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Abstract

Debating Legality in Fremont, Nebraska:
Migrant Political Participation and the Growing Trend of Local Immigration Enforcement

Vanessa Hope Martinez, M.A., M.S.C.R.P.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Nestor Rodríguez
Co-Supervisor: Bjørn Sletto

This research uses Fremont, Nebraska, and City Ordinance 5165, passed in June of 2010, as a case study to explore the effects on migrant political activity of local legislation that prevents undocumented migrants from renting homes and acquiring jobs, and also investigates the nature of migrant participation in opposing such measures. Fremont is one of many U.S. cities that have passed ordinances targeting undocumented migrants, and while continuous legal battles have delayed these laws from going into effect, they reflect a growing attempt to undertake immigration enforcement at a local level. Interviews with Fremont community members suggest the effects of the passage of Ordinance 5165 and surrounding debate are primarily negative, including community division, increased racism, and a challenged sense of safety and belonging for many residents. However, the legislation has also had some positive influence, such as
motivating higher levels of civic engagement among migrants and Latinos, and spurring mobilization efforts that have served as points of solidarity and empowerment for these same groups. Furthermore, because places are formed by way of their relations to other places, fieldwork was also conducted in Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico one of the largest sending communities to Fremont. These complementary findings exposed how global realities, such as economic need and transnational social ties, shaped happenings in Fremont; and interviews with return migrants and migrants’ family members in Chichihualco suggest that it is unlikely the law will deter migration to the city nor persuade migrants to relocate or return to their countries of origin. The Fremont case study provides insight concerning the nationwide trend of local immigration enforcement, highlighting the need for continued investigation of the ways in which community members are organizing against such policy measures, and the observed and potential effects for various actors at different scales. This sort of legislation is being passed with greater frequency in the U.S., and this research argues that its effects have been overwhelmingly negative, and that such laws represent a missed opportunity to instead integrate growing migrant populations into city planning and development processes that could be beneficial for entire communities.
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Chapter One: “The Good Life” in an Era of Restriction

Introduction

On June 21, 2010, voters in Fremont, Nebraska, a city of about 26,000 in the eastern part of the state (See Figure 1.1), became the most recent jurisdiction to join numerous others across the U.S. that have passed laws seriously restricting the living and working rights of migrants. The passage of Fremont Ordinance 5165 represents the climax of a two-year-long political battle over the divisive legislation, which requires all prospective renters to apply for an occupancy license in order to verify with the federal government that they are lawfully present in the U.S., and also requires all employers within the city to check the immigration status of potential employees using the federal electronic verification program E-Verify. While at the time of completion of this thesis, the law has yet to be enforced in its entirety due to ongoing legal challenges, its passage and surrounding debate have already proven to have lasting social, political, and economic effects on city residents, as will be discussed in the following chapters. Many of these effects began to be visible even in the early stages of debate of the legislation, of which I hold a first-hand account as a result of my previous advocacy work in the community. It is due in large part to this work, in combination with my affection for Nebraska as my home state that I chose to take on this research.

Figure 1.1: Reference map showing the location of Fremont in Nebraska.¹

---

¹ All figures, photos, and maps by author unless otherwise noted.
As a native Nebraskan, I understand well the local politics and share sincere pride in “The Good Life,” our state motto, and all it represents. Likewise, I have witnessed the state’s changing communities as a growing migrant population and ethnic diversity challenge current social and political dynamics, and making many longtime Nebraskans uneasy. Yet, through my advocacy work and community involvement, I have also witnessed the way in which recent immigrants have begun to revitalize numerous towns across the state, bringing new business, a younger workforce, and families whose children—unlike many of those born to non-immigrants—decide to remain in these small towns, adding to the prosperity of local communities.

Unfortunately, this perspective is one shared by a minority of Nebraskans, at least publicly, and the state has been a key player in what migration studies scholars have referred to as a nationwide “Era of Restriction” due to high counts of deportation and increased attempts at immigration enforcement at the local level, including agreements between federal agencies and city police, and laws seriously restricting migrants’ rights in certain jurisdictions. Thus, this research uses Fremont, Nebraska as a case study to explore the effects of such attempts at local immigration enforcement and the ways in which migrants participated politically to oppose the law. The primary question guiding this case study is: How has Fremont Ordinance 5165 affected migrants, their families back home, and the Fremont community, and how have migrants worked to oppose such legislation? I hope that findings from this case study can contribute to the broader discussion regarding local immigration enforcement and its effects on both domestic and international communities.

In beginning this investigation, I saw a need for dialogue across academic disciplines—Urban Planning, Migration Studies, Sociology, Geography, and Latin American Studies—and two primary perspectives are assumed throughout this research.
The first, which will be referred to later as Human Agency Analysis, is the recognition that migrants are not only victims or pawns in regards to actions taken by the state, but that they also have agency (Rodriguez, 1996; Smith, 1989). The second asserts that community member participation in urban planning and city development is important, which will be described later as Participatory Planning. Furthermore, this research also puts forth the hypothesis that there exist possibilities to increase the benefits facilitated by migration—benefits for both the receiving and sending communities as well as migrants—should migrants become more involved in planning processes for community development; and it is hoped that this investigation might serve as a first step toward that goal.

**Latino Migration to Nebraska and Meatpacking**

Nebraska, along with other Midwestern states such as Iowa and Minnesota, has been called a “new destination” state for Latino migrants. This term refers to the establishment of new, permanent settlements of primarily Mexican migrants in nontraditional areas of the country during the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s (Zúñiga & Hernández-León, 2005). However, researchers have clarified this description and instead of calling Nebraska simply a “new destination” state, describe it as a “re-emerging destination for Mexican immigrants and a new destination for immigrants from Central and South America” (Gouveia, Carranza, & Cogua, 2005, p. 23) due to the previous arrival of Mexican immigrants in the early 19th Century, primarily to work in the sugar beet fields. Still, by comparison, this second wave of Mexican and other Latino migrants is much more significant in terms of numbers and permanent settlement. In fact, Nebraska experienced the highest foreign-born population growth rate during the 1990s of all Midwestern states, with the foreign born population more than doubling from 1.8%
of the total state population in 1990 (28,198 people) to 4.4% of the total state population in 2000 (74,638 people; Zúñiga & Hernández-León, 2005; Migration Policy Institute, 2012).²

This increase has been attributed primarily to two factors: 1) The consistent demand for low-wage labor, specifically in agribusiness and 2) Existing social networks of largely Mexican migrants (Gouveia et al., 2005). The demand for low-wage workers, specifically in the meatpacking industry, has likely been a significant factor in attracting migrants, both directly from Latin America as well as those who were already in the U.S., living in other more traditional receiving states such as California or Texas. It is likely, as has been seen in other new destination states, that Nebraska’s immigrant population increased substantially due to established social ties, as migrants sent for their families or informed friends of job opportunities (Massey, 2008, Dalla, Ellis, & Cramer, 2005). Although currently, Nebraska’s foreign-born population is estimated to be only about 6% of the state population, in smaller cities located in more rural regions of the state where jobs in agribusiness are concentrated, the foreign born population is often as high as 20%-37% of a city’s total population: in Schuyler, Lexington, and Crete, for example, the number of foreign born accounts for 37%, 35% and 21% of the total city population, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). These larger foreign born populations have led to concerns about takeover, especially within anti-immigrant popular discourse. Such discourse, which often refers to towns with higher foreign born populations as cautionary examples of migration that has led to the creation of “little Mexicos,” has caused residents of other Nebraska communities to view their growing migrant population as a threat, and encourages support of restrictive legislation. This discourse has been present

² For comparison, at the national level, the foreign born population is currently estimated to be about 12.9% of the total population, compared to 11.1% in 2000 and 7.9% in 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010; Migration Policy Institute, 2012).
in Fremont since the city is only about 30 miles east of Schuyler, the town with the largest foreign born population as a percentage of total city population in the state (37%). This relationship will be discussed further in later chapters.

Migration to the city of Fremont has mirrored that of the state, with a six fold increase in the foreign born population from 1990 to 2010: from 1.2% of the city’s population in 1990 (289 people) to about 6% of the population (1,584 people) in 2010 (ibid). As with the state, the majority of migrants are estimated to be Mexican, and fieldwork in Fremont suggests a large group are from the town of Chichihualco in Guerrero, Mexico (See Figure 1.2), as will be elaborated upon in Chapter 5.

![Reference map showing the location of Chichihualco in Guerrero, Mexico](Source: Wikipedia, modified by author).

This rapid increase in Fremont’s migrant population is due in part to employment opportunities at the nearby Fremont Beef and Hormel meatpacking plants, which straddle the southern city boundary. As will be discussed later, the location of these plants caused
some confusion during debate of the legislation as to whether or not they would be held subject to ordinance since they were partially outside Fremont city limits (See Figure 1.3).

Figure 1.2: Circle indicating property parcels of Hormel and Fremont Beef meatpacking plants that straddle Fremont city limits.

In fact, various studies show that the meatpacking industry has contributed to changing demographics in rural communities, specifically due to its increasing dependence on migrant labor (Nebraska Appleseed, 2009; Broadway, 2007; Champlin & Hake, 2006; Kandel & Parrado, 2005). It has been observed that the “ruralization” of the meatpacking industry, or relocation of plants from densely populated cities to remote rural areas, has facilitated the use of migrant labor as an industrial strategy. Because
advancements in transportation technology such as rail and major highways facilitated the relocation of many plants to rural areas, meatpackers were granted more immediate access to feedlots and open space. Thus, they were able to conduct all steps of the process—from livestock raising and slaughter to packaging and freezing products—within a single location, making the industry more vertically integrated. This relocation also limited meatpacking workers’ rights by increasing the distance between workers and union leadership and other entities for monitoring worker safety conditions (Nebraska Appleseed, 2009), and has made the meatpacking industry increasingly dependent on short-term, low-skilled employees, specifically migrants.

With the relocation of plants to rural areas, “profitability often depends on continuous high throughput production. To succeed, the industrialization of meatpacking requires a large pool of easily replaceable labor that has no control over the pace of work on of the shop floor” (Champlin & Hake, 2006, p. 49). It is argued that this type of industrial restructuring parallels increasing restrictive U.S. immigration policies, such as greater border enforcement and stricter requirements for worker visas. These policies result in a loss of bargaining power by some workers due to their status as undocumented, or unauthorized to work, providing just the workforce the meatpacking industry needs in order to continue to maximize production and minimize costs. It is this workforce that is often pointed to as part of a city’s “illega immigrant problem,” and what most attempts at local immigration enforcement have sought to address.

**Local Immigration Enforcement and Fremont Ordinance 5165**

Over the past five years, city ordinances aimed at preventing immigrants from renting homes and/or acquiring jobs based on issues of “legality” have been passed across the country. These ordinances reflect a growing attempt to undertake immigration
enforcement at the local level and are often fueled by nativism and conservative local politics. While ongoing lawsuits have delayed much of this legislation from going into effect, the mere passage of such ordinances raises a number of concerns from residential segregation, to racial profiling, to discriminatory hiring practices. Furthermore, these ordinances are by no means the first or only attempts at local immigration enforcement. Since 2000, approximately 107 U.S. towns, cities, or counties have approved policies “intended to regulate immigration or limit its effects on the local community” (O’Neil, 2010). These laws are in addition to the passage of similar restrictive legislation at the state level (Arizona’s SB 1070 and Alabama’s HB 56), and moves by the federal government toward local immigration enforcement utilizing such tools as the 287(g) Agreements currently active in 24 states, and the Secure Communities Program, which is expected to be implemented in all 3,100 state and local jurisdictions by 2013 (Immigration Policy Center, 2010; 2011). Local immigration enforcement is increasing nationwide. But, the effects of such attempts, especially involving city legislation, are largely unknown. For these reasons, I hope that this case study can be used as a first step toward understanding the preceding political climate, opposition efforts, and immediate effects of local legislation that restricts worker and renter rights.

In the summer of 2010, voters of Fremont, Nebraska approved an ordinance to prevent undocumented migrants from working and renting homes within the city. The law is similar to other legislation that was passed in 2006 in six other jurisdictions across the nation: Hazelton, Pennsylvania (July), Valley Park, Missouri (July), Riverside, New

---

3 Section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act allows for the delegation of some immigration powers to a limited number of officers within local police forces through agreements between Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and local authorities (Immigration Policy Center, 2010).

4 Secure Communities, a program of the DHS, requires that local jails submit arrestees’ fingerprints to immigration databases in an attempt to identify migrants who are deportable (Immigration Policy Center, 2011).
Jersey (August), Escondido, California (October), Farmers Branch, Texas (November), and Cherokee County, Georgia (December). To date, all of these ordinances have either been repealed or defeated in court. Fremont Ordinance 5165 requires all prospective renters over the age of 18 to apply for an occupancy license in order to verify with the federal government that they are lawfully present in the U.S., and requires all employers within the city to check the immigration status of potential employees using E-Verify. The law also establishes penalties for landlords and employers who hire or rent property to undocumented migrants within the city limits (City of Fremont, 2010). The legislation was actually introduced in 2008 by City Council member Bob Warner, who stated his growing frustration with the increasing undocumented population and the lack of federal enforcement of immigration laws (Bowen, 2008, May 14).

Because concern with the undocumented population (or “problem”) was touted as a primary initiative for the ordinance, it is worth examining more closely. While there are arguably numerous means of measuring the undocumented “problem” in Fremont, perhaps the simplest approach is to estimate the actual number of undocumented migrants living in the city. In 2008, the year the ordinance was introduced, Fremont’s migrant population was estimated at 1,117 (4.4% of the city’s total population). This group included approximately 285 naturalized citizens and 832 either documented, non-citizen or undocumented migrants. Of these 832, it is estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau that approximately 335 (30% of the city’s total foreign born) were undocumented (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). However, the Pew Hispanic Center reviewed the same American Community Survey data, estimating that Nebraska’s undocumented population was closer to 39%-48% of the state’s foreign born population (Passel & Cohn, 2009, p. 28). If we apply this estimate to Fremont’s foreign born, Ordinance No. 5165 targets at most 536 persons (48% of the city’s foreign born population), or about 2% of the city’s total
population. The Senior Demographer of the PEW Hispanic Center, Jeffry S. Passel, is reported to have estimated Fremont’s undocumented population to be even lower, at 491 (Real-McKeighan, 2010). These estimates call into question the actual severity of the “undocumented problem,” as well as the true motivation behind the legislation.

Nonetheless, the ordinance did gain support, and one month after Warner had introduced the proposed legislation, the City Council held a hearing to receive public comment on the ordinance. Over 1,000 people attended the hearing and the City Council heard comments from over 70 people for four and a half hours. The hearing ended with a split vote by the City Council, which in effect defeated the proposed legislation (See Figures 1.4 & 1.5). The late Fremont Mayor “Skip” Edwards also publicly announced his opposition at the hearing, stating that immigration control was a federal issue (Columbus Telegram, 2008). Those Fremont community members who had worked to defeat the ordinance were relieved and expressed hope in overcoming the division the proposed legislation had created in order to get things in the city “back to normal.”

Figure 1.4:  Community members file pass a police officer as they enter the public hearing for Fremont Ordinance 5165 (photo: Lincoln Journal Star, 2010)
However, in September of 2008, three Fremont residents initiated a petition drive to allow Fremont citizens to be able to vote on the proposed ordinance and in March 2009, they were successful in submitting 3,300 signatures petitioning the City Council to hold a special election on the ordinance (only 3,000 signatures were required). For the next year, from March 2009 to April 2010, legal challenges regarding the ordinance were cycled through the Dodge County District Court and Nebraska Supreme Court, primarily concerning whether or not the ordinance language complied with state law. Finally, the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld the County District Court’s decision that the ordinance language was in compliance and the special election was expected to be set for July 2010. However, the date was then moved earlier to June 21st, 2010, giving those who opposed the ordinance only two months to organize in their attempt to influence election results (One Fremont One Future, 2010; City of Fremont, website, 2012). It is this point in the legislation’s timeline, when community members began organizing to defeat the ordinance in the special election, which serves as the primary focus of this research.

Table 1.1 serves as a timeline outlining the legal events of Fremont Ordinance 5165. It begins with introduction of the legislation in 2008 and follows primary legal proceedings through the most recent ruling in February 2012, and date of enforcement of
certain sections in May 2012. As highlighted in the table, the housing portions of the ordinance are currently suspended, meaning that “no landlords or tenants have any obligations under Ordinance 5165 at this time,” and housing provisions of the ordinance “will not be enforced until there is a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit permitting the enforcement of all, or a portion of, those provisions” (City of Fremont, 2012). However, the employment provisions went into effect March 2012, requiring that:

All business entities doing business in the City of Fremont that employ one or more persons must register in the E-Verify program on or before May 4, 2012 […] and A business entity that applies for any contract, loan, grant, license, or permit from the City after March 5, 2012, must provide documentation that the business entity has registered in the E-Verify program and must execute an affidavit stating that the business entity does not knowingly employ any person who is an unauthorized alien (ibid).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ordinance Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 2008</td>
<td>• City Council member introduces ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 2008</td>
<td>• Public hearing ends in City Council split vote: Ordinance is defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2008</td>
<td>• 3 citizens begin petition for special election</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mar. 2009   | • 3,300 signatures submitted to City Council requesting special election  
• City of Fremont brings legal challenge concerning ordinance language and state’s single-subject law                                                  |
| Apr. 2009   | • Lower court rules ordinance language complies with state law  
• City of Fremont appeals                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Apr. 2010   | • Nebraska Supreme Court upholds lower court decision  
• Special election expected for July 2010                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Jun. 2010   | • Special Election: Voters pass Ordinance 5165  
• Ordinance expected to become effective July 29, 2010                                                                                                                                                    |
| Jul. 2010   | • City of Fremont prepares to implement law  
• The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) file a lawsuit alleging that the law is discriminatory, representing 5 prospective renters, 2 rental property owners and 2 local employees  
• Fremont City Council passes a resolution to suspend implementation and enforcement of the ordinance during legal proceedings |
| Nov. 2010   | • Nebraska Supreme Court decides against review, indicating there is no particular state law or state constitutional provision specified that Fremont’s ordinance could violate  
• Ordinance continues to be challenged in Federal District Court in Omaha, Nebraska                                                                                                                             |
| Feb. 2012   | • U.S. District Judge rules that the City of Fremont cannot prohibit the renting of homes to undocumented migrants. However, the city may still require prospective renters to apply for a $5 permit and swear they are in the U.S. legally  
• In the same ruling, the judge upholds the following elements of the ordinance: 1) Use of E-verify for all businesses within the city; 2) Business owners who violate the ordinance are liable to fines and revoking of business licenses/permits  
• The ACLU appeals the decision, asserting that the remainder of the ordinance still imposes an illegal and unfair burden on their clients  
• The City of Fremont chooses to delay enforcement of the housing provisions of the ordinance (Sections 2-4) until the pending appeal(s) are finished |
| Mar. 5, 2012| • Those sections of the ordinance pertaining to E-verify become effective (Sections 1 and 5)                                                                                                                      |
| May 4, 2012 | • All business entities doing business in the City of Fremont that employ one or more persons must register in the E-Verify program on or before this date                                                             |
| Present     | • The case will go to the U.S. 8th Circuit Court of Appeals                                                                                                                                                        |

Table 1: Timeline of Events for Fremont Ordinance 5165
The remaining chapters of this thesis are organized in the following manner: Chapter Two provides a foundation for discussion by reviewing existing literature on “New Destinations” for U.S. immigrants, Transnationalism, and Multicultural Planning. Chapter Three describes methodology, including reflections on intersubjectivity, positionality, and the use of a transnational lens of analysis. Chapter Four presents key findings related to migrant political participation in opposing the Fremont ordinance, examining local power relations, legal status or “legality,” and gender. Chapter Five focuses specifically on a consumer boycott, the form of opposition in which the most Latinos and migrants participated, and also the specific opposition effort of which they spoke most proudly. Chapter Six consists of complementary findings from two follow-up investigations that took place after initial fieldwork in Fremont, which include: 1) An analysis of the special election that passed the ordinance, and voter demographics; and 2) Perceptions of the ordinance from community members in Chichihualco, Mexico (the sending community for a majority of Fremont migrants), and also presentation of existing cross-border linkages between Chichihualco and Fremont. Finally, Chapter Seven puts forth some conclusions regarding the Fremont case study and its implications for the growing trend of local immigration enforcement, and suggests future research directions.
Chapter Two: Discourses on Movement: A Literature Review

Migration to “New Destinations”

An understanding of some of the aspects that define “new destination” states, like Nebraska, as well as some general characteristics of migrants who live in new destinations, enables a more complete picture of the situation in Fremont and provides a context for the events leading to the passage of Ordinance 5165. The 2000 U.S. Census, along with various studies dating from the 1990s, describes a significant shift in the geography of migrant populations in traditional destination states like California, Texas, and Florida, to new destination states such as Georgia, North Carolina, Nevada, Kansas, and Nebraska (Dalla et al., 2005; Donato, Tolbert, Nucci, & Kawano, 2008; Zúñiga & Hernández-León, 2005). Scholars have identified a number of interrelated factors, from legislative, to economic, to personal, that have contributed to this shift. Legislative factors include changes in U.S. immigration law such as the passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) in 1986, which led to the residential legalization of over 3 million migrants, 2.3 million of whom were Mexican. This allowed many migrants who were previously unauthorized to work to find jobs, which saturated labor markets in traditional destination states, specifically in California where residents were already heading into an economic recession. However, for many migrants, IRCA also eliminated the risk to relocate, allowing them to move to seek jobs in different parts of the country (Massey & Capoferro, 2008).

In addition to the scarcity of jobs in traditional destinations, other federal legislation encouraged migrants toward new destination states, including the implementation of policies to increase security at the U.S.-Mexico border and deter undocumented immigration. Strategies such as Operation Hold-the-Line (1993), Operation Gatekeeper (1994) and other Border Patrol crackdowns that were intended to
decrease the amount of illegal border crossings instead merely shifted the places along the border where migrants tended to cross, and the geography of these shifts made migrants less likely to settle in traditional areas. Additionally, the intensification of the border made migrants who were already in the U.S. less likely to risk any back and forth movement and instead served as an incentive for them to send for their families (ibid). These, along with other U.S. legislation enacted during the 1990s increased the need for migrants to rely on their own social networks (Rodriguez, 1996), as well as the probability of long-term settlement, and no doubt influenced migrants’ goals and perspective for their lives in the United States, changes that are intimately connected to the economic and personal factors contributing to migration to new destinations.

Economics have also played a hugely important role in migration to new destinations, primarily in regards to “demand” or “pull” factors, i.e. a need for workers. Employment opportunities have long been principal reasons for the movement of people, at a number of scales, but industrial restructuring during the 20th century—as with the meatpacking industry described earlier—created an increased demand for labor in many of the new destination states, which local populations did not satisfy (Leach & Bean, 2008; Broadway, 2007). For one, many new destinations, as is the case with Nebraska, simply did not have the workforce needed to fill new jobs due to outmigration of the working age population, low birth rates, an aging population, and generally low unemployment rates (ibid; Nebraska Appleseed, 2009). Because these jobs were concentrated in industries requiring intense physical labor, older, native born workers were often less qualified. Furthermore, the jobs created by industrial restructuring were most times not attractive to younger, native born workers as a direct result of the industries’ primary goal to reduce costs, which meant lower wages, fewer unions, reduced fringe benefits, and easier layoffs (Hirschman & Massey, 2008).
These conditions are fostered by employers who seek migrant workers with little bargaining power, and help explain why most migrants living in new destinations tend to be younger, less educated, more recently arrived to the U.S., and overwhelmingly Mexican (ibid). This profile of new destination migrants has been specifically attributed to recruitment efforts by meatpacking employers conducted in Mexico and in different towns along the U.S.-Mexico border. The recruitment is conducted by mobile teams of recruitment officers, worker advertisements on radio stations whose transmission reached Mexico, and by a labor office in Mexico City offering to pay new hires’ bus fares to come work in the U.S. (Miraftab, 2011; Broadway, 2007; Cohen, 1998). These recruitment efforts, combined with increased border enforcement and stricter requirements for worker visas created conflicting messages for potential migrants and produced a labor force with little bargaining power in terms of fair wages, work conditions, and other worker rights. Yet, this description by no means encompasses all migrants in new destinations, and there are also non-economic, personal reasons for which migrants choose to move to and remain in new destination states, including Nebraska, central to which are social ties.

For one, the majority of migrants likely received word of job opportunities in new destination states from friends or relatives who were already working these jobs. The term “new destination” does not imply a previous absence of migrants in these areas, but rather refers to the establishment of new, permanent settlements of primarily Mexican migrants. In fact, Mexican migrants had come to Nebraska in the early 19th Century to work in the sugar beet fields and though fewer in numbers, these earlier migrants were able to offer newcomers a place to live and connections for employment in order to try out their luck in these non-traditional receiving communities. As these newcomers
became established, they sent for friends and family (Dalla et al., 2005), a key process in what is referred to as “cumulative causation.”

Cumulative causation is a theory describing how migration is perpetuated by social networks in which members’ support of one another makes additional movement likely, regardless of whether or not factors that originally encouraged migration—in this case, numerous job vacancies for field laborers and later due to industrial restructuring, combined with unemployment elsewhere—are present or not (Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino, & Taylor, 1993). Additionally, the presence of families and increased permanent settlement in new destinations further suggests migration for personal, lifestyle reasons (Leach & Bean, 2008), as has also been documented in Nebraska (Dalla et al., 2005).

In part because border hardening and other measures had made back and forth movement more difficult, migrants considered options for permanent settlement in the U.S. and pursued ways to send for their loved ones, both through legal and illegal channels. In this sense, new destination states presented a unique opportunity in that they were those where it was often easier to purchase homes and benefit from local economies (ibid; Leach & Bean, 2008). In other words, new destinations’ lower cost of living and consistent need for labor made them a more viable option for family settlement. For these reasons, new destination states are distinctly different from more traditional receiving states, which results in migrants experiencing and interacting with receiving communities differently when compared to traditional settlement states.

As described above, new destination states tend to be more rural, have well-developed, growing, low-skill service sectors, and have recently experienced some sort of industrial restructuring, all of which likely influenced migrants’ decision to move to these states and contribute to their position in the local economy. However, because new
destinations have overall smaller migrant populations and less ethnic diversity, they generally have had little experience in cross-cultural communication, and have few institutions in existence to integrate newcomers (Hirschman and Massey, 2008), which may explain some of the pushback from longtime residents and their support of restrictive, local legislation. Miraftab (2011) refers to this experience as “emigration in situ”, and notes that “without having moved an inch, they [original white residents] feel they have moved across borders to a different place” (p. 396). In many new destination states, and perhaps especially in small towns, communities are facing new ethnic diversity not experienced in recent memory, making growing migrant and Latino populations “front-page news” (Hirschman & Massey, 2008, p. 7). Furthermore, rapid population growth alone challenges a community’s ability to provide housing, education, healthcare and welfare services to its residents and often contributes to heightened sense of racism and discrimination (Dalla et al., 2005; Broadway, 2000; Prochaska-Cue & Ziebarth, 1997). More often than not, these changes result in news media reports highlighting conflicts among longtime residents and new migrants, which raise important questions regarding social and political justice. Such questions are further complicated when one considers how migration often challenges notions of societal boundaries and belonging, and naturally produces cross-border linkages, or what has been debated in migration literature under the term “transnationalism.”

**Transnationalism**

Academic debates surrounding the definition and usefulness of transnationalism as both a theory and lens of analysis have been frequent. However, transnationalism as a lens of analysis has proven quite useful throughout scholarship on migration, and for this case study in particular due to its central investigation of the roles and interaction of
migration and the nation-state. The foundational questions that propel a transnational lens of analysis and its place in migratory processes consider the extent to which migration leads to new linkages between sending and receiving societies (Castles & Miller, 2009). Analysis also considers the implications of these linkages for economic development processes, building of social capital, formations of cultural identity, and action taken by nation-state. As the term implies, transnationalism describes linkages established beyond or across national borders of the origin and destination countries in a migratory circuit, primarily in reference to linkages that extend beyond loyalties that connect to any specific place of origin, or ethnic or national group. This is differentiated from ‘international’, which refers to relationships between or among nation-states. It was this assertion that migration was facilitating cross-border linkages that functioned beyond the state that prompted heated scholarly discussion regarding the term.

Transnationalism emerged as a highly debated body of theory around the mid-1990s, largely in response to the work of Basch, Glick-Schiller, and Blanc (1994) who argued that migratory processes were creating “deterritorialized nation-states” that challenged understandings of national identity, allegiance, and international politics. This idea of “deterritorialization” was based on the observation of a change in the perception of the nation-state to include as citizens those who lived physically outside its borders but who remained connected culturally, politically, socially and/or economically. Basch et al. considered as “transnational actors” those individuals who were part of at least two different categorical relationships—familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and/or political—in both their home and host country.

But even before this definition, usage of the term was becoming widespread throughout migration studies as it was employed both as a theoretical lens of analysis (Portes & Dewind, 2004; Parreñas, 2005) and to describe new phenomena, principally in
reference to advancements in communication and transportation technology (Kearney, 1991; Glick Schiller, 1999; Vertovec, 1999; Adler, 2000). In response, other scholars argued that back-and-forth movement of migrants and political and economic transnationalism were as old as migration itself (Portes, Guarnizo, & Landolt, 1999; Foner, 1997; Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004) and pointed to migrant groups coming to the U.S. during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries who took part in the same practices as those being labeled as transnational today (Portes & Dewind, 2004). There was also concern expressed about the exaggeration of migrants’ mobility within some research on transnationalism (Dunn, 2010; Portes, 2003; O’Flaherty, Skrbiš, & Tranter, 2007, Skeldon, 2008), and many scholars took issue with work they felt misleadingly downplayed the role of the state in migrants’ lives and migratory processes (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004; Turner, 2007). This final point is most important for our Nebraska case study, which illustrates the inherent role of the state in transnationalism.

Much research shows that for the large majority of migrants, the presence of state institutions is central to their experience, as these institutions engage migrants at every step of the social and political processes of migration (Zolberg, 1999; Hernández-León, 2008; Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004), and often determine the way in which migrants are able to engage in transnational activities, in particular regarding physical cross-border movement. Government-sanctioned mobility, or the legal right to move across political borders is characteristic of U.S. immigration law. In this way the nation-state often provides the options available for transnationalism in deciding who has the legal right cross political borders and take greater part in economic, social, and political events in more than one country. That is not to say that migrants are merely pawns and only reactive to state decision-making, but rather that they are made to navigate state policies, some of which have also been developed based on migratory flows and migrant decision-
making. In other words, the state and migrants often engage in a process of action and reaction based on the goals and movements of each. This recognition of migrant agency is frequently referred to as Human Agency Analysis.

Human Agency Analysis emphasizes the importance of understanding migrant and migrant household perceptions of and reactions to migration law and other state actions, as well as migrants’ and their families’ own agendas and motivations, which are not solely economic. This approach acknowledges that while political and economic structures create the context within which migrants operate, it is migrants themselves who give these contexts meaning and through their actions, develop forces that eventually affect core institutional sectors in mainstream society (Smith, 1989; Rodriguez, 1996). Thus, Human Agency Analysis is based upon the belief that individuals are producers of experiences and shapers of events, and highlights the importance of investigating how people perceive and manage the events that affect their lives. Because for migrants and their families, key events are often facilitated by the state and civil society, these actors become the focus of questions regarding transnationalism.

Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004) refer to the interactions described above as “collisions” between cross-border, social organization facilitated by migration and the state’s reactive efforts to produce state-society alignment. In other words, states continuously attempt to act as containers, defining boundaries for ethnic groups, political allegiances, economies, and society in general. However, migration across state boundaries threatens to sever the alignment of territory, political institutions, and society that states try so hard to create. Thus, a transnational lens of analysis examines how the means by which cross-border linkages form and operate are contingent upon multiple political constraints, including relationships between and public opinion of home and host countries, and civil society actors who produce different messages for state allegiance,
community membership, and sense of belonging. These collisions involve diverse actors at multiple scales and are hardly ever cut and dry in terms of a single, unifying message or action by one group against that of another.

For instance, the state requires a growing economy as financial basis for its own maintenance, and thus has promoted different aspects of economic globalization or cross-border linkages including international trade agreements such as NAFTA, U.S. plants moving offshore, and policies that facilitated the movement of capital and goods across international borders. As a result, the U.S. job market is affected and immigration is pointed to as part of the problem since it brings foreign workers into the increasingly competitive U.S. labor market (Wright, 1997). For this reason, the state can not only support cross-border linkages, or transnationalism, but also must advocate for nationalism, and protect state-society alignment. As Wright explains:

The state must act to ensure its own legitimacy in the eyes of the electorate if it is to remain in power within a liberal democracy. As resistance to globalization grows within the electorate, the state has an increasing interest in supporting the forces of nationalism, expressed for example in exclusionary immigration policies that appear to lessen domestic job competition (ibid, p. 207).

As such, transnationalism itself is intimately connected to nationalism, and the state and civil society often engage in actions that facilitate movement across national boundaries, or arguably even promote the deterioration of these boundaries while at the same time engage in actions that harden national boundaries and strictly define those who do and do not belong within a society. However, it is important to note that these drawings of boundaries and collisions between migration and state-society alignment are not only occurring at the national level, as has traditionally dominated transnational scholarship.

While multiple scholars have called for attention to local politics in understanding
diverse government and territorial fragmentation across the U.S. (Staeheli, Kodras, & Flint, 1997), this effort has never been more important for migration studies in light of the recent, nationwide trend of attempted immigration enforcement at the local level. As Dunn (2010) asserts, “transnationalism as a global process is locally embedded” in that the same cultural group in two different cities can have extremely different experiences and impact based on a variety of factors from local migration history, to government policy, to the housing market (p. 3). For these reasons, this research will take up a transnational lens in order to focus on state-society collisions that occur at a smaller scale due to legislation like Fremont Ordinance 5165 that restricts migrants’ rights in certain jurisdictions.

**Multicultural and Participatory Planning**

A primary arena in which state-society alignment plays out at the local level is city planning. For much of history, specifically in line with Modernist thought, planning policy and tradition have been seen as potential solutions to social problems, and have been used as tools of the state to define and impose citizenship rights and practices, both in the U.S. and abroad (Holston, 1999; Watson, 2003; Scott, 1998; Outtes, 2003). Furthermore, a silence about the denial of such rights within mainstream planning histories has perpetuated a systematic avoidance of how planning practice has sustained racial segregation and discrimination (Sandercock, 1998; Sen, 2005). While there are numerous minority groups who have often been denied citizenship rights and practices via planning policy (*ibid*), migrant populations in particular have raised significant issues for city planners throughout U.S. history (Vitiello, 2009).

During the late 1880s, city planning decisions led to the construction of hundreds of settlement houses in migrant neighborhoods in places like Boston, Chicago, and New
York whose purpose was to “facilitate American citizenship” through assimilation and the teaching of American values (Spain, 2001; Kondo, 2012). Since then, residential segregation and discrimination against migrants has frequently manifested in planning policy, often in the form of zoning and building codes (Harwood, 2005), and migrants continue to be excluded from decision-making processes regarding the development of their U.S. communities (Kondo, 2012). As illustrated by the Fremont Ordinance, as well as the other half-a-dozen pieces of legislation limiting migrant home rental options that have been passed across the country—not forgetting the hundred that have been proposed—the trend does not seem to be waning.

A number of reasons have been put forth as to why migrants and other minority groups have often fared poorly in the planning realm. Holston (1999) argues that it is the perspective that the state is the single, legitimate source of citizenship rights, meaning, and practices, and the refusal to recognize other forms of citizenship that prevent planners from seeing alternative practices for development and belonging within a society. Relatedly, Young (2003) discusses how traditional planning goals of an ideal community tend to value and enforce homogeneity by excluding those with whom the majority or prime decision-makers do not or cannot identify. Sandercock (2003) and Harwood (2005) take this lack of mutual understanding a step further and argue that planning decisions are often the moments in which fears about racial and economic changes within a community get legitimized and adopted into policy responses. General consensus within multicultural planning literature has been that planners and planning tradition have often denied, ignored, or treated as superficial the reality of different worldviews and value systems (Umemoto, 2001; Fishler, 1995). In response, academics and planners have put forth suggestions for future practices that recognize the diversity of community members and
how different groups experience, perceive, and contribute to the places in which they live.

At the heart of many of these suggestions are one, a switch from prescription to investigation, specifically ethnography, in planning research; and two, the inclusion of traditionally marginalized voices in planning processes and policy-making (Sandercock, 2003; Thomas, 2003). The first change is in direct response to the history of planning, as described above, whose objectives were citizen-making and the ideal community. Holston (1999) asserts that ethnographic investigation is the best way to find out how locals participate in planning their cities and specifically to uncover what he calls “insurgent citizenship” or those non-traditional ways of belonging to and functioning within a community that challenge the normative and assumed categories of social life. He suggests that a balance between these insurgent forms and state-directed initiatives will lead to more successful planning that addresses current social diversity. This is in line with Sandercock’s (1998) earlier call for increased ethnographic study within planning, arguing that ethnography is especially useful in foregrounding excluded voices and stories. However, she asserts that the mere inclusion of these voices is not sufficient and that entire planning histories must be re-theorized using, for example, racial and gendered lenses of analysis. While this is no easy task, further studies reveal that to then take those voices and perspectives highlighted using ethnography and incorporate them within planning processes has posed an even greater challenge.

One approach has been what is generally referred to as multicultural planning. This approach is based on the argument that planning policies are not neutral and the ways in which different groups (women, men, gays, lesbians, heterosexuals, immigrants, Mexicans, African-Americans, etc.) use cities is different and thus, requires special policy considerations (ibid; Gunder, 2005). Multicultural planning attempts to recognize
and respond to diversity, difference and/or multiculturalism, many times by trying to include or represent diverse perspectives within consensus-seeking processes. The first challenge to this approach lies in the reality that these perspectives are often difficult to include since the respective populations may be complicated for planners to reach due to limited city resources and doubts held by government officials as to the willingness and ability of excluded groups for civic engagement (Kondo, 2012). Even if a diverse group is successfully assembled, a second challenge is related to the way in which consensus-seeking processes can work to simply repeat existing power relations, an occurrence numerous scholars argue is too often ignored (Watson, 2003; Young, 2003; Abram, 2000; Neuman, 2000).

Consensus-seeking tends to make two potentially problematic assumptions: one, that any differences in perspectives or beliefs can be overcome through debate or better argument; and two, that at least a single common, reachable goal exists among diverse groups (Watson, 2003). There is no easy answer to this dilemma, especially when considering possible responses on the part of institutions or government entities as they acknowledge the diversity of needs within their communities. Still, a step forward is for planners to search for ways to build consensus between groups that “affirms and valorizes difference rather than erases it” (ibid, p. 398), and to design methods that identify multiple epistemologies and facilitate the articulation of goals from diverse worldviews (Umemoto, 2001). Concrete action for U.S. cities, as suggested by Umemoto (2001) is to seek out planners who can “code-switch,” in that they are able to facilitate planning processes in more than one language and within multiple epistemologies and cultural backgrounds. She also suggests community-led planning as a possible alternative, which would involve community members in the design and facilitation of community-based planning processes.
Planners and researchers in international settings have achieved similar goals by utilizing methods that empower marginalized groups. Options of such methods might include those most often placed under the umbrella of “Participatory Planning” and research tools, such as participatory workshops, diagramming, and mapping (Freire, 2000; Chambers, 1994). Participatory techniques have not only been shown to empower marginalized groups (Pain, 2003), but also often generate culturally appropriate ideas and lead to decisions grounded in local understandings (Sletto, 2008, 2010). As Roy (2011) contends, planning is a “value oriented” profession that is defined by ethics, and as such, it is a profession that is concerned or should be concerned with the public interest (p. 412). Many recent publications would argue that concern with the public interest translates to concern for all groups living within a community, and planners should continue to work to find new ways to recognize various forms of citizenship and increase and diversify participation in planning processes.

Existing literature on each of these topics—New Destinations, Transnationalism, and Multicultural and Participatory Planning—is useful for a number of reasons. Foremost, it facilitates discussion of findings by providing additional context and related studies from which to draw. For example, discussion of migration to “New Destinations” facilitates an understanding of migration trends leading up to the introduction of Fremont Ordinance 5165 and how various economic, social, and political factors have contributed to both the presence and perception of migrant populations in states like Nebraska. Similarly, discussions related to Transnationalism point to additional processes at work in the creation of migratory circuits and actions taken by the nation-state; and literature on Multicultural Planning reveals a precedent to the Fremont ordinance in historical exclusion of migrants and migrant rights from city development. Furthermore, these topics have also informed research design and implementation in that acknowledgement
of the various factors and processes described above are investigated through multi-sited fieldwork and a mixed-method approach, as discussed in the next chapter. Thus, elements discussed in this chapter will assist in the analysis of the Fremont case, and are also considered in recommendations of alternative policy options and future research directions.
Chapter Three: Methodology

A Mixed-Methods Approach

In order to begin to answer the overarching question of this research—which investigates both the effects of attempts at local immigration enforcement that restrict unauthorized migrants’ ability to rent homes and acquire jobs, as well as how migrants have worked to oppose such attempts—a mixed-method approach and multi-sited fieldwork proved necessary. First, my decision to use a mixture of quantitative methods (Graphic Information Systems spatial analysis; presentation of special election statistics; and demographic inquiry using U.S. census data), which will be discussed in detail in Chapter Six, and qualitative methods (snowball sampling technique; semi-structured, in-depth interviews; and surveys), was guided by two primary goals: one, to encourage cross dialogue among different academic disciplines; and two, to facilitate widespread participation in the investigation by both migrants and native born in the Fremont community. In terms of cross dialogue, as mentioned in the introduction, the various issues raised by research on migration and local immigration enforcement are important for a number of academic fields and professions, including Urban Planning, Migration Studies, Sociology, Geography, and Latin American Studies. However, many discussion of migration have taken place completely within a single discipline without intercommunication that would likely have been beneficial in allowing one field to inform another (Pratt, 2010). With that in mind, this research employs different methods that tend to be favored by different disciplines in an attempt to facilitate increased dialogue across academic fields.

Regarding the second goal of the mixed-methods approach, widespread participation refers to generating large samples for surveys and conducting a high number of interviews in order for this research to be more rigorous and representative. Thus, I
conducted a short survey with 115 migrants living in Fremont, and completed 23 in-depth interviews with migrant and native born community members, including city officials, religious leaders, key organizers against the ordinance, and business owners (See Appendices A, B, and C for surveys, participant breakdown, and full results tables, respectively). I conducted the surveys in two of the most frequented Latino migrant-owned stores in the community where many migrants go to cash paychecks and send remittances, and also at the church with the largest Spanish-speaking congregation in Fremont. Surveys conducted at the stores were in the form of a list asking participants to fill-in where they were from, including the name of the city or town, state, and country. This method produced a larger sample by allowing me to leave the surveys at the store over the course of a week, and also allowed store workers with whom migrants likely felt more comfortable to encourage participation by store patrons, ensuring anonymity between myself and survey participants.

Surveys conducted at the church were given on a single day, announced by the priest during the service, and then distributed afterwards by myself to willing participants. These surveys consisted of three questions asking migrants to list their hometown, gender, and the length of time they had lived in Fremont. The third question was included in order to discount those participants who may live in a nearby town but travel to Fremont to attend worship service. Surveys conducted in the church also asked that a survey be filled out for every member of the family born outside of the U.S. in order to acquire a sample of individual migrants rather than households. In both cases, a store worker or I offered to give surveys verbally, if desired by the participant. These survey methods allowed me to reach migrants with whom I had no previous relationship, common acquaintances, and/or shared spaces; that is, many migrants whom I likely would not have been able to access otherwise. It is also this method that determined the
other fieldwork site, as will be described later. However, findings from the survey are limited due to the differences between the surveys conducted at the church and those conducted at the stores. Because surveys conducted at the stores did not include questions regarding participant gender or length of time living in Fremont, participant breakdowns based on these factors could not be generated. Additionally, it is possible that some individuals may have participated in both surveys, thus, skewing results.

The survey method varied greatly from those used in seeking out participants to interview. The first round of interviews conducted in Fremont took place in December 2010 and January 2011, the same time period during which the surveys were administered. That winter, I conducted 17 semi-structured, in-depth interviews with migrant and native born, Latino/a and Caucasian Fremont residents, investigating the nature of community member involvement in debating the ordinance and reactions to its recent passage. While specific questions varied in these interviews, general research questions included: 1) What was the nature of the involvement of migrant community members in debating this ordinance, that is, which individuals and groups participated, in what ways, and what motivated them to do so? 2) Does this involvement relate to previous political participation and/or civic engagement, both in the migrant’s home country and in the U.S.? 3) How do migrant community members feel this legislation has impacted their community, their families, and themselves? I began by interviewing contacts gained through community organizing experience in Fremont, as will be highlighted below, and then used a snowball sampling method to seek out additional participants, meaning that initial interview participants were asked to describe the study to other potential participants, putting them in contact with me to learn more about the research, and to discuss their interest in being interviewed. These methods were most appropriate due to my previously established relationships within the community, which
not only provided an available pool of participants, but also facilitated the snowball sample in that those who knew me were often willing to assist me in finding other potential participants, vouching for my trustworthiness.

While interviews were conducted with both men and women, special effort was made to interview female migrants in order to later conduct a gendered breakdown of issues raised throughout the research, which will be related in Chapter Four. This is particularly important because although women have been taking part in international migration for decades at rates equal or close to those of male migrants, it is not until recently that their stories have been incorporated into academic scholarship (e. g. Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003, 1994; Pessar & Mahler, 2003; DeLaet, 1999; Hagan, 1998). Furthermore, gender relations, played out by various actors, at multiple scales, have been shown to facilitate or constrain both women’s and men’s migration and settlement (Mahler & Pessar, 2006; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003), and various scholars have argued that gender-blind analyses of migration significantly limit our understanding (White & Jackson, 1995; Radcliffe, 1990, 1991; Lawson, 2000).

Although I place great value on the use of feminist methodologies, specifically in their objective to facilitate research carried out with or by participants rather than on them (Bertozzi, 2010; Clark, 2004; Moss, 2002), such methodologies were implemented to a limited extent in this research and it is important to note that a gendered analysis and many questions related specifically to issues of gender, as presented in this thesis, were not formulated until after fieldwork was completed. That is, interview participants were not always asked to describe how they believed gender influenced their participation and the ordinance debate. In this sense, discussion of gender within this thesis is most appropriately considered an examination of fieldwork findings with an eye to gender differences or using a gender-sensitive lens (Peterson & Runyan, 1993; Kunz, 2008),
which enables us to see how the Fremont debate was influenced by gendered concepts, practices, and institutions. In this way, the term “gender” is often used throughout this thesis in reference to a tool for analysis. Such discussion is a first step toward more complete feminist ethnographic enquiry that would take into even greater account the perspectives and understandings of interlocutors regarding their own actions and beliefs, emphasizing local knowledge (ibid; Mahler & Pessar, 2006).

To facilitate the sharing of local knowledge, interviews were done in English and/or Spanish depending on the preference of the person(s) being interviewed, and were audio recorded whenever consent was granted by participants. It is important to note that during this research, participants were never asked to state or describe their legal residential and/or worker status, or that of their family or community members. While many did share this information openly during interviews or related stories in which the information became obvious, this precaution was necessary so that participants did not feel they were putting themselves or others at risk. Similarly, pseudonyms are employed throughout this thesis, except when relating information directly from public material such as media reports or organizational websites. This was done in an effort protect the identity of research participants.

Due to the importance of gaining informed consent and providing protection for persons who participated in this research, The University of Texas at Austin’s protocol for human subjects research, as detailed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), was strictly followed, and fieldwork did not begin until the complete research proposal had been approved. This process included preparation of and adherence to specific guidelines for obtaining informed consent from all participants, maintaining participants’ privacy and confidentiality, and maintaining the confidentiality of research data. Participants were made aware of the steps that were to be taken to protect their privacy and maintain
confidentiality, and many were often reassured due to our previous relationships or the
fact that their participation had been recommended by a trusted friend or family member.

**Nebraska Is Home: Intersubjectivity and Positionality**

A number of the community members interviewed I had come to know in my
capacity as State Coordinator of an effort called “Nebraska Is Home,” an initiative that
sought to unite migrant and native born community members and develop positive ways
to discuss immigration-related issues in Nebraska. While not the primary focus of this
research, my previous community organizing experience in Fremont is important in that
it is largely significant in consideration of intersubjectivity, and positionality, both of
which were prime factors influencing research methods and discussion. Intersubjectivity
is recognized as part of “alternative” or “feminist” methodologies (McDowell, 1997;
Moss, 2002) and is used in reference to a researcher’s personal values, and the
relationships between researcher and research “subjects.” As opposed to objectivity,
intersubjectivity requires that a researcher reflect on and disclose her personal values,
acknowledging that they have influence over the research design and findings. This
approach is distinct from conventional research methods that attempt to be value free and
do not reveal or discuss the researcher’s personal attitude or perspective. Additionally,
intersubjectivity acknowledges that the researcher’s relationship with her “subjects” is
often involved, and there exists a sense of commitment, participation, and sharing of fate
(*ibid*). This is in stark contrast to the conventional, objective approach that assumes a
detached relationship with research “subjects” and for this reason, I choose to use the
terms research “participants” or “interlocutors” instead of “subjects.” The term
“interlocutors” more accurately reflects my research experience in that it suggests an
exchange of knowledge, as with dialogue, and relationships that are more dynamic, rather
than a unilateral gathering of information by the researcher, which is similar to use of the
term by other scholars (e.g. Mittermaier, 2011; Simone, 2008; Said, 1989; Fanon, 1966).

Additionally, intersubjectivity is intertwined with positionality in their shared assertion that researchers must be held accountable for their own perspective and also for each perspective they take on as they relate their findings. The concept of positionality sheds light on the power relations between researcher and interlocutors, and requires that researchers reflect on their privileged position as investigator or interviewer, interpreting the lives of other people and how these interpretations are affected by a researcher’s gender, age, ethnicity, professional background, etc., all of which also affect interactions with interlocutors and the nature of information gathered (McDowell, 1992, 1997; Stock, 2004; Kihato, 2010). As Barnes and Duncan (1992) assert, the relation of research “findings” is often problematic and research writings do not mirror reality, but rather mirror prior interpretation and representations. Thus, considerations of intersubjectivity and positionality provide the premise for discussion of my work with “Nebraska Is Home” as an important aspect of this research.

Fremont was one of five communities in which I worked for over a year, helping residents establish a local committee, organize community-building and educational events, and launch highly visible public relations campaign under the name “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” (See Figure 3.1). This campaign came about in the fall of 2008, just four months after the large public hearing where the ordinance was defeated by a split vote of the City Council. At this time, it was clear the divisive legislation was already leaving its impact on the city and residents who had opposed the ordinance felt a sense of urgency to unite community members. It was with this momentum that “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” began to emerge. Local “Nebraska Is Home” efforts had already been launched in four other communities and so in my position at Nebraska Appleseed, a member of a
network of 16 social justice centers in the U.S. and Mexico who had assisted towns in coordinating campaigns, I presented the idea for an initiative to a group of Fremont community members who had actively opposed the ordinance during the time leading up to the City Council vote. In January 2009, Kristin Ostrom and Gabby Ayala, leaders within the Caucasian and Latino Fremont communities, respectively, began organizing as Co-Coordinators of “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” (See Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1: (left) “Nebraska Is Home” billboard in Fremont, Nebraska as part of positive public relations campaign. Billboard reads: “Sharing Nebraska Values. New Nebraska families make use stronger. Nebraska: A good life for everyone.” (right) “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” Co-Coordinators Kristin Ostrom (left) and Gaby Ayala (right) at billboard revealing and initiative launch (June 2009).

This coming together was later recounted as follows:

For more than a decade, both Gabby Ayala (1st generation, Mexico) and Kristin Ostrom (3rd generation, Sweden) lived in Fremont, Nebraska, but they never met. They were neighbors but did not know one another; they lived in separate circles [...] The two women discovered their mutual concerns about Fremont’s increasing public divide between Hispanics and Anglos. And they realized that there were few opportunities for Hispanics and Anglos to meet in Fremont [...] They organized together from their respective circles and formed an initial group that included 72 Hispanic and Anglo, immigrant and native, Fremont residents. They created the community initiative: Nebraska Is Home Fremont - offering
positive opportunities for people to meet. It was a small step to strengthen the Fremont community (Nebraska Is Home Fremont, One year review, 2010, pp. 1-2).

Ostrom and Ayala began holding organizational meetings in March 2009, the same month residents were successful in submitting the petition for a special election. For the next year, while legal challenges regarding the ordinance were cycled through the court system, “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” continued holding community meetings and organized various events including a community picnic, dance, photography exhibit and dinners to unite residents and educate them about immigration to Fremont (Nebraska Is Home, 2008). I helped to promote and attended many of these events during my employment with Nebraska Appleseed and it was in this manner that most Fremont community members—including those who supported the ordinance—came to recognize me.

On the one hand, my previous relationships with some of my interlocutors were beneficial in that they created a space of trust that facilitated greater information exchange. Because of relationships developed before I began this research, interlocutors knew that I would not disclose sensitive information and also knew well my political perspective regarding the ordinance and other immigration issues in Nebraska. Since I had worked as “Nebraska Is Home” Coordinator, they also knew I was overall sympathetic to the plight of migrants. This proved beneficial to me as a researcher in that they were often willing to discuss personal information and sensitive topics as well as put me in touch with other potential participants, as with the snowball sampling method mentioned above. However, these same relationships complicated other methods used in this research, specifically in-depth interviews, at times causing interlocutors to leave out information they assumed I already knew, or to defer to me to help them remember things “correctly.” Because I had been involved in “Nebraska Is Home” and other immigrant
advocacy organizing in Nebraska, interlocutors would sometimes see me as an authority or expert on such issues. Even if I was not viewed as an expert, the fact that my interlocutors knew I had been closely following legal proceedings made it challenging to encourage them to (re)tell the history of the ordinance and explain to me in their own words what they understood the law would “do” and how it might impact the Fremont community.

In-depth survey and snowball sampling methods were also negatively affected by my previous employment experience in that for some, my involvement with immigrant advocacy work and Nebraska Appleseed—an organization that some Nebraskans felt was too liberal in its programs and mission—contributed to their view of me as a threat and/or as someone who was meddling in their community. This perspective was made clear to me by emails and comments received during my employment as “Nebraska Is Home” Coordinator and affected my decision not to seek out those community members who openly supported the ordinance in conducting this research.

Due to my prediction that supporters of the ordinance would not be willing to speak with me and/or would be primarily defensive in our interactions, combined with limited time to complete fieldwork and the fact that this research was most concerned with migrants’ perceptions of and efforts against the ordinance, investigation related to supporters of the ordinance is conducted via media reports and statements made at public hearings, many of which I attended. Consequently, perspectives from proponents of the ordinance are incomplete and at times absent from findings and discussion. This quite possibly constitutes an absence in the noted effects and broader discussions of local immigration enforcement, and for that reason this research is not definitive. That said, it should not be assumed that all interlocutors expressed complete opposition to the ordinance, an observance that will be related in future writings.
Finally, considerations of positionality bring me to reflect on gender and ethnicity. In the case of gender, it is important to consider how my being a woman may have influenced exchanges with my interlocutors, including the types of information shared and the way in which I relate this information in this thesis. First, it is crucial to recognize that doing research with women, as a woman, does not necessarily grant greater insight or immediate understanding of the issues being investigated, even (or perhaps especially) in relation to gender. Furthermore, shared gender among myself as a researcher and my female interlocutors does not automatically facilitate a mutual exchange of views, nor did it necessarily allow me to build upon commonalities of experience during fieldwork. As McDowell (1997) so accurately describes:

As geographical researchers at different stages of our careers, our life paths will, in many cases, have been different from the women with whom we hope to collaborate, and it has become increasingly recognised that to ignore these differences in favour of an optimistic, all-women-together approach raises problems. Many of us, as university educated (and employed) women, will differ considerably from women whom we study and any number of calls for empathy will not disguise this (sic, p. 390).

It is due in large part to such differences in personal life experience that I feel my gender had less of an effect on interactions with my interlocutors than did my openness about my personal political perspectives on immigrants in the U.S. Additionally, in terms of commonalities of experience on which to build upon, I found more beneficial my experience living in Nebraska and my experience working with “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” than my experience as a woman. My experience as a woman does not include as many shared events or perspectives due to my position as born and university-educated in the U.S., stably employed, a native English-speaker, and relatively young, all of which comprised a background quite different than those of most of my interlocutors. Additionally, I do not perceive my gender to have had any significant impact on my
interactions with male interlocutors in Fremont, nor do I perceive it to have been limiting
in terms of the places I felt were accessible to me. Still, my gender no doubt played a role
in the way I have structured presentation of these findings in terms of what I find to be
important. While I do not believe that this weakens this discussion, it is important to
recognize and also to use for motivation for additional research and conversations
regarding Fremont and local immigration enforcement in general.

Also for the sake of reflecting on my positionality, my own ethnic background
may have influenced how different participants interacted with me. I am a third-
generation Mexican-American born in Nebraska; that is, I am of mixed Latino (non-
white) and Caucasian (white) heritage. In interactions for this research, I observed that
my interlocutors drew initial conclusions about my ethnic heritage based first on my last
name (Martinez) and physical features (brown skin, dark hair and eyes), and second on
my language (native English speaker; non-native, fluent Spanish speaker). In almost
every interview, these initial conclusions were followed-up by questions and
conversations regarding my racial and ethnic self-identification and motivations for
conducting this research, which I expressed openly and in similar fashion to the way in
which I discussed my sympathy for the plight of migrants. Thus, it is likely that in some
instances, primarily with Latino interlocutors, my ethnicity provided a sort of common
ground from which to facilitate communication in regards to perceived shared or similar
ethnic identity and the perception that current themes of racial or ethnic discrimination,
migration and migrant rights apply more intuitively to people of Latin American rather
than European descent.

---

5 In this thesis, the use of the term “Caucasian” is most often synonymous with the term “white,” and also
implies U.S.-born. However, for important discussion on the origins of the term “Caucasian,” see Painter
(2003).
Meanwhile, in other instances, primarily with Caucasian interlocutors, my ethnic background may have served as an initial barrier to communication in regards to perceived differences in ethnic identity and the same perception that current themes of racial or ethnic discrimination, migration and migrant rights apply more intuitively to people of Latin American rather than European descent. In other words, some interlocutors may have (subconsciously) chosen whether or not to disclose certain information or feelings based on my ethnic background. This is not to assume, however, that I was granted any key insight into the experiences of Latinos in Fremont nor that I was denied access to an understanding of Caucasian interlocutors. Recall that a number of characteristics—gender, age, ethnicity, professional background, etc.—affect interactions, and as McDowell (2008) illustrates, “identities are complex, multiple and fluid, continuously (re)produced and performed in different arenas of everyday life” (p. 491). Thus, any single aspect of a researcher’s identity is not completely separate from the others, nor is it perceived as such by those with whom we interact—a phenomenon that has been referred to as “intersectionality” (see e.g. Nagar, et al., 2001). Multiple aspects of a researcher’s identity—ethnicity, gender, age, professional background—simultaneously affect research interactions, the nature of information gathered, and the way in which findings are presented. Herein lies the importance of critical reflection on positionality, as well as continued dialogue and critique across academic disciplines, all of which are objectives of this research.

A Transnational Lens: Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico

A final objective of the methodology employed in this research is to acknowledge the broader context within which events in Fremont are occurring and their potential effects outside of the community, and even outside of the United States. This approach
requires recognition of migration as a dynamic process between at least two places, where happenings in one place inevitably affect the other. As Miraftab (2011) discusses, places are always formed via relations to other places and a multi-sited ethnographic approach works to uncover interrelated global realities that shape a single place’s processes of social and spatial understanding and transformation (p. 393). For these reasons, effort was made to investigate whether there was a single city or town from which a majority of migrants in Fremont came. While it is estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (2006-2010) that over 80% of Fremont’s foreign born population is from Latin America and over 50% of the same population is from Mexico specifically (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010), Fremont migrants’ communities in these countries are largely unknown. Thus, the survey method described above was used as a starting point to answer this question and to begin to investigate how processes taking place in Fremont were connected to other locations beyond its city limits.

The survey had a sample size of 115, or about 7% of the estimated 1,575 foreign born living in Fremont (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Results showed that of the 115 surveyed 20% were from the state of Guerrero, Mexico and 10% were from the town Chichihualco in Guerrero. Of those surveyed, these represented the largest groups from the same community. Furthermore, two of the migrant community members in Fremont who were most active in debating the ordinance by offering statements to the press, helping to register voters, and disseminating information before the special election were from Chichihualco and expressed their willingness to put me in touch with their family members still living in Mexico. Thus, Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico was chosen as the second fieldwork site for this research, which facilitated a transnational lens of analysis, providing additional insight to local power structures and attempts at immigration enforcement in Fremont.
It is important to note, however, that Chichihualco-Fremont is by no means the only or most important migratory circuit present within this context. As other research (Gouveia et al., 2005; Skop & Zanowia-Antonelli, 2011; Dalla et al., 2005) and the survey in Fremont show, there are also significant populations of migrants in Fremont and Nebraska who come from countries such as El Salvador and Guatemala. Additionally, it is important to acknowledge the complexities of migratory circuits, and while descriptions such as “sending” versus “receiving” community, or “home” and “host” country may facilitate discussion about the places within a migratory circuit, exchange and movement between these places is often much more complicated than these terms imply. Furthermore, sending/receiving and home/host tend to suggest false scenarios in which the flows of capital, ideas, customs, and people are unidirectional (Miraftab, 2011). As will be illustrated in Chapter Six, this is most certainly not the case. Rather, it is the constant, bidirectional flows of people, information and practices present in migratory circuits that deserve attention in addressing issues of migrants and migration. In this sense, fieldwork in Chichihualco provides a starting point from which to begin to understand the transnational influences and effects related to local immigration enforcement in Fremont.

Once again, my previous relationships with migrants in Nebraska proved useful in facilitating fieldwork. Interlocutors in Nebraska were able to give me the names of family members living in Chichihualco whom I could interview, and were also able to notify family members of my travel, encouraging participation and verifying my trustworthiness, again facilitating the snowball sampling and in-depth interview methods. For this reason, it was important for me to return to Fremont before beginning fieldwork in Chichihualco in order to reconnect with interlocutors as well as seek out other migrants from Chichihualco with whom I had no previous relationship but whose presence had
been reflected in survey results. On this second visit to Fremont, which lasted only two weeks, I conducted two in-depth interviews with migrants from Chichihualco whom I had not known previously, made contacts with four additional households who put me in touch with their family members in Chichihualco, conducted follow-up interviews with four key interlocutors, and obtained from the City of Fremont the GIS shapefiles that would be necessary in implementing quantitative methods, including demographic analysis of the special election, discussed in Chapter Six.

During this same visit, I was also able to make arrangements for my housing in Chichihualco. Those migrants who had been some of the most active in publicly opposing the ordinance facilitated my staying with their relatives in Chichihualco; in addition, one of the more well known, wealthier families in the town whose immediate members had also spent time living and working in Fremont. They served as my local “guides” putting me in touch with additional interview participants and explaining to me much of the town’s culture, traditions, and economic activities. However, I was also conscious of limiting participation and findings by associating myself with and seeking out additional contacts through a single family in Chichihualco. I tried to mitigate this outcome by also inviting research participants from the four other households mentioned above, as well as through a contact made in Austin, Texas whose partner had recently returned to Chichihualco after having worked in Nebraska and other states.

In June and July of 2011, I conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews in Chichihualco with family members of migrants, and return migrants of 20 different households, as well as with two of the town’s major employers and the local historian. Some of these interviews took on either a partner or even spontaneous focus group setting in which various members of a single household participated in conversations about migration, Nebraska, and Chichihualco. All interviews were conducted in Spanish and
were recorded when permission was given by participants, again emphasizing privacy and confidentiality, and following IRB protocol. In-depth interviews were complimented with numerous shorter, sporadic interactions that took place with interlocutors with whom I had brief contact throughout my month’s stay in the town and who willingly participated in impromptu interviews after disclosing that that they had family living or had themselves lived in Nebraska.

Primary questions specific to this fieldwork site were: 1) How do migrants’ family members back home understand events surrounding the Fremont legislation and how was this information received? 2) What is the nature of communication these family members have with migrants in regards to these events? 3) Have Fremont legislation and related happenings affected family planning, that is, are families planning for migrants to return or be deported, for loss of remittances, etc.? 4) How do interviewees feel U.S. restrictions affect plans for migration in general, that is, is this type of local legislation a deterrent for migrating, or an incentive for return or internal migration?

I began with contacts suggested to me by their loved ones in Fremont and Austin and then employed the snowball sampling method once again in order to seek out additional participants. It was also extremely advantageous that one of the migrant households in Nebraska spent part of the summer in Chichihualco to attend a wedding and throw a quince años celebration for their daughter. I was invited to both and in this way was granted additional opportunities to meet other migrants and their families with whom I arranged interviews in the weeks to follow. My relationship with this Fremont family and especially with their 15-year-old daughter also provided various opportunities for personal observations during time spent hanging out with the town’s youth, most of whom were in their mid to late teens, had either migrated with their parents when they were very young or were the first generation to be born in the U.S., and who returned to
Chichihualco almost every summer during time off from school. As mentioned above, these interactions, along with my general movement around the small town of a little over 10,000 inhabitants (INEGI, 2012) also allowed for spontaneous, short, informal interviews with persons whom I came across in the market, at the soccer field, while waiting on the owner of a soccer ball factory, or while out running errands with my hosts. Thus, findings in Chapter Six draw heavily on interviews and fieldnotes taken after such encounters.

In regards to this fieldwork site, some of the most noteworthy considerations of how my positionality affected research in Chichihualco are related to my age, and ethnic and professional background. First, my age granted me an invitation to interact with the town’s teenage population in informal, low-stress settings in which interlocutors expressed candidly their views on migration and life in the U.S. and Chichihualco—I was 26 at the time of this research but was often perceived by interlocutors to be younger. These interactions added an unanticipated, but greatly welcome perspective to this research, which will be discussed in future writings.

Second, as was observed in Nebraska, my ethnic background and openly expressed sympathy toward the plight of migrants tended to serve as a basis for trust and open communication. Furthermore, my experience as a native Nebraskan allowed me to speak intimately and extensively with return migrants about the state’s geography and different locations they felt had been or were important to them, including different meatpacking plants, dance halls, and sports fields. However, it is also possible that because I am from Nebraska and sought to interview family members of migrants living in Nebraska and return migrants who had also worked in Nebraska, that interlocutors may have been less likely to share negative views about my home state, the U.S., or migration
in general. That is not to say that negative comments did not arise, as will be described later, but rather that they may have been guarded or somewhat suppressed.

Finally, my professional background as an academic researcher seemed to grant me access to certain spaces from which I may have been traditionally excluded, based on my gender. For example, I was welcomed in soccer ball factories (las fábricas de balón), places in which local women are not employed and typically did not frequent, as will be discussed in Chapter Six. However, my positionality as a graduate student studying migration also had negative effects in that it created for many of my interlocutors high expectations in regards to my knowledge of U.S. immigration law. On a number of occasions, I was asked questions about specific immigration cases, including U.S. immigration laws, ways to legally migrate, and legal consequences for breaking certain laws, and I sensed disappointment when I was unable to provide answers. My lack of knowledge in this area and my interlocutors’ expectations of me as a migration scholar created a certain level of conflict that likely affected our interactions. It is also possible that this may have prompted the perspective of me as a researcher who takes from a community without being able to offer anything in return, which raises questions about a researchers’ responsibility to her participants (i.e. Speed, 2006; Naples, 2003; Knight, 2000). Both my readers and I should keep considerations such as these in mind throughout the following discussion of this research.
Chapter Four: Place and Legality: Migrant Political Participation

Examination of the nature by which different community members showed their opposition to Fremont Ordinance 5165 leads us to considerations of space and place: specifically, representations of space, place (re)making by different groups, perceived and imposed place boundaries, and place belonging. Because findings from Fremont suggest that participation often differed according to local power relations, socio-spatial hierarchies, and questions of race, ethnicity and citizenship or legal status, different theoretical frameworks for understanding space and place become useful in describing how and why participation played out as it did. Thus, Chapters Four and Five explore processes in the creation of space and place in order to understand the different forms of participation in the ordinance debate. Chapter Four introduces some of the broad power relations at work in Fremont, and then explores findings with an eye to issues of gender. Chapter Five focuses specifically on a consumer boycott organized to show migrants’ and Latinos’ economic importance to the city, discussing representations of space as they relate to Wal-Mart, the site of the boycott.

While the terms “space” and “place” have been used differently by different authors from various academic disciplines, this thesis draws primarily from theoretical texts discussing “space” within classic Geography and Anthropology (Harvey, 1990; Lefebvre, 2000) to understand Fremont community members’ experiences within a single public space, Wal-Mart, the target of a consumer boycott. This is consistent with previous use of the term by various academics to describe a very defined area in which patterns are organized and in theoretical discussion primarily focused at public space (Thomas, 2011; McCann, 1999; Mitchell, 1995, for example), as will be done in Chapter Five.
Meanwhile, the term “place,” which has been traditionally connected to humanistic geography (Taylor, 2012; Silvey, 2003; Keith & Pile, 1993), is discussed by drawing principally from texts written by different feminist geographers (McDowell, 1998; Bondi & Davidson, 2005; Massey, 1994) and is used to better understand the ordinance debate, and how it is affected by local power relations in Fremont. Neither term is mutually exclusive; rather, employment of each term at different times throughout this thesis is based on the theoretical texts being referenced in order to describe and explore particular observations made during fieldwork. Furthermore, concepts presented here are not meant to suggest any singular manner or set of ways to understand place and space, and discussion is by no means exhaustive. Rather, it is meant to challenge different traditionally held perceptions of space and place as fixed categories or locales and encourage multiple, even conflicting understandings of any singular space or place.

Findings presented in this chapter support the assertion made by a number of scholars that places are defined and understood based on socio-spatial practices and local power relations (all aforementioned authors in this chapter). As feminist geographer Linda McDowell (1998) explains, “[p]laces are made through power relations which construct the rules which define boundaries. These boundaries are both social and spatial—they define who belongs to a place and who may be excluded, as well as the location or site of the experience” (p. 4). While power relations responsible for constructing social and spatial boundaries are numerous—including but not limited to those derived from economic status, labor divisions, citizenship or legal status, gender, culture, language, race and ethnicity—those that seemed most significant in Fremont at the time of the debate were power relations based on race or ethnicity, and citizenship or legal status.
As will be elaborated below, these power relations constructed the rules that defined the boundaries for the debate and passage of the Fremont ordinance. Most obviously, proponents of the ordinance used these power relations in their attempt to define Fremont and its boundaries so that undocumented migrants, and arguably Latinos would be excluded. However, it should not be assumed that Fremont community members who opposed the ordinance or those who held lower positions within socio-spatial hierarchies were prevented from taking part in the discussion of who belongs to the city; but rather, that many did so according to existing, local power relations and social and spatial boundaries most often established for instead of by them. While the focus of the next two chapters is on the local, it must not be forgotten that the Fremont ordinance was part of a growing national movement, and as such is part of a larger social and political development that sought to exclude and restrict migrants. In this sense, a local perspective translates to larger findings and implications at the national scale.

**Place (Re)Making and Power Relations**

An important aspect of the activity surrounding the Fremont ordinance that research and popular media has tended to either overlook or erroneously simplify is local mobilization and organization around the issue. Both migrant and native born community members took part in petition drives, participated in public hearings, and organized local campaigns in an effort to oppose the passage of the ordinance. One of the most publicized local efforts was the formation of the group “One Fremont, One Future,” made up of concerned community members who came together specifically to defeat the ordinance, after receiving word of the public vote. Members of “One Fremont, One Future” included both migrants and native born, and Latinos and Caucasians, many of whom had also been active in “Nebraska Is Home Fremont,” discussed in Chapter Two (See Figure 4.1). “One
Fremont, One Future” described itself as “a community effort to defeat Ordinance No. 5165 because it is unconstitutional and divides the Fremont community” (One Fremont One Future, 2010). The group operated in both English and Spanish, holding press conferences, doing radio spots, maintaining a website, and creating fact sheets, door hangers, and postcards to help voters understand the legal implications of the ordinance, its estimated economic costs to the community, and the process for voting in the upcoming election (See Appendix D for “Vote No” flyer). Due to their high involvement in opposing the ordinance, members of One Fremont One Future were often sought for interviews with the media and also contributed much information to this thesis.  

Figure 4.1: (left) Members of “One Fremont, One Future” wearing a “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” T-Shirt and “One Fremont, One Future” T-shirts. (right) Children helping parents leave door hangers during a “walk party” organized to share information about the law and upcoming special election (photos courtesy of One Fremont One Future).

However, it is also important to recognize that participation in “One Fremont, One Future” does not represent all organized opposition to the ordinance that took place in Fremont. Furthermore, the nature of participation of various individuals, even those  

---

6 Many other Fremont groups also publically opposed the ordinance, including but not limited to The Fremont Ministerial Association, Fremont Chamber of Commerce, and “Centsible Citizens Say No.”
active in “One Fremont, One Future,” often differed according to local power relations, socio-spatial hierarchies, and questions of race, ethnicity, and citizenship or legal status.

From the ordinance’s introduction, it was clear how local power relations were at work, as accusations of the law being discriminatory, especially in terms of race, had been made since it was first proposed by City Council member Bob Warner in 2008 and escalated as the legislation neared the public vote in 2010. The split city council decision in July of 2008, which prevented the ordinance from being passed, as well as then Mayor “Skip” Edwards’s public statement of opposition to the ordinance were thought to have been motivated by convincing evidence related to the proposed legislation’s potential negative economic effects and potential legal challenges, as had been observed in other jurisdictions where similar laws were passed and which had been articulated by Nebraska’s Attorney General (Bowen, 2008, July 30). For these reasons, many community members felt the law had been proven to be damaging for the city, and thus, perceived the subsequent attempt at a public vote to hold direct racist implications. For some, the petition for a public vote felt like a new attack altogether, causing a few migrant interlocutors to speak about multiple ordinances (“las ordenanzas”) during interviews, or to refer to the “first” law, which they had defeated in 2008, and the “second” law, in 2010, which they had not. This is also significant in that some migrants who had been greatly involved in organized efforts to express their opposition to the law before the city council hearing felt discouraged from organizing again to defeat the ordinance at a public vote.

During fieldwork, I brought this up to interlocutors, asking why certain individuals who had been very active, public organizers before the city council hearing had stopped participating in opposition efforts. Interlocutors explained to me the negative backlash former organizers had received, which they felt was responsible for halting
some community members’ participation. Threatening phone messages and emails combined with the fact that many former organizers had young children were thought to be the primary reasons preventing them from continuing to organize against the law. In fact, many interlocutors reported increased experiences of racism after the law had been introduced; take for example, Alejandra.

Alejandra\(^7\) is a college student in her early twenties who was born in Mexico and brought to the U.S. as a child. She has lived in Fremont almost her entire life and describes how the ordinance debate had increased tensions between local ethnic groups. In an interview with her and her father, a local business owner, she explains: “Those who were in favor of the ordinance were pissed that it went away…they hated the city council. The ordinance gave them [supporters of the law] a reason to hate, to look down on Hispanics. It gave people the green light to be racist.”\(^8\) Similar sentiments were shared by a number of interlocutors as reports of the debate actually fueling racial discrimination were brought up in numerous interviews and were also received by local immigrant advocacy organizations. The problem was perceived as severe enough that the group “One Fremont, One Future” facilitated confidential, bilingual “hate incident” reporting by making a form available on their website and putting victims in contact with local community organizations that were also addressing the issue (See Appendix E for Incident Reporting Form). At the time of this fieldwork in December 2010, sixty-five reports had been submitted to Nebraska Appleseed, just one of the organizations that was working to mitigate incidents of racism and had assisted Fremont community members in

\(^7\) Pseudonyms are employed throughout this thesis
\(^8\) Direct quotes taken from interviews are presented in the speaker’s original language. English translations are provided in brackets directly after Spanish quotes. A few interlocutors, such as Alejandra, who were fluent in both English and Spanish, would frequently switch between the two languages during interviews. For these cases, direct quotes are still presented in the speaker’s original language with an English translation in brackets, afterward when Spanish is used. Thus, all quotes that are not presented in brackets indicate the original language in which they were communicated.
opposing the ordinance (Community Organizer, Nebraska Appleseed, Personal communication). Such incidents included being fired at with BB guns, and certain graffiti writings perceived to be negatively targeting the Hispanic/Latino community (See Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2: Graffiti writings perceived to be negatively targeting the Hispanic/Latino community were one example of the types of increased discrimination reported during the ordinance debate (photo courtesy of “One Fremont, One Future,” 2010).

This increase in overt racism within the city also led some interlocutors to speculate that at least one former organizer in particular was not only a victim of racism but was also being pressured by the Fremont Latino community to withdraw from the public debate. This pressure came from the perception that the former organizer’s involvement may have been doing the greater Latino community more harm than good, specifically because this person was a leader of the Latino community and served them in a number of ways, offering interpreting services, for example. This created the fear that backlash or discrimination against the leader would escalate to backlash and discrimination against the larger Latino community, and/or halt or make difficult any
services the leader had been providing. These arguments likely led the former organizer to cease public involvement in opposition efforts. Such fear of racial discrimination and the suspicion that racist motivations were behind the ordinance were widespread. Most Latino interlocutors shared at least one story of racial discrimination they had either experienced or been witness to, and all agreed that tensions between racial and ethnic groups within the city that had existed long before the law’s introduction but had been more covert now played a key role in the ordinance debate.

Alejandra’s father Felipe, who had been one of the first Latino migrants to come to Fremont back in 1980 to work in the Hormel meatpacking plant expressed his ongoing frustration with what he perceived as longtime residents’ disdain for the Latino community. “Hasta con papeles no los quieren (los anglos a los latinos)…quieren nada mas a su raza…Creen que son superiores [Even if they (Latinos) have legal papers, they (“Anglos”) don’t like them…they only like their race…They think they’re superior].” However, when Alejandra was asked if she experienced similar racism before the ordinance, her response was, “No, pero lo veo en otra gente [No, but I see it in other people]. She also added that she feels it is different with community members her age and that she has always had both Latino and Caucasian friends at school. These last comments serve as an important reminder that it is unfair and inaccurate to paint the entire Fremont community, or even all proponents of the ordinance as racist, and also suggest other factors contributing to inter-group tensions, such as generational differences. Longtime residents, like Felipe, would likely affirm that Fremont was not a racially peaceful city before the ordinance debate. However, research findings suggest that the ordinance increased the amount of racial tension felt by community members, even though it is uncertain how much new tension was actually created by the ordinance and how much already existed, even if under the surface. Still, the above examples
illustrate how those who were considering entering the ordinance debate—both Caucasian and Latino—were forced to navigate both existing and perceived racism and discrimination against the Fremont Latino community, and the related consequences that might result from their participation. This points again to the power relations at work in constructing place.

Unequal power relations and accusations of racism were also brought to the surface by the media, as discrimination and mounting community tension was most often the spotlight for stories from Spanish- and English-language, local, national, and international press covering the debate. Headlines such as, “Fremont Council Targets Illegal Immigrants” (Lincoln Journal Star, 2009), “City in Nebraska Torn as Immigration Vote Nears” (Davey, 2010), and “Discriminación contra inquilinos latinos ‘sin papeles’ [Discrimination against Latino tenants ‘without papers’]” (Univisión, 2010) both reflected and contributed to the divisive political climate. As Chavez (2007) asserts in her own research investigating messages about Latinas in the media, “because discourses not only filter reality but help construct what is taken for ‘real,’ they have important material implications” (p. 67). Thus, discourse in the media describing Fremont as a divided community, or one “against” certain groups also contributed to community anxieties and the reality in which individuals made decisions on how (if at all) to demonstrate their opposition to the ordinance. However, during the same time period a counter dialogue within the media that arguably proved useful for local organizers was also taking place.

Because the “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” group emerged just as proponents of the ordinance were petitioning for a public vote after the law failed to be approved by the city council, two contradictory public dialogues about Fremont began occurring in the local media, thus balancing positive and negative stories about migrants and their place in the city. In addition to headlines reading “Fremont group forms to protest illegal
immigration” (Brown, 2009), Fremont was also represented as a misunderstood, welcoming community, struggling to overcome differences. “Nebraska is Home takes unity campaign to Fremont” (Omaha World Herald, 2009), and “Healing Fremont With A Picnic” (KMTV, 2009) also appeared in local headlines and were highlighted on the evening news. Arguably, because public discourse and the media were not dominated by a single, negative view of migrants, greater opportunity for future political participation by migrants was made possible. In other words, support from “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” combined with frustration with the ongoing debate surrounding the ordinance provided a fertile landscape for increased migrant political participation and civic engagement in later opposing the law.

Furthermore, the fact that many community members were introduced to one another through their involvement in “Nebraska Is Home” facilitated their later cooperation in organizing “One Fremont, One Future.” Interlocutors who had been active in both efforts later reflected that it would have been much more difficult to organize across ethnic groups to oppose the ordinance had they not held the previous community building activities as part of “Nebraska Is Home Fremont.” By organizing activities that encouraged positive interaction across ethnic groups and utilizing the media to convey positive messages about Fremont, migrants, and inter-group relations, “Nebraska Is Home Fremont” members were beginning to shift the boundaries established by local power relations, creating additional opportunities for participation in the ordinance debate and place (re)making.

These efforts illustrate one aspect of power geometries, or how individuals are able to influence existing power relations and processes while simultaneously being affected by them (Pessar & Mahler, 2003). As anthropologist Judith Okely (1996) describes, while “places are defined, maintained and altered through the impact of
unequal power relations, ‘different groups inhabiting the same spaces can create and shift boundaries by subtle means’” (p. 3 as qtd. in McDowell, 1998, p. 5). Arguably, efforts by “Nebraska Is Home Fremont,” which partially facilitated “One Fremont, One Future” organization, shifted the boundaries in such a way that not only allowed for additional political participation by various individuals, but also strengthened opposition efforts in terms of greater support, resources and cooperation.

Yet, within these shifting boundaries, those debating the ordinance were still functioning under existing socio-spatial hierarchies in which migrants, Latinos, non-English-speakers, and the undocumented were inferior, as evidenced by interlocutors’ accounts of discrimination and challenged sense of belonging, detailed throughout this discussion. These hierarchies dictated the ways in which said individuals felt most comfortable expressing their opposition to the proposed ordinance and how they participated in place (re)making. For example, place (re)making by migrants, Latinos, and many undocumented took on a more indirect nature. The majority of migrants and Latinos who voiced their opposition to the ordinance did so in less-public, more group-oriented forms as with sign-on letters, petitions only requiring a name, signature and zip code, or through the large consumer boycott to be discussed in Chapter Five. These forms of participation allowed community members to demonstrate their opposition to the ordinance more anonymously and thus with less fear of negative consequences or discriminatory backlash. Because a boycott or signature did not require public or individual expression of opposition, participants did not feel as if themselves or their family members were being made to feel vulnerable or being put at risk.

These forms of participation were also more accessible in that they did not require certain citizenship status or linguistic ability. Political participation that was not regulated by legal residential or citizenship status—as is the case with voting, to be discussed in
Chapter Six—was extremely important for those migrants who were undocumented or non-citizens, allowing them to still express their opposition and play an arguably more direct part in place (re)making. Similarly, signatures and boycotts did not require community members to overcome language barriers or nervousness about speaking at a public hearing or to the media, nor did they necessarily need to find caretakers for their children or put aside other duties in order to participate. Furthermore, these forms were not particularly time consuming and did not have a fixed schedule as with hearings, community meetings, etc., all aspects that made these forms of political participation and civic engagement more accessible to those less powerful groups within existing socio-spatial hierarchies.

The manner in which Fremont community members negotiated these power relations in terms of their participation in the ordinance debate brings us again to power geometries by illustrating the types and degrees of agency people exert given their social location (Pessar & Mahler, 2003), or place in socio-spatial hierarchies. This point becomes more obvious when we compare participation by those toward the bottom of socio-spatial hierarchies (migrants, Latinos, the undocumented, non-citizens, non-English-speakers, etc.) to participation by those individuals with higher statuses in the same hierarchies (native born, Caucasians, citizens, native English-speakers).

Place (re)making by non-migrants, Caucasians, and many documented migrants occurred in very public ways. For example, those community members who spoke to the press or at public hearings often held higher standings in local socio-spatial hierarchies, and were individuals whom existing power relations favored since many were longtime community leaders who were non-migrant Caucasians or documented migrants. This included school teachers, religious leaders, local business owners, and children of
migrants either born in the U.S. or who migrated at a very young age,\(^9\) all of whom were established community members and had significant influence within Fremont (See Figure 4.3). Their standing as longtime Fremont residents also worked to grant them knowledge of city politics as well as relationships with different persons from various sectors of the community, eliminating or reducing some of the barriers to participation and potential discriminatory backlash more recent or undocumented migrants may have felt.

![Figure 4.3](image_url)

Figure 4.3: (left) “One Fremont, One Future” members take calls from listeners during a morning radio show. One woman is active in the local religious community, and the other is a Fremont high school teacher (photo Weaver, 2010). (right) “One Fremont, One Future” member and current college student who migrated to Nebraska when she was a child being interviewed by the press (photo courtesy of One Fremont One Future).

Furthermore, most community members who were public in their opposition efforts were also among those who would be the least directly affected by the law, should it be enforced. Because the majority of this group of participants were either citizens or carried the proper documentation to legally live and/or work in the city, they would not be the ones forcibly excluded from Fremont. Drawing again from conversations with Alejandra, she acknowledged this fact as she explained her motivations for publicly

---

\(^9\) Often referred to as “second-” or “one-and-a-half-generation migrants” (for example, Portes & Dewind, 2004)
opposing the law, “I was involved because I really believed in it...the ordinance wouldn’t really affect me, not as much as it would affect others...but I really believed in it.” She also described her reason for choosing the forms of political participation she did. “Publicity was most effective. When reporters came and the story showed up on the national news and in the papers, it showed the country how racist the town seemed and sort of toned things down.” In addition to supporting the assertion that media discourse plays a role in shaping reality, Alejandra’s comments reflect her greater ability to choose to express her opposition in the way she felt most effective, which earlier discussion shows was an option not available to many participants. By examining different organized efforts to oppose the legislation, it is clear how some community members felt their participation was limited due to their race, ethnicity, and/or legal status, indicating various degrees and understandings of citizenship (Ong, 1996, 2007; Inda, 2007; Rosaldo, 1994). These findings point toward the need to think of place and place (re)making in terms of social relations, with specific attention to power hierarchies. Discussion of various forms of place (re)making in Fremont reveal the complexity and depth of the connection of place to race, ethnicity and legal status, findings that are in many ways similar to Doreen Massey’s (1994) discussion of the relationship between place and gender.

**Shared Places: Considering Gender and Outsider Support**

Because gender is another important aspect within discussion of place (re)making, and in particular within discussion of place (re)making and migration, this sections seeks to employ a gendered lens of analysis in order to: 1) Gain greater understanding of why individuals participated in the debate as they did, again given various power relations at work but also considering personal motivations, 2) Provide insight regarding inter-group
relations in terms of outsider support and coalition building across ethnic groups, and 3) Establish a foundation for discussion of possible opportunities to motivate future political participation and community organizing strategies, which will be brought up again in Chapter Seven.

This section on gender falls within the broader discussion of power and socio-spatial hierarchies in that consideration of multiple scales of power relations is “critical to understanding women’s politics of location in their experience of migration” (Williams, 2005, p. 404), which is especially important in light of research affirming equal rates of migration by women and permanent, family settlement in new destinations, as described in earlier chapters. Here, the term “gender” is used primarily in reference to historically and culturally specific social constructions at work in various mechanisms (representations, social structures, institutions, etc.), all of which have concrete implications that determine how both women and men think, act, and live (Kunz, 2008). In terms of place (re)making in general, gender divisions and spatial divisions—which are often perceived as ‘natural,’ as with the home being thought of as a ‘woman’s place,’ for example—have been shown to be interrelated in both their origins and maintenance (McDowell, 1998), making gender all the more relevant for considerations of space and place in Fremont.

Couched in these terms, this discussion turns first to motivations for participating in organized opposition of the ordinance. Based on information gained during interviews, the primary factor motivating migrants—both male and female—to participate in debating the ordinance was the desire to maintain the safety and peacefulness of the city. Each interlocutor was asked if she or he liked living in Fremont (¿A usted le gusta vivir en Fremont?) and all except one young male replied that they did, emphasizing that Fremont was “un pueblo tranquilo [a quiet/peaceful town].” This phrase came up
numerous times in almost every interview and echoes findings from other researchers doing work with migrants in Nebraska (Dalla et al., 2005), and also in other new destination states like North Carolina (Torres et al., 2006).

Interlocutors’ emphasis on family is also important in that it suggests a greater presence of female migrants in the city, and of permanent settlement. In Fremont, María Elena is a prime example. She and her husband Nicolás had made the decision together that they should migrate for economic reasons. However, due to his recent surgery and their two daughters being enrolled in the university, she was the only family member who could leave. María Elena came to Nebraska six months before Nicolás, crossing with another woman and her children. She had not known anyone in Nebraska previously, except the people she came with, who had relatives in the state. Since she was unable to find work right away, she helped them around the house by doing the cooking and ironing. “Nunca había pensado en venirme para acá [I had never thought about coming here],” María Elena recalls, “pero fue un momento de crisis [but it was a moment of crisis].” Stories like María Elena’s, and other interlocutors’ emphasis on the importance of their families living in Fremont reveal how the city’s migrant community is not strictly comprised of young, single, male, temporary migrants, who were historically favored by U.S. immigration laws such as the Bracero Program (Durand, 2004), and who are typically associated with migration—especially in popular discourse—and its assumed problems, such as increased crime. The presence of migrant families in Fremont (versus single male or female migrants) also points toward intentions of permanent settlement, another characteristic of “new destination” states (Zúñiga & Hernández-León, 2005). As reviewed in Chapter Two, lower cost of living and consistent need for low-skill labor often makes these states a more viable option for family settlement (Leach & Bean, 2008; Dalla et al., 2005). Many Fremont migrants feel invested in the community, generally
enjoy living there, and want to ensure similar, future enjoyment for their children. From their perspective, Ordinance 5165 threatened the peacefulness of the city they valued, and consequently threatened their families’ future wellbeing.

About a month after the public vote, the group “One Fremont, One Future,” issued a press release relating some of the hate incidents they had collected in the months leading up to the special election and asserting that although the law had not gone into effect, it was “increasing conflict and discrimination.” The press release shared the following quotes from Latino community members as evidence of heightened fear within the Latino community:

Three days ago, while looking out the window, I discovered that we were being fired at with BB guns. I am not afraid for myself. I am afraid for my children.

People treat us very badly. People yell at us. I have a 10-year-old daughter and she told me that…she doesn’t want to go outside and play anymore (One Fremont One Future, 2010).

These quotes and Fremont’s transition throughout the two-year debate from a quiet town to a place of fear and discrimination make it clear that migrants’ and Latinos’, and arguably the entire community’s, sense of place was being challenged by the ordinance. It was this reconstruction of place and the threat it posed to families that motivated many community members to participate in the public debate.

It is also interesting to note how this ideology of family that motivated opposition to the ordinance was transformed into a narrative to be used against migrants and Latinos, specifically women. The majority of people who attended community organizing meetings, public hearings, and press conferences were women. These women, especially Latinas, often brought their children with them to such events, whether out of necessity or preference. During various interviews, particularly with native born, Caucasian women, it was brought up how the presence of children at these events bothered many supporters of
the ordinance and that soon children’s attendance was construed by the public and media to serve as evidence of how Latina community members were “orchestrating [city] council meetings” and other events related to the ordinance debate. Other studies have also documented discrimination toward Latina migrants, exhibited both in popular discourse and reflected in public policy debates, which put forth stereotypes of “abnormal,” incredibly high, and even “dangerous” fertility and reproduction by Latina migrants, depicting them as great burdens to social services and handout-seeking invaders (Chavez, 2007). Although it is uncertain whether or not this was the discourse at work in Fremont, the relationship seems implied and further investigation is warranted.

The accusations of migrant women using their children to disrupt or unfairly manage political proceedings is illustrative of how many processes we assume to be gender neutral, in this case a city council meeting, are often infused with gender representations and stereotypes, which lead to gender-based exclusion (Kunz, 2008). Public discourse and the media defined city council meetings as a place where children did not belong (a sort of unwritten rule), and so when Latina mothers brought their children, it was assumed to be either part of a strategy to sway decision makers, or purposefully disruptive. In complete alignment with Kunz’s argument, this gendered representation that (good) mothers keep their children at home implied the exclusion of these same mothers from public meetings. Likely due in part to this gendered representation and exclusion, in combination with racial/ethnic power relations, attendance at public meetings actually seemed most common among native born, Caucasian women, as implied by comments made by interlocutors regarding the discrimination, for example, Rosario. Rosario is very active in Fremont and considered by many to be a key representative of the local Latino community, serving on city planning committees and even running for local office.
Rosario explains that even though she attends community meetings and is involved in local decision-making processes, she feels ignored by Fremont’s key political leaders. She states, “I’ve gone to meetings, and city council hearings, and everything, and I’m involved in the community.” But she feels key leaders present at the same meetings act as if she “doesn’t exist… Para ellos, yo, y los hispanos somos cero a la izquierda [For them, me and other Hispanics don’t even matter].” She adds, raising her eyebrows at me to emphasize the severity and seriousness of the behavior, “they would probably act the same way towards you, and who better to talk to than people like me and you who are involved, citizens, and active within the community.” Rosario’s comments express how members of the Latino community felt excluded from certain aspects of the debate, even if they were physically in attendance at public meetings, causing many to search for other forms of exercising their voice. From this perspective, because many migrants and Latinos felt excluded from certain arenas, collaboration with native-born, Caucasians to defeat the ordinance became at once important, bringing us to discussion of shared places or collaborative place (re)making.

This gendered lens of analysis suggests that the ways in which migrant, Latino community members perceived efforts from those outside their ethnic group varies greatly based on gender. Information from interviews implies that migrant, Latino males often reacted to support from native born Caucasians somewhat shamefully, feeling that they were not doing enough to defend themselves against the ordinance. Migrant Latina females, on the other hand, often reacted to support from native born Caucasians as evidence of strong community ties and opportunity for collaborative efforts. In general, response from the Latino, migrant community to Caucasian, native born advocacy on their behalf is a perspective largely absent from the literature and is much needed, especially in light of increasing tensions concerning migrant populations in new
destination states and movement toward local immigration enforcement. The following paragraphs reveal the nuanced nature of political movements, which often get portrayed as strictly segregated by ethnicity and race.

In Fremont, migrant, Latino male interlocutors referred to opposition efforts by native born Caucasians as sincerely kindhearted, but maintained that members of the Latino community needed to speak for themselves. Drawing again from conversations with Edwin, “La comunidad hispana nunca hizo nada, nunca expresó nada. Los anglos prácticamente defendieron a los hispanos y lo hicieron por sus valores humanos y porque la ley es inconstitucional [The Hispanic community never did anything, they never expressed anything. The Anglos defended Hispanics, and they did it based on their values and because the law is unconstitutional].” He explained that a significant factor contributing to the Latino community’s lack of participation was disorganization and fear, specifically for being undocumented. “La pelea fue entre la gente blanca…la comunidad hispana fue muy desorganizada…ellos no tienen la culpa…cómo va a tener valor uno para enfrentar todo sin papeles? [The fight was among the white people…the Hispanic community was really disorganized…it’s not their fault…how is someone going to have the courage to go up against everything without papers?].”

Felipe and his daughter also pointed to fear, added linguistic barriers, and uncertainty about one’s rights in the U.S. and how to defend them as prime reasons for some of the Latino community’s silence on the issue. Felipe explained, “sí, tienen miedo (los migrantes)...no hablan ingles, no se pueden defender [Yes, they (migrants) are afraid. They don’t speak English; they can’t defend themselves].” Alejandra agreed with her father, nodding and said, “no saben esta informacion...no saben como defenderse [They don’t know this information…they don’t know how to defend themselves]. They don’t know their rights.”
In this sense, efforts by native born residents to oppose the ordinance and support migrant and Latino communities were understood by migrant Latino males as a sort of “call to action,” or as Edwin explained, “aún no estamos organizados como comunidad hispana, pero la necesidad nació [as a Hispanic community, we aren’t organized yet, but the necessity was born].” By example, about five leaders from the Fremont Latino community—all but one whom are male—are heading up development of a local Hispanic organization. The group has decided to call themselves “Un Fremont con Dignidad [One Fremont with Dignity],” has drafted articles of incorporation and is seeking legal establishment as a non-profit organization. The group describes itself as follows: “Somos un grupo de personas residentes en Fremont, Nebraska y hemos decidido organizarnos para defender nuestros derechos y los derechos de la minoría hispana de Fremont y de todo el estado de Nebraska [We are a group of residents in Fremont, Nebraska who have decided to organize ourselves in order to defend our rights and the rights of the Hispanic minority in Fremont and the state of Nebraska]” (draft of organizational donation letter shared in personal communication, December 2010). The purpose of the organization as outlined in a draft of the English version of the articles of incorporation reads:

The purpose of this corporation is to strengthen Fremont, Nebraska as one community by: Promoting and protecting the dignity (rights and responsibilities) of each person; Welcoming and assisting new members (native and immigrant) to fully participate in the community; And working with community leaders and the public to prevent and/or address problems that threaten the strength of the community (ibid).

While it is difficult without additional discussion with interlocutors to determine exact reasons for these reactions by Latino males to outsider support, two possibilities seem to arise with the information given: one, Latino males were responding to perceived
paternalism from outsiders, and two: Latino males were seeking ways to assert agency. The first possibility is raised due to comments such as Edwin’s that the fight was among the white people and it was Anglos who were defending Hispanics, as if they were defenseless children whose fate was to be decided by their parents. While this perception may be present, the second possibility—that Latinos were seeking to assert their agency—seems more likely due to the fact that although the fledgling organization is strongly supported by non-Latino community members, the group makes clear that its objective is to be led by and for Latinos, with all meetings held in both Spanish and English and only granting membership to Latinos. In this way, Latinos are asserting their agency in Fremont as active decision-makers and participants in the community.

Migrant Latina females, however, reacted much differently to support from non-migrants and have taken a slightly different path in terms of future community organization efforts. For migrant Latinas, support from native born, Caucasians was viewed as an opportunity for working together. For example, interlocutors would refer to native born, Caucasian women who were highly involved in opposing the ordinance by saying, “la comunidad hispana la quiere mucho [the Hispanic community really loves her],” as was said by Ángela, a Peruvian migrant who is active in Fremont’s religious community, about a local, Caucasian pastor. Among women, opposition efforts organized primarily by non-migrants reinforced the idea of an existing support system that could be used to build additional efforts across racial and ethnic lines.

For example, two female pastors, one native-born Caucasian and one migrant, Latina who had both been active in opposing the ordinance, decided to organize meetings for the community’s religious leaders to address Latino community member needs. The

---

10 Non-Latino community members have assisted “Un Fremont con Dignidad” in writing and translating to English the articles of incorporation and are helping the group gain non-profit status.
two pastors made it so that religious leaders of the town’s four Spanish-speaking, Christian religious institutions were invited to the Fremont Ministerial Association meetings, which had previously excluded the congregations serving the Latino community. The Caucasian pastor explained that monthly Ministerial Association meetings had been taking place for a long time but that they had been “white pastor ministerial meetings” and that they were “just finally starting to allow their Hispanic brothers and sisters to participate like they should have in the beginning.” Such collaboration is particularly significant in light of the assertion that members of different racial, ethnic, or linguistic groups in Fremont have very little contact with one another, as to be described in discussion of Wal-Mart in Chapter Five.

In addition to the interethnic Ministerial Association meetings, informal community meetings were also organized, mostly among Spanish-speaking religious congregations in order to answer questions regarding the ordinance debate and its observed and potential effects. Emily, a Caucasian women who was involved in the informal meetings and had asked some of her fellow female church members to help bake cookies for attendees, explained the meetings as “eye-opening experiences” since for many of the Caucasian attendees, “it was the first time they had ever been the racial minority in the room” and that “it was very uncomfortable.” While neither the Ministerial Association meetings nor the informal community meetings were limited to female participants, these were the organizing efforts about which most migrant, Latina interlocutors spoke.

Using this perspective, acknowledgement by female community members of organizing efforts that surpass differences in race and ethnic origin has led to interethnic/interracial collaborative meetings and efforts, beyond the struggle to defeat the ordinance. Although additional research is needed, it is also tempting to argue that
women in Fremont were exhibiting a key definition of feminism: that feminism is about building alliances with attention to both differences (not just gender) and universal norms (Pratt, 2004). By this argument, both the official alliance by the united Ministerial Association, and more informal alliances via community meetings, were built with attention to differences in race and ethnicity that were causing conflict, but also with attention to the universal norm or community need to make the town a safe, welcoming place.

Utilizing a gendered analysis, which encourages rethinking gender and its relationship to space and place, these observations suggest that women more than men tend to want to work together in the (re)making of place, despite racial/ethnic differences. It may also suggest that men strive for personal, specific ownership of place, as with the emerging Hispanic organization, while women do not mind shared ownership or (re)making of place, as with the new, more inclusive meetings of religious leaders. Perhaps most interestingly, in both cases, participation in mobilization efforts to oppose the ordinance resulted in further migrant civic engagement, beyond the ordinance. This point is worth highlighting in our discussion of place in that it seems to be exactly the type of place (re)making most proponents of the ordinance were trying to prevent: greater presence and civic engagement by the migrant community.

Many migrant community members are well aware of this probability and a few affirmed that a primary motivation for establishing the local Hispanic organization was to serve as a warning to other towns considering similar legislation. They hope to put forth the example that one of the consequences of the passage of the ordinance in Fremont was greater organization within the Hispanic community. Edwin shares how he hopes that other towns that are considering similar legislation will look at what is happening in Fremont and say, “Mira este pueblo de Fremont, ellos pusieron la ley y ahora tienen una
oficina para la comunidad hispana, no queremos esto aquí [Look at that town Fremont, they passed the law and now there’s an office for the Hispanic community, we don’t want that here].”
Chapter Five: Space and the Consumer Boycott: Exploring Wal-Mart as a Site of Discrimination and Resistance

Perhaps the most illustrative finding from Fremont in which space and place are conceptualized differently, especially by and for different groups, is the consumer boycott organized primarily by migrants and Latinos to show their opposition to the ordinance, and which is the focus of this chapter. Findings from interviews conducted with migrant and Latino community members suggest that a consumer boycott specifically targeting the Fremont Wal-Mart seemed to be the way in which most migrants were able to participate in the ordinance debate. These same interviews also suggest that the boycott allowed migrant and Latino communities to resist or protest local power relations, as evidenced by the proud manner in which they spoke about their involvement in the boycott. Furthermore, these interviews depicted Wal-Mart as a space of both discrimination and empowerment for migrants and Latinos in Fremont. Thus, in order to explore this space as such, this chapter employs two different theoretical frameworks: David Harvey’s (1990) money, time, and space nexus of social power; and Henri Lefebvre’s (2000) conceptual triad: Representations of Space, Representational Spaces, and Spatial Practices. While each framework is no doubt limited in its ability to completely describe the boycott and negotiations of space in Fremont, they do provide useful insights in terms of possible origins of the boycott, and how the single physical space of Wal-Mart functioned in different ways as both a space of oppression and resistance for migrant and Latino communities during the ordinance debate. Each theory offers a slightly different perspective regarding the motivation and rationale behind the boycott, and its ultimate effectiveness. But both make the argument that unequal power relations play a key role in how spaces are defined.
Almost all Latino and migrant interlocutors mentioned their participation in the boycott to show their consumer power and economic significance to the Fremont community. The boycott was an idea developed by Latino members of “One Fremont, One Future,” and was focused primarily against the local Wal-Mart since it is the biggest retailer in the city and trumps other retailers in terms of low prices, and a variety of products at a single location (i.e. convenient “one stop shopping”)—making it an obvious target. In fact, almost regardless of the product, there are limited other alternative shopping venues for consumers within the city, and boycotters were required to travel outside of Fremont—most often to Omaha, which is about 35 minutes away, by car—to do their shopping. Furthermore, while Wal-Mart was not the only site boycotted (some interlocutors also reported boycotting local gas stations) it definitely seemed to be the most significant for the migrant community in Fremont; and many who spoke of the boycott referred to it exclusively in terms of Wal-Mart. Yet, the boycott had been a point of concern among “One Fremont, One Future” members.

Emily,\footnote{Some names are given differently in publicized media sources.} primary contact for “One Fremont, One Future” reported that after discussing the possibility of a boycott, the group decided it would not be in their best interest due to the negative attention it might generate, which could later result in the group being excluded from productive conversations and debate related to the ordinance. She described to me the discussion that had taken place at the organization’s meeting and how she and other native born, Caucasian members felt the boycott would likely have been viewed as a threat by many longtime Fremont residents, and would have received negative retaliation and accusations that that specific form of opposition had no place in the ordinance debate. Emily explained,
We feared a consumer boycott may backfire and provoke reactions like ‘you don’t know how the system works;’ ‘we won’t take you seriously;’ and then we wouldn’t have been allowed at the table...For that reason, those of us who knew the system wanted a less strident way to show consumer power.

Yet, despite the decision of “One Fremont, One Future” not to join the boycott, the idea still resonated with the Latino community as being potentially effective and a group of individuals decided to move forward with the plan. Information about the boycott was sent via text message during the month of the special election (June 2010) and the boycott lasted anywhere from one to 15 days, depending on each individual/family’s ability to do shopping out of town. Some interlocutors reported they are still refraining from spending money in Fremont, as much as possible, as did Nicolás. “No íbamos a comprar en Wal-Mart de Fremont ni en las gasolineras...por texto enviamos mensajes, ‘para 15 días no compres’...era para que la gente veía que si éramos un consumo importante [We weren’t going to shop at the Fremont Wal-Mart or gas stations for 15 days...we sent text messages saying ‘for 15 days don’t buy’...It was so that people would see that we are an important consumer group].” It is this recognition of the monetary value of Latinos and migrants in Fremont that translated into their economic power as consumers, which premised the boycott and supports David Harvey’s (1990) theory on the linkages between money, time, and space.

**Harvey’s Money, Time, and Space Nexus**

Harvey’s text informs the Fremont case study through the way in which it situates postmodernism within the logic of capitalism. Harvey states, “in money economies in general, and in capitalist society in particular, the intersecting command of money, time, and space forms a substantial nexus of social power that we cannot afford to ignore” (p. 226). By understanding money, time, and space as intimately connected sources of social power, we gain insight into the logic behind and potential influence of the Wal-Mart
boycott. Boycotters understood the relationship between their consumer power and the economic stability of the City of Fremont. For example, Ángela, a middle-aged migrant originally from Peru who had moved to Fremont one-and-a-half years ago from Chicago to find work explained, “Los americanos no hacen la compra como nosotros (los latinos) [Americans don’t shop like we (Latinos) shop].” She described how one would see “Americans” (U.S. born, Caucasians) in Wal-Mart shopping alone, with very few things in their cart while Latinos would always be seen in large groups, and always with their carts full.

In a later interview at which Ángela was also present, she and Mariana, a female Guatemalan migrant who had lived in Nebraska for over ten years and who was a leader in the local religious community joked about the consumer power of Latinos. “Son pocos los latinos, pero consumen más [There aren’t very many Latinos, but they consume more],” Mariana agreed, laughing. It was clear in this interaction that both women were aware of, and felt a certain sense of pride in the Latino community’s seemingly ironic economic power and influence within the city. Their recognition of this relationship and potential influence is in essence recognition of Harvey’s money, time, and space nexus of social power. Because migrants and others who opposed the ordinance recognized their potential position of leverage within this nexus, they were granted greater influence over their space—in this case both Wal-Mart and the City of Fremont—by asserting their economic importance in the hopes of defeating the ordinance. Using this perspective, it can be interpreted that via the consumer boycott, migrant and Latino community members—and arguably mostly women, if we view shopping as a gendered activity (Domosh & Seager, 2001)—were again able to subtly shift boundaries by changing the way in which they inhabited the space in question: Wal-Mart, and more broadly Fremont.
The boycott provided a way for the migrant, Latino community to reclaim the city as a space in which they also belonged. The ordinance attempted to create or represent the city of Fremont as a space that excluded undocumented migrants, and arguably Latinos as well, if we include increased expressions of racism fueled by the ordinance. The boycott then, illustrated a space in which migrant and Latino community members could assert their (economic) value to the community. The boycotters imagined and forced other community members to imagine one effect of the actual exclusion of Latinos and migrants: loss of an economic resource for the city. In this way, spatial boundaries were shifted to include migrant and Latino community members.

However, the consumer boycott in Fremont is also, as Harvey points out, like many other movements of its type in that it is one that has been derived from “oppositions to the materializations of money, space, and time under conditions of capitalist hegemony” (p. 238). In other words, it could be argued that the need for the consumer boycott is a reaction and testament to capitalist control and the way in which it has worked to define and organize space. There are a number of ways to interpret the boycott in this manner. First, this aspect of the theoretical framework is supported by comments made by various interlocutors who immediately cited economic hierarchies and a challenge to the status quo as primary motivations for support of the ordinance, even over racial issues. Nicolás explained motivations behind the ordinance strictly in terms of money and power relations: “Los que tienen el poder de dinero, el poder económico no quieren a los inmigrantes. Las personas con el poder económico son gente anciana que quieren conservar el pueblo como era 50 años atrás…no es tanto racismo sino miedo de que las cosas cambien [Those who have the power of money, economic power, don’t like immigrants. The people with economic power are older people who want to keep the town like it was 50 years ago…it’s not so much racism as it is fear
things will change].” He continued to describe how racism was not the root of the tensions, but rather that older generations felt threatened by potential change to the city and status quo. It was a few members of this concerned group who were misinformed or had bad intentions, and were convincing others that migrants represented the greatest risk of change. Other interlocutors also shared the perception that the economic elite were some of those most in favor of the ordinance, which supports Harvey’s premise regarding the inextricable connection between money, space, and time, and the boycott as opposition to the materialization of these linkages under inequalities produced by capitalism.

This framework can also be applied by viewing the boycott as a direct reaction to the proposed passage of the city ordinance, which can be argued to uphold a “purely monetary expression of value and systematized organization of space and time” (Harvey, p. 238). The ordinance can be said to value migrants in purely economic terms in its requirement that all businesses within the city verify the legal working status of potential employees before hire while two of the largest employers of migrant workers (the only population whose legal worker status may be problematic), the Hormel and Fremont Beef meatpacking plants, are just outside city limits, which made it questionable during the debate whether or not they would be held subject to the law. Although both plants report to voluntarily use E-verify to check the status of workers, and employee unions who were active in the plants came out against the ordinance (Steil, forthcoming), it remains uncertain as to whether they would be held legally accountable under Ordinance 5165. Thus, the ordinance’s implicit message is that potentially undocumented migrants may be allowed to work at the two Fremont meatpacking plants, as well as the county’s three other plants—animal processing being the county’s top industry in terms of employment
and export (US Census Bureau, 2007)—and contribute to the local economy, but will not be allowed to rent homes within the City of Fremont. It is also this last point by which the ordinance ascribes to the systematized organization of space and time as put forth by U.S. immigration law, permitting only those whose legal residential status can be confirmed by the U.S. government to rent homes within the city. Under the ordinance, migrants are valued only by their economic potential, and the space of Fremont is ordered and controlled to reflect that value.

A third way to apply Harvey’s theory and understanding of the boycott as an opposition to the materialization of money, space, time linkages under capitalist inequalities are by examining the broader structures at work in the situation in Fremont: namely, Wal-Mart as a capitalist giant, and the meatpacking industry’s dependence on migrant labor as part of an industrial strategy. First, the Wal-Mart corporation and its expansion of retail operations across the U.S. and internationally has created various conflicts that have caused the company to be seen as “an especially vivid embodiment of the tendencies of neoliberal corporate capitalism” (Sites, 2007, p. 2640). Many of these conflicts have had to do with the company’s labor practices (poor benefits, high worker turnovers, gender discrimination, exploitation of undocumented workers, etc.), and retail monopolization. In Fremont, even with a simple drive through the city, one can observe Wal-Mart’s apparent monopoly in terms of product availability. This lack of competition is likely due to Wal-Mart’s creation of an economy of scale, a phenomenon that, along with new technology, efficiencies in logistics, mass advertising, rationalization of site development, and trade liberalization facilitated their domination of global supply chains (ibid.; Karjanen, 2006; Moreton, 2006; Strasser, 2006).

12 The 2012 Economic Census had not yet been conducted at the time of this writing.
Although boycotters almost definitely did not specifically target Wal-Mart in an attempt to oppose capitalist hegemony, Wal-Mart’s position as a powerful capitalist corporation likely influenced their choice due to the lack of other local retailers to boycott, and because it was probably the place where many migrants and Latinos did most of their shopping, given that Wal-Mart targets working-class shoppers (Site, 2007) and about 50% of foreign born living in Fremont made less than $25,000 in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010)\(^{13}\). Thus, although the boycott was not a direct statement against larger structures of capitalism, these structures played a role in the way in which the boycott was organized, and fits within Harvey’s theoretical framework.

A similar argument can be made in relation to the ruralization of the meatpacking industry, as described in Chapter One. The meatpacking industry’s dependence on the limited bargaining power of migrants and especially the undocumented in order to continue to maximize production and minimize costs creates the larger structure of capitalism influencing the ways in which Fremont migrants are organizing. In this way, the meatpacking industry, like Wal-Mart can be considered a capitalist giant in its exploitation of migrant workers and contribution to demographic changes and resulting anti-immigrant sentiment. If the consumer boycott in Fremont is viewed as both originating from and operating within this context, it fits well Harvey’s definition of a movement that has been derived from (indirect) oppositions to the materializations of money, space, and time under conditions of capitalist hegemony.

If we maintain this theoretical framework, Harvey concludes that capital continues to dominate even if opposition movements are successful due to the fact that the movements are (inevitably) defined by the exact thing they oppose (pp. 238-239). In

---

\(^{13}\) 2010 U.S. Census category B06010: Place Of Birth By Individual Income In The Past 12 Months (In 2010 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) In The United States, Universe: Population 15 years and over in the United States. 2008-2010 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates
utilizing a consumer boycott to assert their value to the Fremont community and oppose the ordinance, boycotters are reproducing or perpetuating the purely economic definition of the value of migrants and Latinos that the ordinance and larger capitalist structures at work (Wal-Mart and the meatpacking industry) had put forth in the first place. Furthermore, the inextricable influence of capitalism suggests that boycotters were ultimately organizing against their own interests, since migrants depended on capitalist employers for jobs and capitalist retailers for products purchasable by those with limited economic means. For these reason, Harvey argues that such opposition movements are stuck in a sort of paradox, due to which they are forced to “open themselves to the dissolving power of money” (p. 238). While, as with all theory, it will remain debatable whether or not the Fremont boycott fell victim to this fate, evidence supporting Harvey’s conclusions include recognition of three major outcomes: 1) The impact of the boycott on Wal-Mart itself was almost certainly close to nothing; 2) The boycott did not create great waves in local media and went largely unnoticed by the greater Fremont community, and 3) Ultimately Ordinance 5165 was passed and will be at least partially enforced.

Returning to conversations with Emily regarding the decision of “One Fremont, One Future” not to carry out the boycott, she recalled that at the time the conversation was taking place within the group, “One Fremont, One Future” was searching for effective leadership to emerge, especially among Latino members in order decide how they would move forward with opposition efforts. “It was definitely an example of a strategy from the people,” Emily said. “But they didn’t know how to capitalize on it so that the non-Latino community knew it was happening.” She explained that because those who ultimately carried out the boycott lacked experience in local organizing tools, such as using the media, city council, mayor, and a single, unified voice or message, the boycott was not felt by the majority of the Fremont community, as was also reflected in
follow-up interviews conducted with non-Latinos. However, the effort definitely resonated with the Latino community as being effective, and even empowering. In each interview in which the boycott was mentioned, interlocutors were asked whether they felt it had been effective, and each response was an immediate ‘yes,’ citing actions by Wal-Mart’s staff that showed support and appreciation of Latino shoppers, which will be detailed below.

Even as Emily reflected on the boycott, in an interview one year after the passage of the ordinance, she wondered aloud if it could have been a good organizing tool “to let people know they [migrants and Latinos] were at the table.” Thus, while this application of Harvey’s theoretical framework is useful, it leaves significant factors unexplained, including the boycott’s impact on migrants’ sense of solidarity, community power, and agency, as well as an understanding of the boycott as a protest against the organization of space under established local social relations that were unequal or racist, as outlined in Chapter Four. In this sense, Harvey’s theory leaves us at a loss for understanding the boycott and its relationship to the space of Wal-Mart outside capitalist or monetary terms, and for this reason, theoretical framework put forth by Lefebvre is also useful in exploring Wal-Mart as a space that is created differently by and for dominant and minority groups.

**Lefebvre’s Representations of Space and Representational Spaces**

The Fremont ordinance and consumer boycott can also be understood using two aspects of Lefebvre’s (2000) conceptual triad: “Representations of Space” and “Representational Spaces.” Lefebvre’s conceptual triad has been used by various authors to explore how a single space can be constructed or imagined in different, and often conflicting ways, by different groups (e.g. McCann, 1999; Soja, 1996; Mitchell, 1995;
Lefebvre’s complete triad consists of Spatial Practices, Representations of Space, and Representational Spaces. “Spatial Practices” refer to experience or the lived, material world. This includes social norms that are often used as acceptable behavioral references for moving through space. “Representations of Space” deal with perceptions of the dominant group in terms of how a space should be organized and controlled. Representations of Space are those spaces of a city whose uses and inhabitants are ordered or kept in place by mechanisms or forces of the state, such as land use or planning maps and other city policies. These spaces are planned, controlled, and ordered (McCann, 1999; Mitchell, 1995).

By contrast, “Representational Spaces” are those that are imagined, typically by the minority or weaker group(s). These imagined spaces are often expressed through political demonstrations, or even editorial cartoons. In this sense, they are spaces that are remade or appropriated by political actors in an attempt to assert themselves as a legitimate part of the public (ibid). Because Representations of Space and Representational Spaces are most often in direct conflict, they are useful in exploration of the consumer boycott in Fremont, and Wal-Mart as a site of both discrimination and resistance. In the Fremont case study, Ordinance 5165 and related discrimination at Wal-Mart constitute Representation of Space, or space that is planned, controlled and ordered by the dominant group. Contrastingly, organized opposition to Ordinance 5165 in the form of a consumer boycott targeted primarily at the local Wal-Mart can be considered a Representational Space, or space that is imagined and appropriated by the weaker group in an attempt to assert their importance or place within the city.

Thus, the Fremont ordinance is a Representation of Space—one that is planned, controlled, and ordered by the dominant group—in its attempt to order or construct the city in a way that excludes undocumented migrants. The ordinance limits access to the
different spaces within the town, depending on legal residential and worker status. The ordinance represents in legal terms an imposed space that is structurally ordered by the dominant group (ordinance supporters and the City of Fremont), resulting in the minority group (undocumented migrants) being prohibited from working or renting property in Fremont. This Representation of Space was also carried out in reported acts of discrimination against migrants and Latinos that took place at Wal-Mart. Not only is Fremont a space that is planned and controlled by the dominant group vis a vis the city ordinance, but Wal-Mart also becomes a space that is planned and controlled by the dominant group through acts of discrimination, which were arguably connected to the ordinance in that discrimination was reported to have increased throughout the debate, as discussed in Chapter Four.

This relationship is also exemplified by interlocutors’ comments that directly tied the ordinance to discrimination at Wal-Mart. Interlocutors were asked what they saw as possible motivations behind the ordinance. Many responses pointed toward racism and often referenced as evidence discrimination at Wal-Mart, as in conversations with Edwin. Edwin came to Fremont from Guatemala ten years ago. His father was granted U.S. citizenship in the 1970s and petitioned for Edwin to migrate as well. Edwin became a U.S. citizen in 2009 and has been increasingly active in the Fremont community. He responded to the question saying that the motivation behind the ordinance was “por escuchar español en Wal-Mart [due to hearing Spanish spoken at Wal-Mart].” He explained further, “dicen (los que apoyan la ordinanza) que los inmigrantes son terroristas y que traen enfermedades. Por mi no me van a sacar de la mente que es una ley de racismo…la mayoría de los hispanos pensamos que es una ley propuesta por el racismo [they (supporters of the ordinance) say that immigrants are terrorists and that they bring disease. No one can convince me that this isn’t a racist law…the majority of us
Hispanics think it’s a law that was proposed based on racism].” Other interlocutors also shared stories of being victims of or witnesses to racial discrimination in Wal-Mart, and as mentioned above, reported occurrences of racial discrimination became more frequent as the public vote neared.

Felipe, one of the earliest Mexican migrants to settle in the city, described a recent scene he had witnessed at Wal-Mart in which an older Caucasian male customer had grabbed a shopping cart from an older Latina customer, telling her to get out and go back to where she had come from. This even was similar to others reported by Rosario, another interlocutor who is the daughter of Mexican migrants and was introduced earlier in this thesis for her active involvement in Fremont city development. Rosario was born in the U.S. and spent most of her life in Chicago until she moved to Omaha when she met her husband, and then to Fremont when her sister had her first child. They had only planned to spend two months in Fremont visiting but liked the city so much that they stayed and are now raising their own family there. All of Rosario’s five other siblings also live in Nebraska. Rosario stated that discrimination at Wal-Mart was frequent. “People are rude at Wal-Mart, saying things like ‘go back to Mexico.’” It is in these acts where it is made clear that Representations of Space are held exclusively by members of the dominant group (Caucasian, native born, etc.) and are in stark contrast to the space migrants and Latinos would imagine or construct for themselves. Therefore, Wal-Mart became the site where these different constructs of space collide.

Alejandra explained the negative interactions taking place in Wal-Mart in the following way:

So much discrimination and conflict was happening in Wal-Mart because it is a primary place in town where everyone sees each other, where people who are different interact…There aren’t a lot of other places [in Fremont] where people
will see each other or be put in a situation with other people who are different from them.

Wal-Mart is a unique location in Fremont where migrant and native born, Spanish-speaking and non-Spanish speaking, Latino and Caucasian (among other groups) are forced to share physical space and potentially interact on some level. As a medium-sized city, Fremont is home to just enough restaurants, religious institutions, small retail and service centers (i.e. mechanic, dry cleaner, etc.) that members of these separate linguistic, racial, and ethnic groups do not have to interact often. Even when individuals from different groups are in the same physical space, social separation often still exists and is highlighted within feminist geographic literature. As McDowell (1998) describes, “Social distance does not always imply geographical distance, and occupants of the same Cartesian spaces may live in very different ‘places’” (p. 5).

This separation is so commonly practiced and understood that children too are aware of the heightened tension at Wal-Mart due in part to the fact that it is a place of such unique interaction among different groups. Sylvia, a mother who came to Fremont from Mexico over ten years ago when her husband was able to buy a house described how her school-age children had worriedly stopped her from using the automated cashier’s voice in Spanish when going through the self-checkout line, telling her, “¡Mamá, mamá, baje el volumen! [Mom, mom, turn down the volume!], recognizing that the use of Spanish in public often received negative reactions from non-Spanish speaking Fremont community members. This points to the fact that children are well aware of how spaces are controlled and ordered by dominant groups, and how they too must learn to navigate Representations of Space.

---

14 Schools are often an exception, and many times children have greater interaction with diverse groups than do adults, although, social separation is still possible/probable.
By contrast, the consumer boycott can be considered what Lefebvre terms Representational Spaces, which is an appropriated space, or a space of subversion and the imagination. Representational Spaces do not belong to the dominant group and are often in direct conflict with Representations of Space. In Fremont, the boycotters imagined and forced other community members to imagine as well one effect of the actual exclusion of Latinos and migrants: loss of an economic resource for the city. Representational Space was also created in the ways in which the boycotters considered their efforts effective. Drawing again from conversations with Ángela, she explained, “Lo hicimos (el boicot) para que sepan que los hispanos sí somos importantes [We did it (the boycott) so that they would know we Hispanics are important]… sí funcionó porque el director ejecutivo (de Wal-Mart) pidió una disculpa y dijo que esta a favor de los hispanos [it worked because the Executive Director (of Wal-Mart) gave a formal apology and said that he supports Hispanics].”

Additionally, María Elena reported that boycotters were welcomed by door greeters upon returning to Wal-Mart. María Elena, who migrated to Nebraska before her husband, pointed to the positive reaction of the door greeters at Wal-Mart upon seeing that Latinos were returning to the store as evidence that the boycott had been successful, despite the fact that it did not prevent the passage of the ordinance. “Sí funcionó (el boicot)...se pusieron alegres (los que estaban en la entrada) cuando vieron que los Latinos regresaban a Wal-Mart [Yes, it (the boycott) worked, they (the greeters) were happy when they saw Latinos coming back to Wal-Mart].” In this sense, boycotters constructed or imagined an alternative, welcoming space for Wal-Mart and the town of Fremont, and Wal-Mart became a space for empowerment among migrants and Latinos.

15 While different interlocutors mentioned a broadcasted news story on a Spanish-language network in which a Wal-Mart representative asserted the company was not taking a position on the ordinance, the story was not found.
The boycott provided a way for the migrant, Latino community to create a Representational Space. The boycotters had imagined, and to a certain extent achieved, an alternative, welcoming space for Wal-Mart and the city of Fremont.

Thus, while Wal-Mart was the target for a consumer boycott due to its presence as the biggest retail, and only big-box retail in the town, the site is more significant in its function as both a space of empowerment and discrimination, as reported by interlocutors. By exploring the Wal-Mart space from different theoretical perspectives, we are able to generate a more complete understanding of the ways in which this single space was able to support acts of both oppression and resistance. For Harvey, options for empowerment or resistance, specifically related to the money, space, and time nexus, are inevitably tangled in systems of capitalist hegemony and oppression. Thus, any resistance movement ends up reproducing the same system(s) it was trying to oppose. However, Lefebvre’s theory is useful in that it posits ways for non-dominant groups to reimagine or appropriate space by means Representational Spaces. While a common thread found in both of these theoretical frameworks is the likely temporariness of spaces or movements of resistance, it is important to not let this overshadow the observation that the consumer boycott in Fremont seemed to be the way in which most migrants were able to participate in the ordinance debate and how they most proudly spoke about their participation. In this way, the consumer boycott and Wal-Mart as a space of both oppression and resistance played a significant role in facilitating migrants’ and Latinos’ sense of agency and their involvement in the ordinance debate.
Chapter Six: Enforcing Exclusion: The Special Election and Transnational Effects

This chapter is comprised of complementary findings from questions raised during initial fieldwork in Fremont, which prompted investigation of the special election, as well as fieldwork abroad with families of Nebraskan migrants. The following three sections explore questions related to: 1) The special election and demographic characteristics of voters, 2) Perspectives about the ordinance from migrants’ families and return migrants living in Mexico; and 3) Cross-border linkages between Chichihualco and Fremont that challenge the ordinance’s attempt to act as a social container, as to be described below. Because this chapter attempts to answer additional questions that emerged while doing research in Nebraska, findings are often limited and follow-up research is needed. However, this chapter does well to bring to light the complexity of the situation in Fremont, and acknowledge the influence of factors that lie outside the city’s legal boundaries but are affecting the ordinance debate. Findings and discussion in this chapter are also useful in that they point to clear directions for future research.

The Special Election

Because the Fremont Ordinance was targeted at such a small portion of the population—it was estimated that at most 2% of the city’s population was undocumented when the law was introduced—and because the majority of the migrant population in Nebraska is Latino, and the majority of those Latino migrants are Mexican (OLLAS, 2010), various parties accused the law’s supporters of being motivated by racism and nativist sentiment. Furthermore, because the law seeks to deny certain groups—arguably, any family living in a rental home with a member who is 18 years old or older and undocumented—the right to live within the city, but is not explicit about whether or not
the meatpacking plants would be subject to the law since their property is intersected by city limits, it can be argued that the law is allowing the city to reap the economic benefits of unauthorized workers while keeping them from living there. These accusations have been discussed in earlier chapters and raise questions as to whether or not the law would work to keep out and/or take advantage of certain racial or ethnic groups, in addition to undocumented migrants. Thus, this section seeks to explore the possible demographic composition of groups that voted to pass the ordinance, as well as that of those that voted against it, in an attempt to continue to answer questions regarding the motivations behind the law and how different groups participated in its passage.

The primary question guiding this section is: What is the demographic composition of those groups who took the greatest part in passing Fremont Ordinance 5165? That is, how does the distribution of those voting precincts that voted in favor of the law, in addition to voter turnout, compare to the distribution of various demographic factors: race/ethnicity, household income, and potential voting population (persons 18 years of age and older)? The methodology employed for this investigation included the use of Graphic Information Systems (GIS) technology to create and compare maps of election results and voter turnout, by voting precinct, to maps showing the different demographic composition of each precinct including: Hispanics and Latinos, persons of legal voting age, and median household income, according to 2010 U.S. census data. Such analysis provides a spatial representation of the types of groups that took the greatest part in passing the ordinance and brings to light the complicated nature of the debate and special election.

---

16 Owner- versus renter-occupied housing was also mapped but is not discussed here since findings were inconclusive.
These findings were particularly surprising since they show that the voting precincts with the greatest percentage of voters in favor of the legislation were also those with the highest percentage of Hispanics and Latinos, had the lowest voter turnout, and were comprised of lower income households, all of which will be the focus of this discussion. By comparison, those precincts that most strongly opposed the legislation were primarily comprised of non-Hispanics and non-Latinos, had the highest voter turnout, and included some of the highest income households. While the maps created raise a number of issues and possible dynamics at work in determining the results of the special election, primary focus of this discussion will be on hypotheses of actual migrant and Latino participation in the vote, and related racial tensions. First, it is important to note that this investigation of the special election was motivated by reports from interlocutors in Fremont about the widespread confusion surrounding the voting process.

When the Nebraska Supreme Court affirmed the District Court ruling on April 23, 2010, the ordinance was expected to be placed on the ballot for special election in the summer of 2010. But, the official date of the special election, June 21, 2010, was not announced until May, giving organizers little time, overall, to educate and register voters. Samantha, a non-migrant, local teacher and member of “One Fremont, One Future” explained that with more time, they would have been able to defeat the ordinance. “We only had one month to really organize.” Additionally, many interlocutors, both migrant and native born, expressed frustration with the lack of accurate information regarding voter eligibility based on city boundaries. Samantha described how “One Fremont, One Future” tried to educate about the voting process, but faced a large “falta de conocimiento [lack of knowledge]” surrounding the entire issue. “It was confusing to everyone (migrant and native born, community member and city official) since no one knew what was inside versus outside city limits.” Various interlocutors related stories about
approaching city officials with questions regarding voting eligibility and jurisdiction and being given incorrect information or simply receiving the response ‘We don’t know.’ One specific area in question included the Regency II Mobile Home Park, where many migrants and Latinos reside and which became the area of focus for voter registration efforts by “One Fremont, One Future.” Tension over this area was clear and frequently reported on by outside media sources:

The Regency II trailer park houses immigrants, mostly from Mexico. Many of the trailers are just flimsy boxes. Others are painted brightly, or sport day lilies on a small lawn. One house has an American flag beside it. And on June 21st the Regency displayed a white sign at its entrance with the message: “Vote No” (The Economist, 2010).

Because the mobile home park is so close to the city limits, questions arose regarding the actual side (north/south, east/west) of specific streets that marked the city’s boundaries since at times voter eligibility depended on which side of the street one lived, and people were reported to have been turned away from polling stations for this reason. This area was also a concern in that it was not explicit within the language of the ordinance as to whether or not residents of Regency II Mobile Home Park and the two other mobile home parks in Fremont would be subject to the ordinance since they owned their mobile homes but rented the land on which they lived. Interlocutors explained that with more accurate information, they would have known better where to focus their efforts. Still, the weekend before the special election ballot determined the passage of the ordinance, more than 200 community members, including both migrant and native born, walked door-to-door to reach 9,000 homes in their effort to defeat the proposed legislation (Nebraska Appleseed, 2010), quite impressive in a city of 26,000 people.

Despite this achievement, the final vote resulted in the passage of the ordinance: 3,906 (57%) in favor and 2,908 (43%) opposed (City of Fremont, website, 2012;
documents from the Dodge County Election Commissioner, 2011). Information gathered from the Dodge County Election Commissioner regarding voting results for each precinct (See Appendix F) was used with spatial data (GIS shapefiles) obtained from the City of Fremont with the permission of the now former Planning Director to map the percentages of votes “for” and “against” the ordinance, by precinct. As shown in Figure 5.1, of the twenty voting precincts, in all but three (Precincts, 1C, 3E, and 4D), the majority of voters within the precinct who participated in the special election (51% or more) voted in favor of Ordinance 5165 (See Appendix G for full map layouts and reference list of spatial data). Of the three in which the majority voted against, one precinct (3E) includes part of the property parcel of the Fremont Beef meatpacking plant. This map also shows how the two meatpacking plants straddle southern city limits, making it unclear as to whether or not they would be held subject to the law, as discussed earlier.

The precinct with the least amount of votes in favor was Precinct 1C, with 38%. Those precincts that had the highest percentage of votes in favor of the ordinance (66%-70%; 1A, 3A, 4B, 3C, and 1D) included the precinct in which the Regency II Mobile Home Park is located (3C), with 70.4% voting in favor, which represents the largest majority of votes cast in favor of Ordinance 5165 within a single precinct. This served as the primary map to be compared to all others in order to get a sense of the demographics within each precinct and look for any patterns that might emerge within precincts that voted in favor of the law versus those that voted against.

17 Precinct 4D is split into two sections on each map, but data and analyses reflect the single, entire precinct
First, in light of extensive discussion regarding racist accusations against the ordinance, let us compare the above map showing the special election results to a map showing the distribution of Hispanics and Latinos in Fremont. The map in Figure 5.2 relates local ethnic distribution using the U.S. Census category: “Hispanic or Latino, by Race for the Population 18 Years and over,” also by voting precinct (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The category 18 years and older was used since this is the legal voting age. Total Hispanic/Latino population was also mapped but results were not produced separately since percentages equaled those of the 18 and older population (*ibid*).
As shown above, the largest percentage of those persons 18 years and older who identify as Hispanic or Latino (36%) live in Precinct 3C, which is also the location of the Regency II Mobile Home Park. It should be noted that this is by far the largest group of Hispanics/Latinos who are 18 years old and older in any precinct in terms of real numbers: 487 (the next highest is Precinct 3D with 202). Precinct 3C also has the greatest concentration of Hispanics/Latinos of all ages in the city: 891 of 3,149 or 28%. The next highest is again Precinct 3D with 458 community members who identify as Hispanic or Latino, or 15% of Fremont’s total Hispanic/Latino population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010; See Appendix H for full table). This finding is not surprising in that it reflects focus on the area by both the media and “One Fremont, One Future,” as well as general
comments from interlocutors affirming that many migrants lived in the Regency II Mobile Home Park. Also, two of the five total interviews conducted in migrants’ homes were conducted in this mobile home park (most interviews were conducted in public places, such as restaurants).

However, what is perhaps counterintuitive given the large presence of Latinos in this area is that this same precinct also had the highest percentage of total votes in favor of the ordinance: 70% of the votes cast within this precinct were in favor. Furthermore, the lowest percentage of those persons who identify as Hispanic or Latino—which census data shows are those who primarily identify as “Non-Hispanic/Latino, White” (U.S. Census, 2010)—live in Precincts 1C, 1D, 1E and 4D, two of which are precincts where a majority of total votes cast were against the ordinance (Precincts 1C and 4D).18 Thus, these findings seem to contradict the perhaps most suspected hypothesis (which I also held) that the precincts that had the highest number of votes in favor of the ordinance would also be those with the lowest presence of Hispanics/Latinos.

This arguably surprising finding that the precinct that had the highest majority in favor of the ordinance also has the largest Hispanic/Latino population raises an interesting and important discussion about voter perceptions and turnout. Regarding voter perception, several hypotheses are possible. One points to negative interethnic and racial relations, which is supported by existing literature on new destinations that highlights the new ethnic diversity facing communities and the challenges it presents, as discussed in earlier chapters (Miraftab, 2011; Hirschman & Massey, 2008). This hypothesis would argue that such challenges are most greatly felt by those who live in closest proximity to new ethnic populations. For this reason, those U.S.-born, Caucasian residents in Fremont

---

18 In the other two precincts that had the lowest percentages of Hispanics/Latinos, one had one of the highest majority votes for the ordinance (Precinct 1D at 67%) and the other, Precinct 1E, had a low 54% majority vote for the ordinance.
who lived closest to or among the most concentrated Hispanic/Latino population in the city voted in favor of legislation that would likely discriminate against ethnic newcomers.

It could also be hypothesized that the high number of votes from Precinct 3C in favor of the ordinance were those from Hispanic/Latino community members who actually supported the legislation. Here it might be argued that Latino migrants who have lived in the community longer and/or U.S.-born Latinos voted to pass the ordinance, reflecting negative views held by older generations of migrants and U.S.-born Latinos toward more recent migrants, as has been observed in other studies (e.g. Bach, 1993). However, this research argues that this is not the case in Fremont, as evidenced by three factors: 1) That not once during my time involved in the ordinance as an employee of Nebraska Appleseed nor during fieldwork did a Latino living in Fremont assert her/his support for the ordinance, nor was any Latino who did so referenced; 19 2) Evidence of low voter turnout, especially when considering total potential voters (all persons 18 years of age or older) and real numbers; and 3) Interlocutors’ stories of migrant Latinos’ inability to vote due to non-citizen status, in addition to data from other studies regarding low participation by both migrants and Latinos in U.S. electoral politics.

First, voter turnout can be considered in an effort to judge how representative election results were of the Fremont population. Voter turnout can be measured in various ways depending on how the total or base population is defined. One method is to map the number of people who voted by precinct as a percentage of registered voters at the time of the special election, again utilizing information from the Dodge County Election Commissioner. Voter turnout as a percentage of registered voters in Precinct 3C was 33.2%. As shown in Figure 5.3, of the twenty total voting precincts only two others had

19 During the large public hearing at which the ordinance was defeated by a split vote by the City Council, one Latino migrant from Iowa did speak in support of the law, explaining that migrants needed to come and remain in the U.S. “the right way,” with the proper legal documents.
lower voter turnouts than Precinct 3C (Precincts 1D and 3B with 30.6% and 31.9%, respectively). The single fact that voter turnout was low does not prove that those community members who did not vote were Hispanic/Latino, and thus, additional insight is drawn from other measures of voter turnout combined with qualitative data.

Figure 5.3: Map of Voter Turnout as a Percentage of Registered Voters

But before moving on from the map in Figure 5.3, it is also interesting to note that voter turnout was highest (51%-56%) in Precincts 1C and 4D, where the majority who voted actually opposed the ordinance, suggesting that a vote ‘against’ Fremont Ordinance 5165 may be more representative of the greater community. Recall that these are also two precincts whose residents are majority Caucasian (4% or less Hispanic/Latino), evidence
that racism is not necessarily common among Caucasian groups in Fremont, or at least that racism has not manifested as support of the ordinance.

A second interpretation of voter turnout uses total population 18 years and older as the base since this is an approximate estimate of the eligible voter population instead of only registered voters. This group is considered to consist of potential voters since they are of legal voting age. However, it is important to recognize that this does not take into consideration other factors that determine voter eligibility such as, citizenship status, location of primary residence, etc. Figure 5.3 uses U.S. Census data to map the number of people who voted by precinct as a percentage of total persons 18 years of age or older:

![Map of Voter Turnout as a Percentage of Persons 18 Years and Older](image)

Figure 5.4:  Map of Voter Turnout as a Percentage of Persons 18 Years and Older
In this representation, Precinct 3C has the lowest voter turnout of all twenty precincts, with only about 17% of those 18 years or older participating in the special election. This points to a significant lack of participation in the special election by Precinct 3C, which is especially puzzling considering the extent to which the debate and special election dominated local media and arguably the lives of most Fremont community members. While there is no way to be certain with the information at hand that Latinos in this precinct did not participate in the special election, investigation of these same statistics in terms of real numbers also supplies evidence that this was the case. Table 5.1 shows a breakdown in real numbers of the information discussed thus far for Precinct 3C. The following hypothetical situation draws from these numbers in an attempt to approximate the amount of votes “in favor” of the ordinance, cast by Hispanics and Latinos in Precinct 3C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Total Votes Counted</th>
<th>Votes &quot;For&quot;</th>
<th>Votes &quot;Against&quot;</th>
<th>Potential Voters</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>White*</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Non-Hispanic/Latino, White only

Table 5.1: Precinct 3C Election Results and Voter Turnout in Real Numbers (Dodge County Election Commissioner, 2011; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010)

Precinct 3C had 671 registered voters at the time of the special election. If we assume that the number of voters directly reflects the population in terms of ethnic makeup, then 36% of registered voters in Precinct 3C should identify as Hispanic or Latino. Recall that Hispanics/Latinos both as a percentage of total population within the precinct and as a percentage of the population 18 years old and older represent 36%.

---

20 Precincts 3B, 3C, and 1D had the lowest voter turnout as a percentage of potential voters (17%-20%). These were also two of the precincts with the largest majority (66%-71%) that voted in favor of the ordinance. Precincts 1C, 4D, and 1E had the highest voter turnout as a percentage of potential voters (40%-57%). Precinct 1C and 4D include a majority that voted against the ordinance and Precinct 1E includes a lower majority of 54% that voted in favor of the ordinance.
Thus, of the 671 registered voters, 241 should identify as Hispanic or Latino. Using voter turnout in the precinct, as a percentage of registered voters (33.2%), 80 of those Hispanic/Latino registered voters should have participated in the special election. Thus, of the 223 votes counted within Precinct 3C, 80 should belong to Hispanic/Latinos. In the case that all 80 Hispanic/Latino voters voted in favor of the ordinance, this would account for about half of the total votes in favor of the ordinance from Precinct 3C. However, because that situation is unlikely considering migrant and Latino interlocutors’ comments that they were against the ordinance, a second measure is to simply divide these 80 votes between “for” and “against” using as a reference the final results of the special election: 57% of total votes “for” and 43% against.

Therefore, of these 80 Hispanic/Latino votes in Precinct 3C, 46 (57%) should have been in favor of the ordinance and 34 (43%) should have been cast against the ordinance. The 46 hypothetical votes by Latinos “for” the law account for just 29% of the 157 total votes counted “for” the law from Precinct 3C. Thus, even when we create a hypothetical situation that does not factor in racial tensions surrounding the ordinance, we are able to contribute less than one third of the votes cast for the ordinance in Precinct 3C to the highly concentrated Hispanic/Latino population. Furthermore, Precinct 3C only accounts for about 4% (157 of 3,950) of the total votes in favor of Ordinance 5165 with the greatest majority of total votes in favor from any precinct coming from Precinct 2C with 305 (8%) of total votes in favor. In sum, it seems unlikely that Hispanics/Latinos voted in favor of Ordinance 5165 and, thus, information from interlocutors and data on migrant and Latino electoral behavior is perhaps more useful in explaining election results in Precinct 3C. More specifically, it is important to tie these findings from spatial analysis of the special election to questions about voter eligibility, education and electoral behavior in relation to voter turnout. These factors, as well as others that may have
possibly contributed to lower voter turnout should be explored, especially in cases where legislation is challenged as unconstitutional and discriminatory.

For example, voter eligibility, specifically in relation to citizenship status may have prevented some Fremont community members from voting. This is not to suggest that groups of Hispanics/Latinos are largely non-citizen, and by no means undocumented (legal permanent residents are also prohibited from voting), but rather to point out the possible correlation between Hispanic/Latino, foreign born, and voter eligibility. Interlocutors’ comments suggested this correlation may be present, and those who were able to vote in the special election often cited part of their motivation for doing so as the understanding that others could not. Take, for example, quotes from a conversation with Edwin, the Guatemalan migrant who had just become a U.S. citizen the year before.

“Tengo que hacer algo para los que no pueden defenderse...tengo un amigo mexicano que me dice ‘yo no puedo, pero tú sí puedes’ [I have to do something for those who can’t defend themselves…I have a Mexican friend who says to me, ‘I can’t, but you can’].” In some instances, those migrants who come into the U.S. without the proper documentation are prohibited from eventual naturalization. Additionally, recent migrants who have not yet achieved a defined minimum period of residence are also ineligible for naturalization (DeSipio, 2011; Passel, 2007). These factors may have limited certain migrant Latinos living in Fremont voting precinct 3C from being able to register to vote in the special election, especially when one takes into account that Latinos migrating to new destination cities are, for the most part, recent immigrants (Benjamin-Alvarado et al., 2010; Hirschman & Massey, 2008). Thus, although migrant Latinos living in precinct 3C may be legal permanent residents or have legal residential status under a visa, if they are not naturalized citizens they are ineligible to vote. This requirement is clearly outlined on the Nebraska Voter Registration Application form, on which question one reads: “Are you a
citizen of the United States of America?” Question two asks if the applicant is at least 18 years of age, and directly below the form reads, “IF YOU CHECKED ‘NO’ IN RESPONSE TO EITHER OF THE QUESTIONS ABOVE; DO NOT COMPLETE THIS APPLICATION” (See Appendix I for Nebraska Voter Registration Application). Furthermore, various obstacles are commonly cited in preventing eligible migrants from naturalization, including the difficulty of the application process, the cost of applying, and the lack of institutional resources to assist migrants in pursuing naturalization (DeSipio, 2011). However, identification as Hispanic/Latino most definitely does not equate to being a migrant, and for this reason low voter turnout cannot only be attributed to ineligibility to register to vote.

It is important, then, to not forget the confusion surrounding voter eligibility, as mentioned in the beginning paragraphs of this section, which likely also contributed to the low voter turnout in Precinct 3C, due to Regency II Mobile Home Park’s close proximity to city limits. Furthermore, regardless of possible confusion concerning voter eligibility, voter turnout at the national level among migrants and Latinos has been documented as low. In the U.S., migrants register and vote at rates lower than U.S.-born citizens. Yet, naturalized Latino citizens are more likely to register and vote than are U.S. born Latinos. In fact, voter turnout for Latino/Hispanic U.S. citizens, regardless of where they were born, is lower than for non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks (ibid, p. 1199). Thus, low voter turnout among Hispanics/Latinos in Fremont can be expected if one considers national voting trends.

A final factor that may have contributed to the high percentage of votes cast in favor of Ordinance 5165 in the same precinct with the greatest number of Hispanics and Latinos is perceived job competition. Other researchers have raised the question of job competition negatively affecting and contributing to anti-immigrant sentiment among low
income, U.S.-born groups (Borjas, 2006; Carter, 2005; Stoll et al., 2002, to name a few). This hypothesis was tested in the Fremont case study by mapping median household income across precincts. Election results were compared to two maps showing median household income of renters and then, owners. Data was separated in this way due to the large disparity in median income between owners and renters and also to explore the relationship between the election results and these groups that pertain so strongly to the mandates of ordinance. It should also be noted that data was obtained at the census tract level from the 2000 U.S. Census since it was not available for 2010 or at a smaller scale.

As shown in Figure 5.5, Precinct 3C, in which the Regency II Mobile Home Park is located, had the lowest median family income for owners ($38,924 per year),\(^{21}\) which is likely related to the high presence of mobile home owners.

\(^{21}\) Precinct 3C overlaps Census Tract 9844, which has a median household income among owner-occupied households of $38,924 per year, the lowest income level of the seven census tracts mapped, according to the 2000 U.S. Census
Precinct 3C also fell into the second lowest category for median household income for renters, at $25,644 per year (As shown in Figure 5.6 below).\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{22} Precinct 3C overlaps Census Tract 9844, which has a median household income among renter-occupied households of $25,644, ranking fourth from lowest to highest of the seven census tracts mapped, based on 2000 U.S. Census data.
The finding that the precinct with the greatest majority of votes cast in favor of the ordinance is also one of the lower income areas of the city suggests the possibility of perceived job competition. As mentioned in earlier chapters, many migrants, especially those in new destination states, tend to hold low-skill, low-wage, labor-intensive jobs (Benjamin-Alvarado et al., 2006; Gouveia et al., 2005). However, this does not mean that there is not competition between native and migrant workers, and much less that there is not perceived competition, especially that triggered by public discourse and the threat of
migrants “taking American jobs”\textsuperscript{23} or burdening social services. While such concerns may be legitimate simply due to the fact that new destinations are seeing rapid population growth, which introduces new workers into the job market and stresses existing services (Broadway, 2000), these concerns are often exacerbated by the local media, resulting in a heightened sense of racism and discrimination (Prochaska-Cue & Ziebarth, 1997). Evidence that suggests this may be the case in Fremont is based on the prediction that those native U.S. workers who may hold or are seeking low-skill, low-wage jobs or are in greatest need of social services, thus feeling competition by migrants, are likely those who have lower household incomes (either because their income is a reflection of their position holding one of these jobs or because they have not found other work). Thus, lower income residents living in close proximity to migrants and/or Hispanics/Latinos may feel an increased threat to their economic security and thus be more likely to vote in favor of legislation that would likely discriminate against these groups.

Although additional research is needed to better explain these findings and the demographics of voters who supported the ordinance, each of these hypotheses—lack of participation by migrants in the special election due to citizenship and naturalization requirements or as a general trend among migrant and Latino groups; and racial tensions and perceived job competition motivating voters to pass the ordinance—raise important questions regarding the nature of voting processes for measures that purposefully exclude certain members of the population: Are those groups who are voting in said elections also those that would be directly affected by enforcement of the law? Are there certain groups that are excluded from voting? Are there certain factors—such as, income level or proximity to ethnically and racially diverse neighborhoods—that make persons more

\textsuperscript{23} Unemployment rates in Nebraska have been generally less than 4% for the past decade, the highest being 4.8% in 2009 (down to 4.2% in 2011), which is relatively low when compared with the rest of the nation (Nebraska Department of Labor, 2012).
likely to either support or oppose such legislation? In this way, such complementary research was useful in exploring the complexity of the situation in Fremont and suggesting directions for future research, goals that the next section also achieves.

The Reach of Restriction: Perspectives from Chichihualco

A final element of this research, which is perhaps one of the least often considered, are the international effects of Fremont Ordinance 5165 and those findings from fieldwork completed abroad in Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico. A majority of migrants living in Fremont were found to be from Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico and because migration is a dynamic process involving at least two or more places where developments in one place affect the other, it is important to also ask questions about how the Fremont ordinance affected those living in Chichihualco, and to explore connections between the two places. These final sections represent preliminary steps in using transnationalism as a theoretical lens to describe transnational events taking place in Nebraska, in relation to the Fremont ordinance.

Chichihualco is a town of about 10,700 inhabitants (INEGI, 2010), located in the state of Guerrero, Mexico, nestled in the Southern Sierra Madre mountain range (See Figure 5.7). Chichihualco and Fremont form a migratory circuit that includes, as discussed in Chapters Two and Three, inherently political processes in which migrants and the state take part in action and reaction dictating population movement, and the alignment of territory, political institutions, and society. Thus, while Fremont Ordinance 5165 is a local law, it is also part of multiple, larger, international processes such as migratory flows, global economics and labor, social networks, family ties, and household decision-making. In this sense, the Fremont ordinance has been effected by, and will almost certainly affect not only migrants and U.S.-born living in Fremont, but also
migrants’ families back home, and even potentially U.S. immigration law and future migratory flows. While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore each of these relationships, acknowledgement of the larger context within which the Fremont ordinance belongs is made by presenting information collected during fieldwork in Chichihualco related to the ordinance and also describing some of the cross-border linkages that exist between the two places. These sections discuss: 1) Knowledge of and reactions to the Fremont ordinance in Chichihualco; and 2) Ongoing relationships between Chichihualco and Nebraska, referred to as cross-border linkages. As discussed in Chapter Three, these findings are drawn from in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted in Chichihualco with family members of migrants, and return migrants of 20 different households, as well as with two of the town’s major employers, and the local historian.

Figure 5.7: (right) Photo overlooking Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico. (left) Street in Chichihualco.

A primary research question for this aspect of fieldwork was: 1) How do migrants’ family members back home understand events surrounding the Fremont legislation and how was this information received? Most interlocutors in Fremont had
affirmed that their family members living in their countries of origin were aware of the happenings in Fremont. However, when asked if they had discussed the ordinance with family members, they said they had not and that instead family and friends in Latin America had found out by watching the news. Many Fremont interlocutors explained that they did not want to worry family members back home, especially when the law was not being enforced, and for that reason refrained from telling them. A few interlocutors, such as Edwin, also refrained from discussing the ordinance with their families back home because they felt they would not be able to relate to the racism and community tensions Fremont migrants were experiencing. Edwin’s daughters, who are both young adults, still live in Guatemala. But Edwin does not talk to them about the ordinance debate, explaining “no, a mis hijas no porque no entienden el racismo aquí [no, not with my daughters because they don’t understand the racism here].” Thus, migrants’ family members were often made aware of Fremont happenings primarily by watching international news, as confirmed by interviews in Chichihualco.

For example, in a conversation with Daniela, a young woman who migrated when she was 19-years-old to Iowa, and then Nebraska to be with her mother and try to save money, she described how the first time she heard about the Fremont ordinance was watching the news. “…hasta Don Felipe salió en Univisión [Mr. Felipe was even on Univision].” Even though Don Felipe was well known in both Chichihualco and Fremont, Daniela had been surprised to see someone she knew from such a small town like Chichihualco on international news. She added that although she was not sure exactly what the law would do, she had heard it was racist (“dicen que sí es racista”). Other interlocutors shared similar stories of watching news reports about the Fremont ordinance but being uncertain as to exactly what the legislation entailed.
When I asked Pepe, a 19-year-old who had migrated when he was 16 to Kansas, and then Nebraska to work with his brothers in the meatpacking industry, if he had heard anything about the Fremont law he replied, “Salió en las noticias. Lo que pasa es que cuando allá pasa algo importante, lo pasan en las noticias de aquí…no me acuerdo bien que dijeron pero sí escuché algo [It was in the news. What happens is that when something important happens there, they put it on the news here…I don’t really remember what they said but I did hear something.]” 24 Similarly, Rafael, who had left two and a half years earlier to find work in Nebraska but returned to Chichihualco when his wife was unable to join him, was also unsure about where the legislation stood, saying, “Creo que la única ley que le dejaron era que los hispanos nuevos que llegaron no pudieron rentar [I think the only law they kept was the one where new Hispanics that came couldn’t rent].” While other interlocutors knew slightly more, there was still plenty of confusion about what had been occurring with their migrant family members in Fremont, some of which reflected similar confusion in Fremont, as with the belief that there was more than one law at work.

Furthermore, persons in Chichihualco did not necessarily feel the need to investigate the law further since many of their family members in Fremont continued to reassure them that things were fine. Worries were also lessened by stories from return migrants who spoke positively about Fremont. Rafael, for example, immediately after telling me that the law against undocumented renters had been upheld, added that in general, Hispanics were treated well in Fremont and when living in Fremont at the beginning of the debate, he had been assured by white community members who were also landlords that they did not support the law. “Pero habían muchos wedos que rentan

---

24 Daniela and Pepe had been deported back to Mexico within the past four years and since then had been living in Chichihualco.
casas y que decían, ‘yo no tengo nada en contra de ustedes (los hispanos), ustedes no tienen porque salir, no tengan miedo, yo no tengo nada en contra de ustedes [But there were a lot of white people that rent houses that said, ‘I don’t have anything against you all (migrants), you don’t have to leave, don’t be scared, I don’t have anything against you all’].’” He went on to say that “mucha gente sí quiere a los hispanos, son los viejitos que no. Los otros están bien, hasta que le hablan a uno [A lot of people do like Hispanics, it’s the old people that don’t. The others are good, they’ll even talk to you (if you’re Hispanic).]” These comments were combined with stories from other migrants who had lived in different states and said that Fremont was not as bad as other places, which made people in Chichihualco less fearful of the Fremont ordinance. Many mentioned the Arizona law, and one even mentioned more negative attitudes towards migrants in North Dakota.

Manolo, a return migrant who had left Chichihualco at the age of 15 and had spent over half his life in the United States working in various packing plants in North Dakota, Minnesota, Idaho, Nebraska, and Kansas, felt that other states had harsher laws and practices. “En North Dakota está más dura la ley…son más racistas…piden papeles en la calle [The law is harsher in North Dakota…they’re more racist…they ask for your papers in the street].” Most interlocutors in Chichihualco were aware that similar laws were being proposed across the United States and no one reported their loved ones returning to Mexico or moving to another state because of the Fremont ordinance. Similarly, when asked if these laws in general served as a deterrent for migration to the United States, almost all interlocutors said that they did not, asserting that those factors that motivated people to leave Chichihualco for the U.S., such as lack of employment opportunities and economic need, were still very present.
Pepe’s response to the question asking if these laws prevent people from migrating was, “Yo creo que no, igual porque aquí la vida es dura... pues allá también puede estar dura pero no es igual porque allá todos tienen un trabajo fijo y aquí está medio duro para conseguir trabajo [I don’t think so, for the same reason that here life is hard... well there life can be hard too but it’s not the same because there everyone has steady work and here it’s pretty hard to find work].” Other interlocutors affirmed Pepe’s reasoning and added that even if one were to find work in Chichihualco, earnings were barely enough to buy food, let alone pay educational expenses or have a decent house.

Naomi, a mother of three who was able to migrate legally and build her house in Chichihualco with money earned from working at Fremont Beef, lamented,

_Pobre gente, se van allá porque quieren una mejor vida, que estudien sus hijos... porque aquí también hay trabajo y todo, pero, pues, lo haces en más tiempo, si quieres hacer tu casa, lo haces en 10 años, pero si vas a estados unidos, lo haces como en 5 años_[Poor folks, they go because they want a better life, [they want] their kids to go to school... because here there’s work and everything too, but, well, it takes more time, if you want your house, you build it in 10 years, but if you go to the United States, you build it in 5 years.]

A closer look at employment opportunities in Chichihualco does well to illustrate her point that saving for education expenses or to build a house is difficult. In the municipality Leonardo Bravo, to which Chichihualco belongs as the largest locality with over half the population of the entire municipality, 83% of households are underemployed, meaning that total household income is less than minimum wage earnings for two people (INEGI, 2010). Many people who are living in Chichihualco are either employed in agriculture or make soccer balls (Trujillo, 2008). Interlocutors estimated that about half of the town farms while the other half works at making soccer balls, of course with some overlap and a few exceptions. Most agricultural workers do not own the land, but rather are paid by landowners to farm. One such landowner tells me
that on average, workers earn $1.50 per hour planting (sembrando). Having also lived in Nebraska, he tells me the local wage in U.S. dollars and adds, “lo que ganas allá (en los E.E.U.U.) en casi un día, aquí ganas en una semana, y allá sabes que es nada más 8 horas de trabajo y ya [what you earn there (in the U.S.) in about a day, you earn here in a week, and there you know that it’s not more than 8 hours of work and that’s it],” emphasizing the wage difference between Chichihualco and the U.S. While there are various farming techniques employed (See Figure 5.8), most interlocutors who were agricultural workers stressed the difficulty in earning enough to pay for anything beyond very basic living expenses in Chichihualco.

Figure 5.8: (left) Farmer in Chichihualco using a mule drawn plow. (right) Greenhouses in Chichihualco used for growing tomatoes.

Those who were employed making soccer balls also reported similar frustrations about low wages. Since the 1960’s, soccer balls have been a major export for Chichihualco and are so important for the town’s economic prosperity that the soccer ball is incorporated in the municipal shield, shown in Figure 5.9. Soccer balls are exported not only to larger cities in Mexico such as Chilpancingo and Mexico City, but also
internationally to the U.S., Europe, and South America (ibid). Presently, there are three major soccer ball factories in Chichihualco (See Figure 5.9).

Figure 5.9: (left) Municipal Shield of Chichihualco with soccer ball in lower right hand corner showing its importance to the local economy. (right) Business sign for Balones Guerrero, the oldest soccer ball factory in Chichihualco.

Entire households in Chichihualco and surrounding areas dedicate themselves to sewing soccer balls. Workers receive the materials from any of the three main factories and then return sewn balls to be cleaned, inflated, given final paint touch ups, packaged and sold (See Figure 5.10). Workers are paid 10 pesos per ball sewn and it takes an experienced worker about two hours to sew each ball. Interlocutors estimated that one person is able to sew about 5-6 balls per day if they dedicate themselves to working 10-12 hours, only stopping to eat. Thus, workers are making about 5 pesos per hour, or roughly 60 pesos ($4.60 USD) per day, working 12-hour days. While those who work directly inside the factories gluing and cutting materials, painting, and packaging can earn up to 230 pesos ($17.60 USD) per hour\textsuperscript{25}, each factory only employs between 12 and 15 workers, making these higher earning jobs scarce.

\textsuperscript{25} These wages were made by workers gluing materials, a historically dangerous job due to the flammable nature of the glue. A maximum of two employees with this position were observed in any single factory.
Illustrative of this point, in one of the largest factories, five of the nine men working had previously migrated to the U.S. in search of work (three to Nebraska, one to Kansas, and one to Utah). I asked these men if there was something important I should include in my writing when sharing their stories. Jesús, whom everyone called “Chucho,” responded immediately telling me to include, “el miedo…el miedo que tiene uno de brincar (cruzar la frontera), de andar allá (en los E.E.U.U.), y todo lo que hace por la familia de uno [the fear…the fear one has crossing the border, being over there (in the U.S.), and everything one does for her or his family].” Chucho and his wife had both migrated to Nebraska in an attempt to earn money to buy her a secure position as a schoolteacher (una plaza) since neither of them could find work. Job scarcity is even more prevalent among women since higher paying jobs, such as those within the soccer ball factory, are exclusively occupied by men. This leaves women to sew soccer balls, work in agriculture, or dedicate themselves to artesian work, such as making napkins, aprons and tablecloths for sale in local markets (See Figure 5.11).

Figure 5.10: (left) Sewing soccer balls by hand is a primary economic activity in Chichihualco. (right) Soccer ball factory in Chichihualco where higher paid workers are inflating, cleaning, touching up, and packaging sewn balls.
In this way, the economic situation in Chichihualco is similar to that observed by researchers in other Mexican rural communities and communities with high rates of migration to the U.S. in that most jobs available locally are low paying, agricultural work (e.g., see Ramirez & Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2009), and while higher earning positions do exist, they are few and often reserved for men (Pagán & Sánchez, 2000; Foulkes & Real, 2001; Hirsh, 1999). As Victoria, a mother of three young children who makes decorative napkins to earn money, explains, “aquí no hay más que el balón ¿y cuánto le gana uno por hacer un balón? Poco. Y una servilleta, 20 pesos por una, y gastando dos días para hacerla; es un trabajo medio laboroso …está difícil la vida aquí” [Here there’s nothing else but the soccer ball, and how much does one earn for making a soccer ball? Little. And a napkin, 20 pesos for one, and spending two days to make it; it’s kind of a difficult job…Life here is hard].” Victoria’s parents, as well as most of her aunts and uncles all live in the U.S. so she and her husband and children are able to live in a relative’s house until those relatives return to Chichihualco. Her husband recently tried to migrate as well but was caught and sent back just after making it across the border. The family needs him to try again but it is dangerous and expensive.
It is important to note that economic factors are not the only ones taken into account when decisions are made to migrate, and to suggest so is to erroneously simplify these issues (Massey & Capoferro, 2008; Zúñiga & Hernández-León, 2005; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003). Familial and social ties also play a primary role in such decisions and many interlocutors in Chichihualco also stressed that numerous migrant households faced challenges of family separation. However, these aspects will be highlighted in future iterations of this research, and instead social ties will be discussed here in terms of cross-border linkages between Fremont and Chichihualco.

**Chichihualco/Fremont Cross-Border Linkages**

As discussed in Chapter Two, the foundational questions that propel academic conversation of transnationalism and its place in migratory processes concern the extent to which migration leads to new linkages between sending and receiving societies (Castles & Miller, 2009). This section describes a few of those linkages observed between the “sending society” Chichihualco and the “receiving society” Fremont. For our purposes, it is most useful to discuss these linkages by employing Waldinger and
Fitzgerald’s (2004) term “state-society collisions,” which refers to conflicts between cross-border, social organization facilitated by migration and the state’s reactive efforts to produce state-society alignment. These collisions are typically discussed at the international scale. But, due to legislation such as the Fremont ordinance, state-society collisions are also occurring at the local level. In this case, as an effect of international migration processes, members of familial and other social groups now span beyond a single country’s borders, connecting Fremont and Chichihualco and creating new linkages between the two communities. This ultimately challenges traditional understandings of a single community as a container that defines the boundaries for ethnic groups, political allegiances, economies, and society in general, especially when boundaries are defined in legal terms, as attempted by Ordinance 5165. Thus, despite efforts to maintain Chichihualco and Fremont as separate by legally prohibiting migrants from living in Fremont, cross-border linkages continue to emerge between the two communities. This section will discuss two such examples: migrant economic cooperation to support cultural celebrations in Chichihualco, and undocumented back-and-forth movement for the same celebrations.

Evidence of migration to Nebraska is hard to miss in Chichihualco, since it is easily visible in the town, from Nebraska license plates on vehicles on what seems like every other street, to Chichihualtecos of all ages sporting Nebraska Husker football T-shirts, caps, and other memorabilia (See Figure 5.12). But, cross-border linkages are more than the exchange of products between communities and many migrants in Fremont feel an economic commitment to their hometown, which they often express by sending money for *El día del migrante* (Migrants’ Day) during the annual town festival or *feria*. Of course, remittances sent to migrants’ family members also make up important economic flows and are key in discussing transnationalism and migration, but this
research will focus exclusively on monies sent for *El día del migrante* due to its benefits for the entire community and direct relationship with Nebraska.

Figure 5.12: (left) Nebraska license plates were a common site on vehicles in Chichihualco. (right) A family picnicking by the river in Chichihualco brings their Nebraska Husker Football cooler.

*El día del migrante* is held every year on October 4\(^{th}\) as part of weeks of celebration that make up the annual *feria* to honor the town’s patron saint, Saint Michael Archangel. Traditional dances, costumes, parades and rodeos all take place during the *feria*, which begins on September 29\(^{th}\) and lasts until October 12\(^{th}\) (See Figure 5.13). But, *El día del migrante* is unique in that on this day all food and festivities are free thanks to money sent to Chichihualco by migrants. In conversations with Naomi, she describes the day as follows:

*El 4 de octubre es El día de migrantes. Todas las personas que están en los Estados Unidos y los migrantes que vienen a la feria, este día se festejan. Hay una corrida para todos, ellos ponen la música, viene una banda, regalan balones los baloneros, otras personas regalan trastes…Y este día no cobran ni un cinco, todo es gratis, y hay muchos regalos de los comerciantes. Se cooperan (los migrantes) para todo, fruta, naranja, limones, todo eso es gratis* [October 4\(^{th}\) is Migrants’ Day. Everyone that’s in the U.S. and those migrants that come to the
Feria are celebrated on this day. There’s a bullfight for everyone, they play music, a band comes, the soccer ball makers give away soccer balls, others give away cooking utensils… And this day they don’t charge one cent, everything is free, and there are a lot of presents from business owners. They (migrants) send money for everything, fruit, oranges, limes, everything is free].

Migrants living in Fremont and surrounding towns such as Schuyler send amounts anywhere from $10 to $100 dollars each, giving their donation to a representative collecting money in Nebraska, often located at one of the local businesses owned by migrants from Chichihualco.

In Chichihualco, migrant donations are handled by an appointed Mayordomo, who facilitates payments for Migrants’ Day and also leads decision-making processes as to how additional communal remittances should be spent. Previous projects in Chichihualco have included reparations for the local Catholic church and construction of a kiosco or pavilion. Pooled migrant remittances to be used for projects in their hometowns are especially common, have been written into Mexico’s local and national governmental programs, and are prevalent within migration literature (Escobar, 2009; Skeldon, 2008; Kapur, 2004; Massey & Parrado, 1994, to name a few).
Thus, what is perhaps more surprising is the high number of migrants—both documented and undocumented—who were reported to come back to Chichihualco for the *feria*. Various interlocutors affirmed that even those who did not have legal documents returned for the *feria*. They explained that returning was often easier once one had crossed previously, and that payment for a *coyote* or *pollero* to assist with border crossing was less since one only had to pay to cross the border and then could make it back to Nebraska on one’s own, instead of paying to be taken all the way to Nebraska, as was done the first time.

Still, risk was present, and as one interlocutor asserted, “*claro que regresan en septiembre aunque no tienen papeles, aunque van a tener que cruzar de nuevo…no les importa* [of course people come back in September even if they don’t have papers, even though they will have to cross again, they don’t care].” Comments such as these reflect the cultural and personal importance of the *feria* for most Chichihualtecos. Interlocutors who were return migrants even described having saved their vacation time at the meatpacking plants in order to be able to visit Chichihualco during September festivities,
and almost all interlocutors described how full (lleno) the town became during this time of year. In the same conversation with Naomi, she told of being sad the years she and her husband were unable to return for the feria. “Es muy bonito aquí (en Chichihualco durante la feria). También los que vienen de Estados Unidos se visten (de traje tradicional para las danzas) [It’s really pretty here (in Chichihualco during the feria). Those who come from the U.S. also dress up (in traditional clothing for the dances)].”

During interviews, interlocutors were often delighted when I would ask about the feria and its different days of celebration and insisted that I return in September. The town historian also presented me with a set of DVD’s with recorded videos from three different years of the feria. As we sat watching clips in his living room, he pointed out his daughter and son-in-law whom I had interviewed in Fremont, as well as other community members whom I had met either in Nebraska or Chichihualco. We also raised our glasses of Coca-Cola when the camera zoomed in on a group of community members who shared bottles of mescal, saying “salud por los en Nebraska [cheers to those in Nebraska],” which multiple interlocutors had explained was commonplace during such celebrations. While it is undeniable that a lack of proper legal documents prevents many from returning for the feria, those who do return, in addition to those migrants who collaborate economically to support the yearly celebrations represent a cultural affinity that has contributed to new linkages between Chichihualco and Nebraska.

Even beyond flows of money and people inspired by the feria, migrants from Chichihualco who live in Schuyler, Nebraska (about 30 miles west of Fremont) have had their suits and traditional regalia for the dances brought to them so that they are able to wear them in Schuyler’s annual Memorial Day parade. “Andan a pedir sus trajes, sus mascaras…allá (en Schuyler) tienen hasta la tradición de aquí también [They go asking for their suits, their masks…there (in Schuyler) they even have the tradition from here]
too],” explained one interlocutor, whose report was later affirmed by others in both Chichihualco and Nebraska. Since many of these interactions between migrants and the town take place via migrant owned businesses in Nebraska, as with pooled remittances mentioned above, collisions between state-society alignment are also expressed through the presence of local businesses in both Schuyler and Fremont: Tienda Chichihualco in Schuyler and Tienda Guerrero in Fremont, both whose owners are from Chichihualco.

At the national level, political boundaries shape Fremont migrants’ options for transnationalism as illustrated by Chichihualco-Fremont cross-border linkages in the fact that some migrants’ legal status prevents them from back-and-forth movement to attend the feria or forces them to do so clandestinely. But, passage of Fremont Ordinance 5165 and its establishment of legal boundaries excluding certain community members makes clear that it is not only nations that are acting as (legal) social containers, but cities as well. This draws attention to a smaller scale of political and social boundaries shaping the options for transnational activity, and findings from this fieldwork suggest that cross-border linkages will continue to challenge even city-level containers, as with the Chichihualteco-owned stores and migration cooperation in sending remittances. The nature of the cross-border linkages presented here—almost all related to the feria—also suggests that although presence of the state in migration processes is undeniable, the state cannot regulate people’s cultural attachment and affinity to the feria; they can only influence how it is expressed.

Finally, findings from Chichihualco highlighting economic need and social ties imply that local attempts at immigration enforcement, like Ordinance 5165, will not deter migration to these places, nor encourage migrants currently living in such jurisdictions to relocate or return to their countries of origin. Furthermore, despite attempts at local law enforcement at the city- and state-level (E-verify is also mandatory for all Nebraska State
contracts) that attempt to delimit social, ethnic, and cultural boundaries, migration facilitated cross-border linkages seem to increase or deepen in some areas, as with Schuyler migrants sending for traditional cultural clothing, and wearing it in the town’s Memorial Day parade. Such cross-border linkages are an inherent component of long-distance migration that deserve a closer look, and raise important questions regarding social containers established by local immigration enforcement and how they “collide” with migration processes. These questions will be outlined in the concluding chapter.
Chapter Seven: Conclusions

This case study exploring migrant political participation surrounding the passage of Ordinance 5165 in Fremont, Nebraska in 2010 leads to several conclusions regarding the law’s local effects and migrant civic engagement. As outlined below and evidenced in previous chapters, these effects are both negative and positive, including community division, increased racism, and higher levels of civic engagement among migrants and Latinos. The upcoming enforcement of the law’s employment restrictions in May 2012 and continued legal battle over the housing restrictions raises important questions regarding the possible intensification of effects observed during the debate and passage, as well as the emergence of new effects. Additionally, findings from Chichihualco suggest that measures such as Ordinance 5165 will not serve as a deterrent for migration nor persuade significant numbers of migrants to relocate or return to their countries of origin. Similarly, a transnational lens of analysis reveals active cross-border linkages between Fremont and Chichihualco that challenge the ordinance’s establishment of legally imposed social boundaries or containers.

The Fremont case study also provides insight concerning the nationwide trend of local immigration enforcement, and highlights the need for continued investigation of the ways in which community members are organizing against such policy measures, and the observed and potential effects for various actors at different scales. This sort of legislation is being passed with greater frequency in the U.S., and this research argues that its effects have been overwhelmingly negative; moreover, such laws represent a missed opportunity to integrate growing migrant populations into city planning and development processes that could be beneficial for all. For these reasons, additional
research is much needed and some possible directions for future investigation will also be mentioned here.

**Effects of Ordinance 5165 and Migrant Political Participation**

The effects of Ordinance 5165 for the Fremont community have been overwhelmingly negative. As described in Chapters Four and Five, even before the law was passed, the surrounding debate escalated incidents of racism and discrimination and challenged many Hispanic and Latino community members’ sense of safety and belonging. Such tensions were directly confronted by those who participated in organized opposition of the ordinance, as local power relations influenced the nature of their participation, and some opponents’ options for political engagement were limited based on their race, ethnicity, gender, or legal status. However, these same community members confronted local power relations by subtly shifting the city’s dominant social and spatial boundaries. Through public hearings, voter registration and education, a consumer boycott, and other numerous efforts, both migrant and native born residents created new discourses to reflect the way they hoped Fremont could be defined as a place. As related in Chapter Five, the consumer boycott in particular also served as a point of organization and solidarity for migrant and Latino communities; and regardless of other measures of the boycott’s success, it created a sense of empowerment for migrants and Latinos in Fremont.

Furthermore, this high level of political organization among migrants is especially attention grabbing due to the lack of civic infrastructure to support migrants and different ethnic groups in Fremont, and in Nebraska overall. Academic scholarship written on the subject of migrant political participation in the U.S. generally predicts that areas with smaller, more recent migrant populations and fewer resources to assist newcomers and
ethnic minorities, as in new destination states, will have lower levels of political participation and mobilization (Desipio, 2011; Benjamin-Alvarado et al., 2009; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). Thus, Fremont Ordinance 5165 can be argued to have had a unifying effect among migrant and Latino communities and their allies, actually spurring increased mobilization and civic engagement, as has been observed in other research in Nebraska regarding anti-immigrant legislation at the federal level (Benjamin-Alvarado et al., 2009). This unifying effect is seen in migrant participation in the organization “One Fremont, One Future,” the consumer boycott, formal and informal community meetings inspired by the ordinance, such as those of the multi-ethnic Ministerial Association, and the creation of the local Hispanic organization Un Fremont con Dignidad. In fact, the unifying efforts of “One Fremont, One Future” received statewide recognition as the group was presented with the Dr. Mathew O. Ricketts Trail Blazer Award in January 2011 at the state capitol building in Lincoln, Nebraska (See Figure 7.1). Named after Nebraska’s first black state senator, the award recognizes “those who have made a difference in furthering the rights of others” (Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Youth Rally, January 14, 2011). While other research observes that civic engagement tends to dissipate when a key decision has been reached regarding the specific anti-immigrant legislation (Benjamin-Alvarado et al., 2009), the climate in Fremont suggests opportunities for continued migrant political participation, including the recognition of organizing efforts by state groups, as with the Trail Blazer Award, ongoing legal proceedings, and the establishment of a permanent local Hispanic organization.
This discussion also reaffirms the positive potential of efforts such as “Nebraska Is Home,” which provided Fremont community members from different ethnic backgrounds the rare opportunity to interact with and get to know one another, and facilitated later political mobilization vis a vis “One Fremont, One Future.” Because traditional community based organizing tends to focus recruitment efforts and resources on those who have shown a willingness to participate in the past instead of reaching out to new groups; and political organizations are also less likely to reach out to migrant and ethnic communities due to their inexperience with these populations (Desipio, 2011; Putnam, 2000; Verba et al., 1995), those efforts that specifically target migrants and multi-ethnic group relations, like “Nebraska Is Home” can have significant impacts on local politics and community development. Thus, while effects of Ordinance 5165 have been primarily negative, local organization that was triggered by the legislation could prove to have lasting positive outcomes for migrant political participation in Fremont.
Transnationalism Revisited

An additional perspective was gained by using a transnational lens of analysis to investigate the impacts of Fremont Ordinance 5165 on the migrant population of the city. Because places are formed partly by way of their relations to other places, fieldwork in Chichihualco, one of the largest sending communities to Fremont, revealed how global realities, such as economic need and transnational social ties, shaped developments in Fremont. Interviews with return migrants and migrants’ family members in Chichihualco suggested that it was unlikely the law would deter migration to the city nor persuade migrants to relocate or return to their countries of origin. Fieldwork in Mexico also served to reveal active cross-border linkages between Fremont and Chichihualco that conflict with the City of Fremont’s attempt to act as a social container. Despite passage of Ordinance 5165—what could be considered local attempts at state-society alignment under Waldinger and Fitzgerald’s (2004) discussion of transnationalism—migratory processes continue to produce social organization that spans across state imposed boundaries, *i.e.* what Waldinger and Fitzgerald call “collisions.” This is evidenced by migrants’ support of cultural activities back home, as with communal remittances sent for *El día del migrante*, and cultural sharing and acceptance in Nebraska represented by the presence of Chichihualteco-owned stores catering to migrant and Latino populations, and by the inclusion of Chichihualco traditional dance regalia in the Schuyler Memorial Day parade. Thus, while state imposed boundaries no doubt affect migrants and their options for transnational activity, they are not perfect containers of social relations and instead tend to stratify migrant populations in terms of legal status and mobility, as has also been documented in other studies on migratory circuits (*e.g.* Hernández-León, 2008).

Most importantly, application of a transnational lens in this case study calls attention to the need for investigation at a smaller scale. While transnationalism implies
activity and analysis at the national level, the recent, growing trend of local immigration enforcement demands investigation of city and state level politics, and also of city and state level cross-border linkages. In the current “Era of Restriction” it is not only nations that are acting as containers, defining boundaries for social, political, and ethnic groups, as well as allegiances and loyalties, but states and cities as well. Thus, future research regarding migrant transnationalism should be focused at the local scale, searching for patterns attempts at state-society alignment their “collisions” with migration processes, and investigating the different circumstances and roles of various actors involved in these interactions. Furthermore, additional emphasis should be placed on sending communities and how their politics affect options for transnationalism, explicitly avoiding the tendency to view migrants’ places of origin as constant (Hirsh, 1999). Considerations of transnationalism are too often left out of discussions of U.S. immigration issues, especially when the topic of investigation appears indefinitely local, as with the Fremont ordinance. However, a transnational lens of analysis is invaluable for understanding the larger context within which U.S. immigrants make decisions and local immigration issues operate.

Local Immigration Enforcement and City Planning

Finally, the Fremont case study provides meaningful implications for city planning. First, legislation like Ordinance 5165 attempts to conduct local immigration enforcement via housing regulations, which raises significant concerns regarding equal housing opportunities and residential segregation, processes that negatively affect socially just city development. Furthermore, migrant populations have been proven to be vital to Nebraska’s economic wellbeing (Gouveia, 2006), and Fremont is no exception given that migrants represent a needed workforce, important local consumer group, and
certain future stability since children of migrants are more likely than children of native born parents to remain in the city. But instead of looking toward the growing migrant population as an opportunity for increased economic benefit and further city development, those who voted to pass the ordinance have ultimately required the City of Fremont to spend amounts estimated between $750,000 and $1 million per year to defend the legislation in court, raising local property taxes to cover the cost of legal challenges and enforcement26 (City of Fremont, “City budgets,” 2010; Center for American Progress, 2011). This money could have been put toward a number of community projects, and in this way, such laws represent a missed opportunity to integrate growing migrant populations into city planning and development processes that could be economically beneficial.

In addition, the potential benefits presented by migrant populations for city development are not solely monetary. As mentioned in Chapter Three, numerous planners have called for institutions and government entities to acknowledge and address the diversity of needs within their communities. Participatory Planning techniques in particular can empower marginalized groups and generate culturally appropriate ideas that lead to decisions grounded in local understandings. Should migrants become involved in participatory planning processes, new ideas and possibilities for community development that decrease ethnic and racial tensions and provide positive responses to growing migrant populations are likely to emerge.

Latino communities in particular have a long history of organizing to protect themselves against racial discrimination (Benjamin-Alvarado et al., 2009; Marquez and Jennings, 2000) and as one Fremont interlocutor asserted, “que la gente se trata de

---
26 For the 2010/2011 budget, the City Administrator recommended “raising the overall property tax rate by about 5.8 mills. This would mean an average tax increase of $116 per year on a $200,000 home” (City of Fremont, “City budgets,” 2010).
organizar es una reacción natural cuando les quitan sus derechos [People organizing themselves is a natural reaction to having their rights taken away].” In other words, instead of continued attempts at local immigration enforcement and subsequent attempts by opposing groups to stop it, government institutions and community-based organizations should proactively channel resources toward promotion of widespread civic engagement that does not have the same economic or social costs to jurisdictions, and benefits all community members. This could also include exploring alternative basis for collaboration, especially if planners who are able to code switch or residents who are willing and able to lead design and implementation of planning processes are not immediately available.

One option might be to use a gender analysis to inform collaboration, as based on findings from our limited gender analysis regarding how men and women conceptualize and re(make) places in collaboration with individuals outside their ethnic or cultural groups. The outcome of this suggestion, as with the outcome of any suggestion put forth in this thesis, is by no means guaranteed; and any attempts at future collaboration and participatory planning must recognize that individuals of any particular gender, race, ethnicity, age, etc. do not represent a homogenous group. However, participatory city planning that actively involves growing migrant populations represents a positive alternative to local immigration enforcement and its damaging effects for communities.
Appendix A: Community Member Origins Survey Conducted in Catholic Church

*Favor de llenar esta encuesta para cada miembro de la familia que nació fuera de los E.E.U.U.

1. ¿De dónde es, usted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ciudad/Pueblo</th>
<th>Estado/Departamento</th>
<th>País</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **Sexo** (marque con un círculo):

- Masculino
- Femenino

3. ¿Por cuánto tiempo ha vivido usted en Fremont?

Esta información será utilizada para un proyecto académico cuyo propósito es explorar las experiencias de los migrantes en Fremont. Para mayor información contacte a Vanessa Martínez (402-318-2736; vmartinez@mail.utexas.edu)
Appendix B: Community Member Origins Survey Left in Stores

¿De dónde es, usted?
Esta información será utilizada para un proyecto académico cuyo propósito es explorar las experiencias de los migrantes en Fremont. Para mayor información contacte a Vanessa Martínez (402-318-2736; vmartinez@mail.utexas.edu)
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Appendix C: Community Member Origins Survey Results and Participant Breakdown

### Community of Origin Surveys Conducted in Fremont, Nebraska (Dec. 2010-Jan. 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Surveys</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed in Stores</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed at Church</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top Results by State/Departamento¹

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiche, Guatemala</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanajuato, Mexico</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, Honduras</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campeche, Mexico</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Combined surveys (conducted at church and stores)

### Top Results by Town/City¹

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyabaj, Quiche, Guatemala</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escárcega, Campeche, Mexico</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participant Breakdown by Gender and Country²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²Only available for surveys completed in church
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Length of time living in Fremont</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paraíso</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paraíso</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paraíso</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>Petén</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyabaj</td>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>División del Norte</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>16 months</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escárcega</td>
<td>Campeche</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>16 months</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Juarez</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal</td>
<td>Estado de</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mexico City)</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Guadalajara</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Hidalgo</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe</td>
<td>Guanajuato</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teloloapan</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichihualco</td>
<td>Guerrero</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuquío</td>
<td>Jalisco</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexicali</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico City</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Blank cells indicate that portion was left unanswered by participant*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community (City/Town, State (Departamento), Country)*</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichihualco, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyabaj, Quiche, Guatemala</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escárcega, Campeche, Mexico</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, Santa Ana, El Salvador</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala City, Guatemala, Guatemala</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelia, Michoacán, Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapán, Santa Ana, El Salvador</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huehuetenango, Huehuetenango, Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playa Grande Ixcan, Quiche, Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel Las Flores, San Marcos, Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irapuato, Guanajuato, Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilpancingo, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copala, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalapa, Veracruz, Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Concepción, Chalatenango, El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetzaltenpeque, La Libertad, El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio el Rosario, Nueva Concepción, El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel, San Miguel, El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Concepción, Escuintla, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestina De Los Altos, Huehuetenango, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalapa, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Pedro de Alvarado, Jutiapa, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalpatagua, Jutiapa, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jutiapa, Jutiapa, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naranjo, Petén, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetzaltenango, Quetzaltenango, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro Sacatepequez, San Marcos, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazatenango, Suchitepequez, Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos de Colon, Honduras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegucigalpa, Francisco Morazán, Honduras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguascalientes, Aguascalientes, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapachula, Chiapas, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro Obregón, Chihuahua, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Chihuahua, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango, Durango, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papasquiaro, Durango, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrito Federal (Mexico City), Estado de Mexico, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>León Guanajuato, Guanajuato, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pénjamo, Guanajuato, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acapulco, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (City/Town, State (Departamento), Country)</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atoyac de Alvarez, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuatro Bancos, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ometepec, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teloloapan, Guerrero, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayotlán, Jalisco, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuquio, Jalisco, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tepatitlan, Jalisco, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matugeo, Michoacán, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuernavaca, Morelos, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelos, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Blas, Nayarit, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sola de Vega, Oaxaca, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamoros, Tamaulipas, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omealca, Veracruz, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andres, Veracruz, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojo Caliente, Zacatecas, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Any omitted city/town information indicates that the information was not given by participant(s)*
Appendix D: One Fremont, One Future “Vote No” Flyer

Did you know?
There is a special election on June 21st, 2010 for the residents of the city of Fremont to vote on the anti-immigrant ordinance, which prohibits harboring, hiring, or renting to illegal aliens.

Do you remember?
JUNE 2008 - City Council member, Bob Warner, introduces the proposed ordinance.
JULY 2009 - City Council holds a hearing at Fremont High School with over 1,000 attendees. The City Council is split on the decision (4 votes in support, 4 votes against). Mayor Edwards votes “no” and the ordinance is defeated.
MARCH 2009 – A petition drive collects over 3,000 signatures to have a special election on the proposed ordinance.
MARCH 2009 - Fremont City Council seeks a ruling from the Dodge County District Court on the constitutionality of the ordinance
APRIL 2009 – The District Court rules the City of Fremont must proceed with the petition initiative.
APRIL 2009 - City of Fremont appeals the decision to the Nebraska Supreme Court.
JANUARY 2010 - Nebraska Supreme Court hears oral arguments.
APRIL 2010 – Nebraska Supreme Court agrees with District Court’s decision.
MAY 2010 – Fremont City Council sets date for special election.

We are a group of Fremont residents committed to Fremont’s future with a focus on the positive contributions of all residents to the community as a whole.

VOTE “NO” on June 21st!

Paid for by Pagado por
One Fremont – One Future
906 E. 6th St.
PO BOX 516
Fremont, NE 68025

www.onefremontonefuture.org
¿Sabía Usted qué?
Habrá una elección especial el 21 de junio, 2010 para que los residentes de Fremont puedan votar acerca de la ordenanza en contra de los inmigrantes, que prohíbe ayudar, contratar, o rentar a inmigrantes ilegales.

¿Se acuerda Usted?
JUNIO 2008 – Miembro del City Council, Bob Warner, introduce la ordenanza propuesta.
JULIO 2008 - City Council tiene reunión en Fremont High School con más que 1,000 personas. El City Council se divide en la decisión (4 votos de apoyo, 4 votos en contra). El alcalde Edwards vota “no” y la ordenanza se derrota.
MARZO 2009 – Coleccionan más que 3,000 firmas que están a favor de tener una elección especial acerca de la ordenanza.
MARZO 2009 - City Council de Fremont pide una decisión de la corte del condado de Dodge acerca de si la ordenanza es constitucional.
ABRIL 2009 – La Corte manda que la ciudad de Fremont tiene que proceder con la petición.
ABRIL 2009 – La Ciudad de Fremont apela la decisión a la Corte Suprema de Nebraska.
ENERO 2010 - Corte Suprema de Nebraska oye los argumentos orales.
ABRIL 2010 – Corte Suprema de Nebraska se pone de acuerdo con la decisión de la corte del distrito.
MAYO 2010 – City Council de Fremont pone la fecha para la elección especial.

Somos un grupo de residentes de Fremont comprometidos por el futuro de Fremont con un enfoque en las contribuciones positivas de todos los residentes de la comunidad entera.

VOTA “NO” el 21 de junio!

Paid for by/Pagado por
One Fremont – One Future
906 E. 6th St.
PO BOX 516
Fremont, NE 68025
www.onefremontonefuture.org
Appendix E: One Fremont, One Future Hate Incident Reporting Form

Informe Confidencial de Incidencia
Confidential Incidence Report

¿QUÉN? (describir a la persona)
WHO? (describe the person)

¿Había un testigo?
WITNESS?

¿QUÉ?: (es lo que ha sucedido?)
WHAT?: (what happened?)

¿CUÁNDO?: (fecha y hora)
WHEN?: (date/time)

¿DÓNDE?: (ubicación)
WHERE (location)

La fecha de hoy/Today’s Date:__________________ NO:__________________
Nombre/Name:________________________
Teléfono/Telephone:____________________
Dirección/Address:_____________________

"Un Fremont, un Future" recolectará su informe y mantendrá su nombre y cualquier otra información de identificación personal CONFIDENCIAL. Sólo podrá hacerlo público con su permiso por escrito. Su historia podrá ser compartida sin fines de lucro, al gobierno y otras organizaciones con el único fin de reducir incidentes de odio y mejorar la seguridad comunitaria.

"One Fremont One Future" is collecting your report and will keep your name and any other personally identifying information CONFIDENTIAL. It can only be released with your written permission. Your story may be shared with nonprofit, government and others with specific interests in reducing hate incidents and improving community safety.

"One Fremont One Future” Fremont, Nebraska 68025 (402-317-7823)
## Appendix F: Fremont Ordinance 5165 Special Election Results

(Documents from Dodge County Election Commissioner)

### Fremont Special Election Results: June 21, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes in favor of proposed Ordinance No. 5165</th>
<th>No against proposed Ordinance No. 5165</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-1A</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-1B</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-1C</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-1D</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-1E</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-2A</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-2B</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-2C</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-2D</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-2E</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-3A</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-3B</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-3C</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-3D</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-3E</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-4A</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-4B</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-4C</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-4D</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont-4E</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Voters</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,966</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Election Voting Ballot

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE NO. 5165**

"Shall the City of Fremont, Nebraska, enact proposed Ordinance No. 5165, amending the Fremont Municipal Code to prohibit the harboring of illegal aliens or hiring of unauthorized aliens, providing definitions, making provision for occupancy licenses, providing judicial process, repealing conflicting provisions, and establishing an effective date for this ordinance?"

- Yes in favor of proposed Ordinance No. 5165
- No against proposed Ordinance No. 5165
## Fremont Special Election Voter Turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Turnout w/o Prov</th>
<th>% Turnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Voters:** 489

**TOTAL:** 15,208  6,880  45.2%
Appendix G: Special Election Demographics: Full Map Layouts and Spatial Data References

Predictions Based on Ethnicity Prove False

Enforcing Exclusion: Voter Demographics and Anti-Immigrant Legislation in Fremont, Nebraska

Shared Legend
- Major Roads
- Railroad
- Regency Mobile Homes
- Meatpacking Plants
- Lakes
- Nebraska

Votes In Favor of Fremont Ordinance 5165 by Precinct

Fremont
City Limits
Voting Precincts:
Voted In Favor*
- 50% or less
- 51%-60%
- 61%-65%
- 66%-70%
*Percentage of total votes by precinct

Hispanics/Latinos 18 Years and Older by Precinct

Voting Precincts:
% Hispanic/Latino
- 4% or less
- 5%-7%
- 8%-10%
- 11%-20%
- 36%
**Percentage of total persons 18 years and older by precinct (Equal to overall Hispanic/Latino population distribution)

Author: Vanessa Martinez, December 7, 2011
Data and Projection: NAD 1983, State Plane Nebraska, FIPS, 2400, Foot
Sources: City of Fremont, Dodge County Election Commissioner, US Census Bureau
Low Turnout in Precincts that Vote 'For'

Enforcing Exclusion: Voter Demographics and Anti-Immigrant Legislation in Fremont, Nebraska

Shared Legend

- Major Roads
- Railroad

- Regency Mobile Homes
- Meatpacking Plants

Lakes

Nebraska

Votes In Favor of Fremont Ordinance 5165 by Precinct

Fremont City Limits
Voting Precincts:
Voted In Favor*
- 50% or less
- 51%-60%
- 61%-65%
- 66%-70%

*Percentage of total votes by precinct

Voter Turnout as % of Total Population 18 and Older

Voting Precincts:
% Voted
- 17%-20%
- 21%-30%
- 31%-40%
- 40%-57%

Author: Vanessa Martinez, April 20, 2012
Datum and Projection: NAD 1983, State Plane Nebraska, FIPS 2690, Feet
Sources: City of Fremont, Dodge County Election Commissioner, US Census Bureau

148
Spatial Data References


Dodge County, Nebraska Demographic Summary File P4 Data [CSVfile]. US Census Bureau, 2010.

Dodge County, Nebraska Demographic Summary File S01-S07 Data [CSVfile]. US Census Bureau, 2010.


Fremont, Nebraska, City Limits [shapefile]. City of Fremont, 2010.

Fremont, Nebraska, Lakes [shapefile]. City of Fremont, 2010.

Fremont, Nebraska, Railroad [shapefile]. City of Fremont, 2010.

Fremont, Nebraska, Major Roads [shapefile]. City of Fremont, 2010.

Fremont, Nebraska, Parcels [shapefile]. City of Fremont, 2010.

Appendix H: Fremont Hispanic/Latino Population by Voting Precinct

Fremont, Nebraska Hispanic/Latino Population by Voting Precinct (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Hispanic/ Latino</th>
<th>Non Hispanic /Latino</th>
<th>**Total 18+</th>
<th>18+ Hispanic/ Latino</th>
<th>18+ Non Hispanic/ Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>26397</strong></td>
<td><strong>3149</strong></td>
<td><strong>23248</strong></td>
<td><strong>20006</strong></td>
<td><strong>1795</strong></td>
<td><strong>18211</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates total population (all ages)

** Indicates total population of persons 18-years-old and older

Source: 2010 U.S. Census
Appendix I: Nebraska Voter Registration Application

### Nebraska Voter Registration Application

**Please Print**

1. Are you a citizen of the United States of America? Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Are you at least 18 years of age or will you be 18 years of age on or before the 1st Tuesday following the 1st Monday in November of this year? Yes ☐ No ☐

**If you checked "no" in response to either of the questions above: Do not complete this application.**

### 3. Personal Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>M Name/Ml</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Maiden Name (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nebraska Drivers Lic. #:</th>
<th>If non-last 4 digits SS #:</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Home ☐ Work ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If no numeric street or road address, provide directions from nearest town:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Dist:</th>
<th>County:</th>
<th>Inside city limits: Yes ☐ No ☐</th>
<th>If no, provide Section/Township/Range:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Party Affiliation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrat ☐</th>
<th>Republican ☐</th>
<th>Libertarian ☐</th>
<th>Non-Party ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note:** If you wish to vote in both partisan and non-partisan primary elections for state and local offices, you must indicate a political party affiliation on the registration application. If you register without a political party affiliation, you will receive only non-partisan ballots for state and local offices at the primary elections. If you register without a political party affiliation, you may vote in partisan primary elections for congressional offices.

### 6. Applicant's Oath

To the best of my knowledge and belief, I declare under penalty of perjury that I live in the State of Nebraska at the address provided in this application. I have not been convicted of a felony or, if convicted, it has been at least two years since I completed my sentence for the felony (including any parole term). I have not been officially found to be a non-citizen (in the sense I am a citizen of the United States).

**Important:** Any registrant who signs this application knowing that any of the information on the application is false shall be guilty of a Class IV felony under section 32-1302 of the statutes of Nebraska. The penalty for such a violation is up to 3 years in prison, a fine of up to $5,000.00 or both.

### 7. Registration taken by: Date Applicant Signed:

**I. General Instructions**

- **This application may be used to:**
  - Register to vote in Nebraska for the first time; and/or
  - Update or change your name, address, or party affiliation on your current Nebraska voter registration
- Upon completing the application, submit it to your local Election Office:
  - By personal delivery
  - By mail, personal messenger or personal agent
- To be eligible to vote in an election, your completed application must be:
  - Delivered in person prior to 6:00 PM on the second Tuesday preceding the election in which you wish to vote
  - Delivered by personal messenger or personal agent on or before the 3rd Tuesday preceding the election in which you wish to vote
- Must be mailed postmarked or on or before the 3rd Tuesday preceding the election in which you wish to vote
- Upon receipt of this application, the County Election Office will send an acknowledgement to you indicating whether your voter registration is complete.

### II. Completing the Voter Registration Application

- Answer questions 1 and 2; continue to complete the application only if you answered yes to both questions.
- Complete sections 3, 4, and 5. Incomplete applications will result in your voter registration application being rejected or delayed.
- Read the entire form and confirm the information you provided by signing and dating the application in section 6.
- Failure to accurately complete, sign and date the application delays determining your eligibility to vote until such time as the application is complete.

### III. Special Instructions for Registering by Mail

- If you are submitting this form by mail, and you are registering in Nebraska for the first time, please provide a copy of:
  - Your current and valid photo identification, or
  - A current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or other government document that verifies your name and residence address as shown on this application.
- Providing the above identification documentation along with your mail-in registration at the time you register will enable you to avoid identification requirements when voting for the first time in Nebraska.
- When submitting this form by mail, and if necessary, an envelope for the copy of valid identification please use the appropriate address found on the back.

---

152
References


154


Sletto, B. (Ed.). (2008). El Rincón de los Olvidados: Métodos para el estudio de riesgo y vulnerabilidad en asentamientos precarios. Retrieved from The School of


