a history that would mutilate man (true history is interested in the whole man, with his body, his sensitivity, his mentality, and not only his ideas and actions) and the same story, that is a total effort to capture the man in his society and in his time.

In the same way, human migrations, understood as a process and not as a string of isolated facts, have been recognized as the essential analytical center of study. Roberto Herrera (2006) effectively establishes that despite studying each factor separately that intervene in the process of migration, although of great utility because it offers an important base of information, is not enough because it runs the risk of taking the conclusions that are derived from its examination as definitive and loses sight of the totality of which they form a part. The social reality in which migration is found requires that researchers of the phenomenon take into account, not only isolated parcels, but also all of its contradictory complexity and its constant evolution. Only in this way is it possible to undertake a plausible analysis of the heterogeneous peculiarities of migrations, such as its most commonly referred to generalizations.

It should be pointed out, beyond economic conditions (lack of employment and resource scarcity), there are strong cultural factors that are equally important detonators in the migratory phenomenon. We qualify this aspect because we believe that the non-economic factors are do not opposed nor deny, on the contrary, they complement the historic-structural character and current flow of migration in general. These motivations are fundamental to a process of such economic-political influence.

Paloma Paredes (2007) observes that if the economic causes and needs determine the great majority of the exit to the north, these combine with many other motivations that have nothing to do with the job market and job opportunities. Equally, Lourdes Arizpe (2007) observes that if economic conditions are enough to explain the ways in which migrants interact economically, socially, psychologically, and culturally in societies of reception and origin. For these and other regions, today’s culture is a key theme in the agendas of international development and geopolitics.

In other words, there is a heterogeneity of circumstances that impulse individuals to leave their country and live in another, which brings us to consider the phenomenon as a symbiosis, a feedback between the more structural motivations (economic-political) and those that are located in the mezzo and micro level (socio-cultural). In this aspect, Massey et al (1993) insist on taking into account a kind of imagined expectation that highly developed countries have formed around their standards of living and that this may be a possible factor that stimulates the structure of motivations to migrate within certain sectors, but which entail an important number of people due to the great influence of the mass media, propaganda, movies, and the own experiences and expectations of the migrants that already reside and work in places of destination.

This feeds into the “culture of migration”, meaning, when migration prevails in a community (that has a fixed tradition), the probability of one deciding to migrate is increased because it awakens values, perceptions, and tastes that are not satisfied in places of origin.
This is what Massey (1993) calls “structural inflation”, which occurs when salaries not only reflect on the conditions and demands of the offer but when they project on the plane of psychosocial appreciation, that is to say, when it means status and prestige.

For Bourdieu (Burke, 2000), economic power is, before and above all, the power to distance oneself from economic need; that is why it is always marked for the destruction of richness, sumptuary consumption, wasteful spending, and all forms of free luxury. Visibly wasteful spending, in reality, is a way to transform economic capital into political, social, cultural, or symbolic capital.

With these theoretical presuppositions we start our analysis of the micro and mezzo structures and their importance in the migratory rise in the last few decades, making it clear that those stated are only few, and we do not exhaust the possibility of investigating other equally important ones. What we intend here is to reveal the pertinence of observing how the diverse components are interwoven into historical processes. If for the aforementioned points the historical, current, macro-structure, and theoretical we turn to secondary sources, such as books and journals, this isolation was a product of participant observation for two years, the qualitative methods (historic-anthropological) and the quantitative methods (sociological-demographic) in Huandacareo, a locality in Michoacán, Mexico that has experienced a high intensity of migration.

With this case study we intend to follow Roberto Herrera’s advice (2006), to not limit studies to statistical descriptions and evaluations of the flows at a highly reduced level of theoretical explanation, that discourage the attempt to bring new indices that may contribute to wider horizons of the conceptual observation. It deals with systematically contrasting the possible conceptual contributions of case studies carried out at a “micro” level with existing models, with the purpose of verifying or ruling out these proposals and to propitiate the necessary correlation of knowledge for the construction of ever broader heuristic levels, which would also lead to a greater interdisciplinary acceptance of the findings and the development of a wider theoretical generalization.

Continuing with the symbolic and the imagined, which Massey and Bourdieu brought to light in previous paragraphs, we can observe the symbolic process of the concepts of Robert K. Merton (1964) of manifest functions and latent functions. The prior are the objective consequences that contribute to the adjustment or adaptation of the system and are sought and recognized by participants in the system. The second are unexpected and unrecognized social and psychological consequences.

The discovery of these latent functions for Merton meant important advances in sociological understanding, as they represent a greater distance from “common sense” about social life. For example, the concept proposed by Thorstein Veblen of conspicuous consumption: the manifest purpose of buying goods and consuming them is to, of course, satisfy the needs that those goods are destined towards satisfying. So, the car allows us to move faster, water help satisfy thirst, etc. However, acquisition and accumulation do not only have the end of consumption. Therefore, the analysis should also consider the latent functions of consumption, accumulation and consumption.

It appears that from this perspective, ostentatious consumption of relatively expensive merchandise means (symbolizes) the possession of enough riches to allow yourself such expenses. Richness, at the same time, confers honor. People that make ostentatious purchases not only receive pleasure from their direct consumption of the product, but also of the elevated situation that it reflects in the attitudes and opinions of others that observe their consumption. The propensity and dilapidation in the “good” and the “brand”, results in not only the direct pleasures derived from the consumption of cutting-edge, fashionable or “superior” items, but also, and this is what stands out, an elevation of social standing. As Peter Burke (2000) also tells us, sumptuary consumption is but a strategy so that a social group may exert its superiority over another.

Ostentation, wasteful spending, and luxury clothing the migrant with an aura of prestige and distinction with regards to non-migrants, competing and in many cases surpassing, in sumptuousness of the “rich” of the town. All of this paraphernalia of recent model and glamorous cars and trucks (mustang, trans-am, scape, BMW, etc.), clothes, a wardrobe full of “brand” clothes and shoes, jewelry, hair dye (which they generally buy for the express purpose of showing off for the first time when the return to the places of origin) permanent pilgrims of malls, security and tonality of their voices that stand out at each step and gesticulating the goodness of “over there” and what is lacking “here”, assiduous visitors of banks and bureaus de change denoting that their bags are a mine of
dollars **bubble of the sumptuous parade**: the pomp of the migrants when they return, and that all migrants are participants and reproducers of this paraphernalia.

It doesn’t matter that the migrant brings practically the essentials to go back, their **social role**\(^4\) is to be triumphant and rub it in the face of the misery of their peoples by a radical change in lifestyle and social standing. It is known that some migrants that do not return to their homelands for the shame of not ostentatiously showing the magnificence of goods that they “should” have.

This **ritualization of the cyclical returns** has provoked children and teenagers that socialize\(^5\) in “primary groups”\(^6\) to visualize migration as a very plausible option given the little means of social mobility that exist in Mexico. Before actual migration there is an **imagined migration**.

As an example we refer to my son. He is an adolescent. Despite the daily advice about the importance of study for his future life, one day out of the blue he asked me:

_Dad, why do you kill yourself studying if people that go up North bring back trucks and go around well dressed and with big chains. When I get out of college I am going with my friend Rebeco, for my dream is getting rich in the North”. Well, son, I said, you will decide that when you are old enough, but tell me, if you try hard studying, can’t you also buy many things, but he didn’t let me finish, when with a newfound resolve, “no, papa, those that go to the north come back soon and don’t kill themselves with books like you do, besides a lot of people study and then go to the United States._

If we observe that being a migrant in a few years’ time represents emulating the wealthy of the communities of origin, this activity becomes a very important objective in their lives. As Luis Eduardo Guarnizo (2007) said, among the desires of many of these migrants is to improve their lifestyle or be recognized as part of the elite, be recognized for their status, in such a way that their purpose is not to finish with inequality but to gain access and climb the social ladder.

Javier Serrano (Escobar, 2007) by observing these symbolic processes says frequently that migration is the consequence of a “Mexican dream”, in which they do not try to integrate with American society, but become a respected person in their society of origin. It is what I call the **search for the imported progress**: this means that in the collective imagination it deals with a material level (house, car, land) in relation to what many migrants have built; new migrants try to acquire them to not fall behind but to climb in social status and prestige.

In parallel to this, as Paloma Paredes tells us (2007), those migrants interviewed have come to the conclusion that the accumulation of other people’s stories has been a central element in their decision to leave. There is no decision without a discursive “North”. That is to say, this north, which they talk about, is clearly a construction that speaks to, above all, the values of the narrator. Therefore life in the neighboring country is an idea that is fed little by little, and each time it is more frequent that more individuals adventure to leave when collective experience exists, when migratory tradition of the community already has a long time practicing it, when the consolidation of networks facilitates the landing of new arrivals. The idea of an abundant and attractive north is constructed through tales of those that come and go, and what they construct in image and goods: the binary architecture of the migrant or Bifocal Migrant Phenomenology.

---

\(^4\)The social role is the collection of patterns or norms of behavior that are expected of one that occupies a determined position in the social structure (Burke, 2000:60).

\(^5\)For Gustavo López Castro (2007) socialization is the mechanism by which all societies normalize behavior, inculcate values, impose norms, assimilate what may be considered acceptable, and to reject the unacceptable in any part of community or personal life. Obviously, as migration is so present in the daily lives of thousands of families, it could not escape this process. In the case of migrant communities, the entire process of socialization, all cultural and social life, is impregnated by migration. Boys and girls are immersed in processes through which they are guaranteed, to a certain extent, acceptance by their social, material, ideological, and cultural circle in which they act as individual bearers of identity. In these transnational towns and communities, the children socialize in trans-nationalization.

\(^6\) Primary groups is a concept of Charles Horton Cooley (1864-1929) that means intimate groups, in which face to face relationships play a central role in the tie between the actor with the rest of society. Primary groups of young people are especially important, fundamentally the family and groups of peers. In the heart of these groups, the individual develops as a social being. It is in the heart of the primary group where the looking glass self is born and where the egocentric child learns to be aware of others, and therefore, becomes a member of society (Ritzer, 2005).
This brings us to what we call systematic comparison. By this we refer to the migrant once he or she “has tasted the north” incorporating in their daily discussion the permanent comparison between “here” and “over there”, which moves the imagination and the itch of locals for the expectations of the “abundant and comfortable there”

No, here it is really difficult, everything is so expensive, and over there you can eat a bit of everything, like the rich here. Here I see people just do errands and buy two or three things, they don’t have enough for more, but over there you can easily take advantage of offers and walk around dressed like the rich people here (...). There, everyone has a car simply because they have a job, and good cars from 20-30 thousand dollars, and here when are the poor field workers and construction workers going around in their little cars? Over there you see them line up (in the field) or in the yard (gardeners) and they go by car (...).

Over there when you see someone throw trash on the sidewalk, the police bust you and give you fine, but here, no way, you see the brats up to the oldest pick it up and eat the chips in the dirt and the trash. Over there you have to watch that you don’t turn up the music too loud, and more at night, because they get the police on you, here, see how you can go around with your noise at any time of day or night and no one says anything, they don’t respect if there are sick or old people. Over there they really respect the police, there you can’t go around above the speed limit, or go through a red light, or pass stop signs. Here whatever happens the police are never there, and when they are they only know how to take bribes… really, you miss your family here and the parties and all that, but you live better there, more comfortable, if you have good credit and you are hardworking you can make your home and if your husband and you work then you can eat well and dress well, but here it is so hard to have what you have over there. That’s why sometimes I think I would like to live round here, but then I really see here that there is nowhere to work or live. Over there we had in a short time what we could never have here (Juana in Huandacareo Michoacán April 11, 2005).

It is common to hear these kinds of convictions among migrants and that even the most recalcitrant become globetrotters. It has come to our attention that there is no trick, the sensitive migrant phenomenology provokes a sensation of accelerated metamorphosis in those who until very recently were common and ordinary individuals. Said phenomenology is perceived as smells, colors, changes in the color and texture of the skin, tones and luster of the hair, “brand” clothing that gives them a distinctive air.

For the simple fact of having migrated and having access to material goods that they did not have when in Mexico, they think that they have automatically climbed a step in the social structure. This is what I call the ascension window: with the simple fact of remaining in a social group (migrants) there is a fictitious notion of accessing a social class (the middle class). In the towns they leave behind there is a belief and tacit acceptance that the migrant must be successful and that by “leaving” their situation changes significantly. There is a strong contempt for those that return “useless” without a peso in their pocket and with many stories of tragedy and disappointment. That is why many of those that have bad experiences want to return but decide not to because they have not changed to the migrant middle class and returned to “no trade, no good”.

This brings us to point out another important element that gives us clues to understanding the overcrowding migration to the United States. I refer to the phenomenon of the vision of the run-away town, which is nothing other than nostalgia, admiration of the climb and progress of those absent, or of the absconded people. Nostalgia is invoked in the large by the absconded infant social world, that is to say, those that were complicit in their first opinions on being naughty, lies, childish games, first big secrets, stealing, confessions, hopes, loyalties, crying, loves, disappearing behind the neighborhood square, absorb the expanse of American geography.

Nor can we leave aside the secularization of extra-familiar and extra-community decisions. When the Bracero program began in 1942 migrants had to obtain the blessing of family and the community before leaving (or the church that was very reticent that they go to the “north”), which weighed heavily on their shoulders. There were rebels, but the majority of young people obeyed these traditions. In recent decades we observe a different phenomenon, young people have greater autonomy of decision making, and many may never consult their parents about migrating. The United States has become for many a libertarian escape, female liberalization, drugs, gangs, and alcohol. The burgeoning migration is set in a context of a lack of sacredness in the powers of parents, community, and the church. Here we relate two stories to emphasize these differences and changes have impacted the weight given by extra-individual consent and personal freedom to decide to leave for the country of the dollar.
In those days when one went as a bracero first one had to ask permission from parents, and consult at least one of the grandparents, godparents, the priest, and there was a big focus on what to tell the elders, there used to be a lot of respect, you couldn’t do anything you wanted. Such as when you asked for a light (a match to light a cigarette) from an older person, not a man, they slapped you and told your father what you were up to. Older people would reprimand you when you did not obey, you would get lashes (punishments with the belt, or rope). When I went to the north for the first time I took into consideration my parents, after begging for several days they finally told me to go! Be good and don’t hang around like they say some gritty people in the north drunk on beer and with long hair. One was afraid so one would take care to obey (José Carmen in Huandacareo Michoacán October 16, 2005).

And a mother of a novice migrant complained and told us:

No child, look, they just ignore you these days, when they get ready to go north they go because they are going. Carmelo (her son recently graduated from high school) he came home saying, mom I’m going to Chicago with some friends next week, get me money for the smuggler. I stood there, I felt terrible, although you know there is no choice, almost all of them go to the north, but I told him: well Carmelo, why didn’t you tell me earlier, and he said he just didn’t want me to worry. The only thing I did was go to the father and confess, and I told him that my son was going north and he told me to give my blessing because it had stumbled into this and that I wasn’t going to get the idea of going north out of his head. I got home and told him: Well, Carmelo, may god be with you. And here when the children have the idea of going not even our Godfather can stop them. All that I know are like that, they just say I’m going; it is odd that the mother says what do you say? I am thinking of going north too. What they want is their freedom so that you can’t tell them anything and they do what they want alone (Irma in Huandacareo Michoacán January 13, 2009).

If, as we analyzed above, the macro-structural causes of the dramatic increase in international migration is located in the context of accelerated economic globalization and the adverse effect of the crises and economic policy in employment and the real salary of Mexico, as well as the dynamic demand for migrant work in the United States economy as it re-structures, the causes at the micro level, such as social networks, are fundamental for the analysis of mass migration in recent decades in Mexico (Ávila, 2006).

If it is true that Mexican networks in the United States have been present since the second half of the 19th century, these have consolidated, grown, and created positive feedback. This is because networks have a dual role. On the one hand they are interpersonal links that work as channels for material or non-material resources that allow for the exchange of information, services, goods, money, or help between actors. And on the other hand, they are affective or emotional ties that maintain cohesion between people, couples, primary groups or communities (Faust, 2002).

Networks, in addition to providing goods and affects that facilitate others’ migration, as the costs and risks are reduced, also transmit information (Pollani, et al., 2001), and they build transnational communities that reproduce many cultural elements from their places of origin. Besides counting new migrants with affective security, information and assistance for getting a job and adapting more rapidly, cash loans, etc., these are found at the reach of a market that satisfies basic physiological needs as well as psychological. It is very easy to find the following in these communities: bakeries, tortillas, taco stands, churches, pool halls and dancing halls with a very distinct culture. Therefore, the reproduction of community abroad is an extra magnet of attraction. Assimilation to American culture is only partial. We can see this in the next testimony, where the aforementioned is observed in a synthetic way:

Look, even after 20 years you miss more from here, your hometown, yes there were a lot of Mexicans, but not like now, now they are everywhere you look, on the corner, in restaurants. Before, I’m telling you, you had to try hard to find something you liked to eat, or things that remind you of your homeland. And now you go to the market and you can find everything that you can buy here: tortillas, tamales, chilies, beer, tequila and beans. And then if you don’t find it at the market there are lots of Mexicans here that put up their snack stands or restaurants that sell tacos, pork scratching, and stew. I have seen people from here that sells fruit on carts. And not only that, if you want to baptize, have a party, get married, it is almost the same as here, there are mariachi, dress stores, and everything as if it were here, and then you get married in a catholic church only with people from here and it isn’t that different... everything they sell and everything there is in Mexico, there they make life much easier (Salvador, Huandacaréo, Michoacán, March 26, 2006).
So, ethnic communities abroad became an extra magnet of attraction. The assimilation of American culture is only partial. For Lourdes Arizpe (2007) this is due to the fact that Mexican migrants take, in their imagination and in their hands, accumulated cultural knowledge and skills from a deep history and a mega-culture of several millennia. Mexico is recognized internationally as a mega diverse nation in terms of biology and also for its mega-culture. This may explain why, in contrast to other immigrant groups in the United States, Mexicans and their descendants have instigated remarkable cultural, artistic, and social movements, whose strength rings out today have the most conservative sectors of American society worried.

At the same time, ethnic roots institutions have proliferated that facilitate the personal relationships of their members: non-profits. They are religious or lay groups (associations or clubs) that help countrymen in need in economic straits, disease, or death. Migrants are commonly heard saying that poverty in the United States is more “manageable” than in Mexico. The church and its support groups have a lot of resources to help with clothes, food, and lodging for those most in need. Clubs have stood out for the ease in which they collect resources for the most serious cases of illness or death of migrants sent to be buried in their places of origin.

“The north was not made for everyone” is a heard phrase in locations with the greatest migrant intensity. It is not enough to be poor to look for better material alternatives, nor voluntary or daring to go after the American dream: it is necessary, in many cases, to know how to access and make use of the social capital that social networks are capable of providing. Social capital is understood as the sum of resources, real or virtual, that an individual or group accumulates in virtue of possessing a lasting network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual friendship and recognition. As such, people gain access to social capital through membership within interpersonal networks and social institutions and then it may be converted into other forms of capital to improve or maintain your position in society (Pollanet et al., 2001).

For Kenneth D. Roberts and Michael D.S. Morris (2003) membership in the network doesn’t only limit risk, but additionally may bring labor alternatives, and as a consequence, greater economic mobility. The interesting part of the analysis by these authors is that they establish the place of origin as the center of migrant networks; it is the organizing element of the transnational social space. Migrants maintain close contact with their communities of origin through visits, remittances, and gifts to the family, friends, godchildren, and donations to community projects. Therefore, community membership requires continuous reaffirmation. In contrast, women that divorce, men that abandon their families, or people that do not keep in touch with locals are not considered part of the network and of the community. So we see that the community of origin is not only the conceptual location of the network, but is also the place where the exchange of information opens a lot of doors.

Another important element that stands out in this research is when they affirm that the community of origin is also the social and geographic location of valuing the status of the migrant. Returning with expensive gifts, or with money to share in community projects, and investing savings in livestock or land are material signs of status that offers individuals and their families’ social mobility. Besides involving oneself more in the community, it gives the migrant the chance to secure back scratching and informal advantages that derive from such investments. This would come as a kind of informal obligation for those that go for their community, family, and friends. We call this the ritualization of the grassroots network. That apart from having an element of sumptuousness and social positioning it has a load of moral responsibility towards its most intimate environment. This has then a double latent function. One migrant commented:

You can’t just up and go and abandon everything you have in your land. I would be an ingrate if I didn’t help my family or my mother. In part you go to be able to help them, so they don’t have such a bad time, if they ever want for anything, always be there for anything they lack. Yes, it is a moral obligation, how could it not be, you should help to fix the house and so that they live more comfortably. I know a few that don’t want to know anything about their hometown, their family, but the live poorly, but they have almost no contact with people round here, they are hermits, wasting everything on drugs, beer, and here no-one will lend them for their hangover, they waste their paycheck on partying on the weekend…you look good if you are polite and you get on with people here, if they see us as selfish, go to your parties. They don’t like the arrogant and uppity people that come back and don’t help out, don’t talk, don’t spend time with anyone, they don’t even give a piece of gum to their neighbors. Even if it is a bar of soap, gum, or anything, I always bring something for the family, one friend to another. That is the tradition (Hector in Huandacareo Michoacán on December 22, 2008).

Another told us the following:
Yes, ever since I was a boy seeing what we lacked because of what happened in the family I told myself that when I go to the north I was going to help. Unfortunately I couldn’t keep studying, I finished high school but I couldn’t keep studying after that, well the chief (dad) died and it was tough to go and study in Morelia. The boss (mom) you see doesn’t have a job and it was looking real difficult. Well, thank god, I earned a little over there, I didn’t miss a day’s work, I almost always had two jobs, and I worked hard to have something. I fixed up my mom’s house; I sent her money every month.

I wouldn’t have felt right if I weren’t aware of what she was missing…I would be embarrassed if they were to say that I went north and I didn’t help the boss and that I didn’t give her a hand with the house. It has something to do with that you go to the north rather than stay here…The northerners watch and just want to see what you brought, because if you brought something it is because you did good, if you don’t bring anything then it is because you didn’t make it there, that’s why even if it is something small you should always bring something for your family, godchildren, and neighbors (Marcos in Huandacareo Michoacán on December 16, 2008).

Other codes that are more intimate than what we call the ritualization of the grassroots network should be deciphered. In order to decipher these codes we must draw from what Daniel Goleman (2006) has called “social intelligence”. In effect, the social circuits in our brain guide us through all meetings. This neurological system works in any interaction in which it is crucial to find harmony and timing. Meaning that we are made to relate.

Neuroscience has found that the very structure of our brain makes it social; it is inevitably attracted to a closer brain to brain bond in every moment that we relate with another person. This nervous bridge allows anything that we interact with to impact the brain and body, as people affect other people. The more we emotionally relate to someone, the greater the mutual strength. During those neurological links, our brains submit themselves to a ritual of emotions and feelings. Our social interactions work as modulators, something like interpersonal thermostats that continually readjust key aspects of our brain function by orchestrating our emotions.

The resulting feelings have long-term consequences that recur throughout the body, sending torrents of hormones that regulate biological systems from the heart to immunological cells. So, our relationships do not only mold our experience, but also our biology. The brain-to-brain link favors our most frequent meetings, they mold us in issues as frivolous as how we laugh at the same jokes or as profound as between soldiers in battle. These social circuits have been fundamental in human history and continue today.

That is why we discuss the ritualization of the network and social networks (admiration/trust) such as submission behavior and admiration for “northerners” in their periodic returns. Support from the network is obtained, in many cases, only if there are previous aspects of ritualization. Social circuits should be exacerbated if you want support. In the public plaza, in the church, on the sports field, at parties, on the street, migrants expect ritualized greetings where admiration for what they have achieved and the phenomenal transformation provokes a tangle of emotions from envy to fascination. By breaking bread, drinking a beer, being a godparent, attending sports events, other experiences, tragedies, comedies, laughing at good jokes, asking when you arrived and when you are leaving, strengthens bonds and allows you to win bonuses for support from the network.

It is therefore feasible to see the network as an emotional thermostat, where the network displays the relationships of power and submission and the biological-emotional need. As such, we have communities with great migratory experience, the ritualization of the network forms part of the culture and as such socializing in it from the earliest stages of their lives and continue to strengthen ties with the passing of the years. Isolating oneself from the network makes the flow of social capital impassable; networks are bonds in the way that these emotional and social canals remain well oiled and in permanent contact.

We cannot set aside the importance of the means of transport that have facilitated the proliferation and reduction in cost of displacements from one country to another. Across the history of humanity, Luis Jáuregui (2004) affirms, transport has been a fundamental activity for the efficient working of market trade. The importance of this activity is in the displacement of products and people in geographic space, temporarily or definitively. Thirty to forty years ago the road infrastructure presented signs of obsolescence and buses took a long time to reach the border, increasing the length of time needed to cross undocumented and find work, costing a lot of money, time, and effort. The construction of modern highways and regional airports has considerably reduced the journey time and the physical and emotional exertion. The multiplication of transnational communities in the United States allows for networks to exist in various parts of the country, for which opportunities and options are greater due to the questions of climate and work.
Effectively, the evolution of transport has allowed for greater displacement of people to the interior and exterior of our borders in recent decades. We put this into context in the following testimonies. It isn’t the same as it used to be, 30 years ago, when you left here, you waited for the bus that went through here that left from Morelia and went to Tijuana, sometimes you would be delayed for hours, and leaving Morelia it would take up to two full days to get to Tijuana and then one or two more crossing with the smuggler to get to where you were going. It was always longer than a week to get there, if you were going well, and here they wouldn’t hear anything from you, no telephones, letters took weeks to arrive too, they would hear from you after three or four weeks, when you were talking about the telephone boxes for taking to your family. And then while you looked for a job, they pay you, and the delay in the mail for letters, we are talking about one or two months to receive the first few cents. But today, what a difference, if you have papers (if you are legal), you go right now to Chicago from Morelia airport and in three hours you take the plane, and in three and a half hours you’re in Chicago, and an hour or two later you’re at home. We are talking 8 hours and you’re there and you are communicating straight away. If you are illegal it is still faster to arrive, everyone gets the plane to Tijuana or to the border, and in a few hours you’re there. And even though you go on waiting, your cell phone lets you talk to your family here or there with your brothers if you need money or something. It isn’t the same anymore; it is easier and faster to leave (Nicolas in Huandacareo Michoacán on December 20, 2009).

No, now people suffer going to Mexico City, and in a few hours they are there. The highways they put in let you arrive on time. No man, before (in the 1930s) in was so tiring to go there. Just think about it, you had to leave here at 3-4 in the morning on donkey towards Moroleón (Guanajuato). From there we took a bus to Querétaro, when we arrived we had to transfer to a train to México City, and we arrived at sundown (Consuelo, Huandacareo, Michoacán, October 18, 2005).

Means of communication have made a significant contribution to the sea of globetrotters. The television has been an indispensable companion of Mexicans since the 1970s/80s, when American programs in which the “American way of life” is omnipresent became notorious; it is the land of opportunity and by antonomasia the land of immigrants that opens its doors to all entrepreneurs that seek progress and success in life. It is a plethora of modernity, security, order, and legality where any disciplined and hard-working person is welcomed and respected. They make the United States an attractive place to live, where hunger and poverty are the favorite sport of the few exposed and poorly adapted. Television is very good at reproducing the appearance of migrants when they periodically return and are ostentatious with glamor and consumer power. Therefore it is no lie that the two realities show. In order to understand this we turn to Howard Zinn (1999) who refers to the American system as the most ingenious system of control in world history. In a country so rich in natural resources, talent, and labor, the system can distribute wealth fairly according to the right quantity of people for containing the discontent of an unhappy minority. No other system of control exists that has so many opportunities, cracks, margins, flexibility, rewards, and so many winning lottery tickets.

Technologies have become an indivisible element in the lives of human beings today. And its impact is so great that every time more studies that deal with unraveling its effects on life, interpersonal relationships, the transmission of information and understanding, etc. One of the vanguard areas of research is on the psychosocial impact of technologies on the transformation and experience of transnational migratory processes. Interest in technology, Carmen Peña-randa (2008) tells us, is based on what forms of part of what we are to the point that it affects our ways of thinking and doing. Human beings cannot be understood without technology, as they would cease to be human. Contemporary societies are based on a dense network of electronic artifacts that keep people together and form and insoluble part of each person’s subjectivity. Technologies transform and widen the scope and nature of our perceptions, information, knowledge, contacts, and movements.

It is also interesting to note what the Spanish researcher tells us when referring to the fact that actual migrations are very intimately related by modern processes of planetary interconnection generated by flows of information and communication, in such a way that it is generating important changes in the way and content of internationally displaced people. It is observed in this historic stage that human beings move between countries, they move in physical and virtual space, they move paper, information, and affects across an extensive network that connects places of origin to destinations at an uncontrolled speed (Peña-randa, 2008).

So we have the telephone, the cellular phone, the Internet, fax, photocopying services, mobile charging, and sending remittances create a notion of an enclosed distance and multi-geographical distance. They are instant communications that may be employed at any place and at any time, which gives the sensation of great closeness.
More that the case of the telephone,\(^7\) which elaborates on emotions and feelings in a more live way than the letter: **instant affects.** Of course, postal correspondence was slow, it took weeks, and you ran the risk of it going missing if it had “little pennies” inside. These modern methods of communication maintain an almost permanent dialogue between the place of origin and destination, narrowing ever more communities through information, jokes, “sayings”, events, tragedies, the difficulties, and the growth of both parties, and above all where the people are. Young people only chat to point the cell phone towards the “north” to soak up information from relatives, friends or boyfriends. And the families wait anxiously for the call from a son, husband, or brother to receive congratulations or remittances.

It isn’t long after something happens in Huandacareo until you find out about it quickly in Chicago. You find out faster here sometimes than when you are there. There you use the phone for everything, to find out about family, I call here once or twice a week, and then I talk or they tell me about my uncle Pedro (they are in Chicago and Florida), so that one you find out what happens in lots of places at the same time…when I go around and I can’t take it I call here to let off steam, and then I feel better knowing that they are well, even though they are far away, you feel like talking to them makes you feel less alone. As long as I have enough to pay the phone bill I’ll keep bothering them with my ills (Juana in Huandacareo Michoacán on April 18, 2005).

This contact in real and permanent time that the media offer has substantially impacted the daily life of a large quantity of migrants that has allowed for a certain family functionality despite the distance. If in bygone decades the migration process presented visible grades of erosion of affective links and for an image of broken families as product of large absences, in recent years the possibility of almost daily contact helps to relativize this hole that distance provokes. Relativize is the word, that as Guarnizo (2007) tells us, you must look closely at the non-tangible pain and costs, the emotional costs that migration brings with it, of those that go and those that stay, The sadness, the depression that provokes so much migration to the north as in the south; if we wish to see it in an instrumental way, the productive apparatus also has high medical costs for society.

Since the Simpson-Rodino law of 1986, many Mexicans are able to legalize, by formal and illegal ways (those called “micas” and “crooked” documents) that at the same time gave rise to the opportunity for legalization and family reunification. The migration of entire families intensified leaving towns with many abandoned homes, above all the mid-west of Mexico. Migrants, although having permission of permanent residency, lack many of the social benefits that only American citizens had a right to. Many Mexicans leaving behind nationalistic tendencies decided to become citizens of the United States. On the one hand this conferred rights and prerogatives, and on the other hand, they were no longer limited to wives and children, they could legalize parents and brothers. Thanks to that, many can come and go without tortuous cross-country through the difficult paths of the desert. The following tales agree with this situation.

It was because of 86-87 that I had the chance to go to the north. I had never gone, but they sold us some cards that proved that we had been working in a company for many years. I took advantage, at that time I worked in Mexico City and the factory where I worked was firing a lot of people, and I wasn’t getting by with what I earned, in those days it was hard, everything became so expensive. And I said, well, let’s go, let’s try our luck. And it did work out pretty soon after. Afterwards I applied for my wife and children and years later we were lucky and they were accepted, and then, then I brought them. Only my brother messed up when the letter arrived, that they sold, ended up saying that he didn’t need to go north, and look now he has to work hard to pay the smuggler (Salvador in Huandacareo Michoacán on March 23, 2006).

I didn’t have any other choice but to follow my family, I was the last to go. I just left high school and I had to go with everything and shame. I didn’t want to go, I wouldha’ve liked to study in Morelia, but it wasn’t possible (Andre in Huandacareo, Michoacán on January 7, 2009).I didn’t feel anything like betraying Mexican patriotism, my becoming a citizen was to get the benefits, I wanted me to give me 100% of my taxes, there are more employment opportunities, and more positions, and otherwise they just keep you wishing. I am still Mexican and I have never felt American, I don’t presume to speak English (Amparo in Huandacareo Michoacán on January 12, 2005).

---

\(^{7}\)Luis Eduardo Guarnizo says that there are multiplying factors that are produced at the root of living transnationally. For example, the area of telecommunications in the United States has grown in an accelerated manner due to immigrants: international calls to places of origin constitute the greatest number. among the first place is Mexico which earns millions of dollars in profit, that is to say the air agencies, and remittance forwarders, etc. (Guarnizo, 2007:41).
No, there is no comparison, going there by paying a bribe is more expensive, you stay longer, and it isn’t as easy now to come back. There are many there that can’t come back because of how hard it is on the border. If you come the right way, you already have family, you spend the day there, and although you have papers you can’t visit that often. Me, thank God, I sorted everything out and I visit once a year, but if I remember the times that I went with the smuggler, I suffer again. That is why it is an advantage to pass with your mica (Jorge in Huandacareo, Michoacán on December 3, 2008).

It is also important to highlight another mezzo-structural element: smuggling. This is also within what we call the industry of migration, which is understood as the chain of economic activities directly or indirectly linked to international migration to the United States. At the macro level, various companies benefit from the demand of goods and services that unravel from remittances, the market of nostalgia, periodic returns and permanent transnational flow: sending-reception of remittances, telecommunications, transport, tourism and “countryman market”. Given the meager growth of the migrant entrepreneur, the industry of migration is principally taken advantage of by multi-national companies, above all in the United States: Western Union, Money Gramm, AT&T, City Bank, Continental, American Airlines, and Wal-Mart etc., in Mexico big corporations as TELMEX, Mexicana, and CEMEX, as well as small and medium companies, such as bureaus de change, paperwork filing and document translation (Delgado and Marquez, 2007).

At the micro level the role that stands out is that of traffickers of undocumented migrants (smugglers) and the industry of document falsification. The smugglers have proliferated in the last few decades, although they had their rest during the Bracero program, and even more so in the Undocumented Period that started in 1964. The clearest consequence of the strategy of strengthening the border after 1993 and intensified due to the September 11 attacks has been redistributing illegal income across the border, far from big frontier cities and towards more remote areas. Therefore the more rigorous control of the border has meant that a greater percentage of migrants turn to professional smugglers to reduce their chances of being caught. The proportion of migrants that turned to smugglers rose from 15 to 41% (Cornelius, 2007). Despite the crossings becoming more dangerous (resulting in an increase in mortalities), and expensive, and vigilante anti-migrant activity has increased, illegal entrants have increased, provoking more permanent stays in the United States and accelerated family reunification. The smuggling industry is booming as a result of the policy of containment.

Despite what some say, the “coyotes are well dressed and respected in their communities, they facilitate migration with their contacts and knowledge of the border, and due to their communities well-known there is more guarantee of faithful and accomplished work, which is why women, men, and children trust in their words (there is no document signed by such a business).

David Spener (2007) explains this process well and tells us that the most socially rooted transactions between migrants and smugglers appear to occur in cases where both are members of the same community of migrants. As such, ways of social capital that are established in these contexts are equivalent to those that work in relationships between migrants. Here, Spener (2007) continues, social capital may emanate from values (smugglers helping family and friends for altruistic reasons, circumscribed solidarity (smuggler helping people from their home town disinterestedly as a way of compensating the community), reciprocity (smugglers helping people from their town with the instrumental expectation that one day the favor will be returned, obliged trust (smugglers know that if they let migrants from the community down then they will be sanctioned and vice versa, if the migrants omit paying they will be equally reviled).

In other words, the practices of smugglers are profoundly dependent on social relations and the level to which this is sustained by the inherent social capital of social relations between coyote migrants and their friends and relatives. Therefore, social support and social capital help migrants and coyotes manage the risks they face when participating in clandestine border crossings. The sale of “crooked” documents in the United States, such as social security, driving licenses, among others, has allowed the undocumented to deal with strong restrictions when applying for a job, shopping, or getting credit. It is known that the intermediaries between corrupt American agents and a large mass of undocumented migrants that seek and pay well for these kinds of documents are principally Mexican.
Conclusion

Migration as a historic-social process has allowed us to analyze the complex framework of circumstances that surround the mass Mexico-United States migration in recent decades, which is a result of historical and contemporary factors. These factors converged into unknown characteristics of the phenomenon in terms of displacement, volume, celerity, transnational contact, technologies, widening of the imagined, symbolism, and the ability to socialize of the migrant culture, in the shapes and forms of social mobility.

Paloma Paredes (2007) rightly points out that the opportunities that the North offers to migrants do not always refer to the monetary aspect alone. Those persons who decide to cross the Bravo, do so in order to improve their living conditions, which implies not only the strictly economic aspect, but they are also, leaving their homeland as a way to become an active member of some kind of special group. Meaning, the reasons for migration go beyond economic and political considerations. We hope that, the proposed conceptualization aiming to include factors of cultural, symbolic, psychological, family, network and migrant agency nature, the industry of migration, modern means of communication and transport, socialization in the phenomenon with strong historical links give innumerable equally important elements to understand the rough waters of heading to the North. For these reasons we have given greater emphasis to the mezzo and micro elements, for we consider them to be more relevant than the traditional explanation. Migration studies have dealt with overemphasising the macrostructural nature of the phenomenon. We only enumerate the subjective, intangible, volitional, an informal, world of life, relatives, and other elements at the mezzo-structural level aim to propose a new theoretical approach to the one of the most complicate phenomenon of globalization, we think migration is.
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