



Migration Jalisco-United States: An Initiative of Building Broader Communities in the Americas

This is a translated excerpt from the 2018 mapping project report:

Migración Jalisco-Estados Unidos: Iniciativa construyendo comunidades más amplias en las Américas

By Corporativa de Fundaciones, Guadalajara, Jalisco Mexico

Translated by CCA in 2021 with support from the Charles S. Mott Foundation

Prologue

This research came about from the need to identify information that permits community foundations to design programs, policies, and support systems for the migrant population between the United States and the state of Jalisco, Mexico. As the first step of a broader project, *Corporativa de Fundaciones* worked with the *Laboratorio de Estudios Económicos y Sociales* (LEES) to identify and characterize people emigrating from Jalisco in the U.S. and locate nonprofits in both countries that support them. The medium-term goal is to strengthen regional ties between those that send and receive migrants for increased economic, political, and social cooperation. Based on connections between the various key stakeholders in each country, it will be possible to plan actions together and find solutions to common problems.

In the initiative Connecting Communities in the Americas (formerly BBKA), the belief is that community foundations can play a meaningful role in developing stronger regional connections, but to achieve that they need to involve new stakeholders in local and transnational community development, both as active participants and social investors (philanthropists). They also need to deepen their understanding about local demographics and transnational relationships, as well as learn about best practices and strategies from other community foundations.

The purpose of this study is to provide the basis for this collaboration by generating information that will permit community involvement in common actions, identifying solutions to common problems, and making international connections. Through the characterization of different migrant groups, it will be possible to design programs, policies, and systems that help to meet their needs. Identifying connections between the migrant communities in the United States and their places of origin, local governments and the rest of Latin America, will allow for the construction of cooperative economic, political, and social networks that foster migrant wellbeing and community development.

Introduction

This project is directly related to Goal 17 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) for 2030 in that it is meant to collect information that can be used to generate alliances between local governments, the private sector, and civil society, with the intention of mobilizing, redirecting, and using the resources that help us to achieve SDG. It is also related to Target 7 of Goal 10, which is to “facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies” (U.N., 2015).

By identifying migrant communities from Jalisco in the U.S. and their communities of origin, we can create alliances and binational communities. In this way, migrant support groups become fundamental stakeholders for strengthening these populations and their relationships.

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA) reported that Mexico is the country with the second highest level of temporary or permanent emigrants and calculated that in 2017 there were approximately 13 million Mexicans living abroad, of which about 12 million were in the United States (UN-DESA, 2017). This is due partly to the geographical position of the two countries and their respective development. Mexico is a developing country with high levels of unemployment and important issues with violence, while the United States is a developed country with work opportunities that don't exist in Mexico and with a more stable economy and society (Pew Research Center, n.d.).

Still, in trying to identify factors that make Jalisco one of the states with the highest numbers of emigrants, its geographical proximity is not the principal factor. Rather, the fact that it lies on one of the most important train routes that has led to strong commercial ties between Mexico and the United States better explains the high levels of migration to its neighboring country (Sandoval, 2017). Migration to the north began long before the Bracero program that was implemented in 1942 (CONAPO, 2012).

Because of this, the prevalence of Jalisco organizations in the U.S. is no surprise. In Chicago there are organizations composed of people from the towns of Mezquitic, Buenavista, San Miguel del Alto and Tecmatlán, and whose primary interests are to maintain the connection to their places of origin and maintain their traditions. Like those in Chicago, there are also clubs, associations and federations in Dallas, Denver, El Paso, Fresno, Indianapolis, Kansas, and other cities that promote and maintain *jalisciense* identity in the United States while facilitating economic and social development in their towns of origin. Nevertheless, many of these organizations are limited in resources, information, and mechanisms for more effective work in their home communities.

In addition to describing the general characteristics of migrants through this study, our goal is also to identify the primary places of residence of *jaliscienses* in the United States and their places of origin. An important part of this exercise is finding the location of existing organizations and the activities that they carry out to maintain their identity or connections to their hometowns.

It is important to mention that this is primarily an exploratory and descriptive study meant to provide the basis for further work. This implies the mapping of the organizations and characterization of migrants - not an easy task due to lack of reliable data. Still, we used national and international databases to identify their general characteristics.

I. Migration from Mexico to the United States

The United States has been the primary destination country for global migration for some time and has more immigrants than any other country. The largest group within the United States is from Mexico, comprising the largest migration corridor worldwide (Serrano, González y Ambrocio, 2014). In 2013, 28 percent of all immigrants in the U.S. were Mexican. It is estimated that in 2014 there were already 11.5 million immigrants from Mexico, matched by equal numbers of second and third generation immigrants (Serrano, González y Ambrocio, 2014). Of the total, only one third has U.S. citizenship.

Mexico is the principal source of undocumented immigration into the United States. According to Pew Research Center estimates, there were approximately 5.9 million illegal immigrants in 2012 and today, the Migration Policy Institute estimates 6.2 million (n.d.).

The factors that most starkly influence emigration of Mexicans going to the United States continue to be differences in the development levels of the two countries, the lack of work opportunities and of social mobility, as well as social issues that translate into various forms of instability. Historically, the United States has been considered a developed country with work opportunities that do not exist in Mexico and with higher levels of economic and social stability.

This perception, along with improved communication between migrants, the strengthening of social networks, salary differences between the two countries, as well as knowledge about the labor markets, routes for migration and mechanisms for crossing the border, have all made migration both more attractive and possible. According to the *Emif-Norte* in Mexico, most of the respondents who had migrated to the United States at some point (70%) reported that their quality of life had increased overall, even when they were not able to return there to work or live (32% and 27%, respectively, Colegio de la Frontera Norte, 2016).

Despite this perception and the context of migration to the United States, between the years 2000 and 2015 the primary direction of this flow began to reverse (Cohn, 2018). The increased security at the border and the economic recession in the United States made crossing the border more of a challenge than staying in the United States. The cost of hiring a *coyote*, or immigrant smuggler, increased considerably, as well as the time needed to find work in the U.S.

The Migration Pendulum

In his book titled *Historia Mínima de la Migración México-Estados Unidos* [Brief History of Mexico-United States Migration], Durand identifies six stages or periods that characterize the migration flow and “tend to mark pendular movements of opening and closing” (2016: 22).

The first stage was named the “attraction stage” from 1884 to 1920. During this time, migration resulted from recruitment campaigns for the nascent area of temporary rural agricultural work and became an international call. The Exclusion laws for Chinese and Japanese immigration and the First World War opened the opportunity for Mexicans to enter, precisely while the Mexican Revolution became a push factor.

Durand named the period from 1921 to 1941 the phase of “deportations, re-closing and massive migration,” characterized by the economic crisis in 1929 and its subsequent massive deportations of

Mexican immigrants due to general unemployment levels in the United States. At this same time the first policy of repatriation was promoted in Mexico.

The Bracero program became the third period of migration flow from 1942 to 1964. This program was characterized by the recruitment of Mexicans by the United States to fulfill labor needs while men were fighting during World War II and was supported by a bilateral agreement representing a legal, rural, male-focused, and temporal pattern. The author calls it an “ideal type” of migration for both countries (Durante, 2016: 143). A notable negative result of the program was the movement of undocumented workers, or “wetbacks,” because the program did not satisfy greater demand and there was bureaucratic corruption on both sides of the border. In the early 1960s and due to internal pressures, the United States ended the program unilaterally.

Durand calls the years from 1965 to 1986 “the era of the undocumented”, as Mexican immigrants and their networks began to supply the U.S. labor market despite a lack of a defined migration policy. At this time, “being Mexican meant being undocumented” (Durand, 2016: 163) and U.S. policy was based on containment at the borders, while U.S. businesses hired migrants under the table.

This period resulted in a diversification of the age, gender, social-economic and cultural origins of undocumented Mexicans. It also led to competition between workers from Central America, South America, and the Caribbean, reinforcing the idea that the United States was losing control of its borders.

“The bipolar era of amnesty and assault” from 1987 to 2007 was characterized by intentions to regulate the flow of people and expel Mexican immigrants. The author mentions four moments here: The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, the control of operations of 1993, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 and the creation of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Homeland Security Act following September 11, 2001. One could say that, while businesses of legalized Mexican immigrants and their participation in union politics increased during a time of amnesty, so did legal and political aggression against the undocumented population.

In the last phase, called the “battle for migration reform” from 2007 to 2014, Durand suggests a new migration model based on three perspectives: migratory, economic, and legal, which indicate a new tendency toward decreasing net flows (more returning emigrants and immigration into Mexico than emigration itself. The migratory changes had to do with the idea that before, the problem was crossing the border, not staying in the United States, while now “there are millions who have been undocumented for ten, fifteen or twenty years and who see deportation as an ongoing threat” (Durand, 2016: 245). The economic changes were explained by a surplus of Mexican labor, competition from Central American migration, inflation, risks in crossing the border, and a lower flow of remittances following the 2008 economic crisis. Finally, legal changes consisted of a combination of institutional measures taken to regulate and control illegal immigration.

Significant changes are not expected in migration trends at the time of this report (2018). Factors that are negatively influencing the flow from south to north are the anti-immigration executive orders by the U.S. president, changes in legislation and the implementation of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), the suspension of Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA), and the general rejection of immigrants.

Places of origin of the migrant population

There are two ways to get an updated estimate of the migrant security consular registrations in the United States by the Institute of Mexican in the Exterior (IME in Spanish); the second is from the National Survey of Occupation and Employment (*Encuesta Nacional de Ocupación y Empleo*, or ENOE).

The first offers information about Mexicans who have registered with their consulates between 2011 and 2016. This allows one to know the municipality of origin and the ten primary states of origin for migrants: Michoacán, Guerrero, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Puebla, Oaxaca, Mexico City, Veracruz, Estado de México and San Luis Potosí. The state with the most emigrants is Michoacán, based on the higher number of consular registrations and the greatest number of residents reported to live elsewhere. The ENOE reports that the states of Guanajuato, Tamaulipas, San Luis Potosí, and Estado de México had the greatest levels of migration in 2018.

Migration Intensity

Another way to analyze migration is by the level of intensity. The National Population Council (CONAPO in Mexico) has calculated the rate of intensity of migration from Mexico to the United States since 2002, considering the demographics and socio-economic characteristics of international migration.

Methodologically, the index captures and summarizes four aspects of migration between Mexico and the United States. This census includes information about:

- households that receive remittances (family-to-family income from abroad),
- households with members who emigrated to the United States from 2005-2010 and who continue to live there at the time of the census,
- households with members who emigrated to the United States, returned to the country between 2005-2010 (circular migrants) and who reside in Mexico at the time of the census, and
- households with members who had lived in the United States in 2005 and returned to live in Mexico before the census of 2010 (returned migrants).

This index captures the intensity rather than the volume of migration. It also uses the household as the basis for analysis and not the number of people living in each home. It is an important indicator because it presents migration dynamics, not only on the state level but also in municipalities and with comparative data from the year 2000. In this way, it allows the identification of federal and state migration data over time...The municipalities with the highest levels of emigration per household in 2010 were in the states of Chihuahua, Guanajuato, Michoacán, Baja California, Puebla, Guerrero, Durango, and Jalisco (CONAPO, 2012).

Forms of Migration

Despite the large number of undocumented immigrants in the United States, most of the people crossing the border do so with the required permission. Even without a work visa, they are searching for ways to survive and generally can get support from friends or family members (COLEF, et.al., 2016). During interviews with EMIF-Norte (2016), 53 per cent of the participants reported having crossed the border for the first time without documentation and with the intention to find work.

In a country with strict (migration) policies, the most common way to enter the country legally is as a tourist or for temporary residency and then to stay beyond the time of the visa. The method for arriving in

the country depends on several factors, but primarily on the local legislation of the entry point, existing support networks and financial resources of the migrant. With this in mind, one can generalize three primary forms of entry to the United States: with a temporary work or study permit, with a tourist visa or without documentation. Once having crossed the border, individuals stay either legally or illegally.

II. Migration from Jalisco in the National Context

Even though Jalisco is one of the states with the largest contributions to the GDP in Mexico (INEGI, 2017), it is also one of the top four states from which migrants leave to live in the United States, despite changes in the intensity migration index for that state.

There have also been important changes on a municipal level. For example, in 2000 Mezquitic was the only municipality with a high intensity of migration, while ten years later the intensity was characterized as low.

These changes have to do with general characteristics of the municipalities in Jalisco. Even though the state itself has a human development index (HDI) slightly higher than the national average (74.03), many of the municipalities within the state have HDI ratings lower than those of Sub-Saharan Africa or Haiti. These contrasts are due to several factors, including differences in income and education levels.

The National Institute for Statistics and Geography (INEGI in Mexico) estimated that in 2014 there were 19,841 *jalisenses* – or people from Jalisco - living in the United States. In the same year, however, there were 77,439 consular registrations from Jalisco in the United States. Combining this date gives an idea of an approximate number of migrants living north of the border, despite lack of current data. For this study, the most important thing is to identify the municipalities with the highest levels of migration from Jalisco in the United States, thus the emphasis on consular registrations.

Primary Destinations

Most consular registrations in 2011-2016 were in California and 58 percent of the *jalisenses* reside near the Mexican consulate in Los Angeles.

Even with the primary locations being California, Texas and Illinois, there are Mexicans concentrated in smaller areas, often arriving at places where there are people from their hometowns. Especially in the case of undocumented immigrants, they are dependent on support networks where family or other hometown members are based.

An example of *jalisense* presence in Illinois is the proclamation of “Jalisco Day” and “Guadalajara Day,” which took place in Elgin, Cicero, Chicago, Evanston and Melrose Park in September of 2017.

It is important to mention, however, that the information received from the consular registrations is not precise since, as we retrieved during the interviews, many (perhaps even the majority) of the migrants that are in the United States without previous experience or for the first time are not aware of the existence and advantage of consular registration.

Still, the information available and mentioned above can help to locate the various groups of immigrants. Those regions identified through consular registrations are not very different from those highlighted during the 2012 election. In that year, most Mexican votes abroad were in California (34%), Texas (19%), Illinois (19%), Florida (8%), New York (7%), Arizona (6%), Georgia (4%), Nevada (3%), North Carolina (3%) and New Jersey (2%), and of those, 14 percent of the votes were from *jaliscienses* immigrants or descendants (IFE, 2012).

A similar phenomenon exists with the places of origin. Even though there are not precise or current data about the principal places of birth of the migrants, one can identify those with the largest numbers of emigrants by piecing together various sources of information.

Finally, an important source of information come from remittances sent from the United States to Mexico. Despite being questioned, this method allows for the location of places that have the most connection and flow of money with its neighboring country, which also presents opportunities for participation in commercial and community projects.

The flow of remittances from the United States to Mexico between 2000 and 2006, one observes an increasing trend despite some dips. This information, as well as general characteristics of economic activities in the municipalities and the existence of migrant organizations, helps to identify which places have organizations that help to channel resources to the communities of origin.

The Migrant Communities: Places of Origin

Although determining the places of origin and destiny of the many migrants between Mexico and the United States presents a challenge, there are some municipalities whose census records and national and international survey data show to have greater numbers of emigrants.

The municipalities that are identified in this study are those that have at least three of the following characteristics:

- 1) They were at the top of the list of consular registrations between 2011 and 2016.
- 2) They had the highest rate of migration intensity in 2010.
- 3) They had a migrant club registered with the *Observatorio de Migración Internacional* in 2016.
- 4) They receive the majority of remittances.
- 5) They participated in the federal 3x1 program at least once in 2013 and 2014.

This information is complemented with that of sister cities and participation in the 2012 elections.

Using these guidelines, we were able to identify 19 municipalities in Jalisco as having a significant movement of emigrants: Guadalajara, Lagos de Moreno, La Barca, Zapopan, Tepatitlán de Morelos, Arandas, Ocotlán, Ameca, Autlán de Navarro, Atotonilco el Alto, Tamazula de Gordiano, Encarnación de Díaz, Teocaltiche, Tala, Yahualica de González Gallo, Ojuelos de Jalisco, Cuautla, Cañadas de Obregón y Mexxicacán. In some cases, it was even possible to identify the towns with the highest levels of migration.

It is important to state that this group of municipalities does not represent all the migrants from Jalisco to the United States, but a selection that is limited by existing official databases. The objective is to identify an initial list that can lead to field work that in the future can analyze the magnitude of migration and the organizational capacity.

(Information in Spanish on each of the 19 municipalities is found in the original report *Migración Jalisco-Estado Unidos*).

III. The Possibility of Connecting Broader Communities in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals

Identifying the places of origin and destination of migrants provides the basis for establishing binational groups that help to improve conditions in the communities of origin, guaranteeing better well-being for immigrants in the United States and add meaning to being a migrant for both sides of the border.

Each one of these groups acts in a distinct way for the well-being of migrants and in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), so identifying how they do this could help them use their resources more effectively. As the first exercise in classification, we can define them according to areas of action: basic rights and livelihood, labor rights and conditions, well-being (in terms of education, healthcare and community living), economic inclusion and civic or political participation (political rights and citizenship concerns). This exercise provides for easy identification of the areas of influence of each organization, depending on the need that it attempts to meet.

If considered as a pyramid, at the base are those organizations that work to secure the basic rights to life and identity of migrants. Next is the right to work in dignified conditions and, ideally, conditions that are similar to the rest of the population in that place. As part of the process of empowerment and the search for well-being are the access to public goods and services such as education, healthcare and living in community. Then is support for economic activities and entrepreneurship, which implies possibilities for self-employment and gaining wealth. Finally, there is the most complex level at the top, which is the exercise of political rights (civil action and policy), participation in public issues and, eventually, the right to residence and citizenship.

In this process we have identified three stages of adaptation. In the first are those who cross the border without documentation and with very little security. They pay *coyotes* or do not have a support network that can receive them, so during the first period in the United States they need to search for ways to survive. In this stage, charity organizations play a very important part to provide food, water, and housing.

Finding work becomes indispensable for longer term subsistence. Many groups in society are dedicated to the defense of immigrant rights and aid in finding work, while others go further to facilitate legal status and improve working conditions, even in an illegal manner.

At the higher level of the pyramid are the organizations that promote the social integration of immigrants in respect to political rights and citizenship. Generally, this type of group associates with those who are already more stable and promotes participation in places where there is a high concentration of immigration.

Not all immigrants require support beginning at the bottom of the pyramid. Some arrive with work that allows them to participate in defending their rights or have enough stability to begin their own businesses.

All this support is related in one way or another to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). One of the primary reasons for migrating is the search for better conditions of life, which one could argue is one of the ways to reach Objective One: *Putting a stop to poverty*. The organizations that facilitate, at least temporarily, to guarantee the right to food, clean water and sanitation, even though they do not achieve *zero hunger* (SDG 2) or *clean water and sanitation* (SDG 6), do make a contribution toward those efforts.

Helping migrants to find dignified work with appropriate working conditions, as well as offering training or support for entrepreneurship contribute to SDG 8: *Decent work and economic growth*. Organizations that promote access to education and healthcare, as well as community welfare for groups of *jaliscienses* in our neighboring country contribute to SDG 3: *Health and wellbeing* and SDG 4: *Quality of education*. When particular care is taken to ameliorate differences between men and women, it contributes to SDG 5: *Gender equality*. Fostering political participation and citizenship programs has to do with SDG 16: *Peace, justice and strong institutions*. All of the social and economic progress that can be achieved with support from these organizations and contributes to securing housing and basic services that are safe and affordable, as well as conserving cultural patrimony of communities of origin, also contributes to SDG 11: *Making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable*.

The Bridges: Migrant Organizations in the United States

The circular nature of migration and the increasing permanence of Mexicans in the United States has led to the formation of increasingly stronger and more extensive networks and connections, favoring the formalization of migrant organizations that seek to maintain their culture in the United States and support the communities of origin where family members are still present. In this way, the organizations have become a support mechanism to help migrants adapt and strengthen cohesion in the United States (Escala-Rabadán, 2014), while promoting development in their communities of origin.

Many of the organizations have been consolidated into federations which, at the same time, has given them visibility as important stakeholders on both sides of the border. At the same time, the network has extended through connections with groups and individuals who are not necessarily from the community or country of origin, yet directly or indirectly help to strengthen the organization.

People organizing themselves began to develop during the 1970s with the first generations of immigrants in the United States, whose main activities were cultural and recreational. They did not connect with other stakeholders to support their home communities, yet today some of the organizations have started to work in this way and have joined migrant clubs. These were the forerunners of the hometown associations, were common in the 1990s, and were formed before the Mexican government 3x1 program for migrants existed. With the initiation of this program, groups of emigrants began to create federations in order to participate (Acosta, 2017 and then, clubs generally formed by the municipal governments were also founded in the communities of origin to solicit funds from the 3x1 program as a source of income for the community.

Unfortunately, political interests that exist in the federations and migrant clubs have made their sustainability and connection between communities challenging, and many of those registered with the IME in 2016 and mentioned in municipal documents no longer exist. However, knowing of their existence is important since they can serve as a prior context for new binational projects.

Organizations and support programs for migrants in Mexico

It is hardly possible to understand all the possibilities and advantages of establishing broader communities if we do not consider the support that returning migrants in Mexico receive or the initiatives through which they share these objectives. There is aid from the government that, in addition to making the return less difficult, help to maintain contact and connections between groups. There are also foundations that work with the objective to build bridges of understanding and collaboration. Here we offer some examples of these initiatives which, together with the previous analysis, helps us to identify areas of opportunity.

It is important to mention that, just as is the case with the migrant clubs, these are not the only existing programs or organizations, but serve as examples of best practices that are being used particularly in the case of migrants in Jalisco.

a) The purpose of the *Programa Paisano* (Countryman Program) is to protect the migrant who is returning to Mexico. It seeks to lessen cases of maltreatment, extortion, theft and corruption that they may be exposed to when they enter the country. This program began in the 1980s with the participation of social, corporate, political, and religious organizations that were pressuring the Mexican government to begin the effort. The primary objective is to secure dignified and legal treatment of those who enter, are in transit, or leave the country.

Primary services include informing and disseminating data about the satisfaction of obligations and rights, protecting physical and property rights, sensitizing and training public servants and civil society, and attending to complaints and claims (INM, 2018).

b) *Somos Mexicanos* (We are Mexicans) gives integrated attention to those who have returned, either voluntarily or by force, and focuses on the process of both returning and reintegration. Since many people arrive in situations of grief and vulnerability, this program offers food services and medical checks, as well as a repatriation certificate, which serves as a basic identification document. They also collect valuable information about the profile of each person and offer telephone services with family members and three months of basic health insurance (*Seguro Popular*). In addition, they provide local and long-distance travel so that migrants can get to their hometowns. When necessary, they also refer migrants to shelters.

Social and professional reintegration of those who are repatriated in their hometowns is done in three ways: orientation, connections, and accompaniment. Through the verification of technical or professional abilities, options for work are sought in the 291 businesses that support this program in Jalisco. The origin of the program was *Yo soy México* (I am Mexico), a program funded by the Charles Stewart Mott (Mott) Foundation from 2010-2016.

c) The MATT Foundation (*Mexicanos y Americanos Todos Trabajando* - All Mexicans and Americans Working) promotes economic development through collaboration between the two countries and supports the development and integration of migrants in the United States. Their projects currently address four of the Sustainable Development Goals: better health (SDG 3), education (SDG 4), economic development (SDG 8) and reducing inequalities (SDG 10).

d) The Center for Migrant Rights is a nonprofit that promotes rights in labor, economy, society, culture and environment, in addition to human rights. It works with communities of origin and destination, not only in Jalisco but in diverse states on a national level.

e) *Necahual México* is a nonprofit that works with returning migrants and their families in Juanacatlán, El Salto, Atequiza, Tlajomulco de Zúñiga and Tonalá. Their areas of attention are emotional health, legal consulting, family unity and family violence.

f) The purpose of *Osati-Trámites Migratorios* (Osati-Migratory Procedures) is to offer consulting in migratory transactions to go to the United States. Their members give talks in various municipalities about the important points to consider during the migration process, and work with communities of origin, returned migrants and families that stay. Their primary locations of service in the state are Jamay, Guadalajara, Jalostotitlán and Acatic.

g) The Technological Institute and of Advanced Studies of the West (ITESO in Spanish) has two projects with migrants in Zapotlanejo through the Program for Migration Affairs at the Center for Research and Social Capacity Building. The project “Woman and family migrants in Zapotlanejo, Jalisco” supports the emotional health of families of migrants through an integrative model that focuses on economic and social development and political skills. The project “Model of social intervention for transnational migrant families and communities in Jalisco” addresses the negative effects of migration through participative evaluation (ITESO, 2016).

h) The nonprofit *Tú y yo en sinergia* (You and I in Synergy) works in various areas to promote personal development, savings and awareness about identity, culture, and migration. It fosters connections through the Jesuit networks with Central and North American migrants and the Network of Equity of Gender and Migration. They work with families of migrants in the communities of origin.

IV. Planning the Way Forward

The experience of governments and nonprofit organizations has demonstrated over time that it is not possible to establish strong connections with communities when they do not know each other. It is even more difficult to take advantage of the full potential of resources that Mexican migrants and their descendants send for the development of their home communities. For this reason, it is important to locate and get to know them (Agunias & Newland, 2012). This is the primary objective of this work.

From this analysis, we can conclude that the patterns of migration and the primary communities of origin have changed over time. There is still a need to go deeper into the characteristics of the diaspora. Still, this first approximation allows us to move on to the next stage: building confidence between the various groups and connecting stakeholders for the benefit of the communities on both sides of the border.

When you build trust and connections, it is possible to move on to the next step in the process of integration of the diaspora in investing in the communities of origin, which means offering capacity building and resources, as well as materials and skills within the groups of migrants, nonprofits, and governments (Agunias & Newland, 2012). This is the work that still needs to be done.

From this first mapping project we can make a number of generalizations about migrant groups and support organizations in Mexico and the United States, which can then help for future decision making, in particular in respect to the interest in taking advantage of resources that a broader community can contribute to development.

1. The patterns of migration have changed. Those who migrate from Jalisco are not the poorest, from the most marginalized communities or with the lowest levels of education. Today, young people migrate with the money to do it, with higher levels of education than their predecessors and, above all, from urban areas. Every day, more professionals try to establish themselves in the United States, yet do not disconnect from their places of origin; some even maintain two workspaces - one in Mexico and the other across the border. Among those with high incomes, the possibility to send their children to study for a few years has become an important way of accumulating human capital, even when the family is temporarily divided, with the father working in Mexico and the mother and children in the United States.
2. Migration is not a random process. In rural areas, those who migrate are the healthier ones with higher skill levels than others in their communities and in some regions of Jalisco, migration is related to social norms that push young people to migrate at a certain age. Many migrants cross the border with the hope of obtaining a job and higher wages, and those who are most successful, have higher levels of education and incomes tend to be more mobile. Neither the poorest nor those with the best economic and work conditions go. The data suggests that migration happens primarily in areas that are less marginalized and with fewer social limitations.
3. Lower costs of migration, expanded social networks, and differences in salaries and wages between the two countries maintain the attraction to the United States, even when the risks of crossing without documentation are higher than before.
4. In addition to the difficulties faced during the process of migration, those who go to live in the United States legally or illegally are met with, in many cases, strong attitudes of rejection that do not ease the entrance into or permanence in the country.
5. The circular and temporary character of migration has lessened bit by bit. Today there are more migrants who establish themselves permanently in the United States. This situation creates important changes in the demographic composition of some cities, and the proportion of Mexicans to the total population in places like California and Texas continues to grow.
6. In addition to being a state with high levels of migration, Jalisco is also a transit route for thousands of migrants from Central America who are on their way to the United States. This has made Mexico a reference point for migrants from other countries, where they will stay temporarily or return to if deported.
7. California, Illinois, Michigan, Texas and Wisconsin are the primary destination states of *jaliscienses* and the fifteen most popular destination cities are Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, San Bernardino, Sacramento, Fresno, San Jose, Las Vegas, Dallas, Santa Ana, Houston, Atlanta, Salt Lake City, Portland and Denver.

8. Even if not strongly organized, the presence of migrant federations and clubs in California, Illinois, Texas, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, New Mexico, Arkansas, Missouri, Indiana, and North Carolina confirm the importance of these areas for the people from Jalisco.
9. The possibility to maintain connections between groups on both sides of the border, whether by informal networks or organized programs, allows the communities of origin to access scientific and technical knowledge and skills in ways not otherwise possible (Agunias & Newland, 2012).
10. Although it hasn't been possible to precisely measure the impact that groups of migrants have on their places of origin, the benefits of remittances, direct investment, transfer of human capital, donations and tourism are undeniable.
11. Migrant clubs are formed with the purpose of supporting the organization of migrants in the United States and promoting social investments in the places of origin. Most are not grassroots groups with many years of existence. In a few cases, the clubs form with already existing groups, yet for this reason are not considered to be strong organizations.
12. Despite the benefits of the Mexican 3x1 Program and the fact that it required migrant clubs, the most marginalized communities have not always benefitted from the program. Usually, the opposite happens. Since the program required a certain amount of organization and local mobility, people from areas with the poorest conditions of legality, economic stability, health, or social networks have been the ones to take the longest to get support in the United States and have tended to live largely isolated (Acosta, 2017).
13. The municipalities in Jalisco that received the most in remittances in 2017, in absolute numbers, were Tonalá, Zapopan, El Salto, Tomatlán, Villa Corona, Guadalajara, Zapotán, Zapotiltic, Arandas and Tlaquepaque. In respect to the total population: Villa Guerrero (43%), Atenguillo (25%), Villa Corona (22%), Mazamitla (13%) and Tomatlán (11%).
14. New migration policies affect people in very important ways, especially for families that are separated. The DACA program no longer has the necessary reach to allow undocumented migrant students to finish their studies. Deportations have increased, many of which have included minors travelling unaccompanied. This and the rise of anti-immigrant attitudes in the United States have led people to fear deportations even more.
15. Given the size of the city, it is not surprising that Guadalajara is the municipality with the most migrants and, for the same reason, with the highest number of organizations in the United States. The rate of migratory intensity is not high because in relative terms, there are not many migrants. However, in absolute numbers, Guadalajara is the primary place of origin for migrants from Jalisco.
16. The municipalities that have been chosen in this study to focus further analysis on are Lagos de Moreno, La Barca, Zapopan, Tepatitlán de Morelos, Arandas, Ocotlán, Ameca, Autlán de Navarro, Atotonilco, Tamazula, Encarnación de Díaz, Teocaltiche, Tala, Yahualica de González Gallo, Ojuelos, Cuautla, Cañadas de Obregón and Mexxicacán (full descriptions in the original report).

17. The support organizations for migrants in the United States can be classified into three large groups: a) defense of migrant human rights, b) support for access to work, education, health and higher quality of life, and c) political participation and civil rights.

Conclusion

This study has allowed us to locate *jalisciense* migrants and identify their main characteristics, which has then led us to have a clearer idea as to where they come from and who they are. This will open the possibility of measuring how well organizations can “build bridges and lower walls.”

We have been able to identify and better understand support organizations for migrants, especially those organizations that are in destinations where *jaliscienses* live. Lastly, we have identified some forms of assistance to migrants in Mexico as well as in the United States.

We still need to go deeper into the characteristics of the various stakeholders and the resources that each one can contribute toward the communities on both sides of the border.

It is necessary to begin establishing new ways of connecting between the two countries, fostering engagement between the community foundations and Mexican communities in the United States, and working with U.S. foundation to help them understand *jalisciense* migrants better, how they think and who they are. This would help to build a stronger base for collaboration.

We have identified some municipalities that we consider important to look at more deeply. Yahualica de González Gallo, aside from being a city with a long history of migration, has organized migrant clubs. Based on our information, we were able to locate an organized town called Huisquilco, which is relatively close in proximity to Guadalajara and thus easier to work with. We would need more fieldwork to verify the importance of the community as a place of origin for *jalisciense* migrant organization in the United States, but based on the lower number of households, it would be easy to carry out and provide the information that is needed for further work with the migrants.

Cañadas de Obregón is another municipality that is strongly organized. There are several migrant clubs and their participation in the 3x1 Program is already underway.

Over the past years, the level of organization by migrant groups from Juanacatlán has increased in Chicago. Even though Chicago does not have the most consular registrations and is not the city with the highest level of migration intensity, it is known for the activities organized by the migrants from Juanacatlán. This is shown both by the actions of the Midwest Federation of Jalisco and of the Necahual México organization in their hometown.

Despite philanthropic organizations showing more interest in participating in development projects every day (Agunias & Newland, 2012), there is little that has been done in this way and identifying organizations and connections to groups of migrants interested in promoting community well-being still needs to be done.

References

- Acosta, T. (2017). "El papel de los clubes de migrantes en el desempeño del Programa 3x1 en el estado de Jalisco". Tesis de maestría en Políticas Públicas. Universidad de Guadalajara.
- Agunias, D. y K. Newland (2012). *Developing a Road Map for Engaging Diasporas in Development. A Handbook for Policymakers and Practitioners in Home and Host Countries*. Ginebra: International Organization for Migration and the Migration Policy Institute.
- Colegio de la Frontera Norte (2016). *Encuesta sobre Migración en la Frontera Norte de México, Emif-Norte*. Mexico City.
- CONAPO, Consejo Nacional de Población. (2016). *Índices de intensidad migratoria México-Estados Unidos 2010*. Retrieved from http://conapo.gob.mx/swb/CONAPO/Indices_de_intensidad_migratoria_Mexico-Estados_Unidos_2010
- Durand, J. (2016). *Historia mínima de la migración México-Estados Unidos*. Ciudad de México: El Colegio de México.
- Escala-Rabadán, L. (2014). "Asociaciones de inmigrantes mexicanos en Estados Unidos: Logros y desafíos en tiempos recientes. *Desacatos*" , 46: 52-69.
- IFE, Instituto Federal Electoral (2012). *Informe final del voto de los mexicanos residentes en el extranjero. Proceso electoral federal 2011-2012*. Ciudad de México: IFE.
- INEGI, Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (2014). *Encuesta Nacional de la Dinámica Demográfica (Enadid) 2014. Tabulados básicos*. Aguascalientes: INEGI, disponible en: <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/enadid/2014/>
- INEGI, Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (2017). *PIB y cuentas nacionales*. PIB-Entidad Federativa, anual, disponible en: <http://www.inegi.org.mx/est/contenidos/proyectos/cn/pibe/>
- INM, Instituto Nacional de Migración (2018). *Programa Paisano*, disponible en: <https://www.gob.mx/paisano>
- ITESO, Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Occidente (2016). *Directorio de organizaciones participantes en el encuentro Comunidades Transnacionales. Fortaleciendo Nuestras Experiencias*. Disponible en: https://blogs.iteso.mx/comunidadesmigrantes/files/2017/06/DirectorioONGs-ComunidadesMigrantes_.pdf
- Pew Research Center (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.pewresearch.org/>
- Serrano, C., J. González y R. Ambrocio (2014). *Anuario de migración y remesas, México 2015*. Ciudad de México: Fundación BBVA Bancomer, AC/Conapo.
- Tinajero, B. (2005). "Políticas migratorias en el estado de Zacatecas". Tesis de licenciatura en Relaciones Internacionales, ITAM.

UN-DESA, United States Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2017). *Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2017 Revision*. Population Division. International Migration. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates17.shtml>