

THE CHICKEN TRAIL

THE CHICKEN TRAIL

*Following Workers, Migrants, and
Corporations across the Americas*

KATHLEEN C. SCHWARTZMAN

ILR PRESS
AN IMPRINT OF
CORNELL UNIVERSITY PRESS
ITHACA AND LONDON

Copyright © 2013 by Cornell University

All rights reserved. Except for brief quotations in a review, this book, or parts thereof, must not be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher. For information, address Cornell University Press, Sage House, 512 East State Street, Ithaca, New York 14850.

First published 2013 by Cornell University Press

First printing, Cornell Paperbacks, 2013

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Schwartzman, Kathleen Crowley, 1948–

The chicken trail : following workers, migrants, and corporations across the Americas / Kathleen C. Schwartzman.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8014-5116-4 (cloth : alk. paper)

ISBN 978-0-8014-7809-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Chicken industry—United States. 2. Chicken industry—Mexico. 3. Foreign workers, Mexican—United States. 4. Unemployment—United States. 5. Unemployment—Mexico. 6. United States—Emigration and immigration. 7. Mexico—Emigration and immigration. 8. United States—Commerce—Mexico. 9. Mexico—Commerce—United States. I. Title.

HD9437.U62S49 2013

338.1'76500973—dc23 2012027611

Cornell University Press strives to use environmentally responsible suppliers and materials to the fullest extent possible in the publishing of its books. Such materials include vegetable-based, low-VOC inks and acid-free papers that are recycled, totally chlorine-free, or partly composed of nonwood fibers. For further information, visit our website at www.cornellpress.cornell.edu.

Cloth printing	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Paperback printing	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

The Chicken Trail, where the externalities of economic theory become the social problems of nations and the tragedies of individuals.

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
List of Abbreviations	xix
1. Why Follow Chickens?	1
2. Ethnic Succession in the South	15
3. Where Have All the Workers Gone?	30
4. Taylorism Invades the Hen House	53
5. Solving Industry Crises: <i>Pollos Y Polleros</i>	77
6. Squeezing Out Mexican Chicken	100
7. Voice: Squawking At Globalization	113
8. Exit Mexico: "Si Muero Lejos De Ti"	130
9. The Global Dilemma: Summary and Reflections	156

viii *Contents*

Notes	167
References	173
Index	195

PREFACE

The relationship between immigration and unemployment has become a particularly controversial topic in the United States. This book is about immigration and unemployment, but it is also about bi-national business restructuring and bi-national labor reorganization. *The Chicken Trail* ties them together. I have two goals in writing this book: first, to outline and analyze the causes and consequences of immigration; and second, to dispel some of the common beliefs about immigration by replacing them with a more historically nuanced sociological analysis. While I do not directly engage the current debate, I offer an alternative framework for understanding the perplexing realities of immigration. This I take to be the sociological mandate: to offer an analysis of how society works and to reflect on policy options. My hope is that those concerned with policy as well as students will find it useful.

I use metaphor of the chicken trail to investigate highly important patterns and transitions that affect America and the entire world. My framework folds the immigration story into the ongoing processes of U.S. and

Mexico labor reorganization and displacement, which it then connects to global transformations. The labor displacement and immigration stories become part of a twenty-first-century “Global Dilemma” and “American Dilemma.” The Global Dilemma is that in developing nations, as rural survival continues to be undermined by international trade, people attempt to alleviate their poverty by abandoning first the countryside and then their country. The American Dilemma is that economic transformations have left the United States with jobs that “nobody wants,” jobs that are shipped overseas, and jobs for which American workers are unqualified.

This book materialized out of several experiential and intellectual encounters. During visits to Alabama, U.S.A., and Sonora, Mexico, I was struck by the presence of unemployed young black men on the streets of Alabama and of ghost villages in Sonora. While America appears to have accepted growing populations of unemployed and imprisoned African Americans, it seems to be at war with, or at least ambivalent about, immigrants. The ambivalence I experienced in Arizona, currently a major thoroughfare for immigrant traffic and engulfed in a firestorm of contentious debate.

The Sonoran-Arizona desert is a space where the reality of immigration and climate interact. It is considered one of the most dangerous frontiers in the world. It is burning hot and inhabited by venomous species. It is also a place where immigrants are assaulted or abandoned by their coyotes (smugglers). Humanitarian groups, alarmed by the deaths of immigrants without documents trying to enter illegally through the Arizona desert, have launched ameliorative actions. Some set up water tanks and first aid stations (Arcs of Covenant); others offer Good Samaritan assistance on the immigrant trails. To publicize the hardships that immigrants endure trying to enter illegally without documentation, groups have organized marches tracing immigrant paths from the Mexican border towns to Tucson, Arizona. Immigrant-rights groups stress the number of Mexicans who die while trying to cross the desert from Mexico into Arizona (estimates of crossings begin at 2,000 per day and go up from there) or the tragedy of family separation when undocumented mothers are deported leaving behind “birthright citizen” children.

On the other side of the Arizona debate are groups advocating immigration restrictions. They are frequently characterized as mean-spirited,

unfair, “driven by hate,” or racists—some are even linked to national white-supremacy groups. Those who oppose immigration (with or without guest labor status) express concern over cultural conflicts as well as economic costs. Here one finds advocates of denying public goods (such as drivers’ licenses, free hospitalization, “in-state” university tuition, or birthright citizenship) to illegal immigrants. Some vigilante groups have attempted to stop illegal immigrant flows with border watches. The heated debate continues with bills such as Arizona Senate Bill 1070. Signed into law in April 2010, SB 1070 gave Arizona law enforcement the authority to stop people whom officers have “reasonable suspicion” of being in the country illegally, detain these individuals while verifying immigration status, and arrest undocumented immigrants for transfer to the custody of U.S. Immigration and Custom Enforcement (ICE). SB 1070 was followed by Arizona Senate and House bills passed in January and February 2011 to deny birthright citizenship to babies of undocumented parents born on U.S. soil.

I am frustrated by the immigration debate, which feeds into public policies that offer inadequate long-term solutions. Why? First, the debate is polarized between what some pejoratively call “racists” and “bleeding-heart liberals.” Battle lines are drawn in legislation, on the border, and also in the language of the debate. A perusal of immigrant-rights commentaries, for example, will reveal the attribution of “racism” to opponents. In 2007, Mexican President Felipe Calderón began a media campaign aimed at influencing American public opinion. The sentiment of many immigrant-rights groups is reflected in the quote of a Mexico City accountant who said, “They don’t treat the Russians or English or other white Europeans like that, and so for me they are a bunch of racists” (Schwartz 2007).

Labels are social constructs that emerge from political debates and carry an emotional charge, whether laudatory or pejorative. Some commentators have suggested, for example, that the very use of the term *anchor-baby* is hate speech. Polarization can also be found in the terms used to describe immigrants. Since U.S. government documents use a variety of labels, I adhere to the labels employed by the respective sources.¹ Apart from these, I interchange them to avoid alignment with any one political position.

Second, the debate is impaired by tunnel vision. The set of stakeholders is reduced to two: immigrants with supporters and those who would

restrict immigration. This oversimplified model must be expanded to include stakeholders such as businesses, governments, native workers, unions, and African Americans.

Third, each side “demonizes” the other. Certainly, there is no analytical value in denigrating immigrants, businesses, or those advocating limited immigration. Because this debate has become so contentious, it is important to differentiate analysis from slander. Facts should not be considered libelous. From an analytical perspective, it is more pragmatic to assume that each group of stakeholders (U.S. business owners, displaced workers, native citizens, and immigrants) lives within its respective institutional framework of incentives. In response to those incentives, they behave as rational actors and pursue their perceived best interests. Slander and sanctification are poor substitutes for analysis. The sociological contribution is to describe the complex intersection of multiple incentive frameworks. In short, this book is not intended to incriminate, “villainize,” or sanctify industries, individuals, or ethnic groups.

Set in the dichotomous frame of “humanitarians” versus “racists,” the debate cannot be resolved. Only by examining immigration in a wider context of labor and global changes do we have any chance of breaking through the heated, uncivil, divisive, and sometimes violent discussions. Chicken may seem like a weak analytical weapon, but the study of its production and distribution is well suited to depict the nexus of immigration, labor displacement, and globalization and to provide the foundation for a more grounded approach to immigration.

Why another book on immigration, on Mexico, on globalization, on poultry, on unions, on the plight of African Americans? Each has been the focus of considerable research, together totaling thousands of pages. Some of the work is single-issue research and some combines several topics. The challenge is to build on and extend that research. Excellent publications have detailed Mexico-U.S. migration: its origin, its destination, and the conditions that affect its flow, ranging from poverty in Mexico to U.S. border policies. Several large scale research programs (e.g., Marcelli and Cornelius 2001; Martinez 2007; Massey et al. 1994) have yielded multiple insights into migratory flows. Ethnic succession—one ethnic group stepping into the jobs or neighborhoods of another—in the southeastern United States has received substantial ethnographic and journalistic attention. Such work documents the arrival of Hispanic migrants in a region

that had not been a traditional migrant destination. Reports address the tensions of integration, competition with residents for jobs and services, and the actions of community and church members to bring Hispanics and blacks together (Swarns 2006a, 2006b).

The political and economic consequences of Mexico's ongoing global integration have been, and continue to be, the subject of extensive and multifaceted research. Authors document how global integration undermined PRI's political monopoly in Mexico (Castells and Laserna 1989); how corn and hog imports undercut Mexican producers (Oxfam 2003; Wise 2003); and how various agents of globalization (including the Mexican business community) encouraged the Mexican government to liberalize many of the previously controlled aspects of the economy (Gates 2009). Likewise, the U.S. poultry industry has been the unwilling target of many exposes by journalists, consumer advocates, and anthropologists. Salmonella in my soup describes how factory farms are fertile breeding grounds for microorganisms, especially salmonella (Bruce 1990), listeria infestations, and avian influenza. Inside the processing plants, the chilling tanks get special attention because they become so filthy that they are referred to as producing fecal soup. Undercover journalists and anthropologists highlight the gruesome work conditions, the injuries, and the low pay. Animal advocates describe the plight of the birds with subheadings such as "treatment of unwanted male chick" and "pain and suffering in birds," and environmentalists worry about the discharge of animal waste into the waters.

For several decades, scholars have investigated the immigrant-native job tradeoff. One common focus is the immigrant impact on the occupational dislocation and employment chances of less skilled and less educated native workers, particularly African Americans. There is no agreement. Some argue that immigrants are not in competition with teenagers, women, or minorities. Neither the garment industry nor agriculture, they argue, could fill its labor needs with teenagers. Such conclusions are based on the observation that immigrants often enter different labor market streams for reasons having to do with the human capital (education, language, and legal status) and an acceptance of low-wage or seasonal/temporary labor. Thus, any observed increase in impoverishment or income inequality cannot be attributed to immigrants.

The other perspective maintains that immigrants are responsible for labor substitution and the decrease in the earnings of native workers.

Borjas (2001) and Briggs (2001) both describe the negative effect of immigration on low-skilled native workers and highlight a more detrimental effect for African Americans. Borjas assesses the claim that immigrants offer a net benefit to the nation. His book, based on a plethora of empirical analyses, including his own, concludes that the correct way to evaluate the immigrant impact is in terms of income redistribution. Because the bulk of contemporary immigrants are low-skilled workers, it is the less-skilled native workers who suffer the most from the economic integration of immigrants. Briggs also uses multiple empirical studies along with his own historical analysis. He demonstrates how, historically, immigration has had the same negative redistributive effect for less-skilled native workers. In addition, Briggs highlights a crucial intervening mechanism, namely the negative impact of immigration on union density. Another important and often overlooked question is how immigrants come to occupy certain jobs in the first place. Waldinger's (1997) conclusions, based on the cross-sectional surveys, suggest what should be included in an analysis. He outlines a process that ends with African Americans being "excluded" (not displaced) from the labor market.

I share subject matter and theoretical principles with scholars in the fields of globalization, immigration, race relations, and labor studies. The title of this book was inspired by Tom Miller's *The Panama Hat Trail* (1986).² He traced the journey of the straw hat from the *Carludovica palmata* green stalks in the coastal lowlands of Ecuador, to weavers and preliminary processors in Ecuador, to finishers in St. Louis and New York, and finally to buyers in retail outlets such as Western Hat Works in San Diego. In a somewhat similar fashion, Deborah Barndt's Tomasita project explored the shifting role of women in the tomato's journey from a Mexican field to a Canadian fast food restaurant (1999). Miller's "actual commodity" journey and Barndt's "same-commodity at different points" journey are single-commodity versions of the global commodity chains described in *Commodity Chains and Global Capitalism* (Gereffi and Korzeniewicz 1994). They define a global commodity chain (GCC) as "the production of a single commodity [that] often spans many countries, with each nation performing tasks in which it has a cost advantage. The components of the Ford Escort, for example, were made and assembled in fifteen countries across three continents" (1994, 1). Authors in that volume followed disaggregated stages of production and consumption as commodities

(organized as interconnected firms or enterprises) crossed national boundaries. The GCC framework defined by Hopkins and Wallerstein (1986, 159) demonstrates how production and consumption connect households, enterprises, and nations.

This work has informed my analysis; however, *The Chicken Trail* is a metaphorical commodity chain. I do not follow an actual product from beginning to end, nor do I follow a single commodity assembled from multiple decentralized networks of labor and production. I do share the GCC perspective of searching for the macro-micro links at the global, national, and local levels as a way to understand contemporary changes. I use the metaphor of a “trail” to link unconnected “poultry sites” in an analytical way. I begin with a trail of migrants to poultry factories in the southeastern United States and then follow a trail of exported poultry and investment to Mexico. I end with a trail of migrants to the United States. As in the GCC essays, my analysis switches back and forth between a developed nation and an “emerging” economy, binding households, industries, and nations to one another within the world system. The value-added contribution of this book is its conceptual linking of global and bi-national economic transformations with bi-national local labor market reorganization and migration. Tracing the intersection of the poultry and emigrant streams exposes the bi-national connections among commodity, capital, and labor flows—the very essence of globalization.

I draw from multiple theoretical perspectives, including world-systems (Wallerstein 1974), split-labor markets (Bonacich 1972), and labor regimes (Przeworski 1985). A wide range of material is cited in the text and in the reference list. Because I have included as many theoretical and empirical contributions as possible, along with contemporary work on immigration and neoliberalism, the bibliography is lengthy. Despite that, I hope that in my survey of these vast literatures, I have not unintentionally overlooked any authors.

My research strategy has been eclectic: following the principle that good narratives need quantitative data and good data need ethnographic narratives. Neither side stands alone; each fortifies and lends credibility to the other. I use as much quantitative data as possible. I have done extensive analysis of the data collections published by branches of the Mexican and U.S. governments. I have used government, corporate, and union press releases. I also used corporate reports, media reports and commentaries,

scholarly monographs, published interviews, and my own ethnography and informal interviews. Most of my conversations in Mexico were conducted in Spanish, and many of the research monographs are written in Spanish. While some books benefit from a single methodological approach, this book weaves together multiple methodologies to construct the trail. At times the path between two trail markers is navigated by data presentation and analysis, other times by ethnographic studies; and still others by deduction.

There were research highs and lows along the way. The two most “exciting” were being evicted from a poultry plant parking lot in Alabama and chasing a rooster in Sonora trying to record its crow for a PowerPoint presentation. Conversations with Americans who migrated from Mexico more than a decade ago and remember purchasing “illegal” American chickens smuggled into Mexico; with undocumented Mexicans who arrived more recently in the United States; with Mexican residents in Sonora; and with former Mexican poultry executives were extremely informative. My conversations with unemployed African Americans and labor leaders in the Southeast provided a human face to the story of ethnic succession. On the other hand, the unsuccessful attempts to acquire more recent data from certain branches of both governments were frustrating. Equally frustrating is the internet: it giveth and it taketh. It is not only blogs that disappear; academic papers, organization reports, newspaper articles, and official government publications and data sets vanish as well.

The book is organized as follows. Chapter 1 introduces the conceptual and empirical elements of this multifaceted framework, and begins the trail with ethnic succession in the United States. Chapters 2–5 describe major historical transformations in the U.S. poultry industry and economy, which contributed to that “ethnic succession.” Chapters 6–8 follow the “chicken trail” of exports to Mexico and examine the effects of trade. Imports rarely enter a country without disturbing the equilibrium. Here the narrative focuses on the impact and the reactions that open commodity and capital markets had on Mexican industry and on Mexican rural subsistence. The concluding chapter reflects on the connections between globalization and local labor displacement in the two countries.

The mechanisms that bind globalization and bi-national labor displacements are neither straightforward nor singular. While industry transformation in the United States rearranged the labor force, it also contributed

to a rearrangement of the labor force in Mexico. NAFTA did much more than facilitate trade flows. As a recent face of neoliberalism, it rearranged relationships among concerned stakeholders: the Mexican government, Mexican commercial producers, Mexican farmers, Mexico's trade partners, foreign investors, and American labor. By analyzing jointly the separate spheres of public policies—immigration reform, NAFTA, and domestic economic development—we derive a more complete and complex understanding of the societal causes and consequences of immigration.

As a sociologist, I hope I have shed light on the deeper process of immigration and moved us beyond what appears as an impassioned conflict between vilified "racist Americans" and denigrated "illegal immigrants." We must be hopeful for the future of both the American unemployed and displaced as well as others displaced from work and country. While Adam Smith theorized that the outcome of individual rational action was a collective good, the outcome for many of the stakeholders described in this book is a collective tragedy.

The author would like to thank Claude Rubinson, Sondra Barringer, Lisa Thiebaud, and Eleanor Simpson for assistance; Ruth Milkman and anonymous reviewers for their suggestions; Fran Bensen for her guidance in manuscript preparation; Michael Burawoy for helpful comments all along the way ;and Alfonso Parks and Fernando G. Tapia for sharing their insights about and lived experiences in Alabama and Sonora. The work was funded in part by a grant from the Rogers Program in Law and Society, Rogers College of Law, University of Arizona.

ABBREVIATIONS

AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations
BIP	border industrial program
CONASUPO	National Company of Popular Subsidies (Mexico)
CPS	Current Population Survey, U.S. Census
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization (United Nations)
GAO	Government Accounting Office (U.S.)
GATT	General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs
LIUNA	Laborers' International Union of North America
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System (formerly SIC)
NLRB	National Labor Relations Board
OSHA	Occupational Health and Safety Administration
RC	NLRB election for Certification of Representative
RD	NLRB election for Decertification of Representation

RWDSU	Retail, Wholesale, Department Store Union; affiliate of AFL-CIO
SAGARPA	Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fish, and Nutrition (Mexico)
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programs (International Monetary Fund)
SIC	Standard Industrial Classification
SSA	Social Security Administration
SSM	special safeguard mechanisms (World Trade Organization)
TRQ	tariff rate quotas
UFCW	United Food and Commercial Workers
ULP	Unfair Labor Practice (NLRB)
UNA	Union Nacional de Avicultores (National Union of Poultry Producers)

THE CHICKEN TRAIL

WHY FOLLOW CHICKENS?

Displaced labor has many expressions, three of which are depicted in this book: unemployed African Americans, ghost villages in Sonora, and Mexican immigrants to the United States. In following the “chicken trail,” I connect the U.S. labor shortage and the Mexican labor surplus. While transformations in the U.S. poultry industry and its labor-management regime created new demands for cheap labor, changes in the Mexican economy, including poultry production, contributed to labor displacement. Many of the displaced entered the migrant stream to the United States. By the 1990s, that stream was flowing past traditional gateway locations (such as California) into southeastern states. Here migrants happened upon an ongoing labor displacement of African Americans.

One theme in the current immigration debate is the link between Mexican immigration and U.S. labor displacement. In this book, I expand upon that theme to include Mexican labor displacement and dynamics of globalization. In so doing, the immigration story becomes part of a new “American Dilemma”—we are a nation that generates some jobs that

“nobody wants,” jobs that people want that are shipped overseas, and other jobs that people want but for which they are unqualified. By broadening the analysis to include globalization, the “American Dilemma” becomes part of a new “Global Dilemma”—in nations where subsistence survival has been undermined by international trade, citizens have attempted to remedy their poverty by abandoning their country.

Ethnic Succession and Immigration

In the brief two-hundred-plus years since its founding, the United States has wrestled with the immigration question many times. While older nations periodically endeavored to prevent their citizens from leaving (Portugal in 1720, Britain in the eighteenth century, and Italy in 1902), the United States periodically has erected barriers to prevent migrants from entering.

Today, some immigration advocates emphasize that immigrants (particularly the undocumented) fill occupational slots that have been rejected by native workers. In a national Gallup poll conducted in 2008, 79 percent of the respondents agreed that “illegal immigrants mostly take low-paying jobs that Americans don’t want”—up from 74 percent in 2006 (Gallup Organization 2008). The debate highlights the work that immigrants do in the agricultural sector. In fact, the lettuce picker became the iconic “hard-working immigrant” doing the job that native workers will not do. On May 13, 2005, President Vicente Fox of Mexico praised Mexican immigrants in the United States for their dignity, great contributions, willingness and ability to work in jobs that “not even blacks were willing to do” (Orlandi 2005).

A closer examination of specific industries, however, reveals that some jobs currently occupied by immigrants were previously filled by native labor. Milkman (2006) describes the ethnic succession in occupations such as building services and truck driving in Los Angeles. The labor force in some southern industries has also undergone an ethnic succession in the last two decades. In poultry processing, Hispanics have become a substantial proportion of a workforce that was previously dominated by African American females. Did these recently arrived immigrants take jobs “disdained” by native workers, thereby filling a labor-market vacuum? Did they supplement the existing native labor force? Did they displace native workers? These questions motivated my research.

The unemployment rate for African Americans is catastrophically high. For several decades, the black unemployment rate has towered above the white rate by roughly a factor of two. In 2005, the national unemployment rate was 5.1 percent. In contrast, the unemployment rate for blacks was 12.4 percent in Mississippi and 9.7 in Arkansas (DOL 2005). U.S. Census data present a grave situation—a permanent recession for blacks. Some traditional explanations still have relevance: the geographic mismatch between suburban jobs and urban residents and the rejection of personal networks in job searches. Other explanations point to more recent economic shifts such as globalization. Outsourcing, offshoring, just-in-time production, and technological substitution have all contributed to widespread industry reorganization and labor displacement. Displacement has been more detrimental for all those at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy. However, in Michigan, which experienced greater deindustrialization and has a larger African American population than the national average, the 2005 unemployment rate for blacks was more than twice that of whites (12.6% and 5.7%, respectively).

Another constant in the CPS data is the persistent plight of young black men without a high school diploma. Like many workers, they were affected by transformations that gave rise to new labor regimes, such as temporary and part-time work. In addition, they may have been especially vulnerable to the ethnic succession that was occurring in certain labor markets. Since the CPS only defines the unemployed as those non-institutionalized persons actively searching for a job, these numbers underestimate the plight of African Americans, as they do for all “discouraged workers.” They also underestimate unemployment due to the high rates of incarceration for African Americans. In midyear 2005, the Alabama prison and jail incarceration rate per 100,000 was 542 for whites and 1,916 for blacks. In Arkansas, it was 478 for whites and 1,846 for blacks; in Georgia, 623 and 2,068; in Mississippi, 503 and 1,742; and in North Carolina, 320 and 1,727 (Mauer and King 2007). In this book I explore the factors connecting ethnic secession and immigration.

Trade and Immigration

Trade is one important component of the totality of global exchanges. Mexico and the United States historically have had a close economic relationship. In contemporary times, vast quantities of people, commodities, capital, and

credit cross the border daily. In 1980, 63.2 percent of Mexico's exports went to the United States, and 65.6 percent of its imports came from the United States. By 1999, those figures had risen to 88.3 and 74.1 percent, respectively (UCLA 2002, 770). The 1990s was a time of exceptional trade growth: U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico grew 12 percent annually from 1990 to 1993. Although the 1995 Mexican peso crisis and ensuing recession triggered a 23 percent downturn in U.S. exports, they recovered by 1997, and the growth rate rebounded to almost 11 percent per year. By 1998, Mexico was the third-largest market for *all* U.S. agricultural exports, exceeded only by Japan and Canada (United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce 1999b). However, there is an appreciable asymmetry between Mexico and the United States. In 1998, Mexico received 12 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports, while the United States received 60 percent of all Mexico's agricultural exports. Agriculture represented only 2 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) and 2.7 percent of the labor force, whereas it contributed 8 percent to the Mexican GDP and occupied 22 percent of its labor force (United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce 1999b).

During the same period, the migratory flow from Mexico was on the rise and seemed unstoppable. Scholars note that the Mexican-born population living in the United States has been augmented by rising legal and illegal flows. The accelerated migrant flow that started in the mid-1990s continued until the end of the decade followed by a decline from 2001 to 2004 (Passel and Suro 2005).

This increase in migration was not predicted. The explicit assumption associated with globalization in general, and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in particular, is that free trade based on the respective comparative advantages of the trading partners would benefit all. According to a letter addressed to President Bill Clinton and signed by a phalanx of professional economists, the bottom line should be "a net positive for the United States, both in terms of employment creation and overall economic growth . . . moreover, beyond employment gains, an open trade relationship." In 1993, U.S. secretary of agriculture Mike Espy said, "American Agriculture will be a winner under the NAFTA"—by increasing exports of capital-intensive grains and meats.

At the same time, according to Rupert, "mainstream economists have argued that NAFTA is likely to have modest positive effects on the U.S. economy and somewhat larger positive effects upon the Mexican [economy]"

(1995, 666). Both Mexico and the United States had comparative advantages. Mexico would increase production of crops that were labor-intensive and better suited to its climate. NAFTA advocates predicted that the treaty would ameliorate Mexican unemployment and poverty, thereby reducing the incentive to emigrate. Mexico's president at the time, Carlos Salinas, envisioned a trade deal that would allow Mexico to export "tomatoes, not tomato pickers." Although a new equilibrium would be established, and some workers might be displaced as "specialization according to comparative advantage unfolds through the operation of market forces" (Rupert 1995, 666), such dislocations theoretically would be offset by the gains that trade would produce. Cornelius and Martin (1993) forecast that rural workers displaced from agricultural sectors such as corn would gain opportunities in new rural sectors.

Mexico's leaders promised its citizens that the agreement would help modernize the Mexican countryside by converting low-yield peasant plots into productive commercial farms growing fruits, vegetables, and noncompetitive crops such as coffee and tropical fruits for the U.S. market (Wise 2003). The 1992 constitutional amendment transformed land tenure laws: it gave small landholders new opportunities to own their own land, acquire new land, and engage in more effective and cost-efficient farming. In addition, increased foreign direct investment would create additional employment in Mexico. The promises by Mexico's leaders and the capital openings and ease of export that would help Mexicans shift to cash crops—which would in turn provide employment—provided the grounds for optimism. Some analysts recognized that the restructuring could bring about a "migration hump"—pressures leading to increased migration in the short term. But this initial period of higher migration would be followed by one of decreased migration once faster economic and job growth arrived (Martin 1998–1999, 424).

Real (1997) describes how one adjustment unfolded in San Rafael, a village in the state of Guanajuato. Farmers had worked on a part-time basis for a Mexican firm (founded in 1986) that harvested, froze, and labeled broccoli and cauliflower for export to Birds Eye Vegetables in the United States. Laborers had adapted to the presence of this agribusiness and had no need to abandon their traditional production of corn and beans. When the firm decided to shift its land use to fodder for livestock, they would have been displaced. Just then, Pilgrim's Pride, a multinational subsidiary in Mexico, opened up an incubator and "growing-out" farms in the area, offering alternative employment. The less fortunate, however, did face dislocation and emigration.

Neoliberalism and Labor

Since 1980, neoliberalism has been the face of globalization. The globalization effect varies by a country's location in the world-system paradigm. In the United States, globalization and neoliberalism are characterized by the breakdown of the traditional labor market, which had been divided into primary and secondary sectors. That segmentation was associated with the nature of the firms and the qualifications of job seekers. In contrast to the primary sector, which hired skilled workers, the secondary sector drew its labor force from the unskilled (Edwards 1973). Changes in industrial societies, including rapid developments in technology, growing international and price competition, and corporate financial restructuring in capital markets, eroded those employment arrangements (Kallenberg 2003, 154). Firms now pursue flexibility in their production processes and employment systems through nonstandard work arrangements: shifting the workforce to part-time and temporary employees or removing employees from the payroll by using outside agencies. To this list of "flexible" hiring strategies used by employers to tackle price competition and profit losses, I argue that we must add employers' use of undocumented immigrant labor.

In emerging markets (previously designated as third-world or semiperipheral countries) promoters of neoliberalism have encouraged governments to reduce regulations on foreign investments, capital flows, and labor systems. Following this advice, Mexico and other countries privatized state-owned enterprises, eliminated price controls, and reduced government subsidies and safety nets for workers. Like it or not, no nation has entirely escaped neoliberalism and its transformative effects. Neoliberalism has been praised by some as the panacea for world poverty and political instability—and denounced by others for aggravating poverty and displacing workers.

Neoliberalism and Its Challengers

In July 2008, the Doha Round of the World Trade Organization (WTO), begun in Doha, Qatar, in 2001, was declared a failure. The final breakdown was the product of a fundamental disagreement between developed and developing countries on the issue of special safeguard mechanisms (SSMs) for agriculture. Nations of the EU and the United States sought

to expand the WTO, thereby giving their own (and subsidized) agribusinesses lower-tariff access to the markets of developing countries. In opposition, India and other developing nations sought the right to protect their at- or near-subsistence farming sectors. For them, global trade between highly developed and underdeveloped countries had destructive consequences, consequences that Marx predicted in the 1840s:

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production, it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e. to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image. ([1848] 1964)

The debate regarding the winners and losers of NAFTA echoes that surrounding the WTO. As in the Doha Round, NAFTA advocates promised that the expansion of trade of goods and services would raise rural living standards and real income. But like the failures of WTO agreements, critics argue, NAFTA has produced some negative realities.

NAFTA brought advantages and disadvantages to Mexican commercial poultry producers. The principle advantages were Mexico's access to global technological developments in the pharmaceutical industry and cheaper producers' goods. Authors who identify disadvantages of free trade for Mexico, the least developed of the three NAFTA signatories, highlight the injurious effects that imports has had on domestic producers. Analysts predicted that the drop in import tax, duty-free quotas with a sliding tariff above the quota, and the streamlined import-permit application process would produce a "poultry crisis," in other words a "debacle" (Hernandez et al. 1996).

Hirschman's 1970 book *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* offers a cogent way to describe Mexican responses to global integration. Emigration (exit) and protest (voice) represent the two ends of his exit-voice continuum. While small barnyard producers chose emigration, the larger commercial poultry producers protested.