

Shamanism in Motion, Pentecostalism on Hold, and Maya Mormonism

Identity and Community in Transnational K'iche Migration

C. James MacKenzie

ABSTRACT: This article examines how religion, including new religious movements as well as older options in new contexts, combines with ethnic and community attachments in shaping the identity of Guatemalan economic migrants in southern California. While the literature on transnationalism tends to view religion and ethnicity as different though sometimes overlapping means by which migrants seek incorporation into new social and political contexts, the ethnographic evidence presented here suggests more complicated dynamics. These are reflected in the experiences of three migrants from a single indigenous community in Guatemala, each with different backgrounds of faith and ethnic identity: a nominal Catholic in his early 20s who is sympathetic to Mesoamerican shamanism though ambivalent about Maya ethnic identity; a middle-aged Pentecostal Christian who is ambivalent about religious practice and belief in the United States and rejects the Maya ethnic label; and a convert to Mormonism in his 30s who has attenuated his ties to his home community while adopting a broader Maya ethnic identity. To interpret these experiences, I develop an analytical framework which draws upon some of Thomas Csordas' ideas about religion in globalization but stresses a renewed attention to community as a persistent, if ambivalent and perhaps inherently conflictive, site for identity formation, especially in the context of migration.

Nova Religio: The Journal of Alternative and Emergent Religions, Volume 18, Issue 2, pages 45–66. ISSN 1092-6690 (print), 1541-8480. (electronic). © 2014 by The Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website, at <http://www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo.asp>. DOI: 10.1525/nr.2014.18.2.45.

KEYWORDS: economic migration, religious pluralism, ethnicity, southern California, Guatemala, shamanism, transnationalism, Maya

The analysis of religion in migration studies often focuses on the role of church institutions in assimilating or otherwise incorporating the migrant into the host community, often along ethnic lines,¹ and shaping migrants to specific nation states, the global political economy, or conditions of modernity.² But as scholarship on new religious movements has underscored, such models often give religion little more than a supporting role in subject-making. Yet, as Catherine Wessinger has pointed out, a defining feature of many new religious movements is their oppositional character. Such movements challenge institutions, worldviews, identities and practices while creating alternatives that may be more meaningful to converts in increasingly plural religious and cultural contexts, including those brought on by migration. In other words, these movements are strongly connected to identity in terms that move beyond narrowly conceived religion, and they “provide social spaces for experimentation in alternative theologies, gender roles, sexual relations, leadership structures, and group organization.”³ Understanding the nature and origins of ethnic and religious pluralism in this identity work is a key goal of this article, which offers an ethnographic analysis of three religious options that economic migrants from a Guatemalan community have adopted or maintained in southern California. Two of these options—Pentecostalism and Mormonism—long have been studied by new religions scholars because they continue, in certain contexts, to exist in tension with dominant societal structures and mores.⁴ The third, an erstwhile localized form of Mesoamerican shamanism, is noteworthy for its unexpected mobility and its role in helping define the plural religious and ethnic landscapes that migrants both confront and construct.

In addressing the transnational dimension of these religions, I consider a set of questions framed by Thomas Csordas, who discusses aspects of religions prone to globalization and the means by which they might travel, and traces several broad themes where religion and transnational mobility seem most salient. He identifies the potential portability of religion, suggesting that non-esoteric practices that are less proprietarily connected with specific cultures and less associated with institutions and ideologies are more likely to “travel well.” He also undertakes the scholarly task of determining how transposable key beliefs and ideas are, and explores relative degrees of “plasticity (transformability) or . . . generalizability (universality).”⁵ As Csordas notes, not every religious practice or idea travels well, though the data I present offer a few surprises concerning the relative mobility of putatively local versus global religions in the migrant context.

Specifically, I argue that, for a number of migrants from the K'iche' Maya town of San Andrés Xecul (hereafter, Xecul), Guatemalans who now live and work in Southern California, ostensibly local religions—in this case a form of shamanism—can travel well without hybridization or simplification. In addition, more self-consciously universal religions—Pentecostalism specifically—can lose their resonance in this context, due largely to a perceived disjuncture between social and moral inflections of ritual practice in the host community compared with experiences of correct religious behavior in the home community. The complex relationship of ethnic, religious and community identity is further illustrated by one migrant's conversion to Mormonism, often considered an exemplar of the successful new religious movement, which aspires to world religion status.⁶ For this individual, conversion has somewhat paradoxically served to engender a particularized Maya ethnic identity while attenuating other ties with Xecul (otherwise the strongest source of this identification). These case studies warrant a few introductory words on the nature of ethnic labels such as Maya and the role of community in Mesoamerican ethnography.

Relations between indigenous Mesoamericans and their ethnic Others long have been a key theme in the literature. Non-indigenous people are generally labeled *Ladino* in Guatemala and *Mestizo* in Mexico, but this simple distinction obscures a range of other identities and actors through time and space, such as ethnic-like distinctions accruing to communities of origin, historical references to the Spanish, and past and current relations with *gringos*. Often a gloss for light-skinned foreigners in general, the *gringos* category often includes Europeans and Canadians, who in a number of Mesoamerican communities are internalized as the subject of primordial myth, and are increasingly present physically in development and other capacities (most notably tourism) in many indigenous towns.⁷ While the tenor of the argument has evolved through time, there seems to be some consensus—from the perspective of indigenous Mesoamericans at least—concerning the malleability of ethnic labels historically and in different contemporary contexts.⁸ Terms like Maya, *natural* (native) and indigenous, among others, are deployed to signal a range of referents including history, class, political relations and degrees of modernity. Recent developments in ethnic relations in Mexico and especially Guatemala, however, speak to the possibility of a broader, more stable form of ethnicity. Since the early 1990s, both the Maya (or “pan-Maya”) movement in Guatemala and the struggles of the Zapatistas in Chiapas have promoted ethnic identities that conform to established Western ideas about the unity of cultures and peoples (especially as vouchsafed through such markers as language, dress and religion) while seeking different degrees of autonomy from, or modified and intensified participation in, Western-derived political structures of the nation-state. A key aspect of a self-conscious Maya identity in these

contexts involves the transcendence of community and linguistic differences to promote a broader sense of solidarity and peoplehood, which often involves a sense of connection with a pre-contact Maya heritage.⁹

Despite the import and relative success of these movements, the complexity of ethnic identity, especially at the community level, has persisted and in some contexts intensified as these relatively new options have been added to the repertoire for self-identification in different towns.¹⁰ Much of this complexity and pluralism has been transnationalized, traveling with migrants from communities like Xecul, where additional ethnic and related possibilities for identity are played out in discourses of Self and Other. Indigenous migrants confront a range of ethnic and national labels, with “Latino” and “Mexican” being the most salient in southern California.¹¹ As I demonstrate here, Xeculenses in Guatemala and abroad are well aware of the variety of identities available to them and are attuned to the potential connection between these options and religion. This especially is the case when it comes to the contemporary meaning of the ethnic label “Maya” which, despite the efforts of cultural activists in Guatemala, remains something of a hard-sell for many potential group members, who may prefer the more neutral “indigenous” or even the more ethno-politically retrogressive *natural*.¹² Among its various referents, a Maya identity often is associated with versions of shamanism that can be difficult for some to reconcile with their Christian identities. A more constant identity referent is one’s community of origin, despite specific pressures of ethno-political activism or general globalization forces often framed as transcending or displacing local loyalties.

I turn now to the first of three vignettes based on ethnographic research conducted among Xeculense migrants in San Diego in 2010 and informed by over 30 months of research in the community of San Andrés Xecul since 1998.¹³ With these narratives my aim is to describe something of the ways migrants have inflected their transnational experiences with a religious valence, including the perspectives of two migrants which reflect the principle institutional religious options (specifically Catholicism and Pentecostalism) available to Xeculenses in Guatemala, and one whose religious affiliation (Mormonism) is familiar to Xeculenses but novel in Guatemalan and migrant contexts. This does not exhaust the possibilities: other Xeculense migrants had different takes on Catholicism and Pentecostalism, were indifferent or even antagonistic to religion, and beginning to explore possibilities of a purified Maya religious identity. Considered together, however, these three cases highlight important characteristics of the transnational tension in new religious identities and older ones in new contexts. Like globalization itself, religions are not inexorable forces that human subjects simply embrace or resist. As Manuel Vasquez and Marie Marquardt observe, such theoretical abstractions “risk obscuring the conflict-laden relations

among global, regional, national, local and individual actors and processes.”¹⁴ Rather, such possibilities, tensions and pluralism arguably constitute the very phenomena in question. Nor does the experience of transnational mobility straightforwardly upend or transcend local attachments. For Xeculense migrants, religious identities are simultaneously grounded in their host migrant context and Guatemalan hometown (replete with affective attachments and antagonisms of kin and community), though this tension is played out in different ways. I begin with the experience of a young migrant whose religious sympathies, while transposed to a novel context, would be considered “traditional” by Xeculenses.

PEDRO: “MY MOM WENT TO SEE A SHAMAN FOR ME”

When we spoke in 2010, 21-year-old Pedro¹⁵ had spent three years in the United States working about forty hours per week split across a number of different restaurants. This was not ideal, as he preferred to work sixty or more hours per week and lamented the broader economic downturn for this state of affairs.¹⁶ Counting on the support of his aunt and uncles, he managed to pay off the \$5,000 USD he owed to the *coyote*, a specialist who plans and facilitates the trip, including entry into the United States (which for Pedro involved a near-fatal crossing of the Arizona desert). He occasionally sent money to his parents, whom he called every two weeks or so. His main goals included buying a car, a house and some land in his hometown, where he hoped to return within ten years. Pedro described his life in San Diego as *encerrado*, closed in—he rarely left his apartment except for work and occasional trips with his uncles who were more familiar with the city. He now had purchased his own car and was learning to drive.

Pedro told me he was Catholic, but not a *Catholic* Catholic. He called himself a *Católico creyente*, a believer rather than active participant. While a number of those I interviewed would blame a drop in their personal religiosity on time constraints associated with the migrant situation, Pedro was clear that he was never much of a churchgoer in Xecul and would often work on Sundays there as well as in San Diego. Still, he was not proud of the state of his religious life:

This is bad though. Because if you don't go to hear the word of God, well. . . You may end up sinning and doing evil, continuing with childish nonsense—bad words. And then you don't remember the Man Upstairs. This is bad. But when you have a problem you start praying and asking for things. This has happened to me, here. . . Well, I don't know what's happened to me here, but I've always thought this. When you have some need or other, you start to pray. But maybe that's because you don't go to Mass regularly. . . But when things are better, you forget it all.

Pedro figured that the migrant context produced something of a détente among erstwhile conflictive religious adherents from Xecul. Rather than positioning himself against other Xeculenses in San Diego on the basis of religious differences, as often happens in Xecul, Pedro noted, “I think everyone is friends here, mostly because you’re alone. This is why you start to get along with everyone well. So you’re more united here, because of the loneliness, and not having anyone else here.” The unity he spoke of perhaps was more imagined than real in any regular context, because he considered his to be a lonely, closed-in existence.¹⁷

Pedro expressed strong and positive opinions on the work of shamans or *ajq’ijab’*, a term often glossed in English as “daykeeper.” While many scholars, following Mircea Eliade, reserve “shamanism” to refer to practices involving altered states of consciousness,¹⁸ in Mayanist literature the term *shaman* describes a specialist in a kind of divination that combines sortilege of sacred seeds (from the *tz’ite’* or coral tree) with a count of days from the sacred 260-day calendar. During divination, specialists pay close attention to signs from their body—twitches and shudders—which, considered together with conventional meanings ascribed to specific calendar dates, suggest answers to a petitioner’s problem.¹⁹ Such proficiency is required for shamans, though their practice also is strongly defined by ceremonies they conduct at various sacred altars, often located on mountainsides. These rituals are occasions to feed chthonic and celestial deities through offerings immolated over a sacred fire, courting spiritual support in the resolution of intractable problems. Together, these practices often are glossed as *costumbre* (custom) and reflect an animistic ontology that shares much with what Brazilian anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro has called “multi-natural perspectivism,” forming a substrate for shamanism in the Americas, whether or not altered states of consciousness form part of a given practice.²⁰

Although many migrants consult shamans to “clear the path” for luck on the trip to the United States, Pedro did not. Instead, he used transnational ties to help resolve problems he encountered in San Diego.

My mom went to see a shaman for me [in Xecul]. Now, I don’t do evil, but if someone is doing evil against me, I just want to defend myself. This is what I did, and God is the one who knows if I’m lying or not, but yes I believe in this. . . . I think you have to have respect and believe as well. Because it’s true what the shamans say. Maybe there are some that are liars, but on the whole I think they’re good.

Although he did not seek shamanic guidance himself, the idea of destiny as a personal path God assigns each human resonated strongly with Pedro’s experience and struggles. He noted that shamanic practice can

be transposed to new settings,²¹ and that migrants can keep up such practices “providing you’re an *ajq’ij* [in Xecul] first. If you manage it there, then you can continue doing it here in the USA.”

This possibility first was broached with me in 2002 in Xecul, when I talked with a returned migrant who was an initiated shaman. Although for her trip she had been unable to take ideal ritual paraphernalia associated with her calling—chiefly the *baraj* or sacred bundle of crystals and divinatory seeds—she stressed that she had found a substitute in kernels of maize (a substance with strong indigenous resonance), with which she performed divinations. Thus, whether a migrant consults a shaman directly or uses transnational contacts to commission divinations and ceremonies from Guatemala, the practice does travel well. Another migrant in San Diego explained:

You carry this in your blood, right? For example, I’ve got a gift: if something is going to happen to me, I get signs. I tremble or twitch. If it’s around my eye, for example, something will be helping me. If this part trembles, it’s money that’s coming. If the other side trembles, money is leaving; maybe I’ll spend money on something. These are things that we carry in our blood. A man who was here before, he was an *ajq’ij* there in Xecul, but here he’d read the [tarot] cards. . . . Here you don’t burn *pom* [copal incense]. That’s the difference. But you can still have your faith.

The work of shamans, especially moderns who tend to identify as *sacerdotes mayas* (Maya priests), is strongly associated with ethnic identity in contemporary Guatemala, though the work undergoes certain transformations as it is politicized and progressively marked as an ethnic practice now generally referred to as “Maya Spirituality.”²² However, for Pedro, a young nominal Catholic with *costumbrista* sympathies, a personal Maya ethnic identity was problematic:

I think I’m a *natural*. I’m not sure. But “indigenous” is like the Mayas, and well, maybe those of us in Guatemala aren’t a hundred percent Maya anymore, or indigenous. Why? Because of the Spanish who arrived in Guatemala and raped the women and had children with them. And because of this they transmitted themselves in all the people, and so you aren’t a hundred percent indigenous. But we still continue as indigenous. . . . But I think it’s *natural*.

Highlighting the unreliability of racialized bodies as sufficient to sustain the difference implied by labels such as Maya or *natural* and Ladino, Pedro eventually settled on language as perhaps the most important distinguishing attribute.²³ In this context, he quickly noted the pride he takes in speaking K’iche’, even in San Diego, and criticized his fellow Xeculenses who choose not to speak the language:

I've never denied where I'm from. . . . I'm not embarrassed to speak my language and speak of my country. I think some *paisanos* ["countrymen"—used by migrants to reference Xeculenses specifically] that I know who are here do this. I speak to them in *idioma* [K'iche' Maya] and they don't speak to me in my language. They answer, but in Spanish. This has been really disappointing for me, a real shame. They feel like they're *musib'* [Ladinos], I'd say. Even though they come from the same place I come from, why don't they speak their own language?

He went on to describe a comparable process in Xecul, noting a friend of his who, following graduation as a school teacher, turned his back on his K'iche' heritage.

In summary, Pedro's experience of religion and ethnicity in the transnational context reflects a number of tensions that are not limited to the migrant context: similar conflicts and antipathies that defy resolution at home in his community and Guatemala have traveled with him. In practical terms, religion was a resource he could draw upon when needed, though he admitted some regret regarding his instrumentalism here, except as concerned his use of shamanism, which in the Xeculense context is often geared towards problem-solving. For Pedro, ethnic identity also was beset with contradictions emerging from *within* his own community (as with *paisanos* who do not speak K'iche'). While he spoke of a strengthened community in the migrant context, this ideal was not reflected in actual socialization. Elsewhere—as in the expression of local pride in language—he saw a similar set of conflicts in both Xecul and San Diego. His vision of community was far from utopian but did reflect a site of concrete sociation,²⁴ which may be defined as much by problems and conflicts that animate daily life as by the structures and norms which aim to resolve the same.

As concerns Csordas' ideas about religious aspects amenable to globalization, Maya shamanism—broadly characterized in the literature as fairly localized to specific Maya communities—actually travels quite well. This portability is not a product of hybrid mixture with other indigenous (or New Age) practices or a consequence of intense simplification downplaying the esotericism of the practices, though this can indeed occur in other contexts, including non-indigenous adherents to this faith.²⁵ Rather, given the highly specialized, individualized, instrumental and, from a Western perspective, esoteric nature of the work, it can be accessed by indigenous Guatemalans in a range of contexts.²⁶ As to Csordas' focus on transposable messages, these seem to be of less interest to Pedro, a reminder perhaps that the theological aspects of religion are not uniformly valued even among self-identifying believers. As Alfred Gell has pointed out, in a great many contexts religion is best understood as a kind of technology rather than the intellectualized “system of beliefs” we currently tend to expect.²⁷ While there is considerable heuristic value to Csordas' analysis of religion in globalization—identifying

practices and messages that may be either assimilated or blocked in global networks and mobilities—it is essential to pay sharp attention to the varying relevance of “practice” and “message” in particular contexts. The nature of the religious message was less important for Pedro than the use he made of it, and other Xeculense migrants experienced these tensions even more fully.

**ROLANDO: “THEY DON’T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT ME,
ABOUT WHAT I DO IN MY HOUSE”**

Rolando was a first-wave Xeculense economic migrant, arriving in the United States in 1986. He made a number of return trips to Guatemala in the late 1980s but traveled less through the 1990s given tighter migration controls. When he received his permanent residency in 2002, he returned to Xecul several times and recently was joined in San Diego by his wife, daughters and a son (all of whom arrived legally). Another son migrated illegally over a decade ago but achieved citizenship and advanced education. Rolando has long worked in restaurants as a dishwasher and most recently a cook. Despite the length of time away from Guatemala, he has maintained an active Xeculense identity and plans to retire in Xecul. Still, he was critical of his fellow townfolk for their infighting and lack of an active spirit of participation: “In the *pueblo*, that’s the way it is. The parents and children just continue like this. They want fame, but other things? No. They don’t want to participate. . . . Not for anything will they protest or anything. They’re good to talk and criticize—‘Why is this so?’ they’ll say—but that’s about it.”

Rolando identified as an *evangélico* or Pentecostal Christian, an identity he adopted as a child together with his immediate family. His religiosity, however, was limited in San Diego:

To go to church here, in comparison with Guatemala, it’s not the same. The difference here . . . well, here, when you go to a church, the women attend wearing certain clothing. Leaving the church, you see everyone wears jeans. So that’s one difference. It’s not good. To be a Christian or an *evangélico*, you should dress normally [i.e. modestly].

He went on to name moral and religious laxities in churches he has attended in the United States. He noted that this might be acceptable on the relativistic grounds that things are different in America, but he criticized specific national migrant communities—Mexicans, Guatemalans, Salvadorans, Hondurans—for not preserving and transposing traditional aspects of their own culture in their religion. He complained that co-religionists in America weren’t interested in participants’ actual lives but were just looking to fill the pews:

Normally, here, with whatever thing that you do—for example, if you drink or hit people or whatever in your apartment—people will know. But as a member of a church, you go a few times and they just ask you a few things: “Are you baptized?” “Sure.” Then they ask you to do important things like pray for people and stuff. But they don’t know anything about me, about what I do in my house. What if I have another woman? [CJM: So they don’t investigate this stuff?] Here no. There, in Guatemala, you have to be more pure—they will know if you’re good or bad. So here they don’t care. Take my brother, for example: his wife is married to another guy and then she married my brother. So they’re in adultery. But the Church here says “No, they’re not.” The *Church!* But the Bible says that they are. So what are you going to respect? The Church or the Bible?

Internalizing his criticism of the Xeculense tendency to be “good to talk” but not much else, he noted that his own consciousness of these problems was part of the problem: “For me, it’s fine to go to a church. But the problem is I won’t manage to handle what I’m going to see there. So this is what’s bad. It’s better not to go. I’m safer in my house. If I go, I’m more likely to go and judge people, to betray them, and that’s just more sin for me.” For Rolando, religion has become a personalized affair, not because he prefers it to the communal religion he remembers in Xecul but because those practices and messages simply have not circulated well in the migrant community, leaving him spiritually *encerrado*.

Rolando traced the relative absence of religious conflict in the migrant context to a regrettable absence of community in general. “Here there’s no problem. If you’re Catholic or *Evangélico*, you don’t say anything. . . . I think it’s because they forget the past problems from Xecul, right? Everything’s fine. No problem. But when they return there, the old conflicts arise again: ‘This guy’s Protestant, I’m better than him.’ But here there’s none of that.” When asked why this might be, he noted that the constricted social network and attendant loneliness migrants tend to experience can cause people to minimize this aspect of their identity, which could be problematic but was considered honest and important. He suggested that perhaps Catholics and Protestants *should* disagree and fight on occasion, as they do in Xecul. “That’s the difference here. Why don’t we say anything? Because everyone is on their own and they don’t have friends. If you want a friend, this is what you have to do. That’s a problem.”

When considering ideas concerning destiny or fate common among traditionalists in Xecul, Rolando voiced a criticism often heard among Pentecostal Christians there, who tend to associate such beliefs with Catholicism and with what they see as a denial of personal agency and responsibility. These ideas are rooted in the history of Pentecostalism in Xecul, established in the late 1960s through the efforts of a local convert, with little foreign missionary direction. Thus, while in broader terms

Pentecostalism in Guatemala can be considered a new religious movement made possible through emergent transnational ties with North American missions, Xeculenses have tended to experience it as a local, largely indigenous affair involving the creation and maintenance of local religious boundaries.²⁸ It is worth noting that when Rolando criticized the notion of destiny, he focused on the experience of shaky Pentecostal converts rather than stalwart traditionalists, complaining that when people in Xecul encounter misfortune following conversion to Pentecostalism they sometimes renounce their decision, interpreting their troubles as evidence of their failure to follow the path God had destined for them. This way of thinking, he figured, was nonsense:

You can't say that you're destined by God. No. Because, for example, if you want to work, it's because you want to work. If you don't want to work, what excuse do you have? "I'm tired or I'm sick, so I'll sleep instead." But you don't say that; instead, you can make an excuse so that people don't think you're lazy or shiftless. . . . This is nonsense. People who think this way, from my point of view, they're just making excuses. . . . It's not destined by God.

A theology of personal responsibility may seem to derive from the neoliberal American context Rolando has lived in for so long, but the roots of his critique are readily traced to Xecul, where a critique of ideas about destiny includes establishing a boundary to help define local religious Others, rather than to more thoroughly champion human freedom. These religious Others increasingly are inflected with ethnic characteristics, as practices and ideas associated with shamans and the sacred calendar become designated as "Maya." When asked about his own ethnicity, Rolando eventually came to similar conclusions as Pedro, though he admitted to considerable ambivalence:

The most correct term, well. . . . With *indígena* [indigenous], I still hear *indio* [Indian, a pejorative term in Guatemala] in there somewhere, and that's offensive. *Natural*, this means you're shorter. As you say, Maya . . . well, there doesn't seem to be a better word yet. For example, indigenous, this still sounds bad. *Natural*, this is the shorter or lower person. Maya refers to the *really old* people [i.e. the Maya of archaeology]. So, given that you can't find anything better, I figure the safest bet is *natural*. Because, well, we do know that we're a little shorter than those who are Spanish. We're shorter than the Americans. So *natural* for me is better. . . . But it's like we've said, Maya, *natural*, indigenous, it's the same. . . . But really [Maya] doesn't exist anymore, it's been lost. . . . Right now, those who say they're Maya, they're the ones who do witchcraft. [CJM: Maya priests?] Yes, these are the ones who say they're Maya. Fine, that might be so. But this is just a practice, and with those from before, for example, the ancient ones from the past? No [they did not engage in these practices].

As with Pentecostal Christians in Xecul, as “Maya” increasingly comes to reference a religious identity as a shaman or, less charitably for Rolando, a “witch,” its appeal and relevance lessens considerably.

After going through some of the limitations of racial and other markings, Rolando, like Pedro, settled on language as perhaps even more important than one’s height in signaling an identity as *natural*. This was connected to the migrant experience of some of his fellow townsfolk’s attempts at “passing”:

Here I feel like a *natural*—the same [as in Xecul]. But the majority do change this. Many, they don’t want to talk to you. . . . It’s like they come here, and they want to just speak English, even when their own people don’t speak this. This is a bit bad, I think. For example, to make out that you’re American, when you really aren’t. If another gringo shows up, if you start speaking K’iche’, they’ll wonder what the hell you’re saying. “They’re probably making fun of me” is what you’d think. This is what happens when *paisanos* speak English to their *paisanos*. It’s crazy, but many want to do this.

For Rolando, labels such as *natural* or “indigenous” are significant only for identification with other Xeculenses. The labels reference notions of humility and a lack of presumption, common concerns in Xecul, and mirror his ideals for religious communities.²⁹ In contrast, in his encounters with people who are not from his community, Rolando routinely presents himself as Guatemalan. As to any additional aspects of his identity:

No. They don’t know anything of this. Because, for example, if you start to talk about this, people might start making fun of you. It’s better not to. So if I’m asked where I’m from, “I’m from Guatemala.” That’s all. Beyond that there’s nothing more—like that I have a language, or this or that. We don’t speak of this, and they don’t ask, either.

As with most migrants I spoke with, he emphasized that the most concrete discrimination he had faced came from Mexicans. He did not see this as particularly ethnic or racial but classist, embodied in a stereotype (which he sharply rejected) of Guatemalans as dirt-poor, as opposed to the “rich Mexican.”

To summarize, issues of what aspects of religion or ethnicity can or should travel in the migrant context are further complicated in light of Rolando’s experience. Religion—in this case Pentecostalism—was for him less peripatetic than was Pedro’s relationship to shamanism, which on the face of it is a far more localized religious practice. Rolando was concerned with the messages of his faith—regarding questions of sexual morality for example—though he turned to biblical authority to justify his views rather than what he saw as the problematic position of congregational leaders in San Diego. In general, however, he seemed to interpret

his religious identity more broadly in terms of practice and moral conduct, summarized in the image of the proper Christian as conservative in dress and general comportment. While Pedro also was concerned with the practical aspects of religion (in particular the instrumental effectiveness of shamanism), Rolando's approach required a communal dimension that he found himself unable to realize, or realize fully, in the migrant context. Scholars of Pentecostal and charismatic Christianity in globalization have highlighted transposability and its ability to adapt to local cultures and transcend them through claims to universal truth,³⁰ but it does not seem that these features need remain stable as the religion (or in this case, the adherent) travels.

While the success of global Pentecostalism often is linked to its strong decentralization (permitting a greater degree of plasticity of messages), in the Guatemalan context part of the adaptation included a strong emphasis on humility and modesty, as well as a strong hand on moral issues deemed locally important. In effect, this often translates to greater centralization and control at the level of hometown congregations. The freedom emphasized in San Diego churches, itself perhaps an expression of some broader American values, did not resonate with Rolando's perspective on the particular nature of this otherwise universal faith. Likewise, ethnicity, or simply the potential to express broader ethnic attachments, did not provide an appropriate idiom for Rolando to effect a broad reorganization of his social relationships. Rather, it was directed inwards—to the Xeculense migrant community, who are the only ones who need know that he is *natural*—and served to reinforce or reference standards of humility, sociability and respect (which also take on a religious cast) common in Xecul, even if these ideals are commonly challenged there as well.

Their hometown remained an important point of reference for Pedro and Rolando, despite (or perhaps because of) the conflict characterizing it; but, for the final migrant I consider here, ties to Xecul have been attenuated through conversion to a religious movement that carries a special, if ambivalent, message for indigenous peoples of the Americas.

GASPAR: "I BELONG TO THE TRIBE OF THE MAYAS"

Gaspar migrated to the United States in 1990 and, like Rolando, witnessed the growth of the Xeculense migrant community in San Diego. As with most other migrants from Xecul he started working in restaurants, but given his young age (15) when he first arrived, he was unable to get regular employment. He took the opportunity to study English, which soon helped him secure better jobs than some other Xeculenses. Within four years, he managed to work his way up the

ladder in a local restaurant, from dishwasher to cook and eventually to supervisor, responsible for most aspects of daily operation. When we spoke, he was still in the after-glow of having recently received approval of his permanent residency after a long, tumultuous and expensive battle. In a number of respects, Gaspar has been an active member of the Xeculense community in a transnational sense. He and a couple of other migrants were the ones who, in the past especially, tended to be contacted for help when migrants died in the United States. He would collect funds from his fellow townsfolk, help arrange for transport of the body back to Xecul, and try to take care of sundry details. Still, as with Rolando, he did not feel that this sort of service actually resulted in any permanent sense of solidarity among the migrants: “You do this as a volunteer. But after all this, they start to talk—‘No, he ended up with the money,’ or this and that. ‘He did it for personal benefit.’ So there’s very little trust.” When asked where this sort of attitude comes from, he was clear:

From Xecul, that’s how we are. . . . We all complain about our neighbors, that this guy is this or that. So I imagine this is a tradition that we bring with us. . . . I know people who are American. I know Chinese and Koreans. I know Taiwanese, Vietnamese. What I’ve seen in Asian families is that they’re really united. If a person arrives and invests in something, they make a business, and with the whole family working, little by little they go paying what remains and whoosh! In a short time, they’ve got a business, a shop. They’ve got incredible things. And with us, this doesn’t happen. It doesn’t happen. If you see your neighbor dying, it’s “Let him die. . . . What can I make off him?”

While surely overstated, this critique did not diminish his sense of commitment to his town; rather, he personalized it. Now that his status in the United States was secure, he spoke of a renewed sense of responsibility to give back to Xecul by way of various loosely defined projects he was working on. He did decide, however, not to work with his fellow migrants to pursue his goals.

Much more than Pedro or Rolando, religion was a defining element of Gaspar’s life, in both theological and practical terms. He stressed the importance of his conversion to and strong participation in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. His conversion had been sparked by a visit from two Mormon missionaries in San Diego. Prior to this, his experience with religion in the United States had left him jaded. He had tried out some Pentecostal churches, having given up on Catholicism, but came to see the whole religious enterprise as more about money than anything he considered true faith. Answering the fateful knock on his door, he initially had challenged the LDS missionaries by asking how much they were paid to preach the gospel; he was chastened to learn of the sacrifice they made for their mission work, and he quickly came to

respect the depth and sincerity of their commitment. He converted in 1996 with his wife and son. Since that time, he has drawn on church support to help him through personal tragedies, including the loss of twins in 2002: one stillborn, and the second, whom he referred to more explicitly as his “son,” died after intensive but unsuccessful medical intervention. He pegged total funeral expenses for this child at \$16,000, which his congregation covered. Gaspar also received material and moral support from his church when he was jailed for a month due to problems with his application for residency.³¹

The LDS community also has been, in many respects, an effective place for him to interpret and practice various aspects of his identity. When, for example, we talked about traditionalist notions of destiny or *suerte* (“luck”) in Xecul, he did not reject these concepts outright as did Rolando:

What our ancestors in Xecul say [is] that everyone has their destiny, or we’re destined and have a *suerte*, I thought this way, too. When I came to know the Church, I learned that we’re *preordained* to do things of the Lord. Before we’re born, we’re already chosen: “You’ll be born in Guatemala and you’ll do this and that.” We were in agreement with this. But in the moment of birth, we’re given freedom to choose. You have free will: to choose the good or the bad path.

A latent validation, and in some respects a correction of his own background and ancestry, is an important part of his Mormon faith. Of the migrants I interviewed, Gaspar was one of the most unabashedly Maya in terms of his ethnic identity:

Just like the Bible was written for the Jews, the Book of Mormon was written for the people, the inhabitants of this territory, Americans—the Mayas, the ancestors. In fact, for us in the Church of Jesus Christ, we believe that much of what our ancestors said is written in the Book of Mormon. For example, with this stuff about *suerte* or destiny: here it is! The [Maya] ruins? They’re there too. And also who the people were who built them, and what the first inhabitants of the Americas were called. . . . I really value this. . . . I don’t want to lose my dialect. I don’t want to lose the things that are part of the *pueblo*. . . . But a lot of our people forget that. They arrive here and they don’t want to speak their dialect, and they adapt to the new models from this country. The language of this country—Spanglish, as they call it—they forget their roots and where they come from. In fact, the Church tells us that we have to keep a journal, maybe for our children in the future, so they’ll know where their roots are.

The LDS concern with genealogy has resulted in a very personal connection to Gaspar’s Maya past, though these roots seem to have been planted primarily on American soil. Unlike Rolando or Pedro, Gaspar

made a point of identifying as an ethnic Maya more than *natural*, Guatemalan or whatever other identity he had at his disposal:

I think that I've always identified this way. People ask me because of my last name. It's a last name that doesn't exist in the Anglo-Saxon population. They always ask me where I'm from, and I say "I'm Maya-indigenous. . . ." The family of my wife are Mexican, and they identify me as Guatemalan all the time. I say to them, "Sure, I'm from Guatemala, but I'm more special, I'm indigenous-Maya." I don't know how many generations of purity; maybe our family has been mixed up somewhat, but my last name continues as an indigenous one. I belong to the Tribe of the Mayas.

He related this to stories of the Lost Tribes of Israel, as recounted in the Book of Mormon, concluding that the Maya must have Jewish roots. Other labels, such as Guatemalan, but also Latino, were not enough to capture this. He went on to discuss how, especially when talking with his son, who knows a handful of K'iche' words, this heritage must be a strong part of his identity, carried in his blood and signaled by his Maya last name. As he has traveled from Xecul his name, and in a way Xecul itself, has traveled with him:

I've got an uncle from Houston, and he didn't know where I buried my son who died, and I said, "My little bit of Xecul is here." And maybe it doesn't just stay there. My other son, I'm not sure who he's going to marry. Maybe he'll marry a French girl, or a Canadian or an American. Xecul will go with him, because the Xeculense is something he'll always carry, due to his last name.

For Gaspar, this talk of travel and roots did not signal a desire to return to Xecul to finish his days, as was the case with Pedro and Rolando, nor was he interested in spreading his Mormon faith there. He already has bought funeral plots for himself and his family in San Diego. When I suggested that this must be difficult for his family in Guatemala to accept, given the tradition of being buried in the same area where one's *muxux* (placenta) is interred,³² Gaspar laughed and switched to K'iche': "*Aunque nu muxux k'o jela pa tinamit, pero ya kinkanaj jun chic.*" (Though my placenta is there in my town, I've already left another here.) While his family in Guatemala apparently was critical of his choice, he noted that beyond the new life he has planted in American soil, some of his hometown traditions simply were not meaningful to him anymore. Describing how he was able to balance what he understood and valued as a Maya identity with contradictory pressures in America, Gaspar again turned to his Mormon faith. Unlike his earlier stress on maintaining indigenous language, and unlike Rolando's more general rejection of certain American mores and styles, Gaspar argued in this context for assimilation: "As far as being a Maya in the same way here as in my *pueblo*, that's another thing we learn in the church. We

have to adapt ourselves to what is here, the laws and norms, because I can't be tied to the laws of my *pueblo* when I'm living a different law here. So one of the things that the prophet has told us, from old prophets, is that we have to learn the language of the place where we will live." He noted that his struggle with legalization was undergirded by this religious imperative to render to Caesar what is his.

To summarize, Gaspar's experience highlights yet another set of complications and possibilities of circulating religious and ethnic identities in the migrant context. While the history of Mormon engagement with indigenous peoples of the Americas (cast in the Book of Mormon and early discourse among the religion's founders as the dark-skinned Lamanites, a fallen tribe of Israel) is predictably ambivalent, Gaspar has been able to draw selectively from church doctrine to reaffirm ethnic pride. The association between Mormonism and ethnicity is, of course, long-standing in the social sciences, from early studies which considered a Mormon identity itself as a type of ethnicity, to renewed focus on ethnic images in the religious narratives and conversion practices of the church.³³ Gaspar's positive reworking of potentially exclusionary Mormon discourse (which otherwise views dark skins as the product of a divine curse) reflects a response seen in other Native American contexts.³⁴ While he was most certainly referring to the stories of Lamanites, Gaspar never mentioned them by that name in our discussion: a "Maya" Mormon label was more specific and appropriate for him.

Evaluating the portability of Mormon practices and the transposability of its messages is somewhat more complicated. Csordas argues that the potential for mobility increases in simplified, decentralized or otherwise less institutionalized practices, and that sacred messages hold potential for universalism and/or plasticity. Mormonism, however, is more highly centralized and much less subject to congregationalism than most other Christian faiths, especially Pentecostal and Charismatic variants.³⁵ Moreover, as Gerald McDermott has noted, while the Mormon message shares a universalizing thrust with Christianity in general, it is resolutely particular and American. "God visited [Mormon founder] Joseph Smith in upstate New York. Eden began in Missouri and the millennium will end there. The new exodus took place in North America."³⁶ I would argue that it is the particularism and not the universalism of the Mormon message, especially as reinterpreted through a positive ethnic lens, which appeals most to Gaspar.

CONCLUSION: TRANSNATIONALISM, RELIGION AND COMMUNITY

Of the general themes Csordas identifies as key for inquiry into the intersection between religion and globalization, the experience of

Xeculenses considered here speaks most directly to questions concerning the relation between indigenous (including pan-indigenous) and world religions, and the “reglobalization” of world religions themselves. Moreover, it presents an additional dynamic. The movement of formerly more or less localized indigenous practices such as divination into the transnational sphere seems to be occurring mostly in tandem with the movement of migrants themselves, and there appears to be less by way of a hybridization or transformation of these practices and sensibilities in the new context: use of maize kernels as a substitute for *tz’ite’* seeds, or the adoption of tarot cards, is opportunistic rather than hybrid, and conforms to the experimental nature of indigenous religious practice on its home turf. In Gaspar’s case, however, Mormonism has provided a space for renewed ethnic identity which does not include religious practices otherwise commonly associated with a Maya identity: divination is not part of his repertoire, though notions of destiny, central as well to the shaman’s practice, are amenable to transposition in a Mormon key.

As concerns the reglobalization of Christianity, in the context of migration by an adherent from the periphery to one of the historical centers or strongholds of this religion (at least in terms of its Pentecostal or charismatic varieties), some additional insights emerge from the materials presented here. First, while in broad terms we might speak of resurgence of religion in a range of contexts globally, there remain options for disenchantment, agnosticism or simple indifference. Rolando and Pedro have more ambivalent relationships to organized religion, though this ambivalence is not simply a product of experiences migration itself might produce. In each case, though in different ways, they traced their disenchantment or current spiritual indifference to their lives in Xecul. While for their part, scholars have been able to find religion in increasingly mundane places, in the context of transnational migration, as Wendy Cadge and Elaine Howard Ecklund suggest, it is important to consider “how immigrants who are not involved in religious organizations experience religion, if at all, a topic about which almost nothing is known.”³⁷

Secondly, the case of Rolando highlights how the successful transnational expansion of Pentecostal Christianity decades earlier in Xecul—and its development in relation to local norms of humility, modesty and dress, as well as mutual surveillance typical of community—did not translate into an active religious identity in the migrant context, as we might expect if his Pentecostal identity was animated by a strong global and transcendent dimension. Given that correct Pentecostal practices and messages were first formed and particularized in Xecul, Rolando’s inability to access these in San Diego diminished his public religiosity. In other words, once globalized, Christianity does necessarily *stay* globalized for adherents engaging in other global flows, including the economic.³⁸

Finally, for Gaspar, religious conversion has been part and parcel of his transnational experience. It may be argued that whatever else Mormonism has provided him—including communal support as he sought integration into American society—its affective and intellectual attraction lies in its *particularism* over its universalism. Mormonism seemed to be prefigured for him as an indigenous person of the Americas, and specifically as a K'iche' Maya from San Andrés Xecul, an identity much more specific and meaningful than the problematic Mormon label of Lamanite. Whether Mormonism can extend this sort of appeal more broadly—to non-Americans with less straightforward claims to a potentially redemptive indigenous ancestry—is less clear.³⁹

An additional dynamic undergirds the experience of the migrants considered here and informs the way they approach religious and ethnic identities in a transnational context, whether these are tightly welded, as for Gaspar, or in occasional dialogue with each other, as with Pedro and less so with Rolando. In each case, the idea and experience of community—especially in its more conflictive sense, well theorized by Verid Amit⁴⁰—looms large. When querying transnationalism and its relationship to collective identity—especially in migrant contexts, where religious pluralism and the potential for new and emergent options are heightened—we would do well renew our focus on community. While Csordas is surely correct to focus on specific aspects of religion as key in determining transnational mobility, the way Xeculenses approach religion, in both message and practice, is sharply influenced (though not always determined) by the same experience in their hometown. Yet, Xeculenses experience and talk about community in a way that does not immediately evoke images of solidarity, to the point that many suggest there simply *is* no real community, either in Xecul or the diaspora. Still, this assessment may be rethought in terms of Amit's notion of community as a “joint commitment,” which does not imply solidarity in the usual sense but an admission that interdependence is at the base of any meaningful form of sociality, and that conflict rather than consensus may be a better marker of community strength.⁴¹

To conclude, this observation suggests that when considering how religion travels in the context of transnational processes, we need to not only break it apart in terms of practices, ideas and messages but also pay close attention to the way community is constituted. Globalization is not synonymous with the reduction of these attachments, nor are religion and other collective forms of identification necessarily being simplified or sharply individualized to appeal to neoliberal denizens of a religious marketplace. It would be easy enough, however, to make such arguments if the sort of conflict in which Xeculenses engage is simply read as a fatal atomization of a preexisting harmony. The fact is, as Gaspar attested (and virtually every Xeculense I spoke to would concur on some level), mutual conflict over the joint commitment that defines Xecul as

a community “is a tradition that we bring with us.” Religion and ethnic identity—while ostensibly and self-referentially about transcendence of such differences toward a kind of imagined sameness—continue to work into this process in the transnational context, though not to a single end or set of effects. Communities like Xecul do not emerge untransformed, but they do endure. This persistence is a product not only of public stress on harmony and consensus but of a time-tested capacity to localize (without resolving, or even hybridizing) conflict and difference, a dialectical process arguably constitutive of community more generally. Religious and ethnic pluralism is common in both host and home contexts, and needs to be appreciated when considering the potential for new religious identities in transnationalism.

ENDNOTES

¹ See Jacqueline Hagan, *Migration Miracle: Faith Hope and Meaning on the Undocumented Journey* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008), 4–6; and Caroline Brettell, “Theorizing Migration in Anthropology: The Social Construction of Networks, Identities, Communities, and Globalscapes,” in *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, ed. Caroline B. Brettell and James F. Hollifield (New York: Routledge, 2008), 134–35.

² See Thomas J. Csordas, “Introduction: Transnational Transcendence,” in *Transnational Transcendence: Essays on Religion and Globalization*, ed. Thomas J. Csordas (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 1–3.

³ Catherine Wessinger, “New Religious Movements: An Overview,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 10, gen. ed. Lindsay Jones (Detroit, Mich.: Thomson Gale, 2005), 6513–514.

⁴ Wessinger, “New Religious Movements,” 6514.

⁵ Csordas, “Introduction,” 5.

⁶ Rick Phillips, “Rethinking the International Expansion of Mormonism,” *Nova Religio* 10, no. 1 (2006): 52–68.

⁷ On *gringos* and other foreigners in myth, see Gary Gossen, *Telling Maya Tales: Tzotzil Identities in Modern Mexico* (New York: Routledge, 1999): 21–27; for a discussion of the role of Westerners in ethnic identity construction in the tourist and development context, see Walter Little, *Mayas in the Marketplace: Tourism, Globalization and Cultural Identity* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004).

⁸ See Mathew Restall, *Maya Conquistador* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998); and Quetzil Casteñeda, “‘We are Not Indigenous!’ An Introduction to the Maya Identity of Yucatan,” *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 9, no. 1 (2004): 36–63.

⁹ See Kay Warren, *Indigenous Movements and their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998); June Nash, *Mayan Visions: The Quest for Autonomy in an Age of Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

¹⁰ C. James MacKenzie, “Of Networks and Hierarchies: Pan-Mayanism and Ethnic Ambivalence in Guatemala,” *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 5, no. 1 (2010): 27–52; and Casteñeda, “We are Not Indigenous!”

¹¹ See Patricia Foxen, *In Search of Providence: Transnational Mayan Identities* (Nashville, Tenn.: Vanderbilt University Press, 2007), 190–94.

¹² MacKenzie, “Of Networks and Hierarchies,” 39–40.

¹³ In the course of this study, I conducted sixteen formal, semi-structured interviews with migrants, and three group interviews, guided by specific themes concerning ethnicity, religion and identity in the contexts of Xecul and San Diego. All direct quotes are taken from these interviews.

¹⁴ Manuel A. Vásquez and Marie Friedmann Marquardt, *Globalizing the Sacred: Religion across the Americas* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2003), 3.

¹⁵ Names of migrants in this article are pseudonymous.

¹⁶ See Foxen, *In Search of Providence*, 109.

¹⁷ See also Foxen, *In Search of Providence*, 119–22.

¹⁸ See Brian Morris, *Religion and Anthropology: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press), 19–22.

¹⁹ See Barbara Tedlock, *Time and the Highland Maya* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1992), on shamanic practices of “reading the blood” in the context of divination.

²⁰ On multinatural perspectivism in the Americas, see Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, “Perspectivism and Multinaturalism in Indigenous America,” in *The Land Within: Indigenous Territory and the Perception of Environment*, ed. Alexandra Surrallés and Pedro García Hierro (Copenhagen: IWGIA, 2005), 36–74. On the relevance of this model to Mesoamerican cosmologies, see Pedro Pitarch, *The Jaguar and the Priest: An Ethnography of Tzeltal Souls* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010).

²¹ See Foxen, *In Search of Providence*, 75, 101, *passim*.

²² For more detail on the nature of Maya spirituality and its relationship to shamanic *costumbre* in Guatemala, see C. James MacKenzie “Judas off the Noose: Sacerdotes Mayas, Costumbristas, and the Politics of Purity in the Tradition of San Simón in Guatemala,” *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 14, no. 2 (2009): 360–88.

²³ See also Foxen, *In Search of Providence*, 171–78.

²⁴ For a discussion of “sociation” in the context of community, which draws upon Simmel’s ideas (seeing both association and dissociation as meaningful forms of social connection which this term aims to reference), see Vered Amit, “Community as ‘Good to Think With’: The Productiveness of Strategic Ambiguities,” *Anthropologica* 52, no. 2 (2010): 357–63.

²⁵ See Thomas Hart, *The Ancient Spirituality of the Modern Maya* (Albuquerque: University of Arizona Press, 2008).

²⁶ See also Walter E. Little, “Ajq’ija’, Transnational Migrants, Telephones, and Nimab’äl K’u’x Mayab,” in *Comparative Indigenities of the Américas: Towards a Hemispheric Approach*, ed. M. Bianet Castellanos, Lourdes Gutiérrez Nájera and Arturo J. Aldama (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2012), 125–38.

²⁷ Alfred Gell, “Technology and Magic,” *Anthropology Today* 4 (1988): 6–9.

²⁸ For background on Protestant and Pentecostal Christianity in Guatemala, see Virginia Garrard-Burnett, *Protestantism in Guatemala: Living in the New Jerusalem*

(Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998); and C. Mathews Samson, *Re-enchanting the World: Maya Protestantism in the Guatemalan Highlands* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2007).

²⁹ See MacKenzie, "Of Networks and Hierarchies," 38–40; and Foxen, *In Search of Providence*, 72–75.

³⁰ See Csordas, "Introduction," 5.

³¹ On the Mormon welfare system, see Elizabeth Dunn, "Money, Morality, and Modes of Civil Society among American Mormons," in *Civil Society: Challenging Western Models*, ed. Chris Hann and Elizabeth Dunn (London: Routledge, 1996), 25–46; and Hildi J. Mitchell, "Good, Evil, and Godhead: Mormon Morality in the Material World," in *Powers of Good and Evil: Social Transformation and Popular Belief*, ed. Paul Clough and Jon P. Mitchell (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001), 161–84.

³² See Victor Montejo, "Tied to the Land: Maya Migration, Exile and Transnationalism," in *Identities on the Move: Transnational Processes in North America and the Caribbean Basin*, ed. Liliana Goldin (Albany, N.Y.: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, 1999), 190–94.

³³ See Thomas W. Murphy, "From Racist Stereotype to Ethnic Identity: Instrumental Uses of Mormon Racial Doctrine," *Ethnohistory* 46, no. 3 (1999): 454–55.

³⁴ Murphy, "From Racist Stereotype to Ethnic Identity"; and Steve Pavlik, "Of Saints and Lamanites: An Analysis of Navajo Mormonism," *Wicazo Sa Review* 8, no. 1 (1992): 21–30.

³⁵ See Rick Phillips, "'De Facto Congregationalism' and Mormon Missionary Outreach: An Ethnographic Case Study," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 47, no. 4 (2008): 628–43.

³⁶ Quoted in Peggy Fletcher Stack, "Keeping Members a Challenge for LDS Church," *Salt Lake City Tribune*, 26 July 2005, available at www.sltrib.com/ci_2890645.

³⁷ Wendy Cadge and Elaine Howard Ecklund, "Immigration and Religion," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33 (2007): 359–79.

³⁸ See Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 37.

³⁹ See Phillips, "'De Facto Congregationalism' and Mormon Missionary Outreach"; Phillips, "Rethinking the International Expansion of Mormonism"; Thomas Murphy, "Reinventing Mormonism: Guatemala as Harbinger of the Future?" *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 29, no. 1 (1996): 177–92; and Chiung Hwang Chen, "In Taiwan but Not of Taiwan: Challenges of the LDS Church in the Wake of the Indigenous Movement," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 41, no. 2 (2008): 3–31.

⁴⁰ Amit, "Community as 'Good to Think With,'" 357–63.

⁴¹ Amit, "Community as 'Good to Think With,'" 359–60.