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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

"To test general theories, we must examine them experimentally in carefully chosen situations; and this procedure is indispensable for general theories about society" (M. G. Smith 1965b:1). In this work I will examine what is probably the most popular theory, or hypothesis, about human migration.¹ That theory, generally referred to as the "push-pull" hypothesis of migration, states that some factor, or factors influence individuals so that they are either pushed out of their current homes (and home culture) or pulled toward another area of residence (and culture). According to the hypothesis people become migrants—that is, they move from one place and culture to another—because deterministic factors are at work. It is said that in most cases economic factors are the prime movers but that other factors do contribute to the decision to leave. Taking that premise, that something must cause migration, as true, the potential migrant,² either compelled by necessity or drawn by opportunity, leaves his home.

¹For simplicity's sake I will refer to Grenadian emigrants and Grenadian immigrants to foreign countries as migrants. The meaning of emigrant, as someone who leaves, is clear and generally regarded as a "neutral" term. Immigrant, like migrant, appears to be a "loaded" term. Following Plotnicov (1970:67, note 2) I will use immigrant and migrant as: '. . . one who makes periodic and temporary excursions to his natal or ethnic area while holding permanent or extended residence elsewhere.' It avoids the pejorative connotation of a poor, backward stranger to a foreign culture and allows for contacts with the home area.

²The idea of a "potential migrant" will be developed more fully in Chapter Five.
When one examines the causes of migration in the abstract, several factors seem important. First, a society may have a "feeble" economy. Anyone wanting to "make it big" would probably have to leave. Second, if the economy is limited, educational opportunities are probably also limited. Such a society would probably not have any facilities for higher education or professional training. Third, a society may not afford much opportunity for its members to experience "life"; if citizens want first-hand knowledge of the wider world they probably have to leave.

Scholarly works dealing with emigration from the Caribbean certainly suggest the importance of these three points. Almost every study, done from the point of view of either the sending\(^3\) or the receiving\(^4\) society, tacitly assumes that some sort of economic forces are the root cause of international migration. Michael Banton, Anthony Richmond, and G. C. K. Peach state that idea very clearly.

Both groups [East and West Indians] were attracted by their belief in Britain as an El Dorado, thinking that as British subjects they would be welcome, and impelled by rising unemployment in their own countries ... . [Banton 1955:13]

Some ... made their way to Britain under the influence of patriotism or the desire for adventure, and others, at various times, have left their home country in an attempt to escape from family and other responsibilities that were becoming burdensome. But the dominant motive is the belief that, in Britain, it is possible to achieve greater security of employment and a higher standard of living ... . [Richmond 1956:187]

\(^3\)The following deal with emigration from various West Indian societies: Cumper 1956; Frucht 1968; Lowenthal and Comitas 1962; Mauder 1955; Philpott 1968, 1970, 1973; Roberts 1955; Tidrick 1966, 1971.

\(^4\)The following deal with West Indian immigrants in Britain: Bagly 1967; Banton 1955; Calley 1965; Collins 1965; Daniel 1968; Davison 1962, 1964, 1966; Dirks 1972; Griffith 1960; Hill 1963; Jones and Smith 1970; Patterson 1968; G. C. K. Peach 1967; C. Peach 1968; Richmond 1956. Green 1970 deals with West Indian immigrants to Canada.
In the large-scale migration that took place from the West Indies to Britain in the 1950's and early 1960's, conditions in Britain were decisive and those in the West Indies were permissive. ... Conditions in Britain determined how far the tap was opened; conditions in the West Indies determined the pressure behind the flow. [G. C. K. Peach 1967:289]

Still in the realm of speculation, several problems seem to hamstring the push-pull theory. First, if economic considerations are so important, why does anyone remain in the West Indies (other things being equal)? Second, a push-pull hypothesis assumes individuals find out about the prospects they face overseas. Why would people emigrate if they thought they stood a chance of failing, or if they knew the relatively unfavorable conditions under which they might have to live?

Third, how can such a theory account for variations around the theme? What of people who do not wish to leave for any of the logical reasons? If they are a small minority they can be relegated to a residual category, but what if they are the majority of cases? Stuart Philpott brings that last point home nicely in his criticism of the push-pull hypothesis.

Ceri Peach ..., a social geographer, has argued that the 'pull' factors were more significant than the 'push' in determining West Indian migration to Britain. Valid though this may be for establishing immigration trends for the West Indies, it helps little in explaining why Montserrat, exposed to the same 'pull' should have a higher proportion of migration than the other islands. [Philpott 1973:29]

The Problem Restated

The push-pull hypothesis of migration implies that potential migrants must create, must dream up, a superior overseas haven as a valued migration goal before they decide to leave. The logical necessity of such an invention should be obvious. Why would anyone who claimed to be dissatisfied with his current lot want to go someplace he thought was even worse? From a purely logical point of view, individuals would not
make the decision to migrate—a relatively difficult and dangerous
course of action—if they were not fairly sure migration was the best
solution to their perceived problem(s). With other, less difficult,
options at hand, the potential migrant would have either to be desperate
or to believe that migration was vastly superior to any of his other
options. A poor, uneducated, "culturally deprived" resident of an
"underdeveloped" country could not take the decision to emigrate lightly.

One possible way of looking at migrants' situations is to ana-
lyze what they must know, and do, before they can be successful migrants.
What do they know of life overseas? How do they value life overseas as
compared with life at home? Where do they get the information upon
which they make their plans? How do they go about creating the idea of
superior overseas havens that lure them away from home? All these ques-
tions are central to a complete theory of migration.

Objects of this Work

The first object of this study is to avoid what I consider the
mistakes of treating migrants as inanimate objects—as tokens of ill-
deﬁned cultures who operate in predetermined ways within the limits set
by a disinterested, objective observer (see below). I will present a
complete ethnography of a culture, not as detailed as I would like, but
as much as I can give within the limits imposed upon me, paying most at-
tention to those institutions especially important for migration. I
will focus on what migrants, and others, think about migration—as ex-
pressed in their accounts—and how these thoughts effect their actions.
Second, I will locate the sources of information residents use when they
make their decisions and plans. That will include an examination of the
various sources and an evaluation—from inside and outside the culture—of their usefulness. Third, I will explain how potential migrants use information to make their plans. That will require that I show who deals with what kinds of information, and what they do with it. Finally, I will describe what Grenadians really believe about migration. Do they, in their daily lives, accept a push-pull theory? And if not, what do they substitute for it? If they do accept it, how do they, as "men in the street" or "expert" social scientists, rationalize the actions of those migrants who do not seem to follow its predictions?

In pursuing these topics I have broken with most of the other scholars who have done work in the Caribbean. Several treat migrants as "counters" moving from place to place. W. F. Maunder (1955) and George Cumper (1956) "grabbed" emigrants at the airport and on the dock as they left Jamaica and Barbados, respectively, to ask them why they were leaving and where they had gotten the money to finance their trips. Horace Patterson (1969) did some of his research by talking with migrants returning from Britain during a nine day trans-Atlantic voyage. Maunder's, Cumper's, and Patterson's interviewees served as ideally patterned grist for the statistical mill. Their answers, neatly packaged in predetermined categories, give little information about what is behind migration.

Two scholars, Peter Wilson and Stuart Philpott, have tried, in part, to answer the question of what lies behind migration. Wilson's work (1969, 1971, 1973), although not primarily concerned with migration, shows men in their daily lives. He shows how migration, among other things, is tied to various other aspects of "being a man" on the island of Providencia. Wilson is one of the few scholars who treat
migrants as people living and acting in a complete world. Philpott's work (1968, 1970, 1973) attempts to show how migration is woven into the very fabric of Montserratian society. He shows how migrants in London keep in touch with people at home, how their lives are influenced by Montserratian values, and how their activities influence life in Montserrat. His solution (Philpott 1973) to the problem is to outline the historical factors that have influenced (and, perhaps caused) Montserratians to become migrants. While he does give information about various aspects of Montserratian life that affect migration—education, economics, history, politics—he side-steps the issue of the people themselves. Although he compares trends in two communities, he says little about the peoples' beliefs about migration and the reasoning that is carried out before potential migrants actively seek to become migrants. Even though he talks about a "migrant ideology" (Philpott 1970, 1973:178, ff.), he pays little attention to it. Although his study is probably the best published source on Caribbean migration, it, too, treats the actual migrants more as "counters" than as people.

Nancie Gonzalez has written the only other published, book-length study of migration dealing with a Caribbean society (Gonzalez 1969). In it she treats labor migration—a special case in which wage labor, not available in the sending society, is the central feature—as a causal factor in determining household and family structure in Black Carib society. Although the study is very useful as an evolutionary analysis of the household and kinship, it treats migration only as a side-light. Her main concern is with something else. Though it is a model of careful, intelligent scholarship, it sheds little light on the general causes and effects of migration. She accepts without
question the premise that Carib men leave their natal villages to search for wage employment. In effect, she accepts the push-pull hypothesis as proven.

The great bulk of studies dealing with the Caribbean do not deal with migration at all, or only mention it in passing. Most of those studies are either ethnographic/ethnological accounts of communities or countries\(^5\) or theoretical works dealing with the evolution and present state of particular institutions within a society—the most usual being kinship and household structure.\(^6\) In either case migration is given short shrift.\(^7\)

When one reads the literature on Caribbean societies he gets the overpowering idea that most of them are "deformed." In almost all cases

\(^5\)Among the most frequently cited studies of this kind are: Braithwaite 1953; Clarke 1957; Greenfield 1966; Herskovitz 1937; Herskovitz and Herskovitz 1947; M. G. Smith 1962b, 1962c, 1965a; R. T. Smith 1956.


\(^7\)I have not included a general review of all the literature concerning migration for several practical reasons. First, the quantity of "migration related" literature is immense, running to well over 1000 books and articles. An adequate review of the literature would be a book in itself. Second, many of the studies have little relation to Caribbean peoples' migrations. Studies that deal with intranational migration, such as rural-urban migration among Mexican peasants, or international migration across unguarded borders, such as some of the studies of African labor migration, shed little light on the problems encountered by transoceanic Caribbean migrants. Third, studies that deal with the natal communities of migrants (the effect of migration on a sending society) or with migrant life situations at their goals (the effect of migration on the receiving society or on the post-migration individual in the host society) are only marginally useful when applied to the Caribbean context in general, and are even less useful when compared to the problems I am addressing. Finally, in so far as non-Caribbean studies apply to the point I challenge, that is, the validity of the push-
works deal with a certain aspect of the society to the neglect of others. One rarely finds descriptions of "complete" societies even if the author says he (or she) intends to do a complete ethnography (Wilson's 1973 account being a welcome exception). One either finds the author's bias boldly presented, such as Henriques' (1953) description of Jamaica or Otterbein's (1966) statistical treatment of Andros Island, or one aspect, or institution, of the society given emphasis that dwarfs and distorts the rest of the society's institutions, such as Braithwaite's (1953) description of Trinidad. I had hoped to remedy that situation by giving a complete ethnography as well as a detailed description of emigration. As I pursued the topic I found that would be unnecessary. Anyone interested in more detail, or detail on other areas, should consult the excellent works of M. G. Smith (1957-1960, 1961, 1962a, 1962b, 1965) and others (see below). For that reason I will limit my ethnography to institutions directly concerned with emigration.

Site Selection

Grenada is a small, densely populated tropical island lying at the southern end of the arc of the Windward Islands in the West Indies. Its 110,000 people live in 122 square miles. The population density is approximately 900 per square mile. Its closest neighbors are St. Vincent, Barbados and Trinidad. On February 7, 1974, after almost 350 years of foreign domination, it became an independent country. Soon thereafter, Grenada joined the British Commonwealth and the United Nations (as its smallest member). From 1650 to 1783 it was a French colony engaged in agriculture and trade for the benefit of France. Some pull hypothesis, I believe I have enough data from Caribbean studies to show how my approach differs from more traditional approaches.
of the French traditions introduced during that period still exist today. From 1783 until 1974 (the last few years as an "Associated State" with internal self-government) it was a British colony engaged in agriculture and trade for the benefit of Britain. Now, as an independent country it is free to pursue its own policies, although it is still tied, by social and economic institutions, with Britain.

The island has always been something of a backwater. Its mountainous interior made it unsuitable for large-scale sugar production when other West Indian islands were becoming relatively rich in the sugar trade. Its French connections have made it a pawn in European politics, it having changed hands at least four times. Its citizens have always had relatively limited opportunities. The English planters who came to the island never became quite as wealthy as their fellow countrymen in Barbados or in the other sugar islands. Blacks, brought to the island as slaves, have had the opportunity to become small landholders, but they, too, could never hope to amass great amounts of wealth. The majority of Grenadians have had to be content as laborers on estates, as fishermen and sailors (a very small number), and as peasant agriculturalists. Very few ever had the opportunity to secure full-time wage employment.

Grenada's most valuable resource, aside from the rich soil which makes agriculture possible, has been her people. Since the turn of the century, and probably long before, she has been exporting people to other countries. In the early stages most went to other Caribbean lands. More recently, Grenadians have gone to Britain, the United States and

---

8Appendix 1 describes the racial classifications used by islanders. Appendix 2 describes the socio-economic classes Grenadians distinguish.
Canada. Some have found their way as far from home as Australia, India, Sweden, Switzerland, the Union of South Africa, Viet Nam and West Germany. The majority of Grenadian expatriates have been skilled and unskilled laborers, but some have also been physicians, lawyers, nurses, white collar workers and even politicians (the current—1974—chairman of the Greater London Council, the chief executive of London, is a Grenadian black). In addition to making their own way in the world, overseas Grenadians have always been most generous in sending money home to family and friends.

Not surprisingly, the small, exotic "Isle of Spices," has received relatively little attention from foreign scholars, or even from the foreign press. Nothing very important has ever happened to make Grenada newsworthy (until the political unrest of 1974 brought it to the front pages of British and United States newspapers and news magazines). Even the "squandermania" revelations of 1961-1962, that caused the British government to suspend its constitution, an unprecedented step, caused relatively little interest abroad. Only one social scientist (Singham 1968) was interested enough to take note.

Some research has been done on the island, however. M. G. Smith studied Grenadian social stratification (1960, 1965a, 1965b), religious practices (1957-1960), and kinship and social organization (1961, 1962a, 1962b, 1965c); Judith Smith MacDonald investigated language use (1973a, 1973b); Jack Harewood examined population trends (1966a) and employment (1966b); and, Angelina Pollak-Eltz looked at religion (1968). None of these authors devote much attention to migration. Smith, MacDonald and Harewood mention the problem, but only in passing. Their other interests notwithstanding, they must have noticed this important problem if, as
Grenadians claim, more Grenadians live overseas than in Grenada.

Grenada looms large as a "sending society." Migration has been a factor in Grenadian life for over seventy years. With as many Grenadians living overseas as at home, it has few rivals as the country most people seem to want to escape. Why should that be so?

The Context of the Research

In May 1973 the British government announced it would grant independence to Grenada. That action fulfilled a campaign pledge made by (now) Prime Minister Eric M. Gairy during the 1972 election campaign. The leaders of the political opposition complained that Britain's action was in violation of the Grenada constitution. That constitution required that Britain hold a plebiscite in which at least two thirds of the voters say they want independence. Instead, Britain based its decision on the results of the 1972 election in which Mr. Gairy's party won thirteen of the fifteen seats in the House of Representatives.

Between the time the British government announced its decision and Independence day, February 7, 1974, a feeling of tension rose between supporters and detractors of the government. Party loyalty was drawn along socio-economic lines, with the Grenada United Labor Party (the Prime Minister's party) having most of its members in the lower-class, and the Grenada National Party (the opposition) having most of its support in the middle- and upper-classes. This alignment re-enforced traditional social cleavages (see Singham 1968). Individuals were labeled, and spoken of, as being either "GULP" or "GNP." A third party, the New Jewel Movement, which claimed it had no interest in traditional "party politics," also gained strength. It drew its followers from the
ranks of the GNP and from among the few uncommitted individuals left on the island. Its stated "alternative" to party politics, and a popularly elected government, was a Tanzania-like system of local assemblies and an island-wide general assembly that would draw its members from the local assemblies.

In addition to political hostility surrounding the independence issue, Grenada was suffering from what residents saw as the biggest "crime wave" ever to hit the island. GNP supporters blamed the perceived rise in crime rates on the government, its policies, its corruption (based on complaints never proven in court), and its police recruiting practices that had, they said, led to the "ruination" of the police force. GULP supporters blamed the crime wave on the anti-government forces whom, they said, were trying to prevent independence by forcing Britain to take over Grenada's internal government operations. They singled out the New Jewel Movement as the main source of the new crime wave. The NJM blamed the corrupt government, the GNP, which they did not consider an acceptable alternative to the Gairy government, and capitalism for the rise in crime rates.

Both sides to the argument followed their leaders with missionary zeal.9 Supporters of each side were constantly attempting to win converts from the "other" side. The GNP-NJM coalition claimed they represented between sixty and ninety per cent of the population. They were trying to win over the remainder of the Gairyite diehards who continued, in the face of all "evidence," to support their leader. Gairy

---

9Since both the GNP's and the NJM's stated aims at that time were to remove the Gairy government from power I have lumped them together as a single "side." However, in most cases they differ in aims and in political philosophy.
and his followers, who claimed to represent well over seventy-five percent of the population, were also trying to show the few remaining members of the opposition the "error" of their ways.

The generally poor world economic conditions at the time increased ill-feelings between the sides. The prices paid for local exports (bananas, cocoa, nutmeg/mace) declined while the prices shopkeepers were forced to charge for imported goods (fuels, staples and luxury items) rose. The normally fragile economic system of the island was given a severe shock by rapid changes in the world economy. Each side blamed the other for Grenada's economic problems.

In September, October, November and December 1973 the NJM and some others called for a general strike to force the Gairy government to resign. Although two short strikes did take place during that period, the government remained firmly entrenched. On January 1, 1974 the "Committee of 22," composed of business, civic, union and church leaders, and the NJM, began an island-wide general strike that was to last until March. The Seamen and Waterfront Workers Union stopped work, shutting the island to external commerce. The Allied and Technical Workers Union, who staff the telephone and electric companies, also joined the strike, shutting off telephone, electricity and wireless services. All of the island-wide chain stores and many small shops also closed. The island's inhabitants were cut off from the outside world for almost three months. Even this strike, which was accompanied by violence and looting, did not force the government to resign, although the treasury was left empty. Instead, the Prime Minister came to rely more and more on a band of thugs and criminals, known first as the "Mongoose Gang," then as the "Police Aides," then as the "Volunteers in Defense of Democracy," and
finally as the "Royal Grenada Defense Force," to keep him in power by intimidating, and when that failed, beating, robbing or, in one case, killing, his outspoken opponents. The island remains in that condition. Business has not regained its pre-strike vigor, people are afraid to walk the streets or speak their minds, and relatively few feel secure in their homes.

My wife and I arrived in Grenada in June 1973. We took up residence in Hillbay, St. Michael's on July 4, 1973 after spending some time familiarizing ourselves with the island, meeting people in the capital, St. George's, and gathering preliminary data there. For the first two months of our stay we lived in a small house owned by one of the local schools. For the rest of our stay we lived in a larger house that is also owned by the school—a house that more closely suited our status of "white foreigners." The house is located on one of Hillbay's three hills, less than 400 yards from the main street of Hillbay. Being so close to Main Street we were constantly visited by people who were "just passing by." Since the house is located next to a heavily trafficked path leading over a steep hill that separates one part of town from another, residents usually wandered in looking for a cool drink. If they happened to arrive while we were eating they usually stayed to join us—a typical feature of most Grenadian households and their guests, either invited or uninvited.

During the course of the study I took great pains to explain exactly what I was doing to anyone who asked. At first, many residents assumed I was some kind of a spy, although they usually had difficulty

---

10 Hillbay, St. Michael's, and all personal names, except those of political leaders, are pseudonyms.
deciding who my employer was. Some thought I worked for the Grenada government. They changed their minds when I pointed out how the government could hardly find a less likely spy. Why would the government hire a white man who stood out like a sore thumb? Others thought I worked for the C.I.A. They, however, were at a loss as to what the C.I.A. hoped to learn by having me in Hillbay. One of my most frustrating experiences occurred while I was taking the household census. I encountered a ten year old boy who had figured out that I was working for both the government and the C.I.A. What was worse, he managed to convince all his neighbors not to talk to me even though I tried my best to overcome their fears. That kind of isolated encounter notwithstanding, I had very little trouble eliciting information from the majority of Hillbay residents and other Grenadians. Some, knowing that I was interested in rumor, went out of their way to bring me any "juicy tidbit" I might not have heard. In addition to the people who dropped into the house for food and drink, others actively sought me out to give me any "news" they thought would interest me.

We left Grenada on April 25, 1974 to spend one month in London and six weeks in New York. During this urban part of the project we talked to "overseas" Grenadians, carried out library research, and acquainted ourselves with Grenadian life-styles and life-situations overseas. Like their countrymen "at home," overseas Grenadians were most helpful with our enquiries and often saved us much time and effort by bringing informants to us without our having to spend time locating them.
Hypotheses and Orientation

I went to Grenada hoping to be able to prove two related hypotheses. I believed, first: Economic factors, while important, are not the most important factors determining who will become emigrants. Stated in a more positive way, in a situation where economic factors are held approximately equal and constant, other factors will determine who will become an emigrant. I assumed that although Grenadians view economic matters differently than I do, within their frame of reference non-economic factors are more significant than economic factors. That hypothesis is correct (see Chapter Six). Second: Potential emigrants could give a detailed account of life overseas before they left Grenada (see Chapter Seven). The importance of this ability lies at the foundation of any theory of migration. If emigrants can not describe what they expect to find at the end of their journey they will not be able to explain their intended actions to non-emigrants within their society. Their proposed actions will be viewed as foolish, or even irrational, and the full weight of public sentiment will be brought to bear against such endeavors. Only if the prospective emigrant can rationalize his chosen course of action will his peers sanction his decision. The situation "on the ground" is much more complex than I had imagined. A partial solution and explanation is given in Chapters Seven and Eight.

In the course of the study I used "standard" ethnological techniques to determine if these hypotheses were correct in the Grenadian context (see Chapter Eight). To operationalize my hypotheses I investigated several facets of Grenadian life. First, could Grenadian emigrants be classified according to demographic or socio-economic criteria? For example, do first sons emigrate more often than other children? Do
more wealthy people emigrate than poor people? The answers to these and other questions were negative. Patterns, if they exist, are more complex than I can account for using simple demographic or socio-economic variables. Second, what reasons do prospective emigrants give to explain their actions? While I found that each prospective emigrant could account for his future actions by giving one of five "standard answers" to the question "Why do you plan to leave Grenada?", I also found that other residents do not accept these answers as definitive (see Chapters Six and Seven). Third, how do non-emigrants account for prospective emigrants' decisions if they are unwilling to accept the prospective emigrants' own stated reasons? I discovered that residents discuss and debate (see Chapters Four and Six) emigrants' reasons much as they do any other items whose validity they question. Migration is not singled out as a particular topic of conversation any more than is any other human activity. Finally, how do Grenadians think of emigrants, do they single them out for special attention, and to what do they attribute their success or failure—defined in their own idiom? Here I discovered that residents tie emigrants' success and failure to a constellation of values and expectations generally associated with being a successful member of society (see Chapter Three). A successful emigrant is nothing more, or less, than a successful "man" whether he chooses to leave the country or not.

Format of the Study

Chapter Two is a description of Hillbay, St. Michael's, the town in which most of the study was carried out. It contains background information about Grenada the reader will need to make the rest of the
work intelligible. Chapter Three describes the concept "manliness," the central feature of Grenadian men's lives. In later chapters the role of manliness in determining who will be a successful emigrant and in constraining individual's access to knowledge will be discussed. Chapter Four is an examination and explanation of "liming," the core activity in Grenadian men's lives. It shows how men interact during their daily lives and in what context migration, and other topics are discussed and debated. Chapter Five deals with the "overt" data concerning migration. It presents a picture of "what everyone knows" about migration as revealed in response to questions such as "Why are you leaving Grenada? Where do you plan to go? Why do you plan to go there?" Chapter Six contains information about the "covert" data dealing with migration. It shows how residents discuss and analyse prospective migrants' reasons for leaving and how they make sense out of that aspect of the world in which they live. Chapter Seven is an analysis of the information with which residents work and an exploration of just how they attempt to explain certain aspects of what they see in the "real" world of everyday life. The analysis is based on the works of the sociologist Alfred Schutz. Chapter Eight, the conclusion, sums up the discussions presented in the body of the work. It also includes my suggestions for future studies of migration along non-traditional lines.
CHAPTER TWO

AN INTRODUCTORY ETHNOGRAPHY

This chapter contains a brief summary of the socio-economic and geographical features of Hillbay, St. Michael's, where most of the study was carried out. Hillbay is the largest town in the Parish of St. Michael's, one of Grenada's six parishes. Main Street is a half mile section of the island's circumferential highway which runs parallel to the sea in Hillbay. Three secondary streets begin at Main Street and rise toward the center of the island on the crests of three low hills. The secondary streets continue inland for about one mile, until they join a secondary road which runs parallel to Main Street one mile inland. The secondary road, called Top Street, joins the circumferential highway one mile beyond the town boundaries on either side of town. People who do not live in Hillbay think of the whole area bounded by Top Street and the sea as Hillbay Town. Town residents say that only the houses on Main Street and on the first half mile of each secondary street are really within Hillbay (cf. Greenfield 1966:80-81). Other settlements within the semi-circle formed by Top Street have their own names. Hillbay residents classify their close neighbors in these settlements by the names of the settlements. The people are "Happy Corner" people, "Cripple Ridge" people, etc. They are identified with their places of residence, not with Hillbay. Following these definitions, Hillbay itself has a population of approximately 1000 people within a land area of about two square miles.
As the largest town in the parish, Hillbay was formerly the seat of the local district board. When the district board system was abolished Hillbay retained all the main branches of essential parish services. These services include the main post office with its district revenue office and savings bank, the main police station and parish court house, the government dispensary and government pharmacy, and the local water board and telephone exchange. In addition to the government services, Hillbay has a physician's office, three local branches of international banks, four branches of island-wide chain stores, three gasoline stations, and over three dozen locally owned smaller shops.

St. Michael's used to be an agricultural parish. It contained several very large estates, many smaller, family-owned and operated estates, and several thousand small peasant holdings. The traditional crops included bananas, cocoa and nutmeg/mace. When Hurricane Janet struck Grenada in 1955 most of the cocoa and nutmeg trees were destroyed. Many of Hillbay's wooden buildings were flattened.¹ Most of the more obvious storm damage was repaired by the early 1960's but Hillbay and St. Michael's have not regained their former productivity. Hillbay residents blame this failure on the present government. After the 1967 elections the government of (now) Prime Minister E. M. Gairy began a "Land for the Landless" scheme. It nationalized many of the larger estates and redistributed the land to the agricultural workers. The estate owners were not compensated for their lands and buildings. The redistribution of estate lands resulted in a decline of cash crop productivity because the small holders no longer have the economies of

¹The people enjoy telling the story of the Pearl's Airport sign and the hurricane. The day after the storm passed, the airport sign was found in Carriacou, an island 26 miles north of Grenada.
scale the large estates had. In addition, many of the small holders were forced to take portions of their plots out of cocoa and nutmeg production to plant them in "provisions" for domestic and market consumption. These changes have eliminated many jobs for the former agricultural workers. The changes have also decreased the flow of foreign exchange into St. Michael's economy. Businessmen and other residents feel that these changes have caused a decline in the economic prosperity they believe existed in Hillbay and St. Michael's before 1967. In any case, the parish is no longer a major agricultural producer and many of the people who were employed by the estates and the ancillary businesses which supported the estates are now out of work.

Ethnohistory

This section contains the "unofficial" history of Hillbay and Grenada. It is the history the people know and tell. In some cases ethnohistory is essentially the same as the "official" history contained in government documents and in the quasi-official history section of the Grenada Handbook (1946). In the majority of cases, however, the official and unofficial versions are not exactly the same. The differences between the two versions reflect the different interests and attitudes of the historians and of the local residents. Since this study focuses upon the Grenadian people's perceptions of the world and not the "objective, real world" seen by unbiased scientific observers it is most important that one understands the world, and its history as the Grenadians see them.²

²In cases where the differences in the two versions are important, where they shed some light on aspects of migration for instance, both versions will be given. The official version appears in [brackets].
For the average Grenadian, history is a disconnected series of disconnected anecdotal events. Each event concerns a known historical figure or a contemporary person; therefore, one can say that history is personalized for Grenadians. Events or periods which do not have a central actor are all but unknown. Ancient history, events before 1900, involves the parents, the grandparents, and the more remote ancestors of living, known people.

Columbus discovered Grenada in 1498, but the island was not occupied by Europeans until the beginning of the Seventeenth Century [1609] when the French took possession. Some Grenadians who have lived in Spanish-speaking countries insist a Spanish colony existed in Grenada before the French took control. They claim the name of the island is Spanish [they mean it is the same as the name of the Spanish city, Granada]. They say its early history is not well-known because the Spanish were no more interested in Grenada than they were in Trinidad [which did have early Spanish settlers]. In any case, nothing much happened until the French took the island away from the Carib Indians [in 1650]. The French chased the Caribs to the northern tip of the island where they forced them to leap from a high hill into the sea in order to avoid capture or a more painful death. The hill has been called morne de sauteurs (leaper's hill) ever since. The town of Sauteurs has grown up around the base of the hill. Nothing exciting or noteworthy took place while the French held the island except that the French began to import African slaves. Besides the slaves the French contributed parts of their language to the local patois (which is dying out) and named most of the local sites.

After a long time the English took the island from the French
[The English took the island during the Seven Years War (to Americans, the French and Indian War), lost it again during the American Revolution, and finally regained it by the Treaty of Paris which ended the American Revolution]. They, too, continued to import slaves. The next important event [1795-1796], which was forgotten until very recently when the New Jewel Movement revived it as an object lesson, was a rebellion led by Julien Fedon against the English. Fedon was a "colored" planter [and slave owner] who tried to drive the English out and establish a free island, or at worst, reestablish Grenada as a French Colony. After a great fight the English managed to overpower Fedon, but he escaped capture and disappeared. The only remarkable event in the Nineteenth Century was that the Queen (no one remembers which one) freed the slaves [in 1838 after a brief period of apprenticeship].

This brings us to the year 1900, which is when the people say modern history began. The distinction is based on the fact that modern history involves living, or recently dead, people. In a sense, modern history consists of the life histories of people born at or soon after the turn of the present century. The first important event of the Twentieth Century was the digging of the Panama Canal. Mr. Bimini, who claims to have dug the Canal with a limited amount of assistance from the other Grenadians in Panama and a few other people, is Hillbay's authority on Panama. If necessary he can validate his account by showing anyone who doubts him the Canal pension check he receives from the U.S. Government once each month. [Such a large exodus of Grenadians to the Canal Zone occurred in 1906 that the history section of the Handbook makes reference to the fact. That is the only reference to migration in the Handbook.]
Once Canal Fever died down things were quiet for a short time. In 1914 the mother country got into a war [the First World War]. Grenada sent volunteers who are thought to have swung the tide in favor of the allies. Mr. Charles Martel (also known as 6789 [his serial number] and 10 Rounds, Rapid Fire) is the only Hillbay resident who fought in the war. His accounts, and therefore the people's knowledge, are not too reliable because he has been "crack" (crazy) ever since he returned from army service in Egypt. All the Hillbay people know for sure is that he won some sort of good conduct or attendance medal.

When the War ended, things went back to normal again. People went back to cutting cane and to planting their gardens. During the 1920's many of the sugar estates changed to cocoa and nutmeg production on all their lands that would support the tree crops. St. Michael's was no exception; and the sugar mill, built with slave labor, went out of production. It was a difficult time. The only work available was estate agriculture, and even that was hard to get. A few men left for (what was then) British Guiana to work for the gold and aluminum companies. Most stayed at home. The world depression was not felt as strongly in Grenada as it was in the more industrialized countries, but there was a slight "pinch" on imports.

Before the Second World War Grenadians were on the move again. This time they went to the Dutch West Indies to help build the oil refineries. Hundreds went, so that each town and village has many authorities on life in the oil fields and on life in the Dutch Islands. When the war broke out for the mother country, Grenadians went to Trinidad in unprecedented numbers to build the American Base [a lend-lease base]. As was the case with the Dutch West Indies, hundreds went to take
advantage of the good "works" (jobs) and to get some American dollars. Each village has several living historians of the Trinidad Base days. Several hundred Grenadians served in the Second World War but their exploits are not appreciated by their fellow citizens who are much more interested in events in Trinidad and the Dutch West Indies.

When the war ended things went back to normal although many of the Grenadians who had gone overseas chose to remain there. Things remained stable until 1951 when "Uncle" Eric Mathew Gairy, an unsuccessful labor leader in Aruba, returned to Grenada. He brought the idea for an agricultural labor union with him. His actions led to labor unrest, strikes, civil strife and violence. After numerous strikes and much violence and arson he got substantial pay increases for the agricultural workers [from $0.91 to $1.20 per day for men and from $0.76 to $1.00 a day for women] before he was forcibly removed from the island.

Again things returned to normal until 1955 when Hurricane Janet struck Grenada. The day, Thursday, September 22, 1955, is still remembered and talked about as the day that the storm hit Grenada. Most of the island's wooden structures were destroyed, and the agricultural industry was wiped out. After the storm, there was nothing: no food, no shelter, and no work. Within a month a gigantic exodus of Grenadians to England began—at first only men, but then men and women. Where migrants to the Dutch West Indies and to Trinidad were counted by the hundreds, migrants to England were counted by the thousands.3 The

---

3Actually there is no way to know how many Grenadians went to the Dutch West Indies, Trinidad, England, and, later, the United States. In many cases, perhaps in the majority, migrants entered illegally. In other cases the receiving governments kept no accurate records. Mr. Oswald Gibbs, head of the Eastern Caribbean Commission in London, said that when he entered England for the first time his passport was not
people left in such numbers that today, twenty years later, almost every household in Hillbay has one or more of its former members, or their descendants, in "London" (Britain). In 1962 the British government passed a law restricting immigration from the New [read non-white] Commonwealth. That law forced many Grenadians to go to the United States instead of Britain. Subsequent British laws have forced a continuation of the trend.

The next significant events took place between the years 1961 and 1967 when Eric Mathew Gairy, "Uncle" Eric of 1951, became Chief Minister and then Premier. In 1962 he was removed from office; the constitution was suspended; and he was forced to retire from politics. His government was accused of "squandermania" and discredited. In 1967, after a pardon from the Premier, Mr. Blaize, Mr. Gairy's political party, with him at its head, regained power (see Singham 1968 for a detailed description of these events as seen by a political scientist). The period from 1967 to the present is considered current events. That is, everyone who is an adult now was living during that period. It is no longer history, since everyone can serve as his own informant.

Kinship, Family Structure and Households

Kinship, household composition and family structure in West Indian societies probably have received more attention than similar institutions in any other culture area, with the possible exception of Australia. M. G. Smith has done an excellent job of reporting and analyzing these institutions in Grenada and its dependency Carriacou (Smith stamped and his entrance was not recorded nor were those of any of his fellow passengers, i.e. more than 400 people.

Grenadian blacks, and most Grenadian East Indians, descendants of people from pre-independence India, use Eskimo type kin terms of reference and address. In most cases the terms are the same as those used in the rest of the English speaking world (see Murdock 1949). The one important addition is the use of the term "in-law" as a modifier to designate all people related to ego through affinal (either legal or customary) ties. Where people in the United States usually restrict the use of "in-law" terms to the first ascending and descending generations and to ego's generation, Grenadians extend its use to the first, second and third ascending and descending generations. They also apply it to affinals beyond the nuclear family categories (i.e. cousin-in-law, aunt- and uncle-in-law, etc.) (see MacDonald 1973b).

Grenadians practice three basic conjugal patterns. Legal marriage is the infrequently obtained "ideal" form. It implies the same set of expectations of structure and function as are implied in England or in the United States, even the idea that marriages may not last forever. Grenadians accept this limitation, but expect people to practice serial monogamy during each marriage. Of course, they are not surprised or offended if the male has a "friend" or a "keeper" on the "outside." The second form of union is called "living" or "keeping" (see Rodman 1971:56). In this relationship the man and woman live together without benefit of legal sanction. In all other respects "keeping" can be the same as legal marriage, and no stigma is attached to the fact that the union was not sanctioned by the church or the state. The third conjugal form is called "friending." In the friending relationship the man and
woman do not live together. The bond is essentially one that involves only sexual intercourse. If the woman has a child, the man is expected to provide support for it if there is no question about paternity. Each kind of union affords wide latitude for individual expression and variation. Personal "style" is usually accepted without comment by the people involved and by the community at large; adverse comments are restricted to cases of incestuous unions and to cases where a "wrong" partner is involved (see Chapter Three). Each of these conjugal unions is quite common throughout the Caribbean (see Rodman 1971; Wilson 1973; Philpott 1973; R. T. Smith 1956; Henriques 1953).

The Grenadian household, like the conjugal unions, is not unique in the Caribbean. No forms or practices are found in Grenada that are not found in one or more of the other Caribbean societies (ibid.). However, household composition is more complicated than kinds of conjugal unions, allowing for many more combinations and permutations. Solien [de Gonzalez] (1959), dealing with the Black Caribs of Guatemala, has shown that the household, not the family, is the basic domestic unit of Caribbean societies. Her analysis points out that the concept "family," and particularly "nuclear family," is of marginal utility for explaining the structure and function of domestic groups (see also, Adams 1960). She also examines the developmental cycles of different kinds of domestic groups in order to explain how various forms have evolved in response to migrant wage labor and other extrinsic factors (Solien [de Gonzalez] 1960; Gonzalez 1961, 1965, 1969). Others have tried to quantify the developmental cycle (that is, produce a diachronic picture from synchronic census data) but their methods and analysis are not up to the standards set by Solien [de Gonzalez] (cf. Otterbein 1963, 1970).
Hillbay, and Grenada generally, has five kinds of households. The simplest form consists of an elderly person living by him/herself. The second form, which may be a variant of the first, is a household of an elderly person and one or more (non-kin) young people. The youngster runs errands, keeps the old person company, and "protects" him from natural and supernatural "evil" agencies at night. The third kind of household consists of a grandmother, her children, and her children's children. This is the "classic" matrifocal household (Solien [de Gonzalez] 1959). The children are usually the grandmother's unmarried daughters, who do not have their own households. In many cases a young grandmother is still having children of her own while her daughters are having their children. The fourth kind of household consists of an unmarried woman, her children, her siblings (usually only female) and her siblings' children. The fifth kind of household most closely resembles the English or United States "ideal." It consists of a couple (married or "living"), their children and in a few instances one of the couple's parents. In each of the last four kinds of households non-kinsmen or distant kinsmen may also be found. Most of these are young children who have been left in the care of the head of the household. The children's parents may be away from the island as emigrants (see Philpott 1973) or may be unable to support them (see Rodman 1971). In either case the "guests" are treated in the same way as the household head's own children are.

**Housing**

When a visitor arrives in Grenada he may be struck by what appears to be the poor condition of local housing. Few structures have fresh coats of paint; on most painted buildings the paint is weathered
and peeling. The majority of structures are unpainted. Yards and areas underneath houses appear to be littered with "junk." Residents explain the situation by saying they are too poor to paint every year—the logic behind that statement being that the sea air corrodes paint so fast yearly painting is necessary—or that the houses are "good enough."

"Junk" abounds because no system of garbage collection exists.

Most people own their houses and house spots outright. A minority rent the sites on which their houses sit. About thirty per cent rent the houses in which they live. Rents vary with the kind of house, its size and the relation of the rentor to the tenant. The least expensive house in Hillbay rents for $3.00 a month; the most expensive house rents for $150.00 a month.\(^4\) The mean rent is below $40.00 per month.

One finds two types of houses in Grenada; the distinction is based on the material out of which the house was constructed. "Board" houses are made of wooden planks and have "galvanize" sheet metal roofs. The most common kind of board house is called a "Janet" house in honor of the hurricane. They were first brought to Grenada in large numbers from Surinam in 1955-1956 as a hurricane relief measure. Since then several thousand have been brought over or built on the island. They are quite small, 8' by 12', although all of them have two rooms: a bedroom and a parlour. Larger board houses with three, four, five, and even six rooms exist. They are built by local "contractors" to the owner's specifications although they often reflect the builder's capabilities more than the rough plans from which they supposedly take their

\(^4\)The local currency, the Eastern Caribbean dollar (E.C.$) is tied to the British pound at the fixed rate of $4.80 to the pound. During the course of my study the E.C.$ varied in value between 45c and 55c (U.S.). All prices in this work are cited in Eastern Caribbean currency.
design. All Janet houses and most other board houses have their kitchens in a separate shed at the back of the house. This is a fire precaution, since much of the cooking is done on a "coal pot." Less than one third of the board houses have pipe borne water supply, and of that third less than twenty per cent have indoor toilets. Most board houses have their own pit latrine at the back of the property, if possible in a clump of trees or bushes.

The other type of house is the "wall" house. These houses, which are usually larger and more expensive than board houses, are built of concrete blocks, which are covered with a "plaster" of fine concrete. Most have galvanize' roofs, although some of the wealthier people have shingle roofs on their houses. The wall house is a relatively new innovation for the majority of the population who traditionally could not afford them. Since they are much more expensive than board houses (a modest wall house in Hillbay costs about $10,000 to $15,000 as opposed to a board house which costs between $1,500 and $4,000), only wealthier, steadily employed people can afford them. All wall houses in Hillbay, and most in St. Michael's, have pipe borne water and indoor toilets. Those located along Main Street are two storey buildings. Invariably the first floor is a shop of some sort and the second floor is a "flat" occupied by the shop/house owner. In the last four years, all but three of the wall houses built in Hillbay have been financed by Grenadians living overseas (cf. Wilson 1973 and Philpott 1973). This reflects the positive value islanders place on having a house "at home" to which they can retire when they get too old to work. Many of the houses have been built by relatively young Grenadians who do not plan to return home in the near future. They view their houses as a good investment, as forced
savings, and as a "hedge" against inflation.

Religion

Through an accident of history Grenada has two established churches, the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England (Anglican). French settlers in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries set up Catholic churches for themselves and later had their slaves converted. Until very recently the Catholic Church claimed sixty-five per cent of the island's church-going population. Each of the island's towns, and many villages, has its own church. The majority of Catholics are members of the lower-class, although a small minority are middle-class.

When Grenada became a British possession in 1783 the new colonists brought the Anglican Church to the island to serve the white population. As time passed some blacks and many "free colored" people were accepted into the Church. The Anglican Church claims thirty-five per cent (some say as much as fifty per cent) of the island's church goers. Its membership includes most of the upper-class, the old elite, much of the middle-class, and more recently, many lower-class people. Grenadians realize that the Anglican Church is prominent among the elite because it was the church of their English overlords. Consequently some of the lower-class members of the Catholic Church say that lower-class Anglicans are "niggers who trying to be white." The lower class Anglicans deny these allegations of social climbing (see Henriques 1953 for a discussion of the "white is superior" bias in Jamaica). They say that they are Anglicans because their parents were Anglicans. This answer satisfies no one, because it only shifts the "blame" from the present generation to the last generation. Of course, no official rivalry between the two churches exists. However, lay members of both churches
often express disdain for the practices, the policies, and the members of the "other" church.

The established churches, and to a lesser extent the smaller Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, have a pressing problem. Many Grenadians view organized religion with mixed feelings. Few would go so far as to say the Church was a bad thing but many say it is a waste of time. The major churches' attendance figures reflect this attitude. In addition to the problem of poor attendance, several fundamentalist sects have been wooing members away from the "real" churches for the past seventy years. Within the last twenty years the defections have become very noticeable. The most vocal of the newer organizations is the Baptist Church, which is really a loosely united set of distinct congregations. Each has its own minister (male) or mother (female), who interprets Christian religion as he or she sees fit. Ministers are ordained by wandering bishops from Trinidad, or by God Himself. Baptist dogma and practice are a fusion of Catholic miracle working and prayer with some of the more flamboyant elements of the Shango Cult (see below). The Baptists have no island-wide hierarchy capable of maintaining order within the sect so each church gets its members however it can. In many cases one Baptist church converts members of another Baptist church who are not "doing it right." The members appear to be less disciplined than members of the more orthodox churches and often follow charismatic ministers as they change from one church to another. Almost all Baptists are members of the lower-class. Many other lower-class people regard the Baptists as fools or religious "nuts." The fact that many Baptist back-sliders drink and "carry on" adds to the impression that the religion is more than a bit hypocritical. However, many Baptists have received
local notoriety for their apparent piety or for their ability to work miracles (and Obeah). Mr. Gairy, the Prime Minister, is the most famous "big man" to become a Baptist. Many of his opponents see his conversion as a trick to curry favor with the "ignorant, illiterate, poor folk," who comprise the majority of his following. Others see it as a way for the Prime Minister to foster the idea that he is a powerful Obeahman, much as Popa Doc Duvalier did in Haiti (see below).

The Seventh Day Adventist Church, the various Pentecostal Churches and the Fire Baptized Holiness Church, all with islandwide and international organizations, are also drawing large numbers of members away from the Catholic and Anglican Churches. Those three sects are less noticeable and more acceptable to non-members than are the Baptists. They are more traditional in their approach to religion and do not lead their members to "play the ass" with such antics as walking up and down Main Street with a lit "coal pot" on your head, ringing a bell and shouting "sudden death" as the Baptists have done.

The Shango cult seems to be dying out in Grenada, or at least in St. Michael's, which has always been a Shango stronghold. There were no ceremonies in St. Michael's from May 1973 through May 1974, and there was only one ceremony reported on the whole island in that period.\footnote{There were some Shango "shows" put on for tourists but these are really only performances held to make money, not to fulfill the traditional functions of the cult.} One reason for the apparent decline of Shango may be the deteriorating economic situation in Grenada. Each ceremony requires that the sponsor supply at least one "animal" (a cow or a sheep or a goat) and several "fowls." With food in short supply, most people are unwilling to part with their valuable livestock. Another reason often given by Grenadians...
is that Shango does not work and that participation shows that Grenadians are "backward too much." While they often stress the latter factor, the former is really more important. Why waste good money when the results are not guaranteed?

Grenadian Shango appears to be less well structured and informed than Shango reported in other Caribbean islands and in Brazil. Mistress Philip, the Shango Queen of St. Michael's explained that her (kin based) Shango group dances for three days and nights, beginning on Wednesday morning, to drive the devil (or the god Shango or the Sea goddess) out of one who is possessed. They also work to placate unhappy spirits of the dead who cause problems for the living. Grenadians who are not members of one of the family based cult groups, more than ninety-nine percent of the population, are often ignorant of the fine points of cult behavior. The average man who admits to having gone to a ceremony says he does so because he wants to see what happens, to dance, to eat and to make fun of the "ignorant" people. Most Hillbay people who say they do not believe in the power of Shango say they go to the ceremonies because they are good entertainment, although they are only a poor substitute for a good Christian wake.

Obeah and the obeahman are more prominent in the lexicon of the supernatural than Shango. The obeahman can use supernatural spiritual forces to affect the natural world, and he can use medicines and magic to achieve desired ends. None of the Hillbay sophisticates admits that he or she believes in Obeah. They claim that there are no obeahmen or Obeah houses in town but stress that if one went into the hills where the "poor, illiterate" people live, one could find many people who claim to be able to work Obeah. As much as they protest their disbelief and
ignorance, everyone knows the signs of Obeah and the precautions to be taken against it. The people's protests notwithstanding, one of the town's fishermen readily admits that he makes "medicines" for anyone who requests them, as he has been doing for the past forty years. He denies that he is an obeahman and claims that all he does is make medicines to make a little extra money. As far as he is concerned, Obeah does not exist, but he does not refuse clients who believe he is an obeahman. Some of his clients are people who have been given up as "lost causes" by Western physicians. He gives these people harmless mixtures (ground tonka beans [vanilla] or aspirin in water) in return for a token payment. People who ask for medicines for illicit purposes get the same mixtures but are forced to pay whatever the market will bear, from $50 to $250. He bases his prices on his own values. For people who have a real disease which he can not cure he charges a token payment. "I the last hope and it don't good to take money from a dying person you ain't help." Medicine that will be used for an illicit purpose is very expensive because the people are willing to pay almost anything to achieve their evil ends. When he prepares a compound, his prices are exorbitant. When he sells someone some materials with which he suspects they will make their own medicines (or have an obeahman make them for them), he often charges ten to fifteen times the actual retail price. "Someone do some nastiness he gots to pay for it. These nigger people so stupid, is they own self fault." In addition to the obeahman there is one older woman, who everyone says is "crack" (crazy), who openly displays her knowledge of Obeah. Her mental problem puts her beyond moral and legal sanctions (practicing Obeah is against the law). She uses some of the more widely known paraphernalia to protect her
garden and her corn plot. All the young (potential) thieves know what the signs mean but do not appear to be intimidated by them.

In addition to Shango and Obeah, Grenadians know of six spirits that can harm the living and their possessions. These spirits are: la diablesse (female devils with one normal foot and one hoof); mama maladie (the spirits of women who have died in childbirth); jockula (poltergeists who throw stones at houses and move objects within houses); baku (dwarf tricksters, from Guyana, who play unpleasant pranks); loup garou and sukuyan (male and female vampires [often translated as werewolf, but I believe that translation does not really comply with the people's notions of the spirits], or witches [after Evans-Pritchard 1937] who can shed their skins at night to fly through the air in search of victims to "suck"); and, maljo (really the evil eye and not a spirit at all, but classed with the spirits by Grenadians). Most people say that the idea of spirits is a "lot of foolishness." Yet, most know the names and attributes of each spirit and can cite examples of particular spirits' having done harm to people they know. While the people claim that the spirits are only "nancy" stories (the African spider, Anansi), which old people tell to frighten youngsters, they all seem to take precautions to defend themselves. The most remarkable attribute of all the spirits is that they can not kill. Since that is the case, no one should be too frightened, because even if one is attacked by spirits he can not be killed.

Economics

Presently, it is almost impossible to give an accurate summary of the islandwide economic situation because all pronouncements about economics are heavily colored by political propaganda. It appears that
Hillbay, St. Michael's, and Grenada are not as prosperous as they once were. People who support Mr. Gairy say that although things are not as good as they once were, they will improve once business gets back to "normal." Mr. Gairy's opponents claim that his government's policies have driven the country into bankruptcy and that the island will remain bankrupt until there are political changes. The issue is confused because the government has not published much economic information since 1968, when the last of the pre-Gairy figures were issued as a matter of course by the responsible civil servants. In the absence of any official figures an observer must base his conclusions on very biased reports from individuals and institutions.

The best, most recent, independent survey of one region's economic prospects is a United Nations development survey of a town and its hinterland in St. Patrick Parish. When I checked the establishments which were reported to have been in business in 1967 against those still in business during my study (1973-1974), I found that the changes were marginal. Only very small, poorly run businesses have closed. All the major firms, and the vast majority of the locally owned shops were still doing business. Several new shops have opened to take the places of those which have closed. Without exception, the shop owners I interviewed in the town claimed that their volume of business was down and that if things continued without change many will close. It must be noted that the town is one of the most anti-Gairy towns in Grenada, and much of what I learned was no doubt colored by political feelings.

*One islandwide chain store outlet and four small shops went out of business during the general strike but this seems to be more a political than an economic consideration. The proprietors said they closed their shops as a protest against the government's inability to keep order.*
The situation in Hillbay is similar to the situation in the other town. None of the firms or shops are expanding; several shops have furloughed one or two employees. The agricultural industry, as mentioned above, is in decline; and the shops that traditionally catered to agricultural workers are suffering. The number of people employed in private enterprise has declined from a peak of about 100 to the current level of seventy-five. The largest employer in Hillbay is the government. It employs about thirty civil servants (in the post office, police station, public works, etc.) and sixty-five local school teachers. Even the government has had to lay off about ten per cent of its work force. The fishing industry, which never employed more than fifty men, is stable, because the demand for fish has not changed. In the long run a drop in tourism may hurt the fishermen, who help supply the island's tourist hotels.

The apparent decline in the economy has highlighted a paradox in the economic life of Hillbay's citizens. The situation is summarized in Tables 1, 2, and 3. The salaries in Table 1 apply to people who have steady work, that is, full-time employment, but more than fifty per cent (and probably as much as sixty-five per cent) of Hillbay's working population are un- and underemployed. The vast majority of people get whatever money they have by part-time or casual labor and from remittances from friends and relatives abroad. Since that is the case, the otherwise "reasonable" prices, given in Table 2, when multiplied by the average purchases per week, given in Table 3, become problematic. When one adds capital expenditures for clothing, rent, school fees, transportation, entertainment, and miscellaneous expenses to the list the shortage of cash becomes more obvious.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>SALARY/PERIOD¹</th>
<th>YEARLY INCOME¹</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>SALARY/PERIOD¹</th>
<th>YEARLY INCOME¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>4.50/day</td>
<td>675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officer</td>
<td>$210.00/month²</td>
<td>$2520.00</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>3.50/day</td>
<td>525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secret</td>
<td>28.00/week²</td>
<td>1456.00</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctor</td>
<td>600.00/month²</td>
<td>7200.00</td>
<td>net</td>
<td>112.50/week</td>
<td>2925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurse</td>
<td>175.00/month²</td>
<td>2100.00</td>
<td>line</td>
<td>125.00/week</td>
<td>3750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>160.00/month²</td>
<td>1920.00</td>
<td>lobster</td>
<td>200.00/week</td>
<td>4800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shop Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerk</td>
<td>150.00/month²</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>62.50/month</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master</td>
<td>390.00/month²</td>
<td>4680.00</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>112.50/month</td>
<td>1350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Help</td>
<td>50.00/month</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd class</td>
<td>167.50/month²</td>
<td>2010.00</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st class</td>
<td>325.00/month²</td>
<td>3900.00</td>
<td>taxi owner</td>
<td>87.50/week</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher, primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taxi driver</td>
<td>37.50/week</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unqualified</td>
<td>150.00/month²</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>bus driver</td>
<td>35.00/week³</td>
<td>1750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified</td>
<td>345.00/month²</td>
<td>4140.00</td>
<td>bus conductor</td>
<td>15.00/week³</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>500.00/month²</td>
<td>6000.00</td>
<td>Building trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher, secondary (from)</td>
<td>250.00/month²</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
<td>mason</td>
<td>2.00/hour</td>
<td>3600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal (from)</td>
<td>800.00/month²</td>
<td>9600.00</td>
<td>carpenters</td>
<td>2.00/hour</td>
<td>3600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>45.00/week</td>
<td>2025.00</td>
<td>plumbers</td>
<td>2.00/hour</td>
<td>2400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>electricians</td>
<td>100.00/week</td>
<td>3500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common</td>
<td>190.00/month²</td>
<td>2230.00</td>
<td>painters</td>
<td>2.00/hour</td>
<td>2800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master</td>
<td>425.00/month²</td>
<td>5100.00</td>
<td>laborers</td>
<td>5.00/day</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹These are averages based on lowest starting salaries for each job.

²Plus allowances for dependents, expenses and seniority.

³Plus lunch and whatever money the worker can steal from the till without being noticed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM/UNIT</th>
<th>PRE-STRIKE PRICE(^1)</th>
<th>STRIKE PRICE(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sugar/lb.</td>
<td>$ 0.35</td>
<td>$ 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flour/lb.</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice/lb.</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk (condensed)/tin</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk (powder)/lb.</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil (cooking)/26 oz.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil (olive)/8 oz.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat (fresh kill)/lb.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish (fresh)/lb</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bananas/stem</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onions/lb.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garlic/4 oz.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bread/loaf</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butter (tinned)/lb.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coffee (instant)/jar</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potatoes (Irish)/lb.</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macaroni/8 oz.</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet drinks/case of 24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charcoal/tin</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerosene/gal.</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>1.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gasoline/gal.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corned beef/tin</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Average prices over a period of six months.

\(^2\)The strike lasted for three months, Jan.–Mar., 1974. Prices began to come down after the strike, but inflation has kept prices above pre-strike levels. By September, 1974 many of the prices again reached strike level.
### Table 3

**Average Purchases per Week/Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Unit</th>
<th>3-5 People(^1)</th>
<th>5-7 People(^2)</th>
<th>8 People(^3)</th>
<th>15 People(^4)</th>
<th>Average/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quantity/cost</td>
<td>quantity/cost</td>
<td>quantity/cost</td>
<td>quantity/cost</td>
<td>quantity/cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sugar/lb.</td>
<td>@ $0.35 4/1.40</td>
<td>10/3.50</td>
<td>12.5/4.38</td>
<td>25/8.75</td>
<td>1.54/0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flour/lb.</td>
<td>@ 0.325 10/3.25</td>
<td>25/8.12</td>
<td>25/8.12</td>
<td>25/8.12</td>
<td>2.58/0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice/lb.</td>
<td>@ 0.35 7/2.45</td>
<td>5/1.75</td>
<td>10/3.50</td>
<td>15/5.25</td>
<td>1.12/0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk (cond.)</td>
<td>@ 0.40 4/1.60</td>
<td>4/1.60</td>
<td>12/4.80</td>
<td>7/2.80</td>
<td>0.82/0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk (powder)</td>
<td>@ 1.65 3.5/5.78</td>
<td>1.5/2.48</td>
<td>2/3.30</td>
<td>3/4.95</td>
<td>0.30/0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil (cooking)</td>
<td>@ 0.85 1.5/1.28</td>
<td>1/0.85</td>
<td>1/0.85</td>
<td>2/1.70</td>
<td>0.17/0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oil (olive)</td>
<td>@ 2.00 1/2.00</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>5/10.00</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.18/0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meat (fresh)</td>
<td>@ 1.50 5/7.50</td>
<td>3.5/5.25</td>
<td>8/12.00</td>
<td>5/7.50</td>
<td>0.65/0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish (fresh)</td>
<td>@ 0.75 6/4.50</td>
<td>10/7.50</td>
<td>15/10.75</td>
<td>20/15.00</td>
<td>1.55/1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bananas</td>
<td>@ 2.00 3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.33/0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onions</td>
<td>@ 0.75 1.25/0.94</td>
<td>0.50/0.38</td>
<td>2/1.50</td>
<td>3/2.25</td>
<td>0.28/0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garlic</td>
<td>@ 0.75 0.25/0.20</td>
<td>1.00/0.75</td>
<td>1.00/0.75</td>
<td>1.00/0.75</td>
<td>0.10/0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bread</td>
<td>@ 0.125 -----</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>-----/0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butter (tinned)</td>
<td>@ 2.00 2/4.00</td>
<td>1/2.00</td>
<td>5/10.00</td>
<td>2/4.00</td>
<td>0.33/0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coffee</td>
<td>@ 2.00 1/2.00</td>
<td>1/2.00</td>
<td>1/2.00</td>
<td>1/2.00</td>
<td>0.12/0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potatoes (Irish)</td>
<td>@ 0.675 3.5/2.36</td>
<td>3.5/2.36</td>
<td>6/4.05</td>
<td>6/4.05</td>
<td>0.54/0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macaroni</td>
<td>@ 0.48 -----</td>
<td>0.5/0.25</td>
<td>2/0.96</td>
<td>4/1.92</td>
<td>0.20/0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet drinks</td>
<td>@ 3.30 0.25/1.60</td>
<td>0.50/3.00</td>
<td>1/3.30</td>
<td>1/3.30</td>
<td>0.83/0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>@ 0.75 3/2.25</td>
<td>2/1.50</td>
<td>2/1.50</td>
<td>3/2.25</td>
<td>0.33/0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerosene</td>
<td>@ 0.875 3/2.63</td>
<td>1/0.88</td>
<td>5/4.38</td>
<td>1.5/1.01</td>
<td>0.32/0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gasoline</td>
<td>@ 1.40 4/5.60</td>
<td>6/8.40</td>
<td>10/14.00</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0.61/0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corned beef</td>
<td>@ 1.60 1/1.60</td>
<td>1/1.60</td>
<td>3/4.80</td>
<td>3/4.80</td>
<td>0.24/0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total cost per week | $55.94 | $61.82 | $101.34 | $85.00 | $9.49 |
| Average per person  | 13.98  | 10.30  | 12.67   | 5.67   | 9.49  |

\(^1\)Based on an upper income lower-class family with no small children.
\(^2\)Based on the "average" lower-class family
\(^3\)Based on a middle-class family.
\(^4\)Based on a very low income lower-class family.
When I asked my informants to explain the paradox of long-term deficit spending, they thought of four possible explanations. The first suggestion was that many households get along by "thieving" (thieving). There is a great deal of praedial larcency (see Wilson 1973:77; Clarke 1957:25). Frederick Gamst (personal communication) suggests that theft obviously is a form of cashless economic exchange that insures scarce resources are evenly distributed. That is, no doubt, true, but it does not explain how people obtain items they can not steal. None of the items in Table 2 exist as free goods, that is, goods that can be obtained without making cash payments. The only exception is that men can get fish by helping the fishermen pull their boats out of the water. Even if they get fish for nothing people still must buy flour, rice, sugar, etc. with cash they do not have.

The second suggestion is that people live on remittances from friends and relatives. That is not a realistic solution because the average household gets less than $15.00 per week in remittances (cf. Philpott 1973:143). By contrast, Watson (n.d.) shows that some Chinese migrants in London regularly remit as much as £75 a month to their households in Hong Kong. At the current rate of exchange that would come to $360.00 per month, or more than most employed workers earn. Watson's overseas Chinese are the sole support of their village; Grenadian migrants believe that their households "at home" are better off than they are. No Grenadian would suggest that overseas Grenadians do or should make such generous remittances. Even if one were to combine remittances and theft the resultant income of cash and in kind is still too little to support the average household.

The third suggestion is that the estimates of weekly purchases
are too high. However, when my informants examined the list they could never pare the total cost to less than $40.00 per week for an "average" household. There is not much information about weekly expenditures for Caribbean households in the literature. Greenfield (1966:Table 15) gives a list of expenditures for families in Barbados and Henrques (1953: Table 10) gives similar lists for urban families in Jamaica. If one translates their figures into current prices in Grenada, there is no significant difference between the three.

The fourth suggestion, made half in jest, does not seem to solve the problem either. Much of the buying in Hillbay is based on credit. A customer can "credit" purchases until he or she gets some money. It is possible to get merchandise for some time before a merchant cuts off the supply of credit. If an individual went from shop to shop in turn he could get a lot of goods before he exhausted all his credit. One of Hillbay's more prosperous people did just that. Unfortunately the scheme falls apart when average people are involved. No merchant will give "too much" credit to the "average" Hillbay citizen. The merchants know how much money each citizen has and what his prospects for getting more money are. By informal agreement the merchants have banded together to defeat the scheme. Many businessmen post signs outside their shops saying that "Mr. A has bad credit. He owes $12.34." Once one sign appears Mr. A's credit dries up. Even if a person could work this scheme for a year it would not solve his long-term problems.

As far as I can see there is no obvious solution to this paradox. If one assumes that every household uses all the four alternatives the people suggested, he would still come up short. Since merchants must pay for their foreign purchases with cash the system must be self-
sustaining. That does not seem to be the case. It is possible that I have overestimated the weekly expenses and underestimated the amount of weekly income, but I doubt if the differences would be significant.\footnote{I have double checked my estimates of weekly purchases through participant observation as well as through third party interviews. They do not seem unreasonable. The bank managers at the post office bank and at the private banks have compared my estimates of remittances against their records of foreign exchange transactions. They agree that my estimates "check" with their records.}
CHAPTER THREE

MANLINESS

The transfer of information about migration is a complicated process. Prospective migrants appear not to wait until some specific set of conditions exists before they react in some culturally determined, normative way. No real culture patterns for migration exist even though migration has been a factor of Grenadian life for over seventy years. Each individual makes his own choices and behaves in ways consistent with his particular personal "style." Since that is the case, an understanding of how men interact in their social world is necessary for an understanding of how migrants get the information they believe they will need to be successful. The background information in the last chapter helps explain the situation "on the ground," but it does not show how day to day interactions color and shape the transmission of knowledge. In order for the reader to understand Grenadian men I must first explain what manliness entails. Again, no clear-cut determinations exist. One must look at the process through which a male is labeled a 'real' man to understand the concept.

The following discussion will be limited to interactions between men for practical reasons. I do not have enough data about women's interactions to warrant a similar description and analysis. Grenadian society is rigidly divided by ideas of sexual propriety; consequently, I was not able to get "really close" to Grenadian women. As a young, married, white man I could not establish intimate relations with
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The following discussion will be limited to interactions between men for practical reasons. I do not have enough data about women's interactions to warrant a similar description and analysis. Grenadian society is rigidly divided by ideas of sexual propriety; consequently, I was not able to get "really close" to Grenadian women. As a young, married, white man I could not establish intimate relations with
Grenadian women unless I were willing to have everyone suspect that I was having sexual relations with them. If I were single that would have been more, but not completely, acceptable. As it was I would have suffered a loss of rapport with many of my male informants if they suspected I might try to get "friendly" with their wives or "keepers."

The most important sentiment in a Grenadian man's life is his sense of being accepted by his peers, of belonging. A Grenadian does not need a home or a family to be a complete man. On the contrary, home life is not the central value for most men (cf. Wilson 1973; Rodman 1971; Philpott 1973; M. G. Smith 1965a, 1965b; Henriques 1953). Acceptance means being a man among one's fellow men. Peter Wilson (1969, 1973) uses the term "reputation" as a gloss for this constellation of values in his discussion of men on Providencia Island. Wilson notes (1973:150-152):

... a man's strength is the foundation of his reputation. ... Reputation stipulates the minimum requirements for adult manhood and respect. With a good reputation a man can take his place in society, and thereafter he may build it up to create his own distinctive position. ... Reputation is not just manliness but also a constellation of skills. Variations in reputation are a function of the number and worth of these skills and the varying degree of proficiency in them.

A male who does not "measure up" to the requirements is not a man.

The ascription of the status and the feeling of manliness are assigned ad hoc. No one can tell a man when he is a 'real' man or when he should feel he belongs. Manliness is constantly renegotiated. Hyman Rodman, writing about a similar situation in Coconut Village, Trinidad, calls the negotiation process "accordin'."

The accordin' attitude is one reflection of the orientation to circumstances. ... To question after question asking for the correct or expected behavior the villager would reply, 'Well, accordin' ... ' and then suggest several alternative lines of behavior that might be taken, depending on the circumstances. With
this outlook it is frequently possible for the villager to fix his behavior to the circumstances and to benefit from the flexible accordin' culture .... [Rodman 1971:173]

The interaction of "reputation" and the "accordin'" attitude can produce a great amount of ambiguity. There are no hard and fast rules to pin down, no simple responses to obvious stimuli. Two things, however, are clear: manliness is not a function of socio-economic class, and it is not a function of age. It would be incorrect to assume that wealth implies manliness. In an impoverished society that would restrict category membership to one or two individuals. The whole context of a man's economic position, how he obtained his wealth and what he does with it, determines his status. For example, Mr. Forest, one of Hillbay's most prosperous and hardworking shopkeepers is not considered a 'real' man. He began his career as a clerk for one of the large, islandwide concerns. Through years of hard work he managed to save enough money to buy his own store. His store is now one of the largest in town. Yet Hillbay people call Mr. Forest a "crab." They say, "He never come out he hole, just like crab." No one can recall a time when Mr. Forest left his shop. He works so hard that he only closed the shop for one hour on the day his wife was buried. When asked why he never "takes a drink with the boys," he said, "I have no time for that sort of foolishness.", meaning idle socializing does not pay the bills.

Mr. Block provides another example. He was born into the upper-class. His family is among the founding members of the St. Michael's elite. Whereas Mr. Forest is a "crab," Mr. Block is seen as a "fool" who "think he smart too bad." People also think he is very mean because "He too tight with a shilling." (the British shilling is worth 25c). As a member of the elite he is resented because "he think he too white,"
"he an Afro-Saxon." Any one of these breaches of expectations is enough to consign Mr. Block to manlessness limbo. Mr. Block could overcome his social liabilities and prove his manliness if he were so inclined (see below). Unfortunately, people question Mr. Block's virility. With all his other liabilities that rumor ensures he will never be thought of as a 'real' man. Since both Mr. Forest and Mr. Block are thought to be rich one could say their rejection by the people is really based on the people's envy of their economic position. That is not the case, and the reason will become obvious later on.

Beyond the restriction that a boy who has not reached puberty is not a man no age restriction on manliness exists. Other factors are more important than age and it is, again, a case of "accordin'." Alexander and Percy are both fifteen years old. Alexander is thought of as a boy while Percy is a man. Alexander left school in the middle of the seventh standard. He lives at home with his mother although he has several "friends." He tries to "lime" with the men but they refuse to take him seriously. His most notorious attempt at being a man was a dismal failure. During the general strike his mother could not get any charcoal to use for cooking. Alexander responded to the challenge by "burning" some coals for his mother. The story of Alexander's failure reached the limers two minutes after Alexander uncovered his pit of ashes which should have been coals. He was ragged unmercifully for over a week and it took more than a month for everyone to stop calling him by his new, derogatory "false name"—Coals. His abortive attempt showed everyone that he does not yet have a man's skills.

Percy still attends secondary school. His father, who owned and operated a small bus that served Hillbay's hinterland, died during the
school year. Percy continued his schooling and took over his father's bus route. The fact that he does neither task very well does not matter. For his efforts Percy was accorded the status of a man. He was elevated from boyhood because he was doing a man's work as well as his own school work.

It should be obvious from these few examples that the definition of manliness is a situated practice (Garfinkel 1967) that is, above all, context sensitive. However, Hillbay residents do use some general personality features to assign the status "man" to an individual. These features, explained below are (1) sexuality, (2) nobility and humility, (3) being "one of the boys," (4) the ability to handle any situation and, (5) the ability to "speak well."

Sexuality

The easiest way to determine if someone is a 'real' man is to see if he has fathered any children. Perhaps that is the reason virility is one of the leading criteria residents use to determine when a male has the right to think of himself as a man. Residents believe a high positive correlation exists between the number of children a man has fathered and his manliness. Catholic priests, behbays (singular, behbay: a retarded or simple person) and physical defectives are the only ones who are exempt from these determinations. Each man is expected to have a "respectable" number of children by his wife or "keeper," or both. Men who live in conjugal households, and even those who have no permanent conjugal partners, are expected to have one or more children "outside," that is, with casual lovers.

If a man has not fathered several children by the time he is twenty-one years old his manliness is suspect. (Similarly, any girl who
has not borne a child by the time she is eighteen years old is called a "mule." If the young man is married or living with a woman he can explain his apparent infertility in one of three ways. He can claim he is practicing birth control, he can claim his partner (never he) is infertile or he can claim "somebody doing me" (someone is practicing Obeah to make him or his partner infertile). The first two excuses, for they are viewed as such, are acceptable if the man has any earlier evidence of his fertility. Claims of Obeah, which seem to have been accepted without question "before times," are no longer accepted save in rare cases where the "accordin'" principle is in operation. If a man can prove that he or his partner has had a disagreement with a known obeahman, or with someone who can obtain the use of a known obeahman's powers, his claim might be accepted. In these rare cases other aspects of the manliness complex may outweigh the virility factor.

In addition to the number of children a man has fathered—the quantity—Grenadian men place a lot of importance on a man's "style," or his quality as a lover. Quality has two components: varied experiences and competence. On such a small island men have difficulty finding a wide range of types of female lovers. Most Creole men claim they have had sexual relations with women of the island's minority "races," East Indians, Dōglas (Creole-East Indian mixtures) and whites. The numerical preponderance of Creoles (about ninety per cent) makes that claim a doubtful ideal. In fact, one can not prove how much inter-racial sexual intercourse does occur. The presence of a small Dōgla population (less than five per cent) attests that some mixing has occurred. The other opportunity for variety comes with foreign travel. Grenadian men who travel away from the island are expected to have sexual intercourse with
foreign women. That expectation is reinforced by the men's tales of real or feigned exploits overseas (cf. Wilson 1969:74). In the absence of positive proof the tales are accepted "accordin'" to the reputation of their teller.

A man can establish his competence as a lover in two ways. He can tell people he is a good lover and he can send them to ask his partners. If the man talks well enough, with enough authority, the final confirmation is not necessary. Two examples may be useful. Robert, in all modesty, claims that he is a very good lover; "not of the best, but not of the worst." To insure his reputation he takes extra pains with his girlfriends. While he lets his wife "do all the work" when they have intercourse he makes sure he takes the lead when he has relations with his girlfriends. He also speaks with enough authority to convince even the most skeptical that he is telling the truth. His knowledge of the sexual appetites of Hillbay's unattached females is legion and can be confirmed. His quality was proven to everyone's satisfaction when Emme, Hillbay's most demanding female, made an invidious comparison between Robert and her current lover. "Robert not like you. He a real man. He work all night to make me happy."

The importance placed on sexual activity is reflected in the expectation that boys should begin their sex lives at an early age; they need not wait until they reach puberty to begin. As a general rule most Grenadian boys have had their first sexual experience by the time they are ten years old. George, who has gone on to father ten children by six different girls, admits with pride that he had his first introduction to sex when he was four or five years old. He was "seduced" by his ten year old cousin even though neither of them had a very clear idea of
what was supposed to happen. He suspected he was doing something wrong when his uncle (not the girl's father) caught them and chased them into the bush. He realized that he had not been doing anything too bad because his uncle laughed and told him that he was "too manish" for a little boy, all the while beating him with a switch.

Several exceptions to the rule that says a man must prove his virility exist. If a man has a number of "friends" who appear satisfied with his sexual abilities, or other attentions, he can escape sanction. Andrew, who is thirty years old, lives with his mother. He claims he has no children and no woman has come forward to "put a child on him." If these were the only facts involved in the determination of manliness Andrew's position would be dangerous. Surprisingly, he has the reputation of being one of the "hottest" men from his part of town. The mitigating factor is that Andrew has female friends throughout St. Michael's. He cannot walk down the road without encountering one of his "friends." In Andrew's case the apparent infertility is outweighed by other aspects of his biographical situation. The question of his virility is not important to determine if he is manly. This, again, is the "accordin'" principle at work.

On the other hand, sexuality can work against a man's attempts to be manly. That can happen if a man chooses the wrong partner. For example, rape, which occurs from time to time, is an obvious case of a man having chosen the wrong partner. Rapists are considered to be crazy and everyone suggests the most severe punishments imaginable for them. Homosexuality and bestiality are also considered aberrations and are strongly condemned; men and animals are not the right partners. If a grown man has relations with a very young girl he has also picked the
wrong partner (considerations of statutory rape aside). However, age is only a relative factor since residents see nothing wrong when a sixty-five year old man marries a sixteen year old girl in church (again, "ac- cordin'"'). Finally, a man is wrong if he "advantage" his friend by having relations with his friend's wife (legal or common law). The woman is, by definition, a wrong partner and the act makes her husband a mahko man (in this case a cuckold, but generally a hen-pecked man). With one improper act a man can ruin a friendship and make his former friend an object of ridicule.

Sexuality, then, is a double edged sword. A competent techn- nician who begins his career when he was a young boy can claim he is a 'real' man. On the other hand, if sex "get the better" of him and he chooses the wrong partner it can cause his downfall and deprive him of his status.

Nobility and Humility

An observer can determine a man's virility by counting the num- ber of children he has fathered and by listening to tales of his sexual exploits. He will have more difficulty observing two other attributes Grenadians look for when they try to determine if one of their fellows is a 'real' man. These are the related qualities of nobility and humil- ity. Each Grenadian man is aware that his peers are constantly judging his performances. They look for indications of what they think are un- warranted pride or boastfulness which they can use as "ammunition" to make a fool of him if the opportunity arises. Any Grenadian man who wants to remain a member of his peer group can not, for example, flaunt his wealth or attempt to condescend to his fellows. Either offense, if repeated often enough, will ensure that a man is ostracized from his
group of former friends and isolated from all other groups of men.\footnote{1}{"Group" will be defined more fully below. For now, "group" means a collection of individuals who usually associate in daily social activities.}

There is a difference between flaunting one's wealth and having more money to spend (disposable income) than one's peers have. The former is an attitude while the latter is the result of an individual's biographical situation. For example Mr. Euclid, one of Grenada's finest lawyers, has a "good" income by Hillbay standards. He is in the position of being able to spend more money than most of his friends. Yet even though he spends freely he is as quick to condemn "sharp" business practices as any of his friends are. For Euclid it is a matter of principle. Mr. Plato, perhaps the island's best lawyer, does the same things but is not respected for them because they do not arise from principle. He too has a good income, but he spends more than he earns. To finance his deficit he borrows money from his friends and takes goods on credit from shopkeepers. His complaints about business practices are usually leveled against the very people from whom he has borrowed money or obtained credit. He implies that any individual should consider himself fortunate that Aristotle Plato, Grenada's best lawyer, owes him money and that his creditor should be ashamed of himself for attempting to ask for payment. When he behaves that way he is flaunting the wealth he does not really have, and he is condescending to the people who finance his over-consumption. As Sidney explained the situation, "We all think Plato a big man when he first come. Now no one trust him because is our money he use to play the ass." Sidney's remarks underline the fact that Grenadians do not like a show-off.

How then is a man to establish himself? Modesty seems to be a
valued attribute. But if a man is too modest no one will know how
worthy he really is. A man must walk a fine line when he tries to
build his reputation. Each man knows and uses the fact that other
people's talkativeness helps to establish one's reputation. They also
know that nothing in Grenada can be done in secret. A man can rest
assured that someone knows everything he does. Ideally, if a man wants
to publicize something he drops a hint and one of his group expands the
hint into a story about the fellow's exploit. If the friend forgets a
point or does not emphasize an important detail the subject elaborates
without fear that anyone will think he is "too forward." After all, he
is just trying to make the story easier for the audience to follow. No
one will complain if in the process he manages to make himself look
better.2

Here, again, is the "accordin'" principle at work. If a man is
always a shy, modest, self-effacing person, a Grenadian Gary Cooper,
people will begin to wonder what he is trying to hide or why he is being
so unsociable. On the other hand, if he is a braggart he will be ridi-
culed. He must learn to act out the role he has selected for himself
"accordin'" to the context in which he finds himself. But the Gary

2Returned migrants can not usually use this process because they
usually do not have an alter ego to tell their stories for them. They
can, however, use another method to make their exploits known. Local
residents, like most people, love to hear funny stories, the more absurd
the better. The returnee can tell humorous stories in which he is the
hero or butt of the joke. At a later date, and in more serious circum-
stances, he can call upon a member of his earlier audience to bear wit-
ness to the veracity of his account. If the situation is serious enough
he can usually count on his friend not to reveal that the "facts" are
based on a funny story. This "ploy" must be used with extreme care how-
ever. In a case where an argument is the second occasion for the telling
of the story difficulties can arise because all the parties involved
strive to be as "factual" as possible. In that case someone will prob-
ably challenge the factuality of the account.
Cooper image is just what a successful Grenadian man tries to accomplish. After all, Gary Cooper did win his duel on Main Street at High Noon which proved he was the best gunman in town. In doing so he shows how important it is for a man to be accomplished at his chosen occupation, whatever it may be. It shows, or Grenadians believe it shows, that a man "just like one of us common dogs" has risen to the top of his calling. He knows he is good but he does not have to tell others. In the same way a Grenadian can be sure his friends and supporters will act as his unpaid publicity agents.

Being the best at something also means that a man can not claim he is successful because he is lucky or because he has "had the breaks." People know better. On the other hand, everyone shows contempt for someone who explains his failures as bad luck or bad breaks. A 'real' man takes full credit for both his success and his failure. If he does less he is not a 'real' man. In success, and failure a man has the opportunity to show the stuff of which he claims to be made. He does that by "making style," that is, by showing off within the acceptable limits. Just what acceptable limits are is a matter of "accordin' to ... ." Implicit in each of the above cases is the notion of egalitarianism that is similar to what Wilson (1973) found in Providencia. No one wants to be accused of "making style" at the expense of others. To do that is to condescend. On the other hand, people value a successful man. In order to be humble and noble at the same time men must be consummate actors. They must know, or sense, how far their audience will allow them to go before they are censured for being braggarts. They must know when their performances have gone far enough to earn them all the credit to which they believe they are entitled. Anyone who can
accomplish these goals earns the respect of his fellows and has accomplished part of what is necessary to be thought of as a 'real' man.

Being One of the Boys

The third attribute Grenadians use to determine if someone is a 'real' man is whether he is a member of a group of men, or, as Grenadians usually say, "he one of the boys." In this context, group does not mean a structured organization. Voluntary associations, and other types of organizations do exist in Grenada, but most draw their membership from the middle- and upper-classes, who view the organizations in terms of extensions of their jobs or charitable activities. Lower-class men do belong to the International Order of Forrester, or the Mechanics. The lower-class aggregates which I call groups are unstructured sets of friends, age mates, co-workers and, less frequently, kinsmen (see Frank Manning's (1973) description of Negro Clubs in Bermuda for contrast, and Wilson's descriptions (1969, 1973) of Providencian "crews" for their similarities).³

The major requirement for group membership is that a man "move well" with the other group members. Except in cases where some extrinsic factor comes into play, such as political animosity, a man can be a member of more than one group. Each group sets its own informal membership requirements, much as a college fraternity or a suburban country club

³An additional problem in describing these aggregates is that the Grenadians, who are English speakers, call the aggregates "groups" or "bunches." They use group because, for them, it means a number of items or individuals set apart or unique in some way. Bunch is, no doubt, a metaphorical extension of the term they use to describe a whole stem of bananas, that is, the most inclusive amount in the series "grain," "hand," "bunch." To avoid confusion, I will use group as the Grenadians use it, not as some anthropologists use it (see Mayer 1966: 97-122).
sets its requirements. But, whereas fraternities or country clubs have formal membership meetings and formal votes on prospective members, Grenadian groups decide questions of membership informally. If everyone feels that a man shares their outlook, an ill defined mixture of values, practices, and notions of etiquette, they will accept him as "one of us." Adrian Mayer might call such an aggregate a "classificatory quasi-group" (1966:97). Since the groups are informal, and have shifting memberships, one has difficulty determining when someone is entering a group, or is an active member of a group, or is easing himself out of a group. For example, I never knew exactly when I became an accepted member of a particular group in Hillbay. I did not realize that I was really "one of the boys" until an "incident" occurred. One afternoon at the height of the anti-government general strike I was liming with my group in one of Hillbay's rum shops. A visitor from another town came into the shop with some important news for some of the boys. He seemed worried by my presence, and he refused to get to the point. Finally, showing very poor manners, he asked who I was. One of my group said "... don't fraid, he a Hillbay boy."

The social gulf between the Grenadian classes is reflected in group membership. There is little community of interests between the classes. As a result, a man in one class finds it almost impossible to be in a group composed of members of another class. Middle-class men are the only possible mediators between the classes, and many do not like that role. If they associate with the lower-class they may be snubbed by their upper-class friends; if they socialize with the upper-class they will probably be ostracized by the lower-class. They are very marginal to both classes and, except in St. George's, the capital, there
are not enough members of the middle-class to form their own groups. Consequently, they are forced into the unappreciated position of marginal men who act as go-betweens. The lower-class men believe members of the upper-class are not 'real' men because they do not socialize with them. The upper-class behaves in strange ways. "They think they too white," which is the cardinal sin of pride. The "common people" believe members of the upper-class regard them as their social and biological inferiors. In fact the upper-class is not usually interested in anything to do with the social world of "them," the Negroes. Segregation, in this case, breeds contempt and, at the same time, curiosity on the part of the lower-class. Lower-class people who "study" the elite are anxious to have an opportunity to discover just what goes on at a "big man's fete." The reports that do filter back to the lower-class groups are almost always rendered in the first person and always emphasize how the lower-class observer was able to cross the social gulf and handle the difficult social situation.

In order for a man to retain membership within his group he must keep up constant interactions with other members. Again, the upper- and lower-classes have different expectations. Within the upper-class, interaction appears to be restricted to business meetings in the work environment and scheduled social events such as cocktail parties or, less frequently, sit-down dinners. For the lower-class, interaction is more spontaneous. It can occur at any time and almost any place. Part of the difference is attributable to the different employment patterns of the classes, which give the lower-class men more time to socialize.

When group members perceive that one of their fellows is not interacting as frequently as they think he should they attempt to bring
him back into full activity. As with everything else, the determination of the proper frequency and intensity of interaction is defined by the "accordin'" principle. Once a man perceives himself as a marginal member of a group, or once a group decides that a man is no longer interested in their company, there are two possible courses of action: the man can quit the group or he can "reapply" for membership by again proving that he "moves well" with the other group members.

Exceptions to the usual practices make part-time group membership possible. If a member of a group moves away from Hillbay, or if his work keeps him away for long periods of time (as in the case of a sailor) he can participate in group activities when he is in town. In those cases everyone realizes that the individual can not interact as often, or as intensely, as a local man. On the rare occasions that the man comes to town, he is taken into his group(s) as if he had never been away. The only requirement is that he initiate the interaction. If the man waits for his former groupmates to seek him out he is showing that he does not want their company. "Since he go to ____ he come too big to be with us." Lack of affirmative action on the individual's part is "prideful" behavior, which will not be tolerated. In the case of returned migrants, or migrants home for a short holiday, a snub of that sort is enough to set every tongue in Hillbay wagging. The returned migrant can regain entry if he tries long and hard enough, but the holiday visitor usually does not have enough time, and possibly not the inclination, to seek readmission to his old groups. Even if he brings "England (America) presents" for everyone, as he is expected to do, he can not regain his former position. In fact bringing presents without trying to reestablish old group memberships is seen as an attempt to buy
friendships. People accept his gifts but still talk about how travel has made "John forget where he come out."

As mentioned above, informal groups are not unique to Grenada. They exist on most of the other Caribbean islands as recognized entities and probably in most other societies. Wilson's description and analysis of "crews" on Providencia Island (1973:166-181) seems to be the most complete and closest to the Grenadian situation. Wilson notes that on Providencia, as on Grenada, there are no formal groups that recognize and sanction a male's status as a man. In Providencia:

In an almost spontaneous, accidental way the men of a community divide up into small groups of approximately four to seven members. They are essentially groups of equals--of the same generation if not the same age, of the same life situation, and with mutual compatibility. [1973:168].

Similar to their Grenadian counterparts Providencians think crew membership is important. As Wilson says:

What seems to me to be the crucial importance of these crews is that they are expressions of a total situation, and that as such they provide a means whereby males achieve existential satisfaction, confirming their identity in a common culture and thereby building up a common sense of communitas based on common values and sentiment. [1973:181].

There are differences between the Providencian crews and what I have called Grenadian groups. Providencia is a tiny island with only a few thousand people. Membership opportunities are much more restricted and restricting. People are known as members of particular crews and are characterized as such. The class structure that exists is largely a matter of definition, since there is no large gulf between the economic situations and lifestyles of the classes. There is also no real middle-class. Grenada is much larger in area and in population. A man has more opportunities for divided loyalties. He can be a member of several groups at the same time, at work, in church, in town, and away from
town. Although he might be characterized as a Hillbay man by those who do not know him (see Chapter Four), his friends and acquaintances know that he is a member of several different groups. That makes classification and stereotyping more difficult. In the next chapter I will explain how group membership is related to liming and the transfer of information about migration.

Handling the Situation

One common thread that runs through the ideas on a man's virility, his nobility, and his group membership is the notion that a 'real' man can "handle any situation." Just as Gary Cooper could cope with anything fate put in his path, a Grenadian who is a 'real' man is never at a loss for something to do when the need arises. Even in a situation where things appear to be really hopeless a 'real' man can think of something. But before he takes some positive action—the last resort—he has several strategies, or shams, upon which he can fall back.

The first, most favored strategy requires that a man try to create the fiction that the situation is not really novel or dangerous. A man should try to convince his audience that objects or events do not surprise him. He is ready for anything. If it becomes obvious that this "ploy" has failed (again, "accordin'") he can try his second option—he can lie. In that situation a lie is not an attempt at fraud or deceit or a breach of the moral code. Lying is the manly way to extricate oneself from an unmanageable situation. If the man can talk well enough he can lie his way out of most embarrassing situations.

Problems do arise when a man finds himself in a novel situation that requires action. After he has tried to pretend he has the situation well in hand, and after he has tried to lie his way out of danger,
he may still have to act. Obviously, the results can be very humorous to a disinterested observer, but they are taken very seriously by the individual and his audience. If he is successful he is a "real man in truth," but if he fails everyone thinks and says that he is just "playing the ass." Two examples might shed some light on this behavior.

Recall the episode of Alexander and the charcoal. When he volunteered to burn some coals for his mother he ran the risk of putting himself in a novel situation. He had seen others burn coals, but he had never done it himself. As his brother said, he suffered from "not accustomed" and "never thought." He was not accustomed to burning coals, and by extension to doing a man's job, and he never thought about what skills were required or what failure would mean. Alexander did not complete what he set out to do. For his failure he earned the scorn of Hillbay's 'real' men and the false name "Coals."

"Norris and the shower" is the second example. Most Grenadians do not have running water in their houses. Norris' house has neither hot water nor running water. One day he had the opportunity to take a hot shower. Rather than admit he was "not accustomed" to hot and cold running water he marched unflinchingly into the shower. At first nothing happened because he did not know how to turn the water on (this shower had four valves—two hot and two cold—to control the flow to the seven nozzles). When he finally figured out how to turn on the water steam began to rise and he whimpered. Someone suggested that somebody should ask if Norris was in control of the situation. But one does not ask a grown man if he knows how to handle a shower. When Norris emerged, he said he enjoyed his shower and hoped he could return soon for another. In private he admitted he thought he would die when the hot
water hit him. He knew he could not yell, so he bit his lip and whimpered until he figured out how to adjust the temperature. No more was said of the incident because he had managed to complete his ordeal without anyone discovering that he was a novice.

Norris' willingness to take his chances with the shower shows another facet of this aspect of the Grenadian notion of manhood. He was willing to try something novel. Taking one's chances with the unknown can bring fame, and sometimes fortune. For example, Coolie, one of Hillbay's smugglers, was returning from Carriacou when his boat's engine failed. He and his crew had no oars and no sails. Fortunately, they did have twenty cases of untaxed liquor on board. After eleven days adrift they were picked up near Aruba by a steamer going to Tampa. They had managed to survive by eating the fish they caught and by drinking the pure water that remained when they distilled the twenty cases of liquor. They returned to Hillbay three weeks after they left for a one day trip. Not only had they managed to stay alive for eleven days at sea on a small boat, but they had also gotten a free trip to the United States. They had conquered the unknown, perhaps unwillingly, and had proved that they could handle a very difficult situation.

The most dangerous situation in which a man can find himself is to be forced into a fight.4 Fighting can destroy a man's reputation more quickly than any other activity. A fight only happens when talking, or shouting at each other, fails to win an argument. Only then will a

---

4Fight is one word which is very clearly defined in Grenada. It means two or more people involved in physical violence. On each of the numerous occasions I told anyone that two people were fighting my listener was immediately impressed. Not wanting to imply that I did not know what I was talking about they politely enquired whether the men had "come to blows in truth." When I invariably said no I was told "They not fighting, they arguing."
'real' man resort to an exchange of "blows." That is consistent with the rest of the system of manliness beliefs, because a 'real' man should be able to talk himself out of anything without having to resort to physical violence. A fight shows that both parties to an argument are not as manly as they might be since neither could persuade the other that he was wrong. Fighting can also damage a man's reputation in two other ways. First, if a man fights and loses (other things being equal, such as both fighters being in the same state of sobriety) he is obviously not as much of a man as others thought. Second, losing a fight shows that a man is not too smart. Only a foolish man picks a fight with someone he can not beat. But, if one fights only with men he can beat, he is a bully and a show-off. The only way to achieve fame as a fighter is to beat men who are known as good fighters. If a man can beat good fighters consistently he proves this aspect of his manliness. Here, then, is another example of a success strengthening a man's reputation and a failure hurting it. Men realize that the odds are too long and consequently try to avoid fights if at all possible. An example of how that attitude affects Hillbay men will be given in the next chapter.

**Speaking Well**

The last important aspect of the definition of manliness is speech ability. Abrahams (1970a, 1970b), Abrahams and Bauman (1971), Manning (1973), and Wilson (1973) all discuss how important speech ability is in Afro-American societies. They follow the general lines laid down by Goffman (1959) to describe speech as a performance. As Manning notes
Talk ... furnishes a good illustration of what Abrahams (1970[b]: 163-179) calls the man of words tradition—a mode of expression emphasizing verbal virtuosity and found throughout New World black societies. The antagonistic and dramatic features of this style are among its most salient characteristics. ... The speaker's primary purpose is not to convey information but either to exhibit his personality and style or to persuade someone else to act in ways that will serve his interests. [1973:61-62].

Wilson points out that speech, as a performance, is an important factor a man can use to establish and maintain his reputation.

... among the most important of them [the foundations of reputation] are sexual skills and closely allied verbal or expressive skills. Sweet talk is part of a wider spectrum of expressive skills ... . [1973:152]

In each of these black societies the ability to speak well is an integral part of the definition of manliness. Grenada is not an exception to that trend.

In St. Vincent (Abrahams and Bauman 1970, Abrahams 1970a), Nevis, and Tobago (Abrahams 1970b) the emphasis seems to be on the "man of words" who performs on formal, set occasions. In other, less formal, situations his speech ability brings him fame he could not otherwise win. In Grenada the tradition is not exactly the same. Grenada no longer has any public events at which a man can "make style" as a speaker. 5 Instead, each man takes whatever opportunities arise to show how well he speaks.

For the lower-class, speech ability means knowing how to use the same standard English the elite and members of the expatriate community use. The more a man uses "good" English the better he speaks. In addition to speaking proper English, an individual who aspires to be a man

5That may be one of the reasons that Grenadian calypsonians, who are verbal virtuosos par excellence migrate to Trinidad where they can show more people their abilities with words. No doubt the economic incentive adds to the "pull."
of words must use faultless logic in his performances. If he speaks well, that is, uses correct English, but "talk a set of shit," he is nothing but a buffoon who has learned the proper words without knowing how to use them. Thus Michael, the route salesman, is regarded as a "funny chap" but a bit of an ass. At the drop of a hat, or the offer of a drink of rum, he can launch into a five minute speech or sermon that includes many polysyllabic words. Everyone assumes he knows what the words he uses mean, although no one questions him. Yet no one takes him seriously because his speeches are apropos nothing. He never argues about a point under discussion or enters into a debate. He prefers to launch into one of his own irrelevant speeches in the middle of an argument. He "talks sweet" so people enjoy listening to him and vie for the chance to buy him a drink.

Speaking ability also has more serious uses. A man can hide, or gloss over, other things he does not want his audience to question. He can explain his apparent lack of virility, he can explain how noble he is, while he hides his bragging in a flow of words, he can ingratiating himself with his group, and he can use his speaking talents to convince others that he can handle any situation. Most important, a real man can use speech to divert his audience's interest from topics he believes could be harmful to him.

A good example of this last aspect of speech ability is Dumb Donald's most famous encounter with the law. Donald is Hillbay's most successful smuggler. He has convinced everyone that he is a harmless, friendly, illiterate fellow—perhaps even a bit mad. Those who do business with him know better, but they are so taken by his "style" they do not challenge him. One day Donald's common law wife "actioned" him
(took him to court) for beating her and for failing to "mind" (support) their children. The magistrate asked Donald for his version of the story. "Your worshipfulness, I coming home from Carriacou with bobol (smuggled goods). You know I a smuggler." At that point the magistrate said he did not wish to know about Donald's business. It was beside the point. "Yes your worshipfulness, but beside, I a smuggler. And anyway, I com-
ing home from Carriacou . . . ." Again the magistrate's warning. The case went on for half an hour with the magistrate alternately warning and laughing at Donald. The result was that Donald was warned not to beat his wife, and was admonished to keep up his obligations to his children. By getting the magistrate on his side, Donald avoided going to jail and having to pay $5.00 a week for the support of each of his children. By "making style" with the judge he was able to avoid punish-
ment.

Speaking well is directly related to liming—the topic of the next chapter. Briefly, a man who can speak well is able to show his erudition and worldliness. If he can do that well enough, he can win all his arguments and establish his reputation as a great speaker who is also a brilliant man.

Summary

Each part of the definition of manliness is part of an inte-
grated whole. Expertise in one field compliments and reinforces expertise in others. If the actor manifests skill and knowledge in one area his exploits are magnified by them and extend to other performances. Success is self-supporting and self-sustaining. A man whose exploits are known to his fellows has the advantage of having other areas of his behavior judged in light of "what everyone knows" about his
successes. Alfred Schutz explains this phenomenon by using the notion of "socially approved knowledge." As Schutz says:

Socially approved knowledge is the source of prestige and authority; it is also the home of public opinion. Only he is deemed an expert or a well-informed citizen who is socially approved as such. Having obtained this degree of prestige the expert's or well-informed citizen's opinions receive additional weight in the realm of socially derived knowledge. [1964:134].

Garfinkel (1967) explains the same phenomenon by adapting Mannheim's (1952) idea of the "documentary method of interpretation" to show how individuals can understand what otherwise might be ambiguous stimuli. The observer, in this case the actor's fellow man, views behavior as an indication of an underlying pattern. The meaning of the underlying pattern is synthesized from the actions whose meaning, in turn, is explained by that very underlying pattern. In other words, the observer assumes that the behavior he witnesses (or of which he is told) is characteristic of an underlying pattern. The pattern itself is defined as the sum of the behaviors that make it up. One aspect reinforces the other, and each bolsters the whole concept.

When an actor seeks to, and is successful at creating the impression that he is a 'real' man, he is effectively shaping the opinions and knowledge of his fellows. Since there are no formal, explicit rules for this impression management the status 'real' man must constantly be renegotiated. Each renegotiation occurs in light of what has happened most recently. An "error," or a series of errors on the part of the actor can result in the removal of the attribution of the status. It is not enough for a man to think and feel that he is a 'real' man, he must constantly reinforce and reaffirm his manliness by his continued manly actions. It is all part of "playing the game."
CHAPTER FOUR

"LIMING"

Each Grenadian spends most of his waking hours talking. Other West Indians claim, perhaps unjustly, that they find that fact remarkable. A Vincentian who has lived in Grenada for more than twenty years remarked, "Grenada people O.K., but they like talk too damn much." The average Grenadian would not disagree with that statement. The great quantity of talk would not be possible if the social situation did not provide ample opportunity for it. According to my calculations between fifty and sixty-five per cent of the working population is unemployed. Most of those who are employed have jobs that do not demand absolute concentration. Therefore, most people find ample opportunity to talk. Given the circumstances an informal institution based on talk has evolved. Grenadians and other West Indians call the institution "liming." By extension, a person who is liming is a "limer."

Several scholars who have dealt with liming and its associated activities in the West Indian context seem to have failed to recognize its significance (Henriques 1953; Clark 1957; Greenfield 1966; Philpott 1973). One researcher claims that it is "... hanging around, relaxing, chatting idly ..." (MacDonald 1973b:45). Others give the impression that it is nothing more than what happens when men get together in informal, friendly groups at the end of a (hard) day (Henriques 1953:86; Greenfield 1966:85-87). But it is more. It is an informal institution. No formal organization exists to regulate it. No formal membership
requirements exist which must be met before a man can be a limer and no formal rites of passage or educational processes instruct the novice in the intricacies of liming behavior. It is, nonetheless, a very important aspect of Grenadian life for several reasons. First, it is the primary male activity (cf. Henriques 1953; Greenfield 1966; Wilson 1973). Second, it is an informal teaching device which, among other things, serves to pass Grenadian culture from generation to generation in the absence of other devices. Third, liming serves as a social integrating mechanism among the groups involved; by extension, it serves as a weak boundary maintaining mechanism. Finally, liming is part of an informal mechanism for social control (see MacDonald 1973a, 1973b; Wilson 1973).

The structure and the functions of liming are difficult to explain because the activity is not rigidly defined by the residents themselves. In what follows I will try to show liming caught at a moment in time with a set of rules, formats and etiquette. These rules, which I have abstracted from Grenadians' behavior, apply in most cases, but they apply within the limits of the "accordin'" principle. A European observer might feel that liming follows no apparent rhyme or reason; therefore, Grenadians appear, to him, to have a high tolerance of ambiguity. On closer inspection he finds that what he sees but may fail to appreciate are variations upon a basic theme. I will attempt to present the basic theme here.

Liming Described

Liming is a sexually segregated lower-class male activity. Women's gossip, the female counterpart of liming, is beyond the scope of the present study. Some middle- and upper-class men say they do not like. Instead, they go to someone's house or to one of the fancier
restaurants or bars to talk. The objective differences are a matter of their own definition. Some of the more candid members of the middle- and upper-class recognize that fact. The distinction they make appears to be a social "distancing" mechanism. Judy MacDonald is not entirely wrong when she talks of liming as " ... hanging around, relaxing, chatting idly ..." (1973b:45). She is wrong when she assumes that it is only that. Liming is any verbal interaction between men\textsuperscript{1} which meets the following criteria: (a) It is informal—as opposed to a formally arranged discussion about a pre-determined topic, as, for example, a meeting of the Banana Growers Association. (b) It is spontaneous. (c) It is not usually concerned with practical, everyday problems. (d) It involves members of a group and/or people who know each other.

Liming has two forms, the moving lime and the stationary lime. A moving lime can have any number of participants, although it usually does not involve more than four or five men. It has no fixed beginning or end. A group of men decides to go "down the road" although they may have no particular destination in mind. As they go more men join the group and others leave it. The route is not usually planned in advance and, consequently, no one objects when someone suggests a change or a stop. In the course of a moving lime the men spend a short time (usually not more than half an hour) in each of several places, usually in rum shops. During any of the stops a moving lime may change into a stationary lime (see below). The limers, who have had drinks at several rum shops may be too drunk to go any further. Some men will go home to

\textsuperscript{1} Hillbay residents insist that "ladies" do not lime. Females who lime are either prostitutes (or "bats") who come to town from time to time to solicit or young women who do not behave as proper ladies should.
sleep while others continue the lime. Also, one of the limers may have some reason for remaining where he is. A man may "get tie up" in a discussion or an argument. Another may find he has run out of money. Still another may stay to romance his "skins" (girl friend). The moving lime continues when one or more of the original group leaves for the next stop.

Everyone expects limers to drink a substantial amount of rum. No shopkeeper sells them very much because, by tradition, they must buy some at each stop. The moving lime is relatively inexpensive because the limers are not expected to "stand rounds" for everyone who is in a shop when they arrive. For example, if there are five men in the group one will buy an "eighths" or a "quarter" of rum at each stop in rotation until each has made one purchase. ² Each man, then, buys one round of drinks at every fifth shop. By the time they have been to five shops the lime will usually have broken up.

Stationary liming is similar to moving liming but takes place at one site. It begins when two or more people meet and talk. They are usually members of a group who have met in their favorite spot (see also Wilson 1973:166-168). The event ends when the participants leave or when part of the group breaks away to start a moving lime. The number of men involved in a stationary lime is restricted only by limitations of physical space.

The Liming Arenas

Rum shops are the favorite sites for liming. Each shop usually has its own group that meets there regularly; larger shops may have more

²Rum, and other liquors, is sold in a one eighth or a one quarter of an Imperial quart bottle.
than one group (cf. Wilson 1973:166-168). The groups, as explained above, consist of friends who usually lime together. By informal pre-arrangement they select a particular shop at which to meet. They choose one shop instead of another because they may like the proprietor, because they may be able to buy drinks on credit or, more recently, because they may want to give the proprietor whom they believe is an "opposition spy" false or misleading political information. Rum shops are also the favorite sites for moving limers who stop at a shop, or shops in which one of the limers is a regular customer.

Grenada has two kinds of rum shops. The division corresponds to the previously mentioned distinction between "board" and "wall" houses. Most of the older, smaller shops appear to have been "board" houses which have been modified to serve as rum shops. The typical board rum shop is approximately fifteen feet by fifteen feet. It usually has two doors that let out onto the street or road in front and one door that lets out behind the shop. A partition separates the public front half of the building from the private rear half. Behind the counter that separates the customers' section from the operator's working and storage areas, the proprietor stores his active stock of rum, other alcoholic beverages and whatever else he sells. Shelves on the partition and side walls hold liquor, beer and non-alcoholic display items. Each shop also has a "fridge," which is usually a large, top opening deep freezer. The owner keeps beer, "sweet drinks" (soft drinks) and ice water in the fridge. Rum shops that have a big fridge often make and sell ice by the block to people who ask for it. The

3 The shop owners favor freezers because a freezer can cool beverages more rapidly than a refrigerator. The only problem is that the freezer must be emptied each night or the beverages will freeze.
shopkeeper also stores perishable items in the fridge for his customers while they are in the shop. The "private room" behind the partition is used after hours and for private conversations. "Wall" rum shops have the same basic lay-out as "board" shops but are usually larger and more sturdy. Both kinds of shops have a minimum of furniture; most do not have chairs or stools for their customers' use. People sit on up-ended wooden sweet drink and beer cases and rest their drinks on the counter.

A shopkeeper must have a government license and must sell liquor by the drink for his store to be a rum shop. Stores that only sell liquor by the bottle are shops, not rum shops. All rum shops also sell beer and stout, sweet drinks, wine (in season) and cigarettes. The shopkeepers get their supplies from legal wholesale merchants and from smugglers and moonshiners (moonshine is called "tomato" or (mountain) "dew"). The former sell their products, with tax stamps affixed, at relatively high prices. Smugglers, who usually get their merchandise in Carriacou, sell their goods without tax stamps but well below wholesale prices. Rum shop owners must buy some merchandise from the wholesalers to satisfy the government tax inspectors who make periodic checks of the shops' stocks. However, the merchants prefer to buy most of their goods from smugglers because the profit margin is higher on illegal liquors and cigarettes.

Rum shop operators also stock other items as a convenience to their customers. Each shop usually has matches, soap, margarine, some kind of bread, canned meats and fish, canned powdered milk and cocoa, flour, sugar, rice (the last three when they are available) and any other items which the shopkeeper thinks he can sell. Although the shopkeepers carry diverse stocks of goods, the majority of their sales are of "drinks" and only a small minority of their cash flow is based on
"non-drink" items. Very recently some of the shops have started selling prepared "snacks." These are usually the kind of foods an individual would eat at home between meals, salt fish cakes, dumplings in fish broth and sweets. Some shopkeepers make confections and sweet cakes, called caca boef (French for cow dung, named that way because they have the shape of cow dung), to sell to school children during the children's morning recess and lunch hour.

In addition to selling liquor and food items the rum shops provide free short term storage service and act as message centers. When someone has a parcel he does not want to carry with him he leaves it at the shop until he needs it. One often sees a small pile of books, papers and packages stored on a shelf behind the counter. People leave messages (verbal and written) with the shopkeeper if they know, or suspect that the individual they seek will stop at the shop. Some shopkeepers complain that more people store packages and leave messages than come to buy things. Although they complain about their non-cash customers, they appear happy to oblige. "Making message" is one way to increase one's reputation for being "one of the boys." It leads others to think the shopkeeper is a 'real' man and to patronize his shop. "Being one of the boys" is a good business practice for a merchant in Hillbay, where there are two dozen rum shops from which to choose.

Over the years Grenadians have developed a set of customs that shape their behavior in rum shops, or a "rum shop etiquette." Asking for a drink requires more than putting one's money on the counter and ordering a beer or an eighths of rum. When a man enters a shop people expect him to do certain things. He must greet all his friends in turn, often asking the same stylized questions of each one. If he sees some
people he does not know he should introduce himself or have one of his friends introduce him. Then he must say a few polite words of welcome. If the strangers are not Grenadians, that is if they are white or if their accents suggest they are from one of the other West Indian islands, the newcomer is expected to welcome them to Grenada and ask how they are enjoying their visit.

Once the introductions are over the newcomer can do one of four things. He can announce that he has come to make a purchase or to deliver a message or package, do what he has to and then leave. That is very unusual. The second behavior occurs if the newcomer suspects that everyone present thinks he has some money. In that case he offers to buy a round of drinks. To order drinks he tells the shopkeeper to "... give us an eighths (or quarter)." The shopkeeper asks what kind of liquor he wants. If everyone thinks the fellow has a lot of money, or that he is wealthy, they will usually ask for Scotch even though they may have an unfinished eighths of rum (which is less expensive) on the counter. If some of the people are not drinking either rum or Scotch the newcomer takes their orders and gives them to the shopkeeper. If someone declines a drink the newcomer is expected to keep after him until he accepts. The newcomer's third option is to beg someone for a drink for himself or for the whole group. He turns on his "victim," either someone he believes has money or someone who owes him a drink, and tells the man to "... makes an eighths na!". If the victim agrees everyone is happy. If he refuses, for whatever reasons he may have, the newcomer asks each other man until someone buys some liquor. The fourth alternative is to wait until someone offers him a drink. Eventually someone will tell the newcomer to "... take one!".
In the course of a lime in a rum shop, which may last from half an hour to several hours, each man is expected to buy "his share" of the liquor, no more, no less. Someone who has no money is excused this time. Everyone realizes and accepts the fact that a man might be suffering a temporary shortage of money and credit. No one appears to be embarrassed because he can not buy his round(s) today. If a man never has money or always begs for drinks he will eventually be ostracized and will no longer be considered a 'real' man.

Leavetaking is less formal. That might have something to do with the fact that most people do not usually leave a rum shop until they are fairly drunk. No one expects a man to be too concerned with the social graces when he is "under he grog." If the man remembers, or if he is able, he says goodbye to everyone and walks out.

Men do not only lime in rum shops. Grenadians stop anywhere to lime. However, when they stop they prefer to have certain things handy to make liming more enjoyable. If they are not in a rum shop they like to be within easy walking distance of an alternate source of liquor. They often stop outside someone's house if they think they can get a drink. Lower-class Grenadians do not usually lime in someone's house. That may seem strange because rum costs less by the bottle than if bought an eighth at a time in a rum shop. Residents say that most houses are too small and do not have enough furniture for five or six men to sit on. Many householders claim they are ashamed of their houses which they feel are not worthy enough to be shown to "people." Since most householders feel that way, most liming that is not done in rum shops is done out of doors.

A second prerequisite for a good liming spot is the presence of
chairs or other objects on which to sit and to lean. If the men expect to be somewhere for a long time they select a place where they will not have to stand. Talking can be hard on the feet and a man is not really comfortable if he has to stand for two or three hours. Men will lean against buildings and trees and sit on or lean against the low walls of one of the numerous small bridges that cross the smaller streams if nothing better is available. Men try to stay off the ground because they realize they may have some trouble getting up when they are "under they grog." When they are out of doors the major difference in behavior is that they must send a child or one of their more sober fellows to get the rum and water. In any case, that is only a minor inconvenience that is easily overcome.

The act of drinking is as stylized as the act of asking for a drink. In a shop, or on the road the men have a bottle containing rum, a second bottle containing ice water (soft drinks are used, but not by 'real' men) and two or three shot glasses. A man fills a shot glass with rum. He swallows the rum and then drinks one or two shot glasses of ice water. The next drinker rinses the shot glass with ice water and repeats the process. If someone does not drink his rum that way, and gives no explanation for not following the usual custom his manliness may be questioned. Needless to say some men have come up with very original reasons to explain their peculiar behavior (ice water gives me gas/cramps/diarrhea, doctor says I need the sweet drinks for my diabetes, etc.).

Favored liming spots have evolved in each town and village in Grenada. In Grenville the men meet near the public jetty, in Sauteurs the men meet in the "Quaysay" (pronounced kweze and named after a popular
meeting place in San Fernando, Trinidad), in Victoria the men meet on
the main street in front of the police station/court house, in Gouyave
the men meet at the "Lance" (French [l'ance] for the beach, which is a
section of the beach where the fishermen keep their boats (see MacDonald
1973a; 1973b)), and in St. George's, which has five to ten times the
population of the other towns and serves as a cultural focus, the men
meet on the bay, in China Town (a section near the wharves), around Mar-
ket Square and in front of the main Post Office. The citizens of St.
David's Parish, which is the only parish without a town, have informally
set aside several sections of highway, one of which they call "Freedom
Street," for limers.

In Hillbay the favorite open-air place for men to meet is
"Brother Irving's," which is the sidewalk in front of an abandoned "wall"
building on Main Street. "Irv's" is particularly well suited for sev-
eral reasons. The building has a portico extending to the street which
protects the men from sun and rain. At the edge of the street there is
a two foot deep drain into which the men can throw their refuse and can
hang their feet when they sit on the edge of the pavement. Several
columns that support the portico make excellent leaning posts. A low
concrete structure (no one knows what it is or why it was built) extends
half the length of the building and makes an ideal bench. In addition,
Brother Irving's is situated in the center of an area that has seven
rum shops. The men can raise their voices and one of the shopkeepers
will send out all the "fixin's" they need for a lime. Residents do not
distinguish between Brother Irving's and the seven rum shops that serve
it. When a man says "I going to Irv's" everyone assumes he will be
within a general area; if he is not in the street he will be in one of
the rum shops. At times there may be as many as 100 men at Brother Irving's, but the usual complement is from ten to thirty men and youths. Between 5:30 A.M. and 1:00 A.M. the following morning someone is almost always liming at Brother Irving's.

The Limers

Sixty men spend some time at Brother Irving's every day, another thirty or forty men are part-time limers there. Part-time limers are men who go to Brother Irving's less frequently than the "regulars." Most of the part-time limers are men who have full-time jobs or who live outside Hillbay. The limers in the area around Brother Irving's have attracted attention to themselves if for no other reason than that there are so many of them. Many visitors from other towns and rural areas gravitate to Brother Irving's to lime because they know they will find "the boys" there and because they know there are seven rum shops in the area. Even people who come to Hillbay on business can not avoid the limers because Brother Irving's is in the center of town. The limers' reputation, or at least the knowledge that Brother Irving's is the meeting place for quite a few "idle boys," has spread throughout the island. Grenadians who do not live in Hillbay or in St. Michael's tend to group most males from St. Michael's into the category "Irving's boys." Only those people who have had dealings with some of the boys or who know the particular circumstances in St. Michael's make further distinctions.

In general Grenadians have three opinions of Irving's boys: "they are good boys," "they are ignorant too bad," and "they are coward too much." In most circumstances, especially those involving the police, Irving limers attempt to give the impression that they are good, honest citizens. They make a great show of helping old women across the road,
of running errands for shopkeepers (for which they are usually paid in money or in kind) and of cooperating with the police in any local matters. On one occasion fifteen men went so far as to perjure themselves in a court case involving a hit and run accident caused by a careless police driver. They claim they lied to curry favor with the police and show them that they were not all bad. As Eggbert explained: "We ain't see nothing, ain't hear nothing. The accident happen right in front we backs [very large wink]. We all too busy playing dominos." Most Irving boys maintain that the whole bunch of them are honest men and make invidious comparisons between their behavior and the behavior of boys from other nearby villages. Many Hillbay residents share that opinion but add that the boys are not above a little "thieving" from time to time.

If someone is "ignorant too bad" he is foolish and quarrelsome and would rather fight than argue. For some reason many Grenadians believe Irving's boys are "ignorant too bad" (cf. MacDonald 1973a, 1973b for evidence of a similar phenomenon affecting the people of the Lance in Gouyave). Hillbay residents explain the unfortunate label in part by saying that many of the "ignorant" people from the country districts of St. Michael's tell other islanders they come from Hillbay. Much of the trouble, and most of the fights the country people cause are attributed to Hillbay boys. The situation is aggravated by the present political situation because one of the villages in St. Michael's is a stronghold of Prime Minister Gairy's followers. More than a dozen of its young men are members of the secret police and have reputations for being thieves and hoodlums. Since most "outsiders" rarely know where a potential assailant lives they ascribe many of the secret police's
depredations to Hillbay men and more specifically to Irving's boys. 4

If someone is "coward too much" he runs away from fights, even fights others think he can win. He will probably run from a good tongue-lashing. This obvious slur of a person's manliness is not something to say lightly, yet many people say that Irving's boys are cowards. Obviously the same group that thinks the boys are "ignorant too bad" does not also think they are "coward too much." The difference of opinion is another of the numerous topics for conversation and argument. The boys and their defenders argue that they are not cowards. They explain their apparent unwillingness to fight in terms of the current political situation. Everyone who attacks the group is, in the boys' stories, a "known Gairyite" who has overt or covert backing from the government. The boys argue it would be senseless for them to try to withstand the combined arms of the police, the secret police and the Royal Grenada Defense Force. 5 The boys label many groups "Gairyites" to explain why they have chosen not to fight. Younger informants explained that before the present political situation there were many more fights. Older informants said that that was not really the case and that Hillbay boys have always been cowards. I was never able to reconcile the two views (see Yablonsky 1963 for a description of similar distortions of 'reality' by members and critics of New York City street gangs).

4 Nineteen secret policemen were assigned to Hillbay during my fieldwork. Of the nineteen only four lived in Hillbay while the remainder lived in outlying areas. Most came from the "other" village.

5 Both of the last two groups have been merged into a new group since I left the field. The new "force," whose name has been changed two or three times, serves the functions of both the old groups. That is, coercion of Grenadians and protection from external invasion are its missions (the former unofficial, the latter official).
Within the set of men who lime at Brother Irving's numerous subsets exist. Many of the sub-sets are what I have called groups. Small groups are consistent with liming behavior because fifty or 100 men cannot and do not interact as frequently and as intimately as can groups of from five to nine men. When too many people are involved an interaction becomes unwieldy. The groups within the set seem to be "natural" groups. Their members usually share one of the following attributes: age, occupation, common interest, employment (versus unemployment) and a more diffuse 'feeling' which, for lack of a better term, I call solidarity. Most of the attributes are self-explanatory. However, the difference between common interest and solidarity may not be clear.

In some cases common interest overlaps other attributes. Men who are unemployed (or men who have the same kinds of jobs) have common interests in securing enough money to live. Men who are on the town's soccer team share a common interest in soccer. Men who compete informally during the kite flying "season" share a common interest during the season. Each of these, and numerous other common interests, may form part of the basis of group membership. Solidarity, on the other hand, is a more ephemeral feeling. For many of the men and youths who lime at Irving's, liming is the central part of their lives. Many have no home lives, others are only marginal members of households. Irving's is a place where they can feel they belong, a place with which to identify. Other Grenadians reinforce that feeling of solidarity by labelling people who spend much of their time liming at Irving's "Irving's boys."

Each of the small groups based at Brother Irving's forms part of a larger "partial network" of men which reaches beyond Grenada to New York, London, Toronto, Trinidad and other places around the world. The
composition of some of the groups is instructive. All the men in one group are unemployed, all are within five years of age of each other (24-29), and all share Irving's as the primary part of their social life. Only one of the men has a wife (legal marriage) and family, although the others have "friends" and "outside" children. Yet even the married man spends most of his time at Irving's. A second group is based on similar employment. Three of the men work together and the fourth is a cousin of one of the three. As with the first group, they are all approximately the same age. Two of the men live in the same household, a third has a common-law marriage and the fourth lives with his wife and family. The fourth man is a marginal member of the group who is included because he is usually at Brother Irving's when the others go there. The other three say he "move well" with them so they let him continue as a member of the group. The main force holding the group together is similar employment. Once the men stop working together the group will probably break up.

A third group which does not live at Brother Irving's provides an interesting contrast. This group more closely resembles what Adrian Mayer (1966:97) calls an "interactive quasi-group" because it is composed of one core member and five of his more or less faithful followers. The identity is not complete, however, because the group only meets Mayer's first criterion, "... they are ego centered, in the sense of depending for their very existence on a specific person as a central organizing focus ... " (1966:97-98). The leader is the best educated, most highly paid member of the group. His followers seek his company and advice, and respect his opinions. Their meetings are usually held at his house or at a place he has chosen. The group is unlike Mayer's
quasi-groups because it does not satisfy his second criterion, that is: "... the actions of any member are relevant only in so far as they are interactions between him and ego or ego's intermediary. The membership criteria do not include interaction with other quasi-group members in general" (1966:98). The leader is the heart and focus of the group, but the other members are not "lost" without their leader. Each of the members is an older man (over forty-five years). They are all employed and are all respected members of their professions (plumber, baker, agriculturalist). When they are not with the leader they usually lime together, although they may lime as members of one or another of the other groups to which they each belong. They follow the leader even though each of them could be a leader of his own group (as two of them are in other circumstances) because they enjoy his company, they are assured of hospitality at his home, they assume he will initiate interesting discussions and, most important, they "move well" with him.

The first two groups differ from the third in an interesting respect. Where the former are egalitarian the latter is hierarchical. None of the men in the first two groups depend upon other members of their groups to initiate a lime, to select a site or to offer hospitality. All the members of the first two groups are Irving's boys. They belong to a locality, are identified with it and use it as a social center. They operate under the premise that other things are equal even if objectively they are not. Members of the third group, on the other hand, do not have a common identification--they are individual personalities--and depend on their leader to give temporary structure to group activities. The reader must remember that one of the primary features of the groups is their lack of permanent structure. In essence they are
collections of men who gather to talk, discuss, argue and, sometimes, fight. Only in these contexts does the notion of groups have any meaning. Irving's, and to a lesser extent other places in Hillbay, provide the contexts.

The Structure of a Liming Event

Liming events have about as much structure as do the groups of men who lime together. No formal rules determine behavior, but during the hundreds of years that men have been liming as groups an informal etiquette has evolved that shapes the course of liming interactions. Limers do not articulate the "rules" under "normal" conditions. Only when someone who should "know better" breaches the etiquette is something ever said. The following is a general framework for "proper" liming behavior, that is, it outlines behavior which will not cause anyone to make adverse comments.

A liming event usually begins in one of two ways. Either two men meet and begin to talk or one or more men join a pre-existing group of talkers. In the first case a liming event can be said to have begun only if the men's conversation is not motivated by a specific pragmatic interest, for example if one of the men is asking directions, or greeting a friend, or asking a specific question which will lead to immediate, or deferred action. Thus two or more men meeting to discuss business are not liming in the strict sense of the term although it is quite possible that their meeting may evolve into a liming event. In the second case the event begins when a new man joins an ongoing interaction, and then only if his arrival changes or disrupts the conversation or argument.

When a new limer passes one of the liming arenas he may see that
something is happening and enter the interaction, or one of the men involved in the interaction may call the newcomer to join in. The newcomer is expected to initiate a conversation with one of a few stylized greetings (see Shegloff 1968:1075-1095 for a similar discussion of "openings" Americans use during telephone conversations). "What's happening there?" is the most frequently used greeting. That opening elicits one of a number of stylized responses such as "I there." or "I watching you." Only after the ritualized opening is the newcomer allowed to explain that he is "... just passing by ..." or that he too is liming ("I limin'."). At that point the interaction can be broken off if the newcomer explains that he is doing something that requires his attention elsewhere. It continues if the newcomer wants to get involved in a lime.

The heart of the interaction begins when a topic is selected. One of the members of the group must select a topic that is broad enough for general discussion while not so broad that it can lead to more than one possible discussion. Typical opening questions are "What's this I hear about Mr. A going to New York?" or "Did you hear about how they changed the price [they are going to pay] for cocoa?". A question such as "What's happening in Brooklyn?" would not be proper unless one of the actors had just returned from Brooklyn or had just received a letter or phone call from there. Before the men get down to a serious discussion they may spend as much as an hour talking about specific "news" items or other practical, mundane topics. Moving limes generally do not get beyond this point. Unless the men spend a relatively long time in one place they never have time to get down to a real discussion. When the limers weary of, or run out of, general talk or when one of them asks a
"conversation-generating question" (see below) talk shifts from questions and answers to conversation.

A "conversation-generating question" is a question with an unverifiable answer or a question that allows for more than one possible answer. They are theoretical questions because they allow the participants to state and defend their theories of the proper answer (and in the process allow men to show how well they speak and how much they know) or because they lead to a theoretical discussion of one of the "right" answers. Two good, reliable conversation-generating questions current in 1973-1974 were "Is the West Indies [soccer team] going to beat England [the United Kingdom soccer team in the test matches held in the West Indies]?", and "Where is [Prime Minister] Gairy going to get the money to pay the civil servants and teachers [this month]?". In both cases the actors can not know the correct answers—in the first instance because either team may win, or they may play to a draw, and in the second instance because they are not privy to the Prime Minister's plans and options.

Once someone asks a conversation-generating question a conversation (or an argument) begins. The first activity is to draw sides, or teams of supporters for each man with a different opinion. Team members generally choose the side of the conversation they believe is correct, although their choice may be colored by extrinsic factors. Some men side with other members of their group just to show group solidarity or because they do not hold a strong opinion on either side of the question. Other men choose to be "devil's advocates" to insure that they have a good conversation or argument. Still others play both sides of the issue by agreeing with what they believe are valid points brought up by
either side (one often hears someone in the background saying "point, point" when one of the speakers has uttered a jewel of wisdom). Each team consists of at least one man. In most conversations there are three teams: two teams with opposing views and a third "neutral" team. When the group involved in a discussion is hierarchically structured, such as the third group mentioned in the previous section, discussions can become lectures with the central member delivering his opinion and the others agreeing with and supporting him with points he might have omitted.

The sequence of the conversation generally resembles the sequence of a college debate. First, in answer to the conversation-generating question one of the team leaders states his point of view or his opinion. He is followed by the opposing team leader who presents what he believes are the important aspects of the question and then explains why his opponent is incorrect. Each team has its turn in rotation until all the factions have spoken. The participants keep order among themselves. Someone who breaches the normal order of speaking is usually told to be quiet ("... hush your mouth!" or if he is really annoying the group he may be told to "... hush your mother's cunt!") and let the proper man speak. People who are known to dislike each other are given extra license but are stopped before they ruin the thread of conversation. After the initial presentations one of two things happens. Either one of the team leaders who has already spoken takes the floor again or the debate is thrown open to the followers of the various leaders. As time passes more and more relevant (and many irrelevant) points are brought up, discussed and rebutted. Orderliness generally depends upon the sobriety of the participants and the fervor
with which they engage in the discussion. In the most decorous cases
the interaction closely resembled college debates or lawyers presenting
their cases before a magistrate. At the other extreme conversations
can degenerate into physical fights.

The participants realize that very often it will be impossible
to convince the other team that their view is incorrect. To avoid that
problem, and to insure some positive conclusion, the participants may
try to find a third party to act as a mediator. Ideally the mediator is
someone who is thought to be in a higher socio-economic class than the
actors (he is what lower-class Grenadians call a "big man"). Since he
is a big man he is thought to be in a better position to judge the facts
(big men are thought to know more than common people), the logic (ibid.)
and the eloquence (ibid.) of the various presentations. The mediator
should also be disinterested in the results of the debate. If he favors
one team, or if he has a vested interest in the outcome, he is dismissed.

The third party mediator serves as the sounding board for each
team's points. Speakers address themselves to the mediator as if he
were the only person listening to them. All their gestures, motions,
facial expressions and pleadings—their non-verbal behavior—are di-
rected at him. After each point is made the speaker demands a judgment
on its validity. Logic and eloquence are judged at the end of the de-
bate. If there is some question on a point of fact, logic, semantics
or syntax the mediator is the final authority. For example, one argu-
ment involved the official rules for driving a motor vehicle in Grenada.
One team, led by Oswald insisted that certain rules of the road exist
in Grenada. The other team, led by Ethelstan said that other rules
exist. In this case Patrick, a local taxi driver who had lived and
driven in England for twelve years, was the third party mediator. Oswald stated his case and turned to Patrick for a judgment. Patrick admitted that he was not really competent to judge the validity of the facts Oswald had adduced since most of them seemed rather obscure. Ethelstan then said that he was not exactly sure of the rules in Grenada but he knew that Oswald's rules did not apply in Britain. He tried to state what he thought were the British rules. Before he could finish his presentation Oswald interrupted saying that Ethelstan was "talking a set of shit." While everyone was talking about driving in Grenada Ethelstan was talking about Britain. Patrick was called upon to render a judgment on an error in procedure. Since the discussion dealt with Grenada was it legitimate for Ethelstan to draw in Britain? After brief consideration, during which both teams cursed at each other, Patrick determined that Ethelstan's statement was not valid and that he should confine himself to Grenada. At that point an argument broke out and the original discussion ended. In another case two fishermen were debating who is the best diver in Hillbay. Coxwin claimed that Euclid was the best diver because he brought up the most lambi (conch) on each dive. Eggbert claimed that he was the best diver because he could dive deepest and stay down longest. Coxwin said that staying on the bottom longer does not mean a person is a better diver, it only shows that he can hold his breath longer. Each then defined diving as he thought it should be and they put their definitions to three third party mediators (two divers and an alcoholic who happened to be present). Neither was satisfied with the judgment and the conversation degenerated into an argument about the relative virility of the two actors.

The second example points up the major problem the third party
mediator has. He is the final authority in conversations only as long as he satisfies the members of all the teams. If the team leader, or his follower(s), becomes dissatisfied with the mediator he ignores him. The leader may try to choose another mediator or he may bring his argument directly to his opponents and the audience. In either case the conversation is likely to break up at that point.

Conversations can end in a number of ways. If the teams reach agreement, which is unlikely, or if they decide a topic is unproductive, they will move on to a different topic or break up the group and go their separate ways. Occasionally there are desertions from one team to another. If a team leader can not prove his point, or if he has a weak argument, or if the other team seems correct, his followers may switch sides. If that happens the leader will usually abandon his position and the group will move on to the next topic. In some cases, as in the first example given above, no agreement is reached and no one is satisfied. When that happens one of the teams usually stalks off complaining that their opponents are "talking a set of shit" and that one can not have an intelligent conversation with such "ignorant" people. The victors, the team(s) who remain on the scene, gloat about their perceived victory and say that the other team left because they are "ignorant too bad" or "stupid too much" and can not carry on an intelligent conversation.

With the exception of men who leave a conversation because they are angry, annoyed, or drunk, everyone is expected to say stylized goodbyes. One is considered a boor if he leaves a conversation without "begging your pardon" for leaving so soon, even if he has been there for several hours, or "asking for an excused" so that he can leave on
some (pressing) business or errand. A person is excused from following
the proper etiquette if his good-bye would interrupt a conversation at
an important point. The only other graceful way for a limer to leave
an interaction is to explain that he is going "down the road" or initi-
at ing his own lime.

A set of guidelines or injunctions for proper meaning or defini-
tion of terms used in a liming interaction has been implicit in this
description of liming interactions so far. The limers never specify
what the rules are but they keep them in mind, perhaps subconsciously,
when they formulate their positions and rebuttals. The first of these
"tacit" injunctions (Polanyi 1966) is that all definitions of terms on
which positions might hinge must be specified and must be agreed to be-
fore the interaction begins. In the second example given above, the
failure to agree on the definition of "diving" forestalled further de-
bate. Each term the actors believe they might use in the course of the
interaction must be defined to everyone's satisfaction before it is used.
If the participants can not agree on a definition, the original topic is
often suspended until agreement is reached. If the participants never
reach agreement the topic of the interaction is usually changed to " ... 
what is the proper definition of ____ ... ?" Second, once a definition
is accepted it, and only it is the correct definition of the term. Even
if the definition does not "make sense" for other purposes, it is accept-
able for the purpose at hand. A corollary to this second injunction is:
any breach of the definition is "talking shit" or "making joke." Both
"talking shit" and "making joke" are unacceptable options in serious
liming interactions. Third, all logical constructs, that is all state-
ments made "for the sake of argument," must follow normal rules of logic
that apply generally, and must employ terms only as they have been
defined for this event. And finally, the judgment of the third party
mediator is final as long as he abides by the first three injunctions.
If one of the teams does not abide by the mediator’s ruling it is dis-
qualified. However, the notion of disqualification and of the rights of
the third party mediator are constantly renegotiated and open to differ-
ent interpretations on the part of the participants. Since these injunc-
tions are never stated openly, and since agreement is rarely reached,
most discussions "bog down" at the definition of terms and few get to
substantive issues.

Arguments and Conversations

The marked difference between a Grenadian (and perhaps any other)
argument and conversation is based on whether the topic at hand is a
practical topic or a theoretical topic. Practical topics have two main
attributes: first, they involve only the actor in his actions in the
everyday life-world (Schutz 1962, 1964) and second, they are concerned
with solutions to mundane problems. Theoretical topics, on the other
hand, involve speculation about what may be possible in the "paramount
reality" of the everyday life-world or in any of the other possible
realities such as phantasy, dreaming or scientific theorizing (Schutz
1962, 1964, 1967). Theoretical topics also involve speculation about
the validity or possibility of "facts" that can not be proven in the
course of the conversation by recourse to logic, empirical tests or by
comparison with what is "known for a fact" from the everyday life-world.

6Grenadians distinguish between arguing and "just liming" but
their distinction is not identical with mine. The difference they note
is one of tone, that is, peaceful interaction (just liming) versus
arguing.
Third, and most important, theoretical topics are not concerned with pragmatic problems of the life-world, that is, they are not concerned with problems the actor currently faces.

Arguments deal with theoretical topics. What may start as a question of fact evolves into speculation of what is possible. The abortive arguments between Oswald and Ethelstan and between Coxwin and Eggbert that were described in the last section are not atypical of Grenadian interactions, but they are not real arguments. Arguments are based on the logical discussion of the possible implications of a particular fact or action. Their course follows that described for typical timing events. In a sense they are formal debates through which the participants hope to solve a problem of fact or definition by using logic and by exploring all the possibilities inherent in the definition or fact. The most important aspect of an argument is that participants can use them to prove their manliness. They can show their erudition and verbal skills and, at the same time, show that they can handle a situation in the form of a challenge their opponent throws at them. An argument, then, is a vehicle to manliness in which a man can show he can "make style." Generally, an argument can not devolve into a conversation.

Conversations deal with practical topics. The actors try, through conversation, to solve practical problems and to keep "current" with local and international news. Whereas a person can gain fame by being able to win arguments, he can not gain fame or prove his manliness through conversation. The material with which he deals (mundane facts) and his style of presentation (answers to questions and straightforward statements of fact) do not enable him to prove that he speaks well--
anyone can recount what happened down the road—or that his vast experiences have enabled him to acquire a stock of esoteric knowledge. People believe he is doing what any child can do when he or she returns from a trip away from home. Unless the actor can modify the style of the interaction he can not exhibit his manliness. Perhaps for that reason many conversations evolve into arguments.

Both arguments and conversations are very important for potential migrants. Migrants get much, if not all, of their knowledge of their destination, of the procedures they will need to follow before they can leave, and of what will be expected of them once they have gone by listening to and taking part in conversations and arguments. I will explain the significance and importance of conversations and arguments to the potential migrant in greater detail in chapters Seven and Eight.
CHAPTER FIVE

MIGRATION: THE OBJECTIVE VIEW

This chapter presents an objective account of the pool of potential migrants found in Hillbay, their reasons for having chosen to become migrants, and the actions they take in order to leave Grenada.¹ The description contains information one might hear during a "typical" Grenadian conversation about migrants and migration. The data are presented as unquestioned facts, much as they are during a conversation, with no analysis or evaluation of the statements by the subjects or the ethnographer.

Migrants' stated reasons for leaving Grenada are treated as "in-order-to motives" (Schutz 1962:21-22, 69-72; 1967:86-91); that is, as motives which reflect individuals' actions directed toward specific goals. So, for example: "I want to go to England to make money." is an in-order-to motive because it explains the actor's actions in terms of a specific goal, or a specific system of relevances. He does what he does in order to attain certain ends. The next chapter will show how local analysts assign "because motives" (Schutz 1962:22, 69-72; 1967:91-96); that is, motives based on individuals' biographically determined situations, to potential migrants' actions. In that case migrants do whatever

¹"Objective" is, of course, a relative term. In this case it means an account anyone viewing the subject might give to anyone who enquired. I make no claims that the facts must be true or that they are unshaded by observer bias. The account is objective in so far as it presents the situation as I believed it existed while I was in the field and again while I reviewed my notes.
they do not in order to attain a certain goal but because their biographically determined situations shape their potential fields of activity. They do whatever they do because they have lived through a certain set of situations and events, or in anthropological terms, because they have been socialized in a certain way within a culture and because they are incumbent in certain statuses and roles.

The Potential Migrant Pool

If one were to assume that a general economic "push-pull" hypothesis of migration is correct he would be forced to claim that almost everyone in Hillbay, and in Grenada, should have left the island. Further, if one assumes that migrants are "rational" actors who carefully weigh all the possible alternatives open to them and consider only the economic aspects of their life situations, as a general "push-pull" hypothesis does (cf. Peach 1968), one would be forced to declare that most Grenadians are irrational. According to this "straw man" theory only the rich, who could not hope to improve their economic situation by migrating, the very poor, who could not accumulate the capital necessary to finance migration, and the old and feeble, who could not survive in a foreign country, would remain at home. All the rest would leave the island in search of riches or some other economic good. In fact many of the rich, the very poor, and the old and feeble do migrate and many of those in other categories (the "prime" migrants) do not leave Grenada. Obviously, other factors are at work.

Potential migrants are individuals who say they intend to leave Grenada and then take some active steps to achieve their ends (even if those steps are not entirely successful), and all returned migrants. The first group includes those who have never been overseas and those
who have returned from overseas but intend to leave again. The second group contains those returned migrants who do not plan to leave Grenada in the future (mostly older, retired people).

When a local analyst discusses a particular case for inclusion in the potential migrant pool he is careful to take into consideration "what everyone knows" about the individual before he is willing to state that the fellow is really a potential migrant. For example, Percy said he planned to go to Aruba to find a "work." He traveled to St. George's to get his passport and then dropped the project completely. Until he stopped his migration-oriented activities he was a potential migrant.

Once he abandoned the project he ceased to be a potential migrant—for the present.² Mr. Miller presents another example. He has spent most of his adult life overseas. Since his return to Grenada in 1970 he has stated, on numerous occasions, that he was going to leave if "things" did not improve (a reference to the political situation). Yet he invested more and more of his liquid assets in island-based properties and made no move to leave. Until he takes some action he can not be considered a potential migrant. Bertha's case presents the opposite situation. In a three month period she made plans to go to the United States, to Canada and finally to England. She got her passport and financing and actively sought to obtain the necessary visa. The fact that she was not able to get her visa does not exclude her from the pool of potential migrants. Given the opportunity she would leave at any time. Unfortunately for her, she can not realize her plans and she is forced to

²At least two scholars (Peach 1968 and Philpott 1973) base parts of their studies of migration on passport applications by potential migrants. The Grenada evidence suggests that many people hold passports but never use them to become migrants and that others who secured passports as the first step in the migratory process never followed through.
remain in Hillbay. She would like to leave, but her contacts are not
good enough to insure success (see below).

Returned migrants are included in the set of people who, for
purposes of data collection, I consider to compose part of a potential
migrant pool because at one time they did leave the island. Their ac-
tions during that phase of their lives are similar to those of current
potential migrants. In addition these people serve as a reservoir of
knowledge about migration which is tapped by current potential migrants.
They also play a part in current migration schemes (see Chapters Six
and Seven). Immigration laws enacted by foreign countries since these
people originally became migrants have changed some of the rules for
migration but the changes are not so great as to lessen the value of
their life histories for the present study.

In the next few pages I will present summarized data on forty
members of the migrant pool in Hillbay. The accompanying commentary
sheds light on local conditions and trends within the migrant population.
However, the commentary should not be confused with the kind of analyses
local analysts do when they consider individual cases. In effect the
data are tabulations of "what everyone knows" about the Hillbay pool of
potential migrants. Local analysts' opinions will be given and explained
in the next chapter.

Tables 4 through 9 present information a listener might hear dur-
ing the course of a Grenadian conversation about migrants or migration.
The data were drawn from a sample population of thirty-one men and nine
women whom Hillbay citizens consider "representative" of "typical"
Grenadian migrants.\(^3\) Tables 9 through 11, which present data from a sample household census and essays by 79 secondary school students, are included for comparison.

Table 4 shows the racial and socio-economic class distribution of the members of the sample.

### TABLE 4

**MIGRANTS CLASSIFIED BY RACE AND SOCIAL CLASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>UPPER</th>
<th>UPPER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DÖGLA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of upper- and upper-middle-class individuals (11) and white and red individuals (13) may appear, at first, to be excessive. Such large numbers were included for two reasons. First, they accurately reflect the percentages of individuals of those kinds in the migrant pool, if not in the general population. Second, local analysts and other

\(^3\) In no case did I consider including a migrant unless at least one person told me a "migration story" in which the individual played a part. In most cases the members of the sample play a prominent part in residents' stories about migration and have contributed a substantial amount to the residents' stock of knowledge of the process of migration and of life overseas.
residents assume that the migrant pool is weighted heavily toward the upper- and upper-middle-classes and the lighter skinned people. The table also points up the correlation between racial category and social class so often mentioned for other West Indian societies (see Braithwaite 1953; Clarke 1957; Philpott 1973; but cf. Wilson 1973).

Table 5a presents the migrants' answer to the question: "Why do you plan to (did you) leave Grenada?". Each category of answers is a summation of variously stated reasons for leaving the island. "Economic betterment" includes such answers as: "leaving to seek a high paying 'work',' "leaving to find a 'work',' "I going where I can make something of myself," "I going where is better opportunities." "Education, trade, profession" includes those answers that show the migrant intends to continue his or her schooling, learn a profession, or take up a trade that can not be followed in Grenada. "See the world" includes answers that show no definite goals but that include such statements as: "I leaving to see the fast life in New York," "I just feel to move," "I want to see city life and live in a big country," in other words, an expression of the desire to travel, a wanderlust or boredom with things "at home." "Local political situation" refers to answers from five people who said the current government has made life in Grenada intolerable for them. The respondents included a career police officer who views recent changes in police hiring policies as an attack on professional standards, and hence law and order, and a teacher who, at the time of the interview, had not been paid for more than a month and a half. The teacher said he could not stay in Grenada and see the government "ruin"

4The number of responses (73) is larger than the number of respondents because several people plan to leave, or have left, for more than one reason.
the educational system. Using the present political situation as a stated cause for migration is probably epiphenomenal. Three of the residents who said they were fleeing to avoid political victimization could not point to any instance in which the government had attacked or hindered them in any way. Their statements were couched in terms of universal wrongdoing to which they objected. In each case local analysts were able to supply more compelling reasons for the potential migrants to leave Grenada. Similarly, hurricane Janet, which struck Grenada in 1955, was probably used as the cause of migration by individuals who had other reasons for leaving (see Chapter Six). "Other" includes the two responses which fit into none of the other categories, viz.: "I leaving to get away from the jockula (a spirit that is currently throwing stones and other objects at the individual's house)" and "I don't know why I gone."

**TABLE 5a**

**STATED CAUSE OF MIGRATION BY SOCIAL CLASS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>UPPER</th>
<th>UPPER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC BETTERMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE THE WORLD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL SITUATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 5a suggest people in different classes may migrate for different reasons. Five of the six upper-class respondents went overseas to learn a profession or to complete their educations, while only two of thirty-eight lower-class responses mentioned education. Conversely, upper- and upper-middle-class individuals do not seem to be too interested in economic opportunities overseas, while twenty-one of the thirty-eight lower-class responses showed some kind of economic motivation. The middle- and lower-middle-class responses show the emphasis placed on an overseas education and the less important attraction of overseas wage employment.

Table 5b shows where the migrants of the various social classes chose to live overseas.\[^{5}\]

\begin{table}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>UPPER</th>
<th>UPPER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESTINATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{table}

\[^{5}\]Nine respondents have been to more than one country and four others plan to go to either of two or three countries.
England is popular as the "mother country" and Canada is the "next best thing if you can't get into England." The United States has become popular in the past few years (see Table 7) as England and Canada have increasingly restricted immigration policies and as Grenadians have come to believe economic opportunities declined in those countries. The socio-economic class bias is evident here also, with the upper- and upper-middle-classes favoring England and the other classes less certain about which is the "best" overseas country.

Table 5c gives the year of migration by social class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>UPPER</th>
<th>UPPER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER-MIDDLE</th>
<th>LOWER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-'38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'39-'45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'46-'54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'55-'62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'63-'68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'69-'74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution may reflect one of several factors. First, the large group of migrants (13) for the years 1955-1962 reflects both the damage caused by hurricane Janet, which struck Grenada in 1955 and the relatively lax immigration laws in existence in England during that period. Second, the large number of migrants in the years between 1969 and 1974
includes potential migrants who may never become actual migrants. Third, the age distribution of residents of Hillbay structures migration cycles to some extent. For example, the upper-class has no ten to twenty year olds at the present time, while it has quite a few individuals more than 60 years old. The number of upper-class people leaving Grenada between 1900 and 1945 and between 1969 and 1974 may reflect those facts. Fourth, the upper-class bias toward the earlier years of the century reflects the difficulty the less affluent may have had securing the necessary funds to travel overseas.

Table 6 outlines the stated causes of migration by the years of departure.

<p>| TABLE 6 |
| STATED CAUSE BY YEAR OF MIGRATION |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>'39</th>
<th>'46</th>
<th>'55</th>
<th>'63</th>
<th>'69</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC BETTERMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION TRADE PROFESSION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE THE WORLD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL POLITICAL SITUATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two shifts in emphasis are apparent. First, more individuals now claim they are going overseas for educational purposes than did in any earlier period. This trend reflects both a growing affluence and an increasing emphasis on the value of an overseas education among the middle- and lower-middle-classes. Second, proportionately fewer people claim to be going overseas to secure employment now than did previously. One rarely hears "I going to get a 'work!'" but more frequently one does hear "I going to learn a trade and do it until I has enough money to come home and start here."

Table 7 describes stated destination by years of migration.

### TABLE 7

**DESTINATION BY YEAR OF MIGRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>'39</th>
<th>'46</th>
<th>'55</th>
<th>'63</th>
<th>'69</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-'38</td>
<td>-'45</td>
<td>-'54</td>
<td>-'62</td>
<td>-'68</td>
<td>-'74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The important trends are the decreasing number of migrants going to England and the increasing number going to the United States and Canada. Trinidad and Other Caribbean countries seem to be maintaining their
traditional popularity as "near to hand" places to which one can travel for relatively little money, with few visa problems, and with good prospects of finding employment at wages higher than one can get in Grenada. The change from England to the United States as the most popular destination is probably the result of two discrete factors. More lower-class individuals are traveling now than did in the past. They do not share the upper-class prejudice that favors England as the best country in the world. The lower-class is more pragmatic in its motivation and they realize their economic and social chances are better in the United States (whose racial problems do not seem to impress them) than they are in England with its color bar. Since 1962 Britain has been putting more and more severe restrictions on non-white immigrants, while changes in the United States immigration laws in the same period have not had as marked an effect. In addition, Grenadians who plan to become "visa jumpers" seem to favor the United States as a destination because they believe they can lose themselves more easily.

Table 8 presents the migrants' stated reasons for leaving by the countries they chose to enter. The data show several interesting points hinted at in the preceding pages.

The United States is now the most important locus of economic betterment, while England, and to a lesser extent Canada, are still favored for educational opportunities (compare Table 8 with Tables 6 and 7). The United States also seems to be thought of as the best place one

---

6 The Dutch island of Aruba is still the most popular non-British territory. Guyana, popular as an overseas haven in the earlier decades of the century, has become less popular since it achieved independence. Grenadians fear they will become involved in the lawlessness they believe exists throughout Guyana.
can go to avoid the current political problems in Grenada. Finally, Trinidad and Other Caribbean countries seem to be favored as places one can go for economic betterment.

**TABLE 8**

**STATED CAUSE OF MIGRATION BY DESTINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>ECONOMIC BETTERMENT</th>
<th>EDUCATION TRADE PROFESSION</th>
<th>SEE THE WORLD</th>
<th>LOCAL POLITICAL SITUATION</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESTINATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents the answers obtained from 79 secondary school students to the question: "If you could leave Grenada where would you go and why would you go there?".

Vice-president Agnew's resignation and President Nixon's problems stemming from the Watergate investigations at the time of the study "proved" to Grenadians that the United States is a country in which even the "biggest men" are not above the law. Invidious comparisons between Nixon and Prime Minister Gairy were quite popular for more than a month after Nixon's resignation.

Three of the 79 students said they would not leave Grenada at the present time for personal reasons. Two of those said they would not leave under any circumstances. The question was given as part of an open-ended career preference and "future plans" assignment involving members of the third and fifth forms at a local secondary school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE</th>
<th>ECONOMIC BETTER-</th>
<th>EDUCATION TRADE</th>
<th>SEE THE WORLD</th>
<th>LOCAL POLITICAL SITUATION</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESTINATION</td>
<td>MENT</td>
<td>PROFESSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students do not seem to agree with their elders about which countries are most inviting and for what reasons. While only twenty-seven per cent of the migrant pool chose to go to the United States, nearly fifty per cent (49.7) of the students chose the United States. Trinidad and the Other Caribbean countries also seem to have lost their lure with only 3.7 per cent of the students choosing them while twenty-six per cent of the migrant pool chose them.

The students' reasons for leaving were also somewhat different from those given by their elders. Only thirty-one per cent of the students (as opposed to forty-one per cent of the migrants) said they would leave for economic reasons, while thirty-nine per cent of them (as opposed to 35.6 per cent of the migrants) said they wanted to further
their educations or learn a trade. These results are not surprising, since the students' responses were obtained from essays written as a school assignment dealing with their future plans. One would assume that young students would be more interested in continuing their educations than would adults. The relative lack of interest in economic opportunities is also understandable in that light. The students' primary concern was to obtain additional education and then to work in their chosen fields once they had secured their training.

The most interesting change, as mentioned above, is the shift away from England and towards the United States as the site for their future education and overseas employment. The change may reflect the growing knowledge that they face more difficulty getting into England, and into a school once there, than they do getting into the United States. Also, general opinion, of which the students are not ignorant, sees greater economic opportunities in the United States than in England.

Table 10 presents the actual destinations of 225 adults who have left Hillbay for overseas locations in the past forty years.9

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF HILLBAY HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS OVERSEAS BY LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CARIBBEAN</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9The 225 adults were members of 169 sample census households. The households contain 336 adults (individuals over fourteen years old) and 173 children, or 509 people.
Table 11 presents a comparison of the destinations of the members of the migrant pool, the sample census, the secondary school students, and the sample census plus the secondary school students.\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{STATED DESTINATION OF SAMPLES}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
SAMPLE & CENSUS HOUSEHOLDS & MIGRANT POOL & SECONDARY STUDENTS & HOUSEHOLDS & STUDENTS \\
\hline
DESTINATION & \% & (N) & \% & (N) & \% & (N) & \% & (N) \\
TRINIDAD & 23.55 & (53) & 10.71 & (6) & 0.62 & (1) & 13.99 & (54) \\
OTHER CARIBBEAN & 16.89 & (38) & 16.07 & (9) & 3.11 & (5) & 11.14 & (43) \\
ENGLAND & 29.33 & (66) & 35.71 & (20) & 24.22 & (39) & 27.20 & (105) \\
CANADA & 4.00 & (9) & 14.29 & (8) & 11.18 & (18) & 6.99 & (27) \\
UNITED STATES & 18.67 & (42) & 23.21 & (13) & 49.69 & (80) & 31.61 & (122) \\
OTHER & 7.56 & (17) & 0.00 & (0) & 11.18 & (18) & 9.07 & (35) \\
TOTAL & 100.00 & (225) & 99.99 & (56) & 100.00 & (161) & 100.00 & (386) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

The results are also correlated as to percentages choosing each destination in each sample.\textsuperscript{11} The least perfect correlation occurs between the students and the migrant pool (r = .519). The correlation between the choices made by the migrant pool and the sample census is higher (r is

\textsuperscript{10}I have lumped sample census and secondary student returns to show the possible effect of time on destination selection. All of the students' migrations will take place in the future, while the sample census members' migrations have taken place in the past. By combining the two one may get a more accurate picture of decisions made by the pool of potential migrants who have migrated in the past, are presently in the act of migrating, and are planning to migrate in the future.

\textsuperscript{11}I used the "Pearson r" (product moment correlation coefficient).
The best correlation exists between the migrant pool's choices and the combined results of the census sample and the secondary students choices (r is .759).

In summary, the data presented in Tables 4 through 11 show several trends. First, migration was at one time the province of the economically better off, the whites and the lighter skinned Creoles who made up the upper- and upper-middle-classes. They chose to go to the United Kingdom. Over time more and more members of the lower classes (the darker skinned) have become migrants. They have shifted their destinations from the United Kingdom to the United States and Canada. In the future, as more and more of today's young people become migrants, more individuals will go to the United States. The primary reasons for migration will probably remain economic betterment and education/vocational training, with other factors coming to the fore as conditions change in Grenada. Trinidad and Other Caribbean countries will remain popular as long as they do not restrict immigration and as long as their economies remain "ahead" of Grenada's.

The Migratory Process

When a potential migrant decides to leave the island he must settle his affairs in Grenada, see to filling out the proper forms and obtain the proper documentation, and secure financing. Each migrant knows that once he announces his plans he can not change his mind without some loss of his acquired manliness. At best his peers will greet his change in plans with the statement that he was "just playing the ass" all along, while at worst they may ridicule him as a fool and a coward who gives up his schemes when faced with some "real work" or when forced to "meet some hard times."
The serious announcement that a man intends to migrate in the near future serves two functions. It enables friends and neighbors to explain what might have appeared to be unusual behavior. For example, a man who has not been on friendly terms with a kinsman effects a reconciliation. Observers do not have to speculate about that strange behavior. They assume that the migrant wants something from his kinsman. He must need something the kinsman has to help him on his way. The announcement also enables observers to prepare for a departure. They offer to assist the migrant with his plans; they contact their friends and relatives overseas to tell them to prepare to help the new arrival; they help the migrant settle his local affairs to his satisfaction; and they prepare a fete to celebrate his departure (cf. Philpott 1973:154–161). Each aspect of the potential migrant's plans is set afoot with the hope that they will all mature at approximately the same time so all factors will be ready on his schedules date of departure. The paperwork, securing financing and settling local affairs are begun in whatever sequence the migrant believes necessary to expedite his departure with the least possible fuss. In many cases everything runs according to plan. In other cases, false starts occur or certain plans are delayed or aborted. The following description shows the generalized preparations that run to fruition without a catch.

The Paperwork

Each Grenadian migrant must have a passport and a visa in order to be able to enter a foreign country.\(^\text{12}\) Anyone can obtain a passport

\(^{12}\)Grenadian citizens need only a passport for travel to Trinidad and St. Vincent. In the past few years Trinidad has become less tolerant of long-term Grenadian visitors and has taken to limiting the length of
upon application and payment of a $10.00 fee if he can prove he is a born or naturalized Grenadian, prove he is the person whose picture accompanies the application (by swearing an oath) and supply four passport pictures. As simple as this process may seem, complications arise in the majority of cases. Most Grenadians do not use their legal ("birth paper") surnames in their daily lives. Instead, they take their father's surname if he is known, or if he acknowledges the child at the time of birth. An individual whose parents were married at the time of his birth can have problems if, as is usual, he is known by a given name which is not his legal given name. In either case a passport applicant who goes by one name must prove that he is the person named otherwise on the application. The government requires a sworn affidavit as proof. The maker of the affidavit, usually a justice of the peace who has known the applicant since he was born, must swear that the named individual is the same infant mentioned on the birth certificate. In cases where a birth certificate is not available a baptismal certificate and a similar affidavit are acceptable. In some cases the prospective migrant must travel all over the island to secure his birth certificate or baptismal papers and several affidavits which attest to his identity. This problem occurs when the migrant's parent has moved several times during his childhood. He must then have several affidavits, one from each location, attesting his identity. Once the migrant secures his birth papers and affidavits he can proceed with the remainder of the paperwork.

---

Grenadians' stays. Unfortunately, in the Trinidad government's eyes, it is very difficult to enforce the decision. The large permanent Grenadian settlement in Trinidad makes it extremely difficult to find those who have overstayed their allotted visits. Almost any Grenadian wishing to stay in Trinidad has no trouble finding people to shelter him.
The forms themselves often present a monumental problem to the prospective migrant. Illiterate and semi-literate migrants must seek help to fill out the forms. Many literate individuals who are not sure which forms they need or who are confused by the bewildering and, sometimes, apparently contradictory demands on the forms must also seek advice. When problems of that nature arise they may turn to returned migrants, who probably know little more about the forms than they themselves do, or they can turn to "migration brokers." Migration brokers are usually justices of the peace who, for a small charge ($5.00-$10.00) fill out the forms properly, write the necessary affidavits and make sure all the various governments' requirements are met. The added expense is just another cost to the migrant who may spend as much as $1000.00 in his attempt to leave the island. Hillbay's chief migration broker has never been overseas himself but his long record of successful applicants insures a constant flow of customers. If one follows his instructions one will usually have no trouble getting a passport.

Securing a visa is much more difficult. The paperwork is complex and even properly filled out forms do not insure the applicant will be granted his visa. In many respects getting a visa is what Douglas Uzzell (1974) has called a "black box play." The migrant submits his application and passport and waits for a reply. He depends upon the unknown workings of a foreign bureaucracy to act according to his wishes without any chance of his being able to influence their decisions. He is at their mercy and can do nothing, beyond filling out the forms properly, to influence their decisions.

The immigration laws of the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada currently require that the migrant prove he has a job waiting
for him if he intends to come into the country as an immigrant. If the migrant intends to enter as the dependant of a Grenadian already overseas he must satisfy the interested government that he falls within a certain category (husband, child, etc. of the sponsor) and that his support is guaranteed. The potential migrant can also apply for a visitor's visa, intending to overstay the time allotted to him, if he can convince the host country that he is indeed a tourist, that he has enough money to support himself during his stay and that he really intends to leave before his visa expires. For example, Bertha, mentioned above, listed her occupation as a domestic servant. She could not convince any authorities that she had enough money to be a "real" tourist or that her position in Grenada gave her sufficient reason to return home before her visa expired.

Whichever option the prospective migrant takes he must get support from someone overseas; someone must find him a job or volunteer to support him. The first step then is to contact a "helper" overseas who will provide the necessary support and fill out the necessary forms. Next, the prospective migrant must obtain visa application forms and have them filled out, usually by the same migration broker who helped with his passport application (for an additional $5.00 to $10.00). When the forms are complete and the pictures are attached they, and the passport, are sent to the host country embassy (or governorship general). In some cases the prospective migrant may be called to the embassy for a personal interview. Once the forms are completed and submitted the migrant can do nothing but wait. If he is fortunate he gets his visa,\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13}Another method of securing a visa, that is used by the majority of prospective migrants, will be explained in the next chapter. In that situation the migrant is completely removed from the application
if he is not he receives a polite rejection letter with no explanation.

Securing Financing

Once the prospective migrant decides to leave Grenada he must secure financing for his journey and the initial period of his stay overseas. Philpott notes that for Montserratian migrants, "Such passages are expensive in terms of lower-class earning power and consequently the mobilization of the necessary fare constitutes an important problem for prospective migrants" (1973:128). Grenadian migrants do not appear to have that problem. Few, if any, individuals are unable to make the trip because they can not obtain the necessary funds. During 1973 the fare to Trinidad was approximately $77.00, to New York $365.00, to Toronto $425.00 and to London $500.00. With the exception of the fare to Trinidad most fares are major investments but not beyond the ability of even the poorest migrant if he can mobilize the proper kind of aid.

Migrants can obtain funds from several sources (see also, Philpott 1973; Maunder 1955; Cumper 1956). Traditionally a migrant would sell movable possessions such as his livestock or his house, but rarely his land if he could avoid doing so. More recently, with the increased affluence of the world-wide Grenadian community, migrants secure

process. Once he expresses a desire to leave the island his "overseas contacts" take care of all the details. The migrant's only responsibilities are to sign the forms in the proper places and to present himself at the embassy if called for a personal interview.

Fares depend on the current rate of currency exchange and the kind of ticket the migrant buys. Grenadian visitors to Trinidad must have a return ticket or they will not be admitted. Immigrants to the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom can buy one way tickets. "Visa jumpers" must hold return tickets if they hope to fool the immigration authorities. These cost at least one and a half times the prices listed above.
financing from friends and relatives at home and overseas. As compared with the Montserratian case where eighty to eighty-five per cent of the people have their passage money sent to them, and that usually by siblings (Philpott 1973:131-134), Grenadians obtain more of their financing at home. The ultimate source of the funds may be remittances sent from overseas by friends or relatives to the donors, but that is impossible to determine. Whereas Philpott asserts that the majority of the funds are supplied by siblings, that may not be the case in Grenada. If, for example, a prospective migrant lives with his mother she usually arranges financing. She may get the money from her children living overseas, the migrant's siblings or half-siblings, from her husband living overseas, possibly, but not necessarily, the migrant's father, or from someone else. She may also get the money from a relative or friend at home. In any case the money is given to her, as a gift or as a loan, and she is responsible for spending it. The donor may not even know how the money will be used. In other cases a sibling may supply the money directly to the migrant. Again, it may be either a gift or a loan. In still other cases the migrant's parent(s) sends the money from his home overseas. Finally, the migrant's parent in Grenada can supply the money or can guarantee a bank, or some other kind of loan with his or her real property. Members of the upper- and upper-middle-classes do not have the same problem securing funds because they, or members of their immediate families, can easily afford the relatively small amounts necessary.

In addition to fellow household members and relatives overseas the Hillbay potential migrants have two other sources of funds. They can borrow from friends and neighbors at home or overseas or they can go to any of five residents who lend money to potential migrants (interest
free) with the understanding that the money will be repaid when the migrant gets settled overseas and finds a job. No borrower has ever defaulted on one of these local loans, although several have taken what the donors consider "too long" to repay them. As long as the lender chooses his borrowers carefully he does not need security against repayment. The migrant could never return to Grenada without repaying the loan before he came home or immediately after he landed. Even if the lender were to die in the borrower's absence his heirs would pursue the case until repayment was made. In addition to legal sanctions, public opinion would be so strong that life on the island would probably be unbearable for the defaulter. Even if the borrower never returns, his creditor still has methods of collecting what is owed to him. He can mobilize public opinion in the overseas community in which the migrant lives to persuade the debtor to repay the loan. The knowledge that one defaulter will put a stop to all five possible sets of loans also acts to force people to repay what they owe. The potential migrant's final option, discussed in the next chapter, is to have his overseas contacts send money and tickets to Grenada once the passport and visa have been secured.

Settling Affairs

When the prospective migrant believes everything is arranged for his departure he must settle his affairs at home. If he has a wife and family he must see that they have a place to live in until he can send for them or send support money for them. He makes sure that his friends will "look in on" them to act as his proxies. He also asks some of his closest friends to keep him informed of his wife's conduct (especially her sexual activities) in his absence. If the migrant is a woman who
plans to leave her children behind she must see that they have a place to live while she is away or until she sends for them. Female migrants realize "caring the children" is a problem for men living alone. They usually arrange to have young children live at houses of their near relatives--usually with their mothers or with their full sisters. If a mother or a sister is not available, a female migrant usually leaves her children with a kinswoman or with a very close friend. Female migrants do not expect their husbands to remain chaste while they are gone. That is another reason for leaving children with female relatives or friends. Women do not want their children to witness their fathers' "dirtiness" firsthand.

The migrant must dispose of all the movable property he can not take with him or that he believes he will not want or need when he returns to Grenada in the future. Some of the property is given to friends as outright gifts while other items (such as cattle) are given into custodial care. The migrant settles his debts. He pays what he owes and collects what is owed to him. If he can not pay all he owes he gives his creditors his pledge they will be repaid as soon as he gets settled and finds a "work."

Departure

Before the potential migrant can leave Grenada he must secure an income tax clearance from the Office of Inland Revenue and buy his ticket. The potential migrant must present himself at the Office to pay a $3.00 fee for his tax clearance, assuming, of course, he owes nothing on his income tax payments. Once he has presented his passport and his records have been scrutinized, he is usually given his clearance
with little or no delay. 15 With his tax clearance in hand he proceeds to one of the island's four ticket vendors and buys his tickets. After that he has nothing to do concerning the government until he presents himself to the authorities at the airport. 16 Once everything has been arranged the migrant returns home to await his departure date.

As the day approaches fellow residents bring local products (cocoa, raw and prepared foods, and rum) to the migrant for him to transport to their friends and relatives living overseas. Fellow limers and other members of the migrant's group(s) give him advice about how to deal with the "fast life" overseas and tell him what they would do if they were in his position. In addition, they give him the addresses and telephone numbers 17 of contacts to be sought out in case of trouble or homesickness. Friends also ask to be given the migrant's possessions they covet. On one or more of the nights before he leaves, the migrant's friends and family will give fetes in his honor (cf. Philpott 1973:154-161).

15 During the 1973-1974 "revolution" anti-government factions spread a rumor that the government would not issue tax clearances to those who opposed it. That was not true. The government did wage a campaign to collect what they said were "back taxes" by announcing delinquents' names on Radio Grenada. However most individuals who were important, or wealthy, enough to be singled out by the government had "contacts" who could insure they would get income tax clearances if they wanted them.

16 Relatively few migrants use steamships for their trips overseas. Service is expensive and infrequent. For trips beyond Trinidad ships are thought to be too slow and much too expensive. Formerly, when air travel was expensive and difficult, most migrants traveled by ship.

17 The addresses and telephone numbers present more problems than a Westerner, or the Grenadian, might assume. Most migrants do not have telephones in Grenada and, consequently, are not familiar with their operation. The assumption that they will know what to do with the number rests on the assumption that they will be able to secure help once they reach their destinations. Addresses present other problems. Both problems will be discussed in Chapter Seven.
The actual departure is confused and noisy. Departures currently take place in the morning because the two Leeward Island Air Transport flights from Grenada to Barbados and Trinidad, the local transfer points, leave at that time. Up before dawn, the migrant finishes packing his belongings and says his farewells to those who drop in to see him on his last day "at home." He leaves Hillbay in a private car, if he or his friends can arrange for one, or in a hired taxi at least two hours before his flight is scheduled to depart. The vehicle(s) is always filled to capacity with as many relatives and friends as can be brought along. When a really popular individual leaves he may have as many as three or four cars full of well-wishers following him to the airport.

At the airport the migrant checks in at the ticket counter and then proceeds through immigration where his papers are checked, his income tax clearance taken up and a $3.00 exit fee is collected. If all his papers and tickets are in order, he is finally "free" and he and his party can wait in the departure lounge. During the wait the well-wishers repeat last minute instructions, check to make sure the migrant has all the addresses and telephone numbers and give him any and all information he could possibly need for a trip into hostile territory. Since a trip to the airport is a major event, the well-wishers remain until the plane has left the ground. All that activity is carried out with much laughing, crying, shouting, joking and, in most cases, pledges of undying faithfulness.

For the people who remain in Grenada the migrant is not really overseas until they receive confirmation he has landed and been picked up by his contact. His creditors are not convinced he has really gone
overseas until the first part of his debt repayment arrives some weeks after he has left.
CHAPTER SIX

MIGRATION: THE SUBJECTIVE VIEW

This chapter presents an account of Grenadians' ideas about migrants and migration: how migrants are classified, what attributes a successful migrant has, what a potential migrant must do to leave the island, and what the "real" causes of migration are. Whereas the information contained in the last chapter was what one might hear during a "typical" Grenadian conversation about migrants or migration, the information in this chapter is what one might hear during a "typical" Grenadian argument about migrants or migration. The data are no longer "unquestioned facts" but interpretations of those facts based on logic and on "what everyone knows" about the background in which the facts are embedded. The migrants' statements and actions are interpreted as "because motives" (Schutz 1962:22, 69-72; 1967:91-96), that is, as statements or actions based on compelling features of individuals' biographically determined situations. Actions show the observer activities directed toward a specific goal, acts point out the underlying motivation

1"Subjective" is, of course, a relative term. The Grenadian's truth is true for him if he believes in it. The "real" facts are insignificant if they are unknown, disbelieved or unacted upon. Similarly, the ethnologist bases his interpretations on what he believes to be true. His "real" facts are no less subjective than are the Grenadian's. He may claim his techniques for discovering facts are more scientific than his subjects' but that may be nothing more than his scientifically based conceit talking. In fact, the Grenadian analyst uses many of the same methods for gathering and analyzing data as does the field anthropologist. The Grenadian too uses formal and informal interviews, life histories, genealogical investigations and various forms of surveys.
for such goals. Therefore the statement: "I am going to England to make money." is no longer seen as cause and effect. It now implies a set of pre-conditions and possible results based upon what the analyst knows about the individual's biographical situation, his motivation and life in England.

The following accounts apply to all Grenadian migrants but especially to the large group of individuals who enter foreign countries under false pretenses. I have called this group "visa jumpers" because although they apply for short term visas (such as tourist visas) they intend to overstay their legally allotted visit. Most of the visa jumpers have no intention of returning to Grenada in the near future but plan their activities to fool the host government into believing they plan to come for only a short time.

Classificatory Schemes

Residents use as many as four related schemes of interpretation to classify potential migrants. Each scheme may be used independently or they may be used in conjunction. Each interpretive scheme presupposes that the sex of the migrant is irrelevant (sex linked roles aside), and that sex affects migration "as everyone knows" without further elaboration.

The first scheme is based on the migrant's age. Young children (under ten years old) and children who are still in school are not voluntary migrants. Their parents, or those responsible for them, send them overseas to complete their educations, to receive training not available in Grenada or to join their parent(s). Young people (fifteen to twenty years old) and adults (anyone over twenty years old) are true voluntary migrants. Those younger than twenty years old go overseas to complete
their educations, to learn professions or trades or to settle down and work. Adults go overseas to work or, in some rare cases, to further their technical educations or improve their work-related skills. Senior citizens (anyone over 40 years old, who would normally be beyond the age of migration) go to join their children, siblings or kinsmen who have preceded them. Although age is the primary classificatory base of this scheme, motivation (what someone should be doing at a particular time in his life) serves to neutralize possible chronological anomalies.

The second scheme is based on the reasons the migrants themselves give to explain why they intend to migrate. Residents recognize four broad categories of "cause" that explain almost 100 per cent of migrants' behavior. The four causes, explained in the last chapter, are economic betterment, education, wanderlust and the present political situation in Grenada. Other, less popular, reasons are "telescoped" into one of the four popular explanations. The transformation is accomplished by saying something along the lines of: "What John really mean is ... " (see below). The scheme is based on explicitly stated "in-order-to motives" and influenced by the individual migrant's demographic characteristics, social class and any other factors the analyst feels important.

The third scheme focuses on the legality of the particular migrant's trips. Within this scheme "legal" migrants (immigrants) have proper documentation and "illegal" migrants lack proper documentation. Lower-class analysts subsume what I have called "visa jumpers" within the class "legal" migrants because they enter the host country legally even though they do not intend to return.

This is the only one of the four schemes that reflects a socio-
economic class bias. Upper- and upper-middle-class Grenadians do not use this scheme at all. For them all illegal entrants are common criminals and, as such, deserve no attention. Legal immigrants are fellow class members or are members of the lower-class who are showing "proper" behavior. They are doing what is expected of them and, as such, deserve no comment. On the other hand, lower-class analysts generally equate the opportunity for legal entry or immigration with socio-economic class. They believe "wealthy" people can obtain tourist visas at will and can become immigrants with little or no difficulty.\footnote{In most cases lower-class analysts are at a loss to explain why a member of the upper-class would want to become an immigrant. They are not privy to upper-class reasoning and motivation and, consequently, cannot give what they consider satisfactory reasons to explain the "real" causes of upper-class migration.} Even if a wealthy would-be immigrant must wait two years for his visa he will not be forced to "take any strain." He can easily afford to wait as long as necessary. By contrast, they believe lower-class migrants must "fight up" to obtain immigrant status. As a consequence they are often forced to take the, presumably, easier course of becoming visa jumpers.

Within the class of "illegal" migrants lower-class analysts distinguish between "smart" and "foolish" individuals, while upper-class analysts consider all illegal migrants foolish. "Smartness" is explained in the next section.

The fourth scheme is based on the analyst's definition of the social class of a particular migrant. In general, and for abstract discussions, analysts distinguish two gross social classes of migrants--"big men" and "common people." "Big men" are either "rich people," members of the plantocracy and others who have inherited their wealth and position, or "big men" who are professionals and others who earn "big
money" through their own labor. "Common people" are members of the middle-, lower-middle-, and lower-classes. Distinctions are usually based on the personal characteristics of the particular individual under discussion. In fact, one person may be classified as a member of more than one class depending on other factors the analyst considers important.

None of the four schemes are truly independent of the others. Definitions used in one scheme depend on factors that may be derived from the other schemes. For example, "Young" Hudson is Mr. Hudson's twenty-five year old son. By objective criteria he is no longer a young migrant, yet he is Young Hudson in deference to Mr. Hudson. The acknowledged reason for Young Hudson's four year stay in Canada was to complete his education. The upper-class, of which he is a member, view the "educational" experience as training for the day Young Hudson takes over his father's business. The more cynical members of the lower-classes view Hudson's educational experience as a "spree" during which Young Hudson "... have a 'good time' on he father money, sleep with white women, see the 'city lights' and the 'fast life' and look for a white wife." The interpretation is relative and can depend on such factors as relative social position, "closeness" between object and observer or observer bias. In this case both upper- and lower-class interpretations are probably correct though different. Each stresses those points that they see as important.

Each of the four schemes may appear relatively objective,

---

3 An interesting feature of that scheme is the ambiguous position of the middle-class. The upper- and lower-classes generally consider the middle-class to be part of the lower-class. The middle-class see themselves as middle-class or as upper-class when compared with the lower-class.
depending on impartial application of set definitions. In practice the definitions and their application are neither impartial nor rigid. Criteria can be, and are, manipulated. One case may be classified in two or more ways depending on the situation and the intent of the analysts. The results resemble a continuum more than a collection of discrete categories.

Attributes of Migrants

Grenadians conceive of proper migrants, those who will be successful, as smart, young, free and manly. Each attribute fits into a generalized idea of a "superior" person who, among other things, should make a successful migrant. The circularity of the definition is apparent to Grenadian analysts. As they see it, a superior person should be a successful migrant and a successful migrant is undoubtedly a superior person.

A smart migrant is anyone who can arrange to get his passage money and his visa with the least amount of trouble. In effect smartness has nothing to do with intelligence but with one's ability to organize people and events for one's own ends. A potential migrant can obtain the necessary funds if: (a) he comes from a good family (one that is cohesive and co-operative); (b) he has other connections (or some sort of network on which he can rely); or (c) he has a good reputation or is considered a reliable person.

Residents assume any potential migrant who comes from a household with members living overseas will be given or will be able to borrow passage money. If the migrant has no household members living overseas he should have "connections" overseas or at home. The "goodness" of each migrant's family or connections is always a matter of
speculation. The final attribution of quality is always post hoc. Analysts may assume a migrant has a "good" family or "good" connections but they will not commit themselves until the money is in hand. Overseas kinsmen and connections are notoriously unreliable. Once someone has been living overseas for any length of time his apparent success is thought to make him forget the "poor people at home." A typical complaint is that relatives no longer "... study they family in Grenada once they Mr. Somebody in England [Canada, the United States]. They forget where they come out." The potential migrant is smart only when he has been able to overcome these problems and secure funds.

Similarly, a migrant's reliability and reputation depend on his ability to obtain funds. Everyone may assume a potential migrant has a good reputation, yet he may not be able to get funds. Obviously their prior expectations have been proven incorrect. For that reason reliability and reputation are constantly renegotiated. A potential migrant who appears reliable one day may be "worthless" the next if he can not convince others to support his plans. Success alone determines a migrant's smartness.

Obtaining a visa is more problematic than securing funds for the trip. Here connections (either family or friends) are extremely important. One must be able to depend upon the good will and continuing support of people overseas. When the potential migrant finally gets his visa he has proven he has powerful allies working in his behalf. However, failure to obtain a visa is not met with the same scorn as failure to obtain funds. Potential migrants who do not get visas on the first attempt are encouraged to try again. The general attitude is "... who know what a government could do?". The unsuccessful applicant is
encouraged to be smart and secure help from someone with a proven record. "Have X help you. He know what he doing." Only the potential migrant who gives up in the face of what he considers unconquerable odds is regarded as foolish. "Where they a will, they a way."

**Youth** is a relative and subjective attribute. Generally youth means the migrant is less than thirty-five years old (but more than twenty years old) and has few or no obligations to tie him to Grenada. Youths are expected to be successful for three reasons. First, they can adapt to their new environments better than older people. Residents argue youths are not set in their ways. They should be more adventurous and daring than their elders. If they enter the target country illegally or if they become "visa jumpers" they should have a better chance of avoiding detection. Too, they should have a better chance of remaining healthy (both mentally and physically) in a strange climate. Sickness invariably results in the migrant being forced, or choosing, to come home.

Second, young people are believed to have a better chance to "get a work" that will enable them to repay the passage money they probably borrowed and to send remittances home. They will be more successful than their elders because they can stay on the job longer. They will also be able to send money back to Grenada to bring up more relatives and friends. One might argue that sending for future migrants does not make a migrant successful. However, sending for friends and relatives is an important consideration. Success is not only measured in an individual's ability to amass wealth, but also in his ability to help those at home. In the process of helping others he builds his reputation and serves as an example of proper migrant behavior.
Grenadians also believe youths can obtain visas more easily than older people. Although most Grenadians are ignorant of the provisions of the immigration laws of the various target countries, they know from past experience that young people seem to have less trouble obtaining visas than do older people. They also believe the various governments will allow young people to come in as dependents, whereas they assume the governments will make it difficult for older migrants to get similar status.

Freedom implies the ability to leave Grenada with the least fuss, leaving the fewest obligations behind. A person is free if he can arrange to have his dependents cared for by relatives or friends (see Philpott 1973:135-138). Since younger migrants have had a shorter time to father, or "birth" dependents than older migrants have had, they are usually freer than older migrants. A migrant who does have a number of dependents is not necessarily in a difficult position. He may leave his dependents with his kinsmen or with friends. This aspect of freedom is clearly tied to having a "good" family or "good" connections. Obligations in Grenada are a second consideration. A migrant who owes no money and has no solid assets which must be looked after has an advantage.

Manliness implies a whole constellation of attributes. Above all a migrant must have mental and verbal ability, mental stability, and the ability to handle the unknown. If any of those attributes are lacking the migrant will probably fail.

Mental and verbal ability enable a migrant to "fit in" overseas, where life is faster and people are more demanding than fellow residents in Grenada. A clever person with a glib tongue can "get past" the immigration authorities with a minimum of problems. He can find a place to
live and a "work" with little difficulty. He can also avoid detection if he has overstayed his visa.

Mr. Richards is an oft cited example of a migrant with mental and verbal ability. He spent six years working in the refineries in Aruba. When he returned to Grenada he had nothing but the clothes he wore. Not having accumulated some signs of wealth would have left him open to criticism. However, after two months at home he decided to go to the United States illegally. In less than a week he made his arrangements and left. He has been in the United States for seven years and is apparently successful. He sends money home irregularly, but in large amounts, has a job and, most important, has managed to avoid detection. Reports reaching Grenada suggest Mr. Richards has managed to get a social security card, a green card (which enables aliens to seek employment legally) and "birth papers" which prove he is a United States citizen by birth. Richards serves as a shining example of what can be done by a 'real' man.

Mental stability is important because the migrant who becomes disoriented, confused or homesick can not hope to be successful. He may not even be able to carry on normal daily activities. Two trivial examples from the early life of Mr. Little in New York show how "minor problems" tend to upset the normal flow of events. When Little first arrived one of his cousins showed him how to find his way home from the subway station. He was never warned that this particular station has two exits. One day, by some happenstance, Little left the station through the wrong

---

4Grenadians at home and in the United States assume getting a social security card is extremely difficult. They equate a social security card with a British National Health identification which is difficult to obtain.
exit. As soon as he reached the street he knew he was in the wrong place, but he did not know where he was. He decided if he kept walking he would probably find some landmark to help him home. To add to his problems he began walking in the wrong direction. After walking for six blocks he turned and ran back to the exit of the subway station, intending to get on the train and ride until he came back to his stop. Then he realized he had no money. Finally a passing stranger (another West Indian) told him where he was and set him off in the right direction.

The second incident also involves transportation. On his first day in the city one of his friends called to take Little visiting. They traveled by bus. Little had been riding on buses all his life in Grenada but had never been on a New York bus. The trip was uneventful except for the wonder of riding on such a large bus that was so quiet and on which the passengers seemed to ignore each other. The trip home was not so easy. Little's guide had to get off the bus before Little. He left instructions that Little should get off after the tenth stop (that is, at the eleventh stop). "All you have to do is ring the bell." The guide neglected to tell Little how to ring the bell. As his stop approached Little began a frantic search for the mechanism for ringing the bell. He had seen people holding onto iron "straps" hanging from the ceiling. He tried to ring the bell by pulling the strap but got no results. His antics must have been strange for everyone in his part of the bus began looking at him. To avoid looking like a fool Little began a careful inspection of the strap, "... just so I look like I know what I doing." At last, three stops past his corner, he saw someone pull the "rope" at the side of the bus and he too knew how to ring the bell. Neither experience has had a lasting effect on Little but even now,
three years later, he does not like to travel around New York alone.

Mr. Bole's case shows what can happen in the extreme. He went to London to live with his daughter. After six months he became ill. He could not sleep and he worried constantly about his family in Grenada. When, at the end of his eighth month in London, he became so ill that he could not leave his bed without vomiting and getting dizzy, his daughter sent him home to Grenada. The local physician told him he was having a "fit of nerves" (a nervous breakdown) and would have to pull himself together. Bole remained in bed for six weeks and was sure he would die. Finally, to confirm his opinion, his family gathered at the death bed, some coming from as far away as London and New York. To everyone's surprise Mr. Bole made a rapid recovery once his family had assembled. He has had no further trouble with his nerves for the past five years. The family was elated, if confused. Bole's neighbors explain his rapid recovery by saying "... he mind wasn't easy when he people all over the world." Residents also use Bole as an example of a person with a "weak" mind who should never have gone overseas. His mind was not strong enough to cope with the problems of living in a "fast" country.

A migrant's ability to handle the unknown can only be predicted to a limited extent. He may have been able to handle the unknown in Grenada, but, after all, what he has accomplished is merely handling a "relatively unknown" unknown. Life overseas is completely unknown (see Chapter Seven). Cases constantly come to light of potential migrants who appear to be in complete control of the situation when they are really anything but.

Grenadians have developed definitions of the attributes employed
to assess a potential migrant's chances of success by examining numerous empirical cases. Migration is no longer new or unusual. Over fifty percent of Hillbay's households currently have members living overseas. In addition, more than 100 returned migrants live in Hillbay. Each migrant's story is known and many of them have been subjected to long, detailed analyses by residents. In addition, "famous" cases, such as that of the woman who became insane by staring at the Empire State Building, are known and often quoted. No one would claim analyses are always perfect, or even right. However, few cases exist for which all the analysts have made incorrect predictions.

Definitions of success and of successful migrants are always evolving. As times and conditions change so too do definitions. What was success yesterday will probably not be success tomorrow. In all cases, however, success and successfulness are determined after the fact. Actions are only analyzed once they become acts. The migrant who is given little hope of "making it" overseas may turn out to be very successful. With so many unpredictable factors few people are foolish enough to state an opinion before all the results are known.

The Act of Migration\(^5\)

Following the Grenadians' lead, the present discussion will focus on the activities of "visa jumpers." The activities of legal

---

\(^5\)"Act" refers to my informants' verbalized accounts and analyses of others' actions during migration. These are post hoc reconstructions, colored by the background information informants use in their interpretations. Acts, because they are located in the past, are unitary and complete. "Actions" (in my usage) occur in the ethnographic present and are therefore not complete and not subject to interpretation as units (although they have been interpreted at least twice in this work—once by my informants and once by me). Once an action is viewed as a completed set of behaviors, and hence amenable to analysis, it becomes, by definition, an act. Schutz (1967:39, 52-63) gives a more complete explanation of both terms.
immigrants present analysts with little food for thought. Illegal immigrants, on the other hand, do present problems for Grenadian analysts. One must be "smart" to enter another country illegally. But "smartness" breeds craft and silence. Consequently, the average Grenadian who has not migrated illegally has no idea how the process of illegal entry works. At best he may be able to secure the name of someone who can help him enter a foreign country illegally; at worst, he can only wonder how it is done. General knowledge, and hence discussion, is limited. Everyone knows who the illegal entrants have been but few know how they did it and even fewer are willing to discuss the process.6

The most important topic for local analysts' discussions is the "visa jumper." Visa jumpers are migrants who overstay their legal visit to the host country. Since they do apply for visas their initial actions are not in themselves illegal. They commit an illegal act when they decide to overstay their allotted time and actually do so. Residents spend a great deal of time arguing about application procedures, target countries' requirements and ways of coping with bureaucracies in order to help potential migrants get their visas. They devote their time even though experience has taught them that potential migrants will usually ignore all they tell them. The advice is given and taken in the spirit of good friendship.

Each potential migrant knows he may be forced to become a visa jumper if the host country does not issue him "enough time" to do

---

6In a society where almost everything is "common knowledge," that fact is rather surprising at first. However, people involved in illegal migration have a vested interest in keeping their knowledge secret. Some make a large portion of their income by helping would-be illegal migrants. Others are frightened their illegal activities may lead to their arrest and imprisonment. For whatever reason, illegal entry is never a topic of conversation.
whatever it is he intends to do. Everyone acknowledges that migrants are better off if they can secure resident alien or immigrant status in a foreign country. An individual who fails to get one of those statuses is advised to become a visa jumper if he convinces others he really wants to spend a number of years overseas.\footnote{The Grenadians' argument is not entirely logical or valid. They operate under the assumption that the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom have a moral obligation to admit or accept any Grenadian (other things being equal) who applies for entry. They realize the wait for immigrant or resident alien status is a long one but they are often unwilling to wait. They have a right, many feel, to be admitted in the shortest possible time. After all, "rich men" get visas in one day while "poor folks" must wait for years. If they or their contacts cannot arrange a resident's visa in a reasonable time they have a right to get a visitor's visa and overstay their allotted time.}

Each host government requires, or, at least, Grenadians behave as if they require, the visitor be able to show he will leave at the end of his stay—he must have a return ticket and something in Grenada that will insure he returns home. They also require he be able to prove he will not become a burden on the state during his stay. That is, he must have enough money to support himself in the normal course of events. In addition, he must prove he is a legitimate tourist or that he will really visit someone he knows during his stay. Whatever the specific requirements of each country residents concern themselves only with obtaining these "proofs." The contact overseas will take care of everything else.

During the last fifteen to twenty years Grenadians have developed the idea that if one has a letter from an individual overseas inviting him for a visit his "visa application will be expedited. They are correct in that foreign immigration officials are more likely to believe Grenadians are going to visit a friend or kinsman than that they are
going as vacationers. But no foreign government requires such a letter by law. Legal requirements notwithstanding, each potential migrant eventually obtains his letter.

The letter must cover everything in which the foreign government is interested. It must express the host's happiness that the visitor was able to secure financing for the trip (or, even better, that the host was happy to send the tickets), contain the date of arrival and the alleged date of departure (actual airline flight numbers add a bit of authenticity) and a statement about how happy the host is to provide room and board during the entire stay. The letter's contents are important because they can, or should, remove some doubts about the visitor's intention to leave or about his becoming a ward of the state. For example, return tickets cost almost twice as much as one way tickets. Grenadians incorrectly believe immigration officials will not think a poor Grenadian could spend such a "large" sum of money to perpetrate a fraud. The letter also is supposed to establish that someone will be responsible for the migrant if something unexpected happens during his stay. Further, it establishes that the migrant is known to people in the target country—hopefully to respectable citizens or resident aliens—and that he has some legitimate reason for his visit and is not just an "idle" tourist. How, Grenadians argue, could a "little man" from a "poor" island be a real tourist to a "big, fast" country? Few, if any, have enough money to be like the "real" tourists one sees from the cruise ships that dock in St. George's. Most do not even own a camera.

To this point the potential migrant has done little himself. Everything has been taken care of by his overseas contact. The potential migrant's own part in migration has been relatively small, in the
main limited to activating his network of friends and/or kinsmen, who organize cooperation overseas. He may have to secure his own financing, but even that may be left to his contacts. To the extent that the migrant is not involved in the negotiations with immigration authorities the whole project is a "black box play" (Uzzell 1974) for him. He merely states his desires, informs his contacts and awaits a decision. In each case he has little or no hope of being able to influence the final outcome. Even when he is called upon to fill out the necessary forms, the potential migrant is usually only an interested spectator. Since the forms are vital to success, residents suspect they must be filled out completely, accurately (that is, to convey the proper impression) and, above all, neatly. Although any literate individual could fill out the forms, an experienced migration broker should be able to fill out the forms "better." The small expense is considered money well spent.

Once the action is set in motion the migrant himself can only await results. They hope their contacts are more able to help them than they are to help themselves. But (and it is an important "but") their contacts' field of activity is limited by the restrictions inherent in the system. The contacts are dealing with foreign governments, not the government in Grenada. Therein lies the rub.

Individuals' relations with the Grenada government are flexible. Ways exist for an individual to get what he desires if he knows the proper people to see or the proper way to present his case. Everyone has kinsmen and friends in the government, even if they are only employed as menial laborers, who can suggest which individuals should be approached, and how they should be approached, if one desires a specific
outcome from the bureaucratic process. Grenadian government officials are not corrupt. But if one has a petition before the government he can insure success by knowing which papers to fill out and to whom to present them. "Contacts" within the government allow a petitioner to negotiate the intracies of the bureaucracy in the shortest possible time with the greatest chance of success.

Foreign governments are monolithic structures that allow no negotiations. Rules are rules for everyone. One does not have a friend or a kinsman working at a foreign embassy where he might be in a position to help. Even if one did have the necessary contacts he could not hope to influence the course of events. After all, you can not "buy" a visa from one of the "big" countries. And bureaucracies are notoriously fickle. One never knows why a visa is refused. Even if the forms are filled out neatly and correctly (with the answers the applicant assumes the host government wishes to see), the bureaucracy may still decide to refuse to grant a visa. Even if an applicant meets all the requirements he may still be unsuccessful. Or, as often happens, the migrant may misunderstand the intention of the host government. In many cases a government will issue a visa that must be used within one year. The migrant believes the visa is valid for a one year stay overseas. Many would-be immigrants complain that when they arrive at their destination they are given only one month on a "one year" visa. Success then, is relative. However, one hope does exist. While the Grenadian at home is impotent, his contacts overseas may be able to insure success.

Not in a position to influence events taking place thousands of miles away, the average migrant must rely on his contacts, who, under the circumstances, become all-important. Contacts "at home" are of two
kinds. They may be friends who offer aid because they are in a position to do so or "migration brokers" who act out of friendship and the profit motive. Neville's case exemplifies one way friends can help.

Neville was a limer at brother Irving's. He earned what little income he had by doing odd jobs for one of St. Michael's planters and by selling fish. For several years Neville told everyone that he wanted to leave Grenada because he could never improve his "position in life" at home. He finally worked up enough courage to ask two "big men" to help him go overseas. Asking for help took some nerve because he estimated he would need approximately $1000 to complete his plans. He managed to have the planter arrange for the planter's brother to receive him when he landed in Montreal. All Neville had to do was secure his passport. His contacts arranged everything else. He was given money, clothes, tickets and room and board in Montreal. His case is exceptional, but in many others potential migrants are almost as fortunate.

Claude's case is also instructive. Early in life he ran afoul of the law. He was afraid he would not be able to get his passport or his income tax clearance. He too feared "... the government have it in for me." Fortunately Claude's cousin had a minor job of some sort with the Department of Public Works and one of his friends had a friend who had something to do with the Inland Revenue people. A migration broker filled out all Claude's forms. He gave the forms to his cousin and had his passport within two weeks. Once he secured his visa he had no trouble with the people at Inland Revenue.

Both cases show how little many residents know of the actual procedures of migrations or of the bureaucracies that determine their fates. For them bureaucracies are mysterious structures that do whatever
they do with no apparent reason. Only when an individual knows someone involved in the bureaucracy does it resolve into the activities of discrete human beings. Even if the migrant has inside information, much of what goes on is still a mystery.

The cases also show how little the migrant himself has to do with the actual process. He merely presents his request to the appropriate person, his contact, and leaves the rest in his contact's more or less capable hands. The same is true for Grenadians' dealings with migration brokers.

Migration brokers help others do what is necessary to go overseas. Residents distinguish between brokers who help with the paperwork and bureaucracy and those who actively send people overseas. In both cases a good migration broker knows how to insure his clients' success. Legitimate migration brokers work within the law. They know which forms are necessary and how to fill them out. In addition they have a practical knowledge of each country's immigration laws. They can advise the applicant what to say on his application and how to behave if he is called for a personal interview. The migration brokers who actively send people overseas are in a different class.

John Smith specializes in sending young girls to the French islands of Martinique and Guadaloupe and to the United States Virgin Islands. For his services, which include securing the applicant's passport, income tax clearance, visa, tickets and a "spiritual guide" that insures success, he charges at least $750 (two or three times the actual costs)—or more if he thinks the customer is willing or able to pay. Only he knows how he manages to get his customers placed overseas, but there is no shortage of speculation about his methods. What he does is
clearly illegal. 8

Returned migrants, who would seem to make ideal migration brokers, are seldom asked for advice. In the rare instances when they are consulted they usually only furnish information about the actual act of migration and not analyses of what one must do in order to be successful. This paradoxical situation arises from the returned migrants' position in Grenadian society. Residents assume returned migrants no longer know the immigration laws and procedures of their own host countries. Yesterday's knowledge is useless today. Also, if a returned migrant appears too knowledgable he will put people off. He may be accused of boastful or prideful behavior, both of which are unacceptable. Rather than risk a bad reputation, the returned migrants withhold their comments to prospective migrants and talk only about "things in general" overseas.

In addition, the returned migrant was able to "reach" overseas only because he too had the help of contacts. While he was overseas he might have become a contact himself. In all probability, though, he was only one link in a chain of contacts that led to a "good" source of information and influence. In either case, why not go directly to the source? Why settle for second best when the best is easily available? Too, familiarity breeds contempt. The overseas contact works in mysterious ways, while the returned migrant is nothing more than one of the

---

8 Soon after I arrived in Grenada I made an appointment to see Mr. Smith about his religious activities not knowing about his other business. He did not keep that, or subsequent appointments. I finally "discovered" he suspected I was a United States government agent who had come to Grenada to investigate and put him out of business. In fact, the "discovery" was the only reason my informants could give to explain why Mr. Smith, who is otherwise a very outgoing individual, refused to meet me. I have no idea why he "really" refused to see me.
"common people."

Finally, the returned migrant is damned by either success or failure. If he has not "made it" overseas, he can not be a very impressive helper. If he were smart he would be rich. Since he is not rich, he must not be very smart. Who wants a stupid helper? If the returned migrant has "made it" overseas he will be unapproachable. The wealthy returned migrant is no longer one of the "common people." One can not approach him as if he were "one of the boys" because he clearly is not. But one can not approach him as a "big man" deserves, because he was not a big man before he left. In general, then, returned migrants provide little help.

Overseas contacts are different from contacts at home. The most obvious difference is physical distance. People overseas are in a position to help because they are overseas. They can take care of the necessary details that are unknown to, or out of the reach of, their dependents. When an individual asks his foreign contact for help he is really only removing the "black box play" by some geographic distance. The real transactions remain "black box plays" to him because he is ignorant of what is happening. The migrant has no more idea about what his contact must do than he has about the internal workings of the local bureaucracy. All the migrant must know is whom to contact and how to state his request.

The overseas contact is shrouded in mystery. Once the process begins the potential migrant receives communications that request specific answers, order certain actions and demand cooperation. If the migrant is not "quick enough" to suit his contact he may be rebuked for wasting the contact's time. For example, Finsley was told he must have
certain forms filled out by a member of the government. When the official in question kept Finsley's papers for over a month without acting on them, Finsley received a telegram "cursing" him for being lazy and wasting time. A subsequent letter suggested that if Finsley was so slow in getting the forms filled out he probably really did not want to leave Grenada and, in any case, he was probably too lazy or stupid, or both, to "make it" in a "fast" country.

In all the interactions the potential migrant views himself as being at the mercy of his contact. He has no real idea of what is happening in the host country even when he receives news of his case's progress. People who are ordinarily skeptical accept their contacts actions and explanations with no questions, even if they really wonder if they will ever be successful. Only when a problem arises, or when a delay occurs, does the migrant question what is happening. Even then he is, or he has to be, satisfied with the explanation he receives.

Migrants and analysts alike can explain, post hoc, why a particular contact has failed in a particular case. No doubt he was not a very good contact to begin with and this difficult case was beyond his meagre powers. The migrant is criticized for not being smart because he picked a poor contact. "Everyone know he (the contact) not very smart when he living in Grenada. How you could pick someone stupid so? How you expect he do good for you in a hard place like America [Canada, England]? If you really smart you get Z to help you."

In the most general terms a "good" contact overseas has the same attribute as a "good" contact in Grenada. He can insure success. He too knows which forms must be filled out, which answers the host
government seeks, and how to use the bureaucracy to his own ends. The idea that a contact can "fix things up" better or more easily than someone in Grenada is a purely local one, fostered by contacts overseas. In the larger scheme of things everyone knows that by being a good contact the overseas Grenadian is building his reputation for his return. When he arrives everyone will know he is a 'real' man because he was able to help his friends and relatives at home.

Migratory actions are markedly different from migratory acts. The last chapter showed the actual steps involved in leaving the island. Everyone knows what the potential migrant must do in order to leave, but the behaviors are seen as unimportant. All the potential migrant does (the migratory action) is run around. In the end, when each case is analyzed, the contacts are seen as the real actors. They were the ones who did "something" to guarantee success. They contributed the significant aspect of the migratory act. The migrant himself only followed instructions. The planning and organization of events were all in the hands of the contact. For the purpose at hand (analyzing a potential migrant's success) the analysts need not distinguish what part the migrant played. His contacts insured he was successful, something the migrant could not have done with all his activity.

Explanations of the "Real" Reasons for Migration

If Grenadian society were one in which statements were taken at face value and in which "other things" were "equal," residents might not

---

9 People who have acted as contacts overseas have told me they knew no more about the workings of the host countries' bureaucracies than their Grenadian dependants. When they are asked for aid they go to their contacts for help. I got the impression that the long chain of contacts ends either in an immigration lawyers' office or in a small
speculate about the "real" motives behind others' actions. However, no one ever assumes "other things are equal." Each case is an exception to some unstated rule. Only a fool accepts what others tell him without question.

Individuals' stated reasons for becoming migrants, like other statements, are the subject of discussion and analysis. At first, everyone may accept what the migrant says. In the course of discussion and analysis the acceptance is modified by the addition of "... yes, but ..." and/or "... yes and ...". "Yes, but" implies the migrant has not stated the "real" reason he has chosen a particular course of action. The analysts agree that the initial statement is plausible, but it is incorrect. As "everyone knows" the "real" reason behind the decision is different. Perhaps the migrant is attempting to hide something. Perhaps he is just lying to make himself seem more of a 'real' man. Whatever the reason for his duplicity the analysts feel compelled to explain the migrant's behavior in terms that satisfy the known "facts" and explain why the migrant has not told the (whole) truth. "Yes and" implies that the migrant's tale is true as far as it goes. For some reason the migrant has neglected to state the "other" reasons behind his decision. He is not lying, but he has not told the whole truth. Everyone knows the migrant's biography and can supply the additional, missing, reasons for a particular course of action.

In each analysis, which usually occurs during a liming event at a rum shop, the discussants make use of "what everyone knows" about the migrant's biography. In such a small community most people know

---

office in Whitehall or on West Broadway, New York where civil servants explain to intermediate contacts which forms to fill out and how.
"everything" there is to know about each other. If one person lacks a particular fact his fellow discussants can explain what he does not know and, probably, why he is not aware of it ("You out the country when that happen." or "They try to keep big secret."). Migrant's biographies provide the background material with which to judge and validate each story. Only when the analysts are satisfied they know "enough" about a particular migrant will they venture an opinion or will they be willing to classify him and assess his chances for success. In the course of the discussion the analysts evaluate all the "important" factors and settle on the most probable explanation of a course of action or a set of events.

The next few pages contain the case histories of five emigrants from Hillbay and its hinterland. Each case gives the migrant's own explanation of his actions, along with the material he volunteered to make his story meaningful. After the migrants' tales the "other" facts are presented. The last part of each case is the analysts' explanation of what "really" happened or what "really" caused each migrant to act as he or she did. I have created the fiction that each migrant is a school teacher to preserve anonymity. In fact none of these migrants are, or were, school teachers.

**Case 1:** Miss Scott. Miss Scott is a thirty-five year old black woman who has been teaching for over seven years. She received her initial training in Grenada and then went to Washington, D.C. to attend university. She returned to Grenada in 1966 to take up a post at one of the island's primary schools as an English teacher. She did well at her job, rising to be the head of the English Department at the school. She can not advance any further because she does not have a graduate
degree. She can become a head teacher but not a headmistress or a senior functionary in the Ministry of Education. In order to advance she must return to the United States to complete her Master's degree in education and educational administration.

Additional facts from Miss Scott's biography: Miss Scott has been having an affair with a married fellow teacher who says he will not obtain a divorce in order to marry her. Her affair has become common knowledge in the community. She has also flagrantly broken some of the school rules relating to sexual conduct between teachers and students. In the six months before she left Grenada Miss Scott had casual affairs with more than ten different men. That, too, is against the school's rules for faculty conduct. These affairs also became common knowledge. In the course of one of her affairs she contracted a venereal disease which she then transmitted to her teacher-lover. When she left Grenada she went to Washington, D.C., allegedly to begin school, but later left and went to New York where she has drifted into a life of prostitution.

Local analysis: "Scott mad and she getting worse!" Scott's story about not being able to advance is true, but she really did not leave because her academic limitations kept her from advancement. After all, anyone should be happy as a teacher. That is a high status job ("a good work"). The real reason she left was that Mr. Melville, her lover, would not leave his wife to "married to her." That also explains why she had numerous affairs with other men. She was trying to prove to Mr. Melville that even if he did not find her attractive, or worth marrying, others did. When she gave him a venereal disease she had no choice but to leave Grenada. Melville's wife even came to her and told her there would be trouble if she remained. The constant fights between
Scott and Melville were an embarrassment to both of them, but the venereal disease was the straw that broke the camel's back. Her subsequent behavior in the United States proves she is mad and that she never intended to finish her schooling. The fact that she has become a prostitute shows she was never a good person and that Melville was correct in his decision not to marry her. All the talk about continuing her education was just "noise" to hide her "sorrow" at having been rejected.

Case 2: Mr. Gore. Mr. Gore is a 55 year old black man who has been living in New York since the month after hurricane Janet struck Grenada in 1955. Both he and his wife were secondary school teachers in Grenada before the storm struck. His wife still teaches. One day, after the storm, Mr. Gore got up and "felt" he must leave the island. He had his passport and a visa for the United States so all he had to do was go to the airport and hop on a plane. As luck would have it he was able to leave that day. He said good-bye to his wife and has not seen her since (for 19 years). Mrs. Gore explains the situation a bit differently. She and her husband realized that after the storm things would not get back to normal for some time. Both had jobs, but their schools were destroyed and it might be a year or more before either of them could earn any money. [Later events proved her incorrect, but the schools were closed for some time and neither of them could have accurately predicted when they would re-open.] One of them had to leave Grenada to make enough money to support them both. Mr. Gore had his passport and visa while Mrs. Gore did not. Too, she had a mother and several nieces and nephews to "care," while he had no one. They decided he would leave and send back money until things got better and he could return.
Additional facts from Mr. Gore's biography: Mr. Gore had a drinking "problem." He was not thought of as an alcoholic (someone who has absolutely no control over himself where liquor is concerned), but he was "falling down" drunk almost every night. Even his friends, members of the various groups to which he belonged, thought he drank too much and would one day get into trouble. Indeed, his superiors at school warned him several times that he was heading for trouble. His wife, a very religious woman, remonstrated with him constantly (some go so far as to say she was even a common scold) and finally threatened to leave him if he did not change his ways. At the height of his problems he left for New York.

Local analysis: "Gore in trouble bad!" In order for him to remain "one of the boys" he had to drink with his friends. He could not pay too much attention to his wife's or his superiors' criticisms if he wanted to remain a 'real' man. However, if he did not stop drinking he would lose his position, his income and his wife. Some, but not Gore, felt he might be better off. If he stopped drinking he would admit, by actions rather than by words, he was not in control of the situation and that he could not talk or act his way out of a difficult spot without bowing to authority (his wife or his superior). He had only two alternatives. He could continue drinking and probably lose his status or he could migrate. The first alternative was unacceptable. The second alternative had two positive values. First, he could do the "manly" thing and migrate proving he was a "real man in truth." And second, once out of the reach of his wife and superiors he could continue drinking or not as he himself chose. With one act he could show his independence, courage, manliness, and smartness (the last by
outsmarting a nagging wife and by being a successful migrant). He took the only really independent alternative.

**Case 3: Mr. Fitzmaurice.** Mr. Fitzmaurice is a twenty-eight year old black man who was an English teacher at Hillbay's secondary school. He got his early training at Hillbay primary schools and then won a scholarship to the Grenada Boy's Secondary School. When he finished the course he became a teacher, a job he held for four years. Eight months before he emigrated he quit his teaching job and spent his time liming at Brother Irving's and at other liming spots on the island. He lived on the money he had saved while he was working. Mr. Fitzmaurice felt stifled living in Grenada. Teaching "dull" secondary students did not allow him to express himself or to help the island. He wanted to do more for himself and for his country. If he stayed in Grenada he would be cheating the people who paid his salary because he would not be able to put his "all" into his job. Rather than feel unfulfilled and cheat his friends and neighbors he would go to the United States where he could learn something useful—perhaps learn a trade or go on to university—and then return to Grenada to help his countrymen "advance."

Additional facts from Mr. Fitzmaurice's biography: While attending secondary school and then later, while teaching, Mr. Fitzmaurice had been "friendly" with several girls. Three of the girls had children by him. His current girl friend, with whom he has had three children, was trying to pressure him into marrying her. He did not want to marry his current "friend" and he could not continue supporting (however infrequently) his other children. He really loved one of his previous "friends" and wanted to marry her, but that was impossible without
hurting his current "friend." He hoped that if he could get established in the United States he would be able to send for his true love and their children and marry her. Since neither of them would be in Grenada he could get married without hurting his current "friend" and without starting any gossip at her expense.

Local analysis: "Fitzmaurice fuck heself into a box. He too hot too bad." All his problems really stem from not being able to control his sexual appetites. His talk about not being able to "fulfill" himself in Grenada was "one set of shit" used to cover up his major failing. A 'real' man may have many children--he is expected to--but he knows how to take care of them, and himself, without getting trapped in an untenable position. Young men are expected to "sow their wild oats" but 'real' men do not get caught. Obviously Fitzmaurice is only a "little boy" if he can not decide which woman he really loves. Once he makes up his mind to act he should not have to wait for someone to tell him that his plans are acceptable. The girl (his present "friend") will recover if he marries someone else. "Women used to that." If he can not see that he must be stupid. His talk about migration is a "cover up" for his failure to be a 'real' man. No one else worries that they are cheating the government or their friends, why should Fitzmaurice?

Case 4: Mr. Corsar. Mr. Corsar is a thirty year old white man, a member of the local elite by birth. In an unusual move, his parents allowed him to attend primary and secondary school in Grenada. When he finished secondary school his parents sent him to England to complete his education "properly" at an English university. He remained in England for five years, although he did not complete his degree course. During his stay he met and married a white, English girl. They have
subsequently returned to Grenada, where Mr. Corsar has become a teacher (over the objections of his family who wanted him to come into the family business). Although theoretically in the same socio-economic position as other teachers Corsar and his wife do not mix with them socially. Their only contacts with the "common people" occur in work-related situations.

Additional facts from Mr. Corsar's biography: The general population believe Mr. Corsar is not too bright. Mr. Corsar's wife's social position (before they were married) has been questioned. Many say she was from a lower-class English family because she was a manicurist before she married Corsar. They also assume the only reason Mrs. Corsar remains with Mr. Corsar, in the absence of children, is her hope that they will become rich when, in the near future, Mr. Corsar's parents die and leave all their money to him. They also speculate she is ashamed to go back to England after having married a Grenadian.10

Local analysis: "Corsar do what he supposed to." He has acted as most people suspect upper-class white men act. He is neither too bright nor too ambitious. If his parents had not sent him to England he would have remained in Grenada waiting for a "proper" wife to appear. While he was waiting he would have had relations with local girls and

10 Braithwaite (1953) reports cases similar to this one have occurred in Trinidad. He assumes lower-class Trinidadians are incorrect when they classify white spouses of Trinidadians as lower-class women who have attempted to "marry up." He also takes objection to the notion that members of the middle- and upper-classes go overseas specifically to find and marry white mates. He claims both notions are artifacts of lower-class thinking and that in most cases that kind of thinking is incorrect. He misses the point completely. It really does not matter that the lower-class analysts have their "facts" wrong. As far as they are concerned they are correct. The analyses proceed as if the facts were correct, and their conclusions rest on what they believe are the facts. Further, their limited interactions with members of the elite are carried out as if their analyses were correct. For example, the
would, no doubt, have fathered several children (as his uncle did). His trip to England was intended to shorten his wait by bringing him into contact with white women he could impress by telling of his social and economic position in Grenada. Maybe he did not bring his friend back to Grenada before the wedding to impress her, but many others do. Since he is not too intelligent or good looking, and since his family's wealth is not too great, he could not hope to marry a member of the English middle- or upper-class. He had to settle for what he could get—a common shop-girl. Proof for his suspected lack of intelligence is supplied by his failure to complete university. "He too busy 'spreeing' to 'study' university and he not smart enough to do both." He has lived up to everyone's expectations since his return by associating only with members of his own class, the upper-class, even though his wife is a lower-class woman.

Case 5: Mr. Young. Mr. Young is a 45 year old black man who has been a teacher for more than twenty years. He received his education and training in Grenada and has yet to go overseas. Until recently he was the sole support for his aged mother. Now that his siblings are grown and working (three of his six siblings live overseas) he feels he can leave Grenada. He complains he can never advance as long as he remains "at home" taking care of his mother, his wife, their children and all his outside children (nine of them). In addition, the local political situation has made teaching a precarious profession, because the government has not been paying its teachers regularly or completely.

Additional facts from Mr. Young's biography: Mr. Young and his usual deference accorded to members of the elite is partially, or completely, lacking when they deal with a putatively hypergamous spouse.
wife of fifteen years have recently separated. Although he has had "girl friends" in the past he has always gone back to his wife. The current breach seems permanent. His economic situation has also deteriorated in recent years. He has spent more than a prudent man should on his girl friends and he has made several loans which have proven to be uncollectable. His siblings no longer send money to his mother, so the full burden of her support has again fallen upon him. Finally, rumors about Mr. Young's dealings with the school's money suggest he may have been covering his shortages with school funds.

Local analysis: "Something wrong!" Here we have a pillar of the community, a church leader, a respected teacher, a man legally married to his wife who also has a number of outside children and all of a sudden he is talking about leaving for England or Canada. For years he supported his mother when his miserable brothers and sisters sent nothing home. All of a sudden he wants to give up all that to go overseas where he will be a nobody who can not work at his chosen profession. There can only be two possible explanations. When his wife refused to take him back and then took up with a plumber she made him a makhon man (henpecked) and a fool. He can not beg her to take him back, yet he loves her and their children. All his recent activity with "bats" (prostitutes) must be a cover-up for how he really feels. It must be a way to get back at his wife. Or, it could be that Young's financial situation has gotten out of hand. He has taken on more than he should have and his problems threaten to overwhelm him. He really has no other way out; he must leave. If he remains in Grenada he will show everyone that he is not a 'real' man because he can not handle his wife or his money. He must do the manly thing and migrate.
In each of the five cases the subject presented a likely reason for having chosen to migrate. Scott said she wanted to complete her education so she could take a better job. Gore and his wife told of a wanderlust backed up by fear of economic privation. Fitzmaurice wanted to experience life in a less confining country and learn something he could not learn in Grenada. Corsar went overseas to finish his education and see what life in the "mother country" was all about. Young feels the local political situation and socio-economic conditions make it impossible for him to "advance." All the reasons would normally be considered rational. They could fit the migrants' usual behavior patterns to a greater or lesser extent. If the local analysts accepted the migrants' basic assumptions about life and values and used their truncated biographies they might be satisfied they knew the real motives behind migration. On the other hand, analysts know more exists than meets the eye. Each knows the "other" factors that shed light on what is "really" happening. Nothing is taken for granted and no fact is too insignificant to be considered in an analysis. In most cases the migrants are not telling the whole truth, naming all the factors. They have to say something when they are asked why they are planning to leave so why not say the easiest thing? People will talk anyway.

Analyses are not limited to the actions of prospective migrants. Residents spend almost as much time discussing and analysing why other migrants have chosen to return from overseas as they do on prospective migrants. Each case is discussed from the point of view of what the analysts knew about the migrant before he left, what they have observed since he has returned and what they have found out about his life overseas. As with prospective migrants the analysts limit their discussion
to "problem" cases. No one is very interested in a sixty-five year old man who has returned to Grenada to live on his United States social security checks. He may be a good person with some interesting stories to tell, but he is certainly not exciting. Besides, only old men remember him before he left and no one likes to argue with old men. The next three cases are about returned migrants who have "stories" behind their returns.

**Case 6: Mr. Matthew.** Mr. Matthew is a thirty-seven year old black man who returned to Grenada from Toronto in 1973 after a four year stay. No one ever thought Mr. Matthew was very bright. He went to Canada with the idea of becoming a salesman but, for some reason or other, he could never get into that line of work. He had to content himself with a series of odd jobs until he finally landed a permanent position as an orderly in a hospital. He was an orderly for three years, all the while trying to get a "respectable" sales position (something like insurance or some other "big price tag" item, not counter work in a shop or department store). He claims he was never able to get the kind of job he wanted because Canadian employers discriminate against West Indian blacks.

Additional facts from Mr. Matthew's biography: In addition to his normal teaching position in Grenada, Mr. Matthew worked as a part-time insurance salesman for several years. He was constantly in trouble with his employers for muddling his accounts, losing track of premium payments and making improper advances to women whose husbands were not at home. He also had the hard won reputation of a "love 'em and leave 'em man" with the local women. Several of his girlfriends were very young and others were not entirely mentally stable. While in Canada he
became involved with several women, one of whom reported him to the local police. Those who knew him in Canada say his relative mental limitations were aggravated by the long Canadian winters so that by Spring each year he was nearly a raving lunatic.

Local analysis: "Matthew crack." Matthew left Grenada saying he would come back a rich man in less than twenty years. He would prove to everyone that he was the best insurance salesman Grenada had ever produced. The Canadians quickly realized Matthew was "crack" and would not give him a position of trust, especially one that involved money. Everyone else who goes to Canada gets a good job and makes quite a bit of money. All Matthew could do was find a job as a hospital orderly, which really points up how stupid he is. When he returned to Grenada with no money, he even took up with the same kind of women again. Now one of them has to support him because he can not get his old teaching job back. He was, is, and will continue to be, a failure because he is a "stupidy" (pronounced /tú-pədi/ but spelled /stupidy/). Only someone as foolish as he could expect to "make it" in Canada when he could not even control his life in Grenada.

Case 7: Mistress Lucas. Mistress Lucas went to New York with her husband in 1955, immediately after hurricane Janet struck Grenada. She remained overseas for two years. When she returned home in 1957 she was "crack" and has been so ever since. She is a black woman who is now in her middle fifties. Her husband was a teacher before Janet struck but like Mr. Gore (case 2) he was thrown out of work when the storm destroyed his school. To avoid disaster the couple left for New York as soon as they could collect the necessary funds. Mr. Lucas has settled in quite well and has held the same job for the last fifteen years.
When they first arrived in New York they were short of money. They both
took jobs until Mr. Lucas could get something that would support them
both. After six months of work Mistress Lucas became ill. She remained
in the house for the next year and a half. She refused to leave the
house and had delusions that the "white people" were after her and would
lock her up if she went outside. Finally her husband, who was working
at two jobs and taking care of the house and Mistress Lucas, had enough.
He arranged her passage and sent her home. He has been sending her
money every month for the past seventeen years.

Additional facts from Mistress Lucas' biography: Those who
remember her before she left for New York insist Mistress Lucas was al-
tways too lazy for her own good. She never did a "lick of work" when
she lived in Grenada with her husband. She made him a *mahko man* by
forcing him to do housework and by following him "in the road" whenever
he went out to have a drink with his friends. [A few people claim that
the real cause of Mistress Lucas' mental problems involves theft from
her employer in New York. That is not common knowledge (without proof
anyone making such a statement could be sued) so few analysts have that
bit of information with which to work.]

Local analysis: "Lucas crazy like fox." Lucas never explained
why she came home. When she arrived she was too "crack" to make any
sense and in the intervening years she has had one of her attacks (she
faints) every time the subject has been brought up. What analysis there
is is based on her known past behavior and what everyone knows about
life in Grenada and in New York. Her "brains come sick" because she
suffered from "not accustomed." In Grenada her husband had the time and
inclination to cater to her rather unreasonable whims. "Is she supposed
to take care the house." Once they reached New York he had no time to do all his work and her work too. What was worse, she had to take a job as a domestic. A woman from her social position (middle-class) who had had her own domestics in Grenada was forced to work as a servant in "white people's" house. The change was too much for her but she was too "prideful" to say anything to anyone other than her husband. Others believe the work itself made Lucas ill. She was always too lazy to do anything for herself in Grenada. Having to work destroyed her mind. [Those who believe Lucas' problem arose from the alleged theft are very guarded about their analyses. They explain she probably got sick thinking about the enormity of what she did. Even the accusation of petty theft would be devastating to a woman in her (supposed) social position.]

Case 8: Mr. Williams: Mr. Williams is the forty year old black husband of a teacher. He is illiterate (which is relatively rare in Grenada). He spent a year in the United States working as a contract agricultural laborer. At the end of the contract he came back to Grenada. Since his return he has been saying he would like to go back to the United States as a migrant, but he has made no overt attempts to begin the migration process. He maintains he must leave because the

---

Ideas about black-white social relations in this and the last case are shaped by what everyone knows about such relations in Grenada. With few exceptions white expatriates get along well with Grenadians. Those who do not are either classified with Grenadian whites ("They think they too good to associate with 'common people'.") or as some sort of aberrant cases who probably did not get along well with their fellow whites when they lived in their own countries. The "black power" and other consciousness raising movements died swift deaths when they reached Grenada. Those who do have ideas that differ from the norm tend to praise whites at the expense of blacks. Prospective migrants are usually warned: "When you in New York (London, Toronto) and you see a white man is O.K. You see a black man you run like hell. Them black men overseas worthless too bad. None of them any good. American Niggers the worst."
local economy has been destroyed and the political situation makes it impossible for him to become economically independent. He spends much of his time liming at Brother Irving's while his wife works to support him.

Additional facts from Mr. Williams' biography: Mr. Williams' wife is considered one of the ugliest, meanest people in Grenada by unanimous acclamation. She has an objectionable personality that offends everyone. In addition, she gives Mr. Williams very little of the money she earns as a teacher. Most of the money either goes into her bank account or to support her two children by another man. She constantly reminds "poor" Williams that if he were a 'real' man she would have had children by him too. At the same time she tells him he can not afford to impregnate her because that would stop his income.

Local analysis: "Williams not a man at all at all." Williams' lack of manliness is the basis of all his problems. The evidence for that assertion includes: (a) he was too stupid to learn to read; (b) he did not have enough courage or ambition to run away when his agricultural contract expired, which action would have allowed him to remain in the United States; (c) he has never "boxed" his woman when she makes statements about his shortcomings in front of his friends; (d) he lives with the worst woman in St. Michael's as a matter of choice; and (e) he gets so little money from his "rich" wife. The only reason Williams came back to Grenada, if his statements about wanting to re-emigrate are true, was to be with his wife. If he really believed he could "make it" in the United States he would have remained. He will never leave Grenada because he is too stupid and because he is a mahko man. His whole pose of independence is a sham to save whatever little masculine status he
has. Even if he could read he would be too stupid and too dependent on his wife to walk across the street in New York without his wife's advice.

The eight cases just presented depict at least sixteen sets of "Truth." In each case the migrants tell their "truths" when they explain why they chose to leave or return to Grenada. The analysts tell their "truths" when they explain the "real" reasons behind the migrants' actions. But which "truth" is the "real" truth and which is untrue? Can both explanations for each be correct?

The migrants tell their stories as "in-order-to motives" in the usual course of events. For them, in their public statements, migration is a means of attaining an end. They migrate in order to achieve something. Their answers are a shorthand for what they assume everyone knows about them, about "things" in Grenada and about life overseas. They need not go into what everyone knows to explain their actions. Any Grenadian will understand them. An observer might say they are deluding themselves or lying if they do not take all that the analysts say into consideration. They really are not. Their object is to give a rational account of their actions in terms anyone can understand. They may be satisfied with the answers they give or they may do their "soul-searching" to find the Truth in private. In public they do only what is asked of them. They are just stating the facts.

Analysts attempt to get at the root causes of individual's actions. Their task, as they see it, is to determine why people act as they do. They are searching for "because motives," the objects and events in individual's biographically determined situations that shape actions. Their task is to explain what others do, without reference to
the others' statements. Their interpretations are based upon what they assume actions mean. Since they can not know what takes place in the migrants' minds they must base their accounts upon what they know about the migrants' biographically determined situations, about "things" in Grenada and about life overseas. In many instances the analysts' accounts supplement the migrants' accounts, but in others they are contradictory.

The very unsatisfying solution to the problem is that both sets of "Truth" are true. Neither group is lying or saying irrational things. But, whereas the Grenadian men in the street can accept two sets of truth—even though they may be contradictory—most social scientists cannot. If "A" is only "A" and "B" is only "B" then "A" cannot be "B". If a migrant says he going overseas to complete his education but an analyst says this particular migrant is going overseas to escape a nagging wife, who is correct? If the migrant is correct his answer fits neatly within one of the accepted motivations for a "push-pull" hypothesis of migration. If the analyst is correct each case must be investigated separately because each cause depends on the particular migrant's biographically determined situation within his culture. A "grand theory" with neatly defined categories of responses—no matter how finely drawn—can not be possible. Everyone's actions are idiosyncratic and no real pattern exists. Can that be true? More on these rather "sticky" points in the next two chapters.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE SUBJECTIVE STOCK OF KNOWLEDGE:

MIGRATION AND EXPLANATION

"What you do in this world is a matter of no consequence," returned my companion, bitterly. "The question is, what can you make other people believe you have done?"

Sherlock Holmes in A Study in Scarlet

The materials in the last five chapters are part of an ethnography of Grenada. They also show how potential migrants use some kinds of communicative modes, and logical processes, in the various contexts of migration. They point to some of the other kinds of factors that influence migration behavior. Residents are presented as actors whose parts change through time as different contexts demand. The underlying implication is that acts related to migration depend on the communication between actors of elements from an intersubjective stock of knowledge. Migration would not be possible without that transfer of ideas. However, Grenadians have a vast fund of knowledge that contains a large portion of "incorrect" information. Incorrect, or not, residents base their actions and order their lives upon what everyone "knows" and assumes is true. As Alfred Schutz explained (1962:5):

Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as facts, pure and simple. All facts are from the outset facts selected from the universal context by the activities of our mind. They are, therefore, always interpreted facts . . . .

The question to be answered in this chapter is how do potential migrants, and others, weld conflicting facts and theories into a coherent
picture of migration and of life overseas?

Each potential migrant must make his decisions and plan his acts in light of his own stock of knowledge. He can also "tap" an intersubjective stock of knowledge. But, limits exist. In the end, his plans and decisions must be his own. He must base his actions on what he knows regardless of the "correctness" of his knowledge. Since he must make rational accounts to his audience, he must understand, or take action as if he understands, how his personal, biographically determined situation affects his decisions. He must know Grenada's past, its present, and its predictable future, its peoples' values—and how those values impinge on his biographical situation; he must also understand the act of migration. He must have some idea of what to expect of life overseas in order to make his plans and weigh his decisions. Finally, he must know something about his peers' beliefs.

The resident analyst must also use details from a stock of knowledge to accomplish his chosen task. He, too, must understand the processes of migration and conditions that exist—or that he believes exist—in foreign countries. He must be able to manipulate, to take apart, the reasons potential migrants give to explain their plans to leave as well as the reasons returned migrants give to explain why they have come home. He must be aware of Grenadian, and overseas, basic values if he wants to account for individuals' motives and acts. Finally, he must be familiar with the detailed life histories of all his subjects. All of this information, in the form of "concrete facts" and previous analyses, has a place in an intersubjective stock of knowledge.

1 The stock of knowledge will be explained fully later. For the present, it can be very roughly equated with that part of the "superorganic" concerned with social knowledge.
Even the very reasons people give to explain their acts and decisions form part of a generalized stock of knowledge. Those reasons take into account the values that exist at home and overseas. The interpretation of those reasons is heavily dependent on specialized knowledge about manliness—how it is achieved, how it is lost, what it means. They are shaped by the individual's position within the society as the analyst, or the casual onlooker, perceives it. In each case, the reason forms part of a broader framework of knowledge that shapes all other reasons and forces particular interpretations.

The stock of knowledge has its sources in written and oral accounts. Written accounts consist of formal, published materials in books, newspapers, and magazines, and informal materials in written messages from sources at home and overseas. Oral accounts come from returned migrants who bring stories of life overseas back with them and from residents who may have never left the island. Residents create their information through negotiation, phantasy, dreaming, "scientific theorizing," and syntheses of others' accounts. Each source is valued differently by each individual. The total accumulation of this knowledge provides a basic corpus of data. Added to that corpus are ideas from each individual's private stock of knowledge which, to a large extent, is egocentric and unshared.

This chapter explains the nature of the intersubjective stock of knowledge. My analysis is based on the works of the sociologist, Alfred Schutz. It will show how certain social strictures limit the sharing of knowledge, how others create "red herrings," or false information, how history shapes and changes the stock of knowledge, and how all of these things operate on migration.
The Nature of Information: The Subjective Stock of Knowledge

Few of Schutz's ideas are either new or startling. His aim was to show why sociological theories, and by extension, anthropological theories, were incomplete. According to Schutz, a theorist who thought he could account for behavior by positing "normative actors" erred. Schutz attempts to point out how those errors were made, and what steps may be taken to correct them.

The Schutzian stock of knowledge is more familiar to anthropologists under their own rubrics for it—mental culture or non-material culture. Each actor in a culture must share part of the cultural stock of knowledge. As Schutz notes (1967:81):

The man in the natural attitude [wide-awake activity in the world of everyday life] "has," therefore a stock of knowledge of physical things and fellow creatures, of social collectives and artifacts, including cultural objects. He likewise "has" syntheses of inner experience. Among these are to be found judgment contents which are the results of his previous acts of judgment.

The stock of knowledge is the sum of what everyone knows—or everyone in one culture knows—about the world. No normal individual can exist and operate without sharing part of the collective stock of knowledge.

Man orders and interprets his life through his use of the stock of knowledge.

All interpretation of this world is based on a stock of previous experiences of it, our own or those handed down to us by our parents or teachers [in the broadest sense]; these experiences in the form of knowledge at hand function as a scheme of reference.

To this stock of knowledge at hand belongs our knowledge that the world we live in is a world of more or less well circumscribed objects .... Yet none of these objects is perceived as insulated. From the outset it is an object within a horizon of familiarity and preacquaintanceship which is, as such, just taken for granted until further notice as the unquestioned, though at any time questionable stock of knowledge at hand. [Schutz 1962:7]

Without a stock of knowledge objects and events in the "real" world
would be meaningless sensory stimuli. A stock of knowledge is so necessary, and so basic, to human existence that it may be overlooked, or taken for granted, in the course of normal events. Each man does not have to verify every object and event for himself each time he encounters them. Indeed, if he did, all communication and social activity would come to a halt (cf. Garfinkel 1967:38-45). "... to the natural man all his past experiences are presented as ordered, as knowledge or awareness of what to expect, .... Ordinary, ... he does not ask questions about how this ordered world was constituted" (Schutz 1967:81).

However, one must not assume that a stock of knowledge is a vast library of definite facts and procedures, neatly ordered, to be used as time and context demand. It is much more flexible than that. It is subject to all the vagaries of human activity and thought. "To be sure the knowledge is not only fragmentary since it is restricted to certain sectors of this world, it is also frequently inconsistent in itself and shows all degrees of clarity and distinctness ... " (Schutz 1962:55, and see Schutz 1962:74-75). Even within these limits the stock of knowledge is useful. "Yet, in spite of all these inadequacies, common sense knowledge of everyday life is sufficient for coming to terms with fellow-men, cultural objects, social institutions—in brief, with social reality" (Schutz 1962:55).

Each actor learns what he knows of the stock of knowledge from other individuals and through personal experiences. Therefore, the stock of knowledge varies from individual to individual, and for the individual from context to context.

Only a very small part of my knowledge of the world originates within my personal experience. The greater part is socially
derived, ... I am taught not only how to define the environment but also how typical constructs [of thought] have to be formed in accordance with the system of relevances accepted from the anonymous unified point of view of the in-group. [Schutz 1962:13-14]

The actor is bombarded with conflicts, and with egocentric bits of information that he, himself, must sort out to form his own stock of knowledge. In addition, he must determine which facts and opinions are relevant in what contexts.⁴ No one can anticipate for him all the contexts he will encounter throughout his life. Since knowledge is socially distributed different people have different knowledge about different topics.

... the stock of actual knowledge at hand differs from individual to individual, and common sense thinking takes this fact into account. Not only what an individual knows differs from what his neighbor knows, but also how both know the same fact. Any individual's stock of knowledge at hand is at any moment of his life structured as having zones of various degrees of clarity, distinctness and precision. ... The knowledge of these individual differences is itself an element of common sense experience: ... .

[Schutz 1962:14-15]

The ideas Schutz posits of learning, and of the stock of knowledge, would not be radical if it were not his phenomenological orientation. To Schutz, the proper study for sociology, or anthropology, would focus on how actors in the natural attitude of everyday life act "as if" they lived in a common world, shared common knowledge, and understood each others' language and motives. Why, he asked, should one assume that life in the everyday world is nothing but the simple interaction of "normative" actors? Why take everyday interactions for granted? That the actor takes his everyday interactions for granted is no reason for

⁴Defining contexts is a social action. Each actor must learn, or discover, how to define contexts for himself. That is one of the difficult aspects of learning a culture. An actor who can not define contexts to his neighbors' satisfaction is thought of as a sociopath or as an anti-social individual.
the social scientist—as social scientist—to do the same. If one does, Schutz believed, he will never understand how the fiction of normative reality is accomplished.

For Schutz, human interaction was the first phenomenon that required study. Once he questioned the validity of the assumption that human interaction was not problematic, he had to show how the problems of social interaction could be overcome. His answer was disappointingly incomplete, but at least he had pointed out a direction for others to follow. Schutz speculated that actors in the natural attitude of everyday life have to make some assumptions about their fellow men, and the situations in which they find themselves, if interactions are to be possible. Actors can not communicate if they take each other literally and wait for clarification of each questionable utterance. In his most concise statement on the subject (in this case, under the rubric of common-sense socialized knowledge), Schutz explains actors' assumptions and the underpinnings of those assumptions:

It [knowledge] is, first, structurally socialized, since it is based on the fundamental idealization that if I were to change places with my fellow-man I would experience the same sector of the world in substantially the same perspective he does, our particular biographical circumstances becoming for all practical purposes at hand irrelevant. I propose to call this idealization that of the reciprocity of perspectives.

It [knowledge] is, secondly, genetically socialized, because the greater part of our knowledge, as to its content and to the

---

3 In recent works the "ethnomethodologists" have expanded Schutz's ideas. Cicourel (1973:42-98) has explained the "practices" actors use in everyday interactions to maintain the fiction that they understand what the "other" means. Garfinkel (1967) has used Schutz's framework to show how interpretive procedures enable actors to "get through" interactions which supply only questionable sensory and perceptual data. Douglas (1970) presents the results of several studies that show, among other things, what happens when the expectations of actors in the everyday world are "breached," and how the interactions themselves are the proper study of a properly constituted sociology.
particular forms of typification under which it is organized, is socially derived, and this in socially approved terms.

It [knowledge] is, third, socialized in the sense of social distribution of knowledge, each individual knowing merely a sector of the world and common knowledge of the same sector varying individually as to its degree of distinctness, clarity, acquaintance-ship, or mere belief. [1962:61, and see 1962:11-12, 1967:97-136]

Schutz's ideas apply to Grenadian migrants and resident analysts in several ways. First, his ideas show how a stock of knowledge about migration may have evolved and what would have been entailed in its creation. The stock of knowledge about migration consists of the analyses residents do to make written and oral accounts meaningful to themselves. Written accounts of migration information are the least reliable accounts Grenadians have. They do not necessarily contain incorrect information, but their very nature makes them unreliable. Books, newspapers, and magazines to which Grenadians have access provide their readers with "indexical" information (Bar-Hillel 1954). The facts and descriptions these materials contain are unembedded. They require the reader to provide his own ideas of physical and social contexts if he is to understand them. Even if one were to assume the Grenadian reader could provide the "proper" context to permit him to understand what he had read, he could not assume the reader and writer share the same, or similar, systems of relevances, or that the reader and writer can assume that their individual biographically determined situations are irrelevant for the purpose at hand. That does not imply a mere misunderstanding or a simple questioning of meaning. It means the Grenadian reader can only understand written materials in light of his own socially derived stock of knowledge. When, for instance, he reads of the London Underground or the New York subway he can only compare it with other information at hand—perhaps the now defunct Trinidad railroad. He may
understand what he assumes is the denotative meaning (Schutz's "kernel")
but he can have no conception of the connotative meaning (Schutz's
"fringe"). Even his understanding of the denotative meaning might be
incorrect in this case, because he would probably picture a freight
railroad that ran through rural areas and carried sugar cane, and a few
people, whereas the writer would mean a vast urban system carrying only
people--underground!

If the potential migrant or resident analyst depended solely on
written information as his source of ideas he could refine and resolve
some of his problems--the most glaring ones. He could never hope to
synthesize the "correct" situation and facts in an overseas country,
let alone in three or four of them. He would be left with bits and
pieces of information and theories to explain--to himself--certain as-
pects of life overseas at certain places, in certain times, and under
certain circumstances.

But the Grenadian reader is not acting on his own; he is not
living in a vacuum. He has associates with whom he can exchange ideas.
Unfortunately for our hypothetical reader, his associates suffer from
the same "blindness" he does. Even if they could "see" better than he,
they could not help him understand problematic facts (see below). At
best, working in concert, associates could devise a scheme of

---

4Stephen Tyler (personal communication) points out that "kernel"
and "fringe" is probably an improper distinction. It presupposes a pro-
per denotative and a set of proper connotative meanings for each lexical
item in all possible contexts. That is, each item would have one kernel
and many fringes. That position is clearly untenable since both sets of
meaning shift with context changes. A more fruitful approach, if one
wants to keep the notion of kernel and fringe, would be to look at
kernel as kernel for this context with all other meanings as fringes for
this context. That approach allows for the fact that kernel and fringe
do change as need arises.
interpretation, and establish a system of relevances, that would account for the facts as they know them. It would allow them, on the surface, to discuss an object or event as if they understood it. But even with assistance, each actor could understand only so far as his personal stock of knowledge allowed him.

Informal written accounts from friends and relatives overseas provide only slightly more help. The reader would still be required to provide the context for foreign information, something he is incapable of doing. The system of relevances the reader and writer might have shared when they were together (in what Schutz calls the "pure We-relation" [1967:164-172]) no longer exists. Each lives in his own world, with its own stock of knowledge and with its own system of relevances. Any advantage that might have been gained from intimate knowledge of each other will have been lost by separation. In most cases, the longer the separation, the greater the loss of sharing (see Schutz 1964:91-106). One might also suspect that if the reader had questions he could write to his correspondent and obtain answers. The answers would be of little material help. He would have the same problems with the answers as he had with the original communication.

If written accounts are almost useless, oral accounts are little better. Although the speaker is right there, and although the listener can ask him questions when he does not understand a particular point, he does not. What he will ask are not questions that deal with basic definitions—remember, he and the speaker assume they share the same basic definitions—or matters of context, but questions that appear to make the flow of the conversation more smooth. The sociologist, Aaron Cicourel, has shown (1973:42-98) that much of what passes for conversa-
tion is, in fact, not true communication. Participants act as if they understand each other and seek, on their own, to make sense of what the other has said. The sociologist, Harold Garfinkel, has shown (1967: 76-103) that conversants can even make apparent sense out of completely arbitrary answers which, in themselves, have no meaning in relation to the question. Both Cicourel and Garfinkel lean in the direction of saying that conversation, as such, is largely a void "filled in" by the actors' use of their respective stocks of knowledge about the other, the context, and the topic. That being the case, oral accounts are of very little help in piecing together the real world of life overseas or of migration action.

The actual contents of conversations also mitigate against a "real" understanding. Residents who have never left Grenada provide one source of information to potential migrants: they may even account for more information than that derived from those who have been overseas. They have created their stocks of knowledge from second-hand sources (written and oral accounts). No doubt some individuals can give a convincing performance for potential migrants, but their apparent knowledge is shallow, and may be an artifact of other factors. For example, Eustace always knows what movies are playing at theaters in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad. He can even say where a theater is located, and how one gets to it from Independence Square (a local landmark). Strangely enough, Eustace has never been to Trinidad--he has never left Grenada! His knowledge springs from his interest in movies. He reads the Trinidad newspapers to see which movies are playing in certain theaters, knowing that two of Grenada's theaters get their films after they play in Trinidad. By reading the papers he can plan his own movie program.
If anyone were to follow his directions for locating a theater, he would become hopelessly lost because Eustace has distilled his knowledge from others' verbal accounts of "getting around" in Port-of-Spain. Those who have been to Trinidad laugh at Eustace's stories and directions.

A second limiting factor of the usefulness of "uninformed" informants' accounts is the dependence on the knowledge of third party mediators in conversations and arguments. When the informant turns to the mediator at the end of a statement and asks "Not so?" the mediator must make a decision. If he does not know the answer, or if he can not speak with enough authority, all kinds of "noise" can filter into the stock of knowledge. The information may seem possible, but it can still be incorrect. In the process, reality has been negotiated. The information becomes fact for the purpose at hand, and until further notice.

A third factor is that extrinsic considerations can effect what becomes part of the stock of knowledge. Status within the group or community lends to, or detracts from, different speakers' believability. Someone who is usually correct will be given more respect than someone who is regarded as a buffoon. The context of utterance—a court case as opposed to a drunken argument—will also influence the acceptability of different facts. Even such intangibles as time of day, mood of discussants, or topic, will effect what information is "correct" and what is "talking shit."

Finally, the participants can evolve a theory which includes all the facts under consideration. Yet, that theory may be completely wrong, although it is convincing. With no one to tell them that they
are wrong, and no way to test their conclusions, they may add their
to the stock of knowledge, inadvertently changing it in the
"wrong" direction. Once that happens, and it happens again and again,
new arguments and theories are based on "incorrect" previous knowledge,
with the trend accelerating with each new addition.

Returned migrants, whom one would think could straighten out the
"mess," form a very interesting sub-population. When they left Grenada
to live overseas they became "strangers" in their new countries (Schutz
1964:91-105). They brought a stock of knowledge and systems of rele-
vance native to Grenada with them. They had to learn their new coun-
tries' "cultures" as growing children would. However, they had already
been socialized in their own culture, and they look at the world as they
learned to do so in Grenada. Their own definitions of situations, ob-
jects, and events, while correct in Grenada, no longer applied. For
a time they had to "translate" everything into the more familiar pat-
terns of "home." What the native takes for granted as something every-
one knows the stranger must mull over, catalogue, and classify.

When the migrant returns to Grenada he becomes a "homecomer"
(Schutz 1964:106-119).

To the homecomer home shows—at least in the beginning—an un-
accustomed face. He believes himself to be in a strange country,
a stranger among strangers ... . The homecomer, however, expects
to return to an environment of which he always had and—so he
thinks—still has intimate knowledge and which he has just to take
for granted to find his bearings within it. The approaching stran-
ger has to anticipate in a more or less empty way what he will
find; the homecomer has just to recur to the memories of the past.
So he feels; ... . [Schutz 1964:106-107]

He returns expecting to find things as they have always been. Perhaps
a few changes have occurred, but not many. While he was away home has
changed and so has he. Conversations that he recalls "as if they had
taken place yesterday" are no longer heard, and worse, the participants may all be dead. What has happened is that time has passed without him. He is out of contact with what has been added to the stock of knowledge, he does not know what has been lost. He has not grown older and shared experiences with his peers. He is no longer one of them. Like the stranger, he must readjust. He must fill in his empty anticipations. Until he does so he will remain a stranger in his own culture. Mr. Bacchus, who has lived in London for fifteen years, plans to go home to Hillbay. His conversation is spiced with Grenadian phrases no longer heard at Brother Irving's. His questions center on the careers of people he left "at home." Many of his friends and associates have left, some have died. A new generation limes at Brother Irving's, men who were boys when he left, and youths who were not even born. Yet Mr. Bacchus talks of, and probably thinks about, Grenada as if he had been there yesterday. He is in for quite a shock.

Returned migrants are also unable to present a clear picture of the countries they have just left. Those who have been back for some time suffer from the usual lapses of memory—they forget and they add to stories. Their accounts of life overseas contain irremediably indexical information, they are also selective, egocentric, and flavored by the demands of the audience. The returned migrant knows, or is told, what his audience wishes to hear. Within the limits of his ability, he presents accounts of life overseas. At times he performs according to his audiences' wishes. At other times he is free to tell of the experiences he believes others would like to hear, or which he believes will re-establish his manliness and reputation.

Returned migrants do not tell stories about day-to-day life. No
one wants to hear about what a fool the migrant felt when he thought his action had broken an automatically opening door (and it is in his best interest not to tell such stories until he has re-established his manliness). That story is not exciting or reputation-building, even if it does shed light on day to day activities. Consequently, residents do not realize how the tales they hear are limited until they try to act upon them once they have gone overseas. During the migrant's first six months overseas he becomes painfully aware of his lack of definite knowledge. But, whereas the returned migrants in Hillbay can laugh at Eustace's stories of Port-of-Spain, the new migrants, who have recently arrived overseas, feel ill-prepared and cheated. After three months in New York Winsley and Emmanuel accused returned migrants of lying to them about life in the United States. "People lie in Grenada. They say how things easy and life good. They never tell about the hard parts. Everybody think you come to America, get a "work," and live good. Not so it is. America damn hard." The bizarre, the unheard of, the unbelievable make good stories. Finding food or lodging or learning how to get around in a strange place are less interesting. In a situation where the stock of knowledge at hand and the Grenadian systems of relevance have never failed them, and where daily life is taken for granted, it would be unrealistic to expect potential migrants to ask about the everyday, taken for granted, aspects of daily living overseas.

Three other factors influence the knowledge returned migrants generate. In many cases returnees impart false information to their audiences. They do not tell "big" lies; they shade the truth. A job as a clerk at a bank is transformed into an assistant managership. A lonely, isolated existence is changed into the gay social round of New
York or London. The transformations in themselves are harmless. They may serve to enhance the returnees' manliness. Taken together they add a large element of unreality to the stock of knowledge of life overseas.

The teller of tales himself is another factor in the incorporation of information into the stock of knowledge. His audience is composed of typical "men in the street."

The man in the street has a working knowledge of many fields which are not necessarily coherent with one another. His is a knowledge of recipes indicating how to bring forth in typical situations typical results by typical means. The recipes indicate procedures which can be trusted even though they are not clearly understood. [Schutz 1964:122]

They know enough to hold their own in a conversation but little more. The teller of tales, on the other hand, is an "expert," or an expert as far as his audience is concerned. His knowledge is not flawed. He knows of what he speaks.

The expert's knowledge is restricted to a limited field but therein it is clear and distinct. His opinions are based upon warranted assumptions; his judgments are not mere guesswork or loose suppositions. [Schutz 1964:122]

Unless the returned migrant tells tales that are beyond belief (and even there he is given great latitude) his word is accepted. After all, he has seen and lived through all he tells. Only the returned migrant who has discredited himself through his other activities will not be given a fair hearing. If he is "one of us," a 'real' man, he is received as an expert. Only if he proves he can not be trusted (if he is not one of the boys) will his stories and "facts" be questioned.

Finally, any one piece of information must "mesh" with what is already present in the stock of knowledge. But the meshing is a contingent factor. The stock is not a neat, dictionary-like set of facts and rules. Its basic structure is chaotic. Bits and pieces are "filed"
everywhere to await the application of a system of relevances. Any one piece of information may be incorporated, and even used successfully on many occasions as long as it does not contradict another bit of information. Only when a question arises are the various bits "pulled out" and scrutinized. Until such time, almost anything is acceptable if it fits within the general rules for the possible. That "colorless green ideas sleep furiously" and "flying elephants" are accepted unless someone questions them. The streets of New York can be paved with gold if no one objects.

Constraints on Information

Information in the stock of knowledge originates with individuals' discoveries. Discoverers spread their knowledge by communicating it to others. Through time, specific pieces of information are passed from generation to generation. Some bits are lost, others are added. The changes are mediated by the transmission process. Whereas ideas in general are learned and passed on in the course of everyday life, ideas about migration are not. Migration is rarely a general topic of conversation or argument. Immigration laws, visa application procedures, and the costs of travel are not discussed. All are private. The only information about migration one hears during a liming interaction is transferred in an off-hand way. The listener must abstract "facts" from the general flow of an interaction that might be about a particular

\[5\text{After eight months in Hillbay the only discussions of migration I had heard were those I started myself. When I asked my most sagacious informant why no one seemed interested in migration he challenged me. "What you mean? They interested. Is just something you don't talk about in public." When I asked him, and others, where they got their information about migration they could point to no one source. The general response was that one listened and gleaned what one could from arguments and conversations that were related to the topic.}\]
migrant, about conditions in a country overseas, or about any of an almost infinite number of other topics. Rarely, if ever, is the information inculcated directly.

Since that is the case, severe constraints exist on the quality and amount of information available. The structure of liming events limits any serious quest for real information—for "hard" data. The limers are not interested in educating anyone. Their primary concerns are "making style" and proving their present positions are correct. Success depends on the speaker's ability to convince the audience he is correct. Speakers use whatever verbal ability they possess to prove their points at their opponent's expense. If, in the course of a conversation or argument, information of value to a prospective migrant happens to come out, no one is impressed. That, after all, is not the point of the interaction. Each prospective migrant must make what he can of what he hears. Since he can not ask questions (see below), he must keep his own council. He must prepare his acts with the information he creates through his own private interpretations of what he has heard.

The time spent "setting up" a liming interaction is another restriction. An hour of each two to three hour event is eaten up laying the ground rules. Only one or two hours are available for the actual conversation or argument. Within that brief period many interruptions occur. The potential migrant is not listening to a set lecture. If he is lucky, and if the argument continues on the same topic for the course of the whole interaction, he may hear five or ten minutes of information about migration. Even so, he must attend to everything if he hopes to get as much as possible from the experience. But the potential migrant is also a participant. He is not there only to listen. He spends much
of his precious time contributing to the interaction (to say nothing of the effect of rum on his mental abilities). The only way he can correct his own misconceptions is by having his statements corrected by others.

If the potential migrant makes a statement during a liming interaction and it goes unquestioned, he has learned relatively little. His point may be true, it may be beyond the scope of the argument, or no one may choose to question him. He can only learn if someone corrects him "correctly." But objections and corrections usually prove worthless. In most cases the objections become the topics of conversations or arguments themselves. Once the argument veers in a new direction the old point is lost in the shuffle.

Grenadian basic values also constrain the creation and transmission of knowledge. The value of each source of information, as mentioned above, shapes its acceptance and its validity. Notions of manliness probably act as the most severe constraint on the process. The prospective migrant must show that he is a 'real' man if he wants others to help him. But, he can not show ignorance. He must accept the wildest statements as if they were not new to him. He can challenge statements he believes are wrong—that is his right. He can not appear to lack information. If he is constantly amazed by what others tell him, he gives himself away. "You mean you didn't know that? Boy, you have a lot to learn before you go to America." Here the "boy" is both a term of address and a commentary on the prospective migrant's relative manliness. No one would think it amiss if the prospective migrant asked about women or about getting a "work" because both are acceptable activities for a man. But a 'real' man does not have to ask about daily life. He knows "all that." Besides, a 'real' man will not have
problems with day to day life. That is just part of the unknown to be conquered. If he must ask about getting off the subway at the correct stop, or about how to signal a bus driver when he wishes to get off the bus [neither question would occur to him in Grenada because they are outside his stock of knowledge at hand, but he might want to ask similar questions about more familiar topics] he must be a little boy. Direct questions, most useful for obtaining information, are not allowed. If he is fortunate others will ask what he wants to know. If they are not 'real' men, or if they do not have to prove themselves, he benefits. If no one else asks questions he will never get the answers.

As a corollary to the last consideration, the prospective migrant is expected to question or attack others' attempts at "making style." He can not allow them to get away with anything. Often he knows as little about the topic as they appear to know. Nonetheless he must challenge their statements with statements of his own. He must show he has as much knowledge as, or even more than they do, even if that is not the case. He, too, must "make style." If he is fortunate he will be corrected and, hopefully, he will have a chance to learn from his mistakes. If he is successful in driving home his point—even if it is incorrect—he will learn nothing because he will only be reifying his own misconceptions.

Prospective migrants, and others, are caught in a trap. They seek information, but they have limited access to it. They can manage their daily lives by accepting "what everyone knows," and by acting within the relatively safe conditions of life in a familiar milieu. If they want, or need, to know more they run into a problem. Information about "extraordinary" topics is hard to find, and once found, almost
impossible to interpret successfully. In most cases they must depend on their own interpretations of objects and events that fall beyond the general Grenadian stock of knowledge. With few exceptions they must create such knowledge and understanding themselves. They will get little overt help from others who may be in a position to correct their mistakes.

Analyses as "Red Herrings"

When a Grenadian analyst gives an analysis, his object is to present a reasonable account of what has transpired. Further, he must account for everything that has happened. Two common mistakes can lead him to fail. He can base his account on incorrect information or he can give the wrong explanation. "Incorrect information" and "wrong explanation" imply the mistake was based upon an initial error--the analyst did not get his facts right--or on an error in analysis--he used the correct facts but made a mistake in logic or in some other aspect of his analysis. Whatever the case, his analysis will tend to mislead his audience. The final test of an analysis is whether it works. Does it explain the facts? Can one use it to predict behavior?

When an analysis is based on incorrect information it should go wrong because the basic facts are incorrect. However, no one "on the scene" is in a position to determine what wrong information is. When the analyst looks at a set of actions, or an account of actions, he may explain any one of them in any way he desires as long as his audience does not disagree. If the audience disagrees, he must prove his interpretation is correct. If he satisfied them he may continue. His interpretation may still be wrong! Since the individual facts are "indexical expressions" he and his audience are the only ones who may assign
meaning to them in the context of analysis. They may assign "incorrect" meanings to facts and not know they have done so. They may assign any number of incorrect meanings to a set of facts and not know it. They are the only judges of "truth," but they judge from relative ignorance. No one can correct their mistakes if their definitions seem correct. The same problem attends a whole analysis. Each step may seem right yet be wrong. If no one questions the steps, they are correct "for the purpose at hand" (unless some external benchmark exists against which they can be measured). The only "rules of evidence" are the general rules for a liming interaction. If an analyst obeys those rules he may say the most outlandish things and have them accepted as correct statements, forming part of a correct analysis.6

Grenadian migrants live by following a set of recipes and prescriptions that are validated by their position within the accepted stock of knowledge. Until some proof of incorrectness is gathered, each fact remains true. That this state of affairs should be so is not surprising. As noted before, the stock of knowledge (about migration) is not homogeneous and it may contain many contradictions. Only when one tries to apply the "facts" can he discover something is wrong. In the abstract anything that seems logical can be acceptable. A classic example from the Grenadian context is the letter inviting the migrant for a visit. The host governments do not require such letters, but they do nothing to discourage migrants from submitting them. They are helping

6Western science abounds with examples of "false" hypotheses being accepted as correct. Notions of spontaneous generation and the ideas of the pre-Copernican universe are two famous examples. The important difference is that no one tried to live by these "false" scientific theories, while Grenadians do try to live by their false ideas.
make a fiction into a fact.

Each new analysis and each new fact accepted into the stock of knowledge has the potential for misleading future migrants. The truth is what residents believe it is. They will make and execute their plans according to their knowledge of the world as reflected in the stock of knowledge. Only constraints placed on the Grenadian stock of knowledge by people operating outside of it (with their own stocks of knowledge and their own systems of relevances) can effectively purge it of "false" information. In the absence of such restraints false information multiplies. That being the case, prospective migrants and migration analysts live and operate in a world of fiction. Only the force of "common sense" keeps the fictions in the realm of the possible.

The Contents of the Stock of Knowledge

The Grenadian stock of knowledge about migration is defective for the reasons I have pointed out in the first parts of this chapter. The most glaring flaw is the lack of a set of consistent ideas about the process of migration and about life overseas. Accounts of both are fragmentary and egocentric, and reflect the pragmatic motivations of their sources. They either serve to build a resident's reputation or to explain his actions in a particular situation.

A more subtle problem stems from the very nature of facts and analyses. Both have "open horizons," that is, almost anything can be accounted for within interpretations of fact and analysis. This openness is reflected in at least three "problem areas." The first, mentioned above, is that apparent knowledge is usually only surface knowledge. The actor knows "enough" to present an account, but his knowledge is not profound. If he were called upon to take action based on what
he knows, he could not. The second problem is an extension of the first. The migrant who leaves Grenada really knows nothing of the actual socio-economic ecology of his new country—he is a Schutzian stranger. Tom's case is instructive on that point. The interview reproduced below took place less than two weeks before Tom was to leave for Canada. He had spent the preceding month preparing for his departure by learning all he could about Canada. However, as he readily admitted, his knowledge was fragmentary and faulty.

**Interviewer:** I want you to tell me what it's going to be like in Toronto.

**Tom:** Okay. Well to start with I must confess, well I haven't got much of insight although they have told me that the place is settled and it's nice and a lot of opportunities there. But still see you can't, you can place your place let's say well in a fair [Expo '69 was a "Caribbean" fair held in Grenada in 1969.] then a world's fair, good? Then here and there, well you wouldn't see much West Indians or much of your friends that as as you would normally think, or want to then. Good? As you move around though, you will be able to pinpoint one perhaps in every few hundred let's say that a West Indian, or somebody you could could feel well he belong to you more or less because he is somewhat like you. I mean as regards let's say race and those sort of thing.

**Int.** Yeah.

**Tom:** For instance if you saw an Indian, you understand because there will be some Indians here or you will see Negroes must have uh, see someone between and you know you don't expect to see that regularly every ten seconds or so. You could see that perhaps at every forty-five or thirty-five seconds and this and that and as you move through and well I know it's that way. I don't believe you have very much of a West Indian, or West Indian gatherings ...

**Int.** What plans have you made about the actual trip itself?

**Tom:** Well, my plans are well to get there settled and then get a job you know? And start going to, to courses. Look at the avenues and start going to courses. Whatever there, or see if I could know courses that would possibly lead me on to university entrance. ... Answers to concrete questions were couched in the most general terms. Plans and actions were glossed over by "larger" considerations. Day to day life and conditions seem to play no part in his plans.
Even after his arrival, Tom was slow to grasp much of what was going on around him. In a letter back to Grenada, written less than a month after his arrival, he still shows that the concerns of daily life are, or may be, beyond him. Only the most prominent aspects of Toronto life strike him as important (this although I had asked him to send me a detailed letter describing his initial impressions).

I find if God had meant men to live in this place he would designed us with fur like sheep and teddy-bear. Anyway I getting used to it, and my greatest consolation is, those who born in it are catching their asses too.

Peter, I cannot find words appropriate enough to describe Toronto, especially from the air at night. Beautiful is all I can say. It haven't fallen below expectations as described to me by several others. It is winter now as you know, and my movements are more or less restricted; especially as I have not yet found myself a job. In fact I have never been to look for a job. So I stay indoors mostly. I read a lot, but with very little concentration, more thinking about River Antoine and Jack Iron [rums available in Grenada] ...

The third problem is that migrants' plans and ideas for life overseas must be based on something familiar. Although a migrant can create a phantasy world in which he is free to imagine his actions, he can not sustain that phantasy. All his ideas are shaped by what he actually knows of life overseas. He must "fill in the blanks" by analogy with life in Grenada. His neighbors can aid him in his self-delusion. The idea of giving a departing migrant addresses and telephone numbers of people overseas is an example of this problem. In Grenada no one has trouble finding someone in an unfamiliar part of the island. Residents assume the migrant will have no trouble locating others when he gets overseas. They do not appreciate the problems involved in finding a street, no less a street address, in a city the size of London or New York. Even a simple telephone call might present grave problems for someone unfamiliar with the use of a telephone.
The three problem areas lead the migrant, or migration analyst, into an unavoidable paradox. As Tom's case showed, he pictured himself as having settled in Toronto with a job and courses leading to university entrance. In essence, his migration was seen as a completed act. He glossed over all the actions necessary to bring him to his final situation. In one leap he went from his situation in Grenada to his new situation in Canada. He projected what will have happened by the time he is settled.

All projecting consists in anticipation of future conduct by way of phantasying, yet it is not the ongoing process of action but the phantasied act as having been accomplished which is the starting point of all projecting. I have to visualize the state of affairs to be brought about by my future action before I can draft the single steps of such future acting from which this state of affairs will result. I must have some idea of the structure to be erected before I can draft the blueprints. Thus I have to place myself in my phantasy at a future time, when this action will already have been accomplished. Only then may I reconstruct in phantasy the single steps which will have brought forth this future action but the future act that is anticipated in the project ... .

[Schutz 1962:20, see also Schutz 1962:68-69]

In order to project the completed future act the migrant, or analyst, must know what to expect in the future. However, "All projects of my forthcoming acts are based upon my knowledge at hand at the time of projecting" (Schutz 1962:20). The migrant is, therefore, in an impossible situation. He must do something that he can not logically do. "In pure phantasy I am not hampered by any limits imposed by reality. It is in my discretion to ascertain what is within my reach and to determine what is in my power" (Schutz 1962:72). But the migrant, or analyst, does not live and operate in a world of phantasy. He is concerned with the outcome of future events in his real world. If he is to be a success he must operate in a real world, not in a private world of his own creation.
Projecting of performances or overt actions, however, is a motivated phantasying, motivated by the anticipated supervening intention to carry out the project. ... Projecting of this kind is, thus, phantasying within a given or better within an imposed frame, imposed by the reality within which the projected action will have to be carried out. [Schutz 1962:73]

Discrete incidents in the migration process must be thought of as completed acts. Getting a passport, getting a visa, getting money, all must be viewed retrospectively from a phantasied future position. But, the phantasy must begin with knowledge at hand at the time of phantasying, not with knowledge gained after the act has been completed in the real world. Yet the three "problem areas" mitigate against the very knowledge the migrant needs to picture the act as complete. He can not make his plans because he has little or no idea of what will be involved. The only alternative the migrant or migration analyst has is to create—or negotiate—a set of actions that will bring him to his desired goal. But he must create them, with the aid and cooperation of others, from the stock of knowledge at hand. What he creates is a fiction about how acts should occur, and about what results can be expected from such acts. Schutz's description of the "stranger's" knowledge (1964:93) also sums up the prospective migrant's condition.

What he wants is graduated knowledge of relevant elements, the degree of desired knowledge being correlated with their relevance. Otherwise stated, the world seems to him at any given moment as stratified in different layers of relevance, each of them requiring a different degree of knowledge. ... within the field covered by the contour lines of relevance, there are centers of explicit knowledge of what is aimed at; they are surrounded by a halo of knowledge about what seems to be sufficient; next comes a region in which it will do merely 'to put one's trust'; the adjoining foothills are the homes of unwarranted hopes and assumptions; between these areas, however, lie zones of complete ignorance.
Negotiated Reality

Migrants and analysts must create the fiction that they live in, and understand, a quasi-rational world. Particular objects and events may seem irrational (such as a host government failing to give a "good" applicant a visa), but, in general, the world and its contents must appear rational to a thinking man. The actor accomplishes that fiction by suspending his doubts about the stock of knowledge. He accepts whatever he knows as being true until further notice. In areas where the stock of knowledge is defective he and his peers synthesize practical meanings with which to interpret objects and events of which they have no previous knowledge.

The migration analyst is "... the special case of an observer who is not a partner in the interaction patterns. His motives are not interlocked with those of the observed person or persons; he is 'tuned in' upon them but not they upon him" (Schutz 1962:26). The migration analyst can set himself apart from the phenomenon he has chosen to observe. He unknowingly assumes the stance of a social scientist.

By resolving to adopt the disinterested attitude of a scientific observer ... the social scientist detaches himself from his biographical situation within the social world. What is taken for granted in the daily life may become questionable for the scientist, and vice versa; ... [Schutz 1962:37]

As a social scientist, the migration analyst is free to manipulate his data. He, and he alone, supplies the system of relevances. "The scientist takes for granted what he defines to be datum, and this is independent of the beliefs accepted by any in-group in the world of everyday life. The scientific problem, once established, determines alone the structure of relevances" (Schutz 1962:39). He creates an artificial world he can manipulate to his ends. He is free to people it with
actors to do his bidding according to the facts he gives them, and in
ways he sees fit.

The homunculus is invested with a system of relevances originating
in the scientific problem of his constructor and not in the par-
ticular biographically determined situation of an actor within the
world. ... The scientist determines the stock of knowledge his
model has supposedly at hand. The stock of knowledge is not
socially derived and, unless especially designed to be so, without
reference to social approval. [Schutz 1962:41-42]

The analyst's model is no longer "Jim," who lives in Hillbay, but a
puppet that is, and knows, only what the analyst says. He has stopped
being a human, a 'real' person, and has become a fiction created for
a particular purpose by the omnipotent and omniscient analyst. A real
person has been transformed into a set of data. When one analyst dis-
cusses a "case" with other analysts they, too, adopt his system of
relevances, his interpretations and his data. A question of fact, once
it is settled, becomes one more datum.

In most instances analysts do not act as social scientists.
They are interested in particular courses of events. Their subjects
are 'real' people whose pragmatic interests are important. When he
leaves his role--when he stops arguing and begins conversing--the
analyst resumes his position as just another man in the street. He is
just as "short sighted" as anyone else. But, he can go back to being
a social scientist at will. He can resume his role of social scientist
by stepping out of the world of daily interaction into the world of
scientific theorizing. As a man in the street he treats the world of
migration as an unquestioned reality; he, too, uses the documentary
method of interpretation, just as his neighbors do. But using that
method he gets no further in "understanding" what has "really" happened
than his neighbors do. He may be able to explain the case at hand, but
he can not explain how it relates to migration in general. Only in the scientific attitude can he formulate the rules that "really" apply to all cases. Only there can he invent a "metalanguage" of causation. Once he has made his formulation he can step back into his daily life. By stepping back and forth he can link one system of relevances and style of thought to another. As scientists, analysts create a fiction of what migration involves and what it means; as men in the street they apply their fiction to friends and neighbors in order to explain otherwise unquestioned events in the "real" world. Each explanation is then incorporated into the stock of knowledge. To accomplish the incorporation, one reconciles disparate elements (to a greater or lesser degree) and questions are removed for the purpose at hand.

The Problematic Nature of Migration

The activities of migrants and migration analysts are directed toward a definite goal. The migrant wants to leave the island and the analyst wants to understand the process by which the migrant may be successful. But, as I have shown, the migrant does not have a simple course of action to follow to an inevitable end. He must be constantly on his guard; he must be prepared, at any time, to change direction. He must know exactly what he is doing at all times.

Unfortunately, the migrant does not have a very clear picture of what is involved in his actions. He knows the initial situation (more of less), and he believes he knows the desired result. He has relatively little idea of what comes between the two. Migrants are forced to depend upon others whom they believe know more than they do. In fact, these "contacts" operate in the same way, with the same ideas. They, too, depend on others who, they believe, know more than they do.
Throughout the system each set of individuals—migrants, contacts, contacts' contacts, ad infinitum—perceives a course of action and strives to interpret it. Their interpretations are attempts to explain the incomprehensible. Each explanation is added to a stock of knowledge, but that stock of knowledge is shot through with negotiated reality that is contingent upon being able to account successfully for known facts (facts that themselves may be incorrect or the products of "mis-understanding"). At each step understanding is one more "remove" from "objective reality."

The notion of a rational migrant must be re-evaluated in terms of synthetic reality. The potential migrant can not be a rational actor if rational action is defined as "... an action with known intermediate goals" (Schutz 1967:61 [my emphasis]). What the actor knows are his

7 Douglas Uzzell has made two important criticisms of the material in this chapter (personal communication). Both hinge on the definition of "rationality" I have used. He says, first, that I have not addressed myself to the actual process by which an individual decides to become a migrant. Instead I have focused on what happens, how the migrant gets along, after he has made the decision. My answer is that the process, the "mental acrobatics," are very similar, if not identical. The potential migrant must make sense—for himself—of his life-world before he can make the decision to become a migrant. He has the same kinds of data, and uses the same kinds of processes, to make that decision as he does later, when he is concerned with the actual process of migration and with life overseas. I did not think it necessary, or advisable, to repeat the analysis since both would have been almost the same.

Uzzell then argues that the decision to migrate "... may be quite rational, without my having any notion of how to get along once I arrive." He bases this argument on his definition of rationality: "Rationality refers to a system of data processing, not to the "correctness" of the data or the conclusions." I do not agree with that definition because it says nothing of how the individual decides which information to "feed" into the system—something all actors must do at some time. However, I believe I can meet his criticism on his own terms.

Uzzell has fallen into a trap that often catches social scientists. He defines rationality as a "man in the street" would define it. His definition is a member's definition, that is, any member of his
definitions of a few intermediate goals. Each step in the process is a step insofar as he has defined it. It may have no, or very little, relation to events in a "real" world. If, as the Grenadian evidence seems to indicate, the "real" factors are largely unknown, the rational actor is only rational within the context of his stock of knowledge. Yet the stock of knowledge, too, is defective. And, as long as the migrant can only operate within what he knows, the taken for granted reality of his everyday world, he must be regarded as irrational by "objective, disinterested" observers. Instead of a sapient migrant who society could use his definition. As long as the member can account for his actions in a way that is satisfactory to his peers, he, and they, consider him rational. He does what any one of them would do if they were called upon to do so. He gives a rational account. However, the point I have made is that all "normal" citizens' accounts are rational in the "here and now," and for the purposes at hand. But as a social scientist I, not the man in the street, define terms. For my purposes, which may be different from those of the Grenadian, I define rational as Schutz does, that is, as "... an action with known intermediate goals" (1967:61). In doing that I am attempting to set parameters for "homo economicus," the economists' rational actor. The economists' actor, by definition, since he does not have to exist, acts rationally by attempting to maximize his information before making a decision. If the migrant is to be viewed as a rational actor—not as a man who can give rational accounts of his decisions and behavior, but as a man who seeks to maximize his information about conditions in the "real" world—he must be viewed as a homunculus endowed with the motives I, or another social scientist, say he has. His rationality consists of searching for the truth about a certain topic, and then acting once he has discovered that truth. In that, the Grenadians fail. They, like all other men in the natural attitude of everyday life, are not concerned with the truth; they are concerned with getting enough information to be able to take action and to give accounts to their peers. They are perfectly "normal." They do what other "rational" beings do. But, as I say, their rationality is defined for their purposes, not for my purposes. They are failures as models, as homunculi. By the same token, the social scientist who accepts the members' construct as if it were a scientific construct (context free, devoid of an internal time perspective, unmotivated by pragmatic interests, and free of all dependence on individuals' biographically determined situations—either the actors' or the scientists') has failed to distinguish between his own constructs and those of his subjects. Both are valid topics for study, but they are not the same thing.
operates to maximize his options in his life situation, the migrant must be viewed as a bewildered soul attempting to make sense out of his life-world. The questions to be asked are not how does a migrant decide to migrate, and then migrate, but how does the migrant perceive his world, how does he discover his options—among which may be migration—and how does he attempt to get "enough" knowledge to make migration a possible alternative with some chance of success. The proper study of migration is probably not a study of decision-making but a study of information-gathering. How does the migrant create and sustain a sense of social structure in his everyday life, in the everyday life of the bureaucrat with whom he must interact, and in the everyday life he imagines exists overseas?
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

In this chapter I shall present a summary of findings of the study, my conclusions based on those findings, and suggestions for further research to deal with some of the questions left unanswered.

The Problem

My initial goal was to discover and define the cognitive processes by which Grenadians create "superior" overseas havens as valuable migration goals before they leave the island. To do that I had to examine residents' conceptions of life and times in Grenada, their conceptions of the world to be found overseas, and the ways they use their knowledge of "home" and "away." Grenadians' conceptions include such features as their beliefs about the opportunities open to them, the factors that may limit any individual's chances of attaining his selected opportunity, how each individual views his own position within the society, and how he believes that position will influence success.

If I was to understand residents' ideas of life overseas, I had to examine what Grenadians claim they know as incontrovertible facts, and what they assume is possible based on those facts. I had to discover the world of possibilities as created through their use of "sure" facts. Finally, I should be able to say something about how residents use their knowledge, and how that knowledge leads them to create a superior overseas haven. In other words, I must show how migrants decide
living overseas is superior to living in Grenada.

The Research

Three primary techniques seemed most useful for gathering the kinds of data I thought I would need. They are survey research, including taking a household census, and using formal questionnaires; other kinds of formal and informal interviews, including collecting life histories; and participant observation. Each technique is legitimized by a long history in anthropological fieldwork. One might expect that I, specializing in cognitive anthropology, would suggest and use "formal eliciting" (Black 1969). I did use that technique but found it almost useless for the kinds of information I was seeking. No doubt the technique can be useful with a restricted corpus of data, as it proved when I used it to elicit kinship terms, but it is severely limited when one is collecting more diffuse information about a topic, such as migration, that is neither simple nor well defined for the interviewer or interviewee.

Survey research can be useful when one wants to generate a large amount of "surface" data in a short time. It is a relatively "quick" way to gather background information on the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of a large population. However, the technique has several shortcomings that limit its utility in the village situation I found in Hillbay. First, the nature of the research tool, a set of prepared questions, or data "blanks" to be filled in, limits the researcher. In the present case survey-type research was adequate to generate the explicit reasons potential migrants give for leaving Grenada (what I have called "stated cause of migration"), but it was not sufficiently probing to collect others' accounts of why individuals
"really" chose to leave the island. Using a "shorthand" technique, one can be left with shorthand data. Second, surveys tend to lend misplaced concreteness without determining the validity of any of the materials one has collected. In the absence of a marginal note, such as "interviewee not sure," the researcher could assume each response he obtains is an equally valid "hard fact." The questionnaire often leaves no room for uncertainty, and no opportunity for the researcher to question seemingly "normal" responses. Third, the subject may not have an opinion on a particular question until someone asks him. He may give an answer nonetheless. Also, the subject may not be the unit of opinion for a particular question. He answers as he believes others would or as he believes the interviewer wishes. Fourth, since most interpretations of survey-gathered data are based on statistical analyses, the results can be viewed only as trends. The researcher cannot make statements about causality. In the case of this project, where causal factors were important, that defect would have been fatal. Finally, the meaning of responses one gets is never entirely clear. Understanding rests on the (problematic) assumption that the questioner and the respondent share a set of meanings, and that objective criteria and techniques are applied when the responses are coded for analysis (see Garfinkel 1967:18-24; Leiter 1969). If, as I believe, there is no way of knowing whether or not respondent, interviewer, and coders share meanings—even to the extent of being able to meet the "requirements at hand"—the results from such an analysis can be very misleading.

Formal and informal interviews—working from prepared, open-ended questions, or creating questions during the course of an interview—are also useful for obtaining background information. They enable the
researcher to learn parts of what everyone knows and takes for granted. In the course of interviewing, the researcher is forced to question statements whose meaning is based on knowledge he does not possess. When he does that he learns what residents take for granted, or what they assume is too basic to need further explanation. In general, the information one obtains is difficult to quantify, but it will enable the researcher to discover areas in which numerical data can be useful.

Interviews, too, have several drawbacks. First, they are time consuming. Whereas survey researchers often ask their questions and move on, an interviewer must listen to complete stories or opinions. After all, he usually is the one who brings up the topic. While a survey researcher can be dismissed as someone who can not mind his own business (perhaps a government spy who has to gather information so that the government can increase taxes), the interviewer, once he has convinced his informants he is serious, must be treated as someone who really deserves an answer—a full and complete answer. Second, the information an interviewer receives can be very misleading. In many cases the information he gathers consists of pre-digested bits of history that have been analyzed in the past. He can not know if what he is told is based on actual events as they happened, or as they were seen to happen in light of subsequent events. Third, extrinsic factors may color accounts. The interviewer's presumed social position, the presence of a particular person during the interview, the interview situation itself, or any of hundreds of other factors may shade what an

\[1\] One of my assistants could, and did, give statistics on almost every question. His answers reflected what he felt about the question, not the "real" world. He thought he was being very "scientific" and, hence, more helpful. For example, in answer to a question such as: "Do most of the people who leave Grenada do X?", he would respond:
informant says. Fourth, the informant assumes that he and the interviewer share a set of knowledge about the topic under discussion. If the interviewer has raised the topic he must know something about it. The informant does not think it necessary to explain every statement he makes as if he were talking to a child. The interviewer can not stop the informant every time he says something the interviewer is not sure he understands. If he did, the interview would "bog down" in a sea of definitions and explanations (and see the discussion of the nature of oral accounts in Chapter Seven). The interviewer can only hope that eventually he will be able to understand everything his informant says as if he, too, were one of the boys. He, too, will then be able to take what they take for granted as a matter of course.

Participant observation is, perhaps, the best technique for getting "inside" a foreign society. As a participant, the researcher learns--through imitation and inculcation--how to act as a member of the society he is studying. He also has the opportunity to observe on-going processes; he observes the very processes responsible for generating the data he hopes to collect. Too, he has the opportunity to learn what his subjects have learned in much the same way they have done it. At the beginning he is a Schutzian "stranger," but as time goes on he can become a marginal and then a "quasi-acceptable" member of the society. He discovers for himself "what everyone knows." Obviously, the process is very time consuming. On the other hand, it enables the researcher to invest the data with a "richness" that would otherwise be denied him. At best, he can understand the data from the "inside,"

"Probably sixty-five per cent do and thirty-five per cent don't. Or, maybe seventy-five/twenty-five. Anyway, most people do, or more people do than don't."
while at worst, he has an extensive knowledge of the practices that went into generating the data.

The political situation in Grenada at the time this study was conducted shaped the techniques available to me. Residents would not tolerate a "stranger" taking notes while he talked with them. Audio tape recordings, of anything but formal interviews with selected informants, were unacceptable. No one wanted his own voice condemning him if the tape fell into the wrong hands. The household census, originally intended as a census of every household in Hillbay, was limited to the 169 householders who would answer questions. Even then, certain questions, especially those dealing with money and land holdings, usually went unanswered. Denied pencil, paper, and tape recorder, I usually could use only participant observation and informal interviews—the distinction between the two not always being very clear. In another situation I might have found more opportunity to use formal interviews. I would prefer not to use them in a West Indian context. If one pays one's informants for their time, formal interviews may be acceptable. In Grenada, and from what I have heard of other West Indian countries, one usually collects information in friendly gatherings—usually held in the presence of strong drink. If the researcher is buying, his guests feel compelled to answer his questions. In many cases they will manufacture information for his benefit. If everyone is buying the liquor, residents may—and usually do—feel it an imposition to have to answer a seemingly endless series of questions. In a context where liming is a way of life it can be easier, and more useful, to attend liming events and direct the flow of conversation than to set up artificial interview situations.
The Solution

The solution of the problem I initially set for myself came as something of a jolt. I discovered that the formulation of the problem was defective. The notion of a superior haven overseas is inadequate. It assumes that a "push-pull" hypothesis of migration is correct as its initial condition. If a migrant constructs a superior overseas haven (assuming he is not engaged in day-dreaming or some other unintentional mental activity) he must be motivated by one of two factors. Either his life in Grenada is not what he wants—he is being pushed off the island—or, he assumes life overseas will be better for him for some reason—he is being pulled to a superior life overseas. My initial formulation took as given the very hypothesis I wanted to question or to disprove. But why is the hypothesis incorrect?

A "push-pull" hypothesis forces an analyst to make at least three invalid assumptions. First, he must assume migrants are rational—or if rational is too strong, reasonable—actors who carefully weigh all the alternatives of which they are aware before they make any decisions. Real people, people "out there," in the "real world," do not often operate as theorists would like. What may appear rational (or even possible) to the actors may be the height of irrationality to the analyst. If one takes a culturally relative position on rationality he destroys the concept's explanatory power. If rationality is culturally defined, as it must be, the grand theory must be modified each time it is applied. A major hypothesis becomes a patch-work of bits and pieces.

Second, a "push-pull" hypothesis must assume some notion of uniform causation and cultural homogeneity. Certain causal factors should operate in all instances to determine if, and when, an individual will
decide to become a migrant. Whatever the factors (economics, politics, religion, kinship, or any other) the actor is reduced to the status of "judgmental dope" (Garfinkel 1967) or a "homunculus" (Schutz 1962).² When he perceives a certain set of factors, the actor behaves in a culturally determined manner. He blindly follows cultural responses to perceived stimuli. However useful that construct may be for statistical analysis or abstract theory, the notion of a normative actor who automatically migrates when he perceives "A," "B," "C," and "D," is false. "Not so it is in Grenada," and nowhere else (cf. Philpott 1973: 29).

Third, and most telling, a "push-pull" hypothesis assumes the actors have useful information upon which to base their rational/reasonable decisions. Rationality would founder without a useful information base. To say an actor acts rationally based upon what he knows, is to beg the point. A rational actor should not act if he thinks his information were at fault. Grenadians recognize they do not really know what awaits them overseas—they do not even know what is nominally required of them to complete their projects—yet they migrate into the void.

If the notion of a superior overseas haven for emigrants (or for emigrants who plan to return home from overseas) is inadequate, how can a theorist account for migration? Even though the theoretical aims of this study were faulty, the practical aspects—the kinds of information sought and the techniques used to obtain it—were sound. If one can

² Some theorists (cf. Peach 1968) treat the push-pull hypothesis as a proven fact. They posit some cause for migration—usually an economic factor—and claim verification from the demographic data, which purportedly shows the effects. Their reasoning is completely circular, to say nothing of the fact that it may have nothing to do with the "real" causes of migration.
explain what, and how, potential migrants think of their homes, their futures, and their chances overseas, he can shed some light on the phenomenon.

Schutz's ideas about the nature of human knowledge and interactions seem to provide a useful approach to the problem of the creation and the transmission of fact and information. If one follows Schutz, and throws out the idea of normative actors who follow prescribed courses of action in well defined situations, he may be able to arrive at a useful explanation. First, the researcher must assume the fiction his subjects do not think and act as if one, and only one, reality existed. Actors, in this case potential migrants, define natal and target country realities for the purpose at hand, leaving Grenada. They may create the picture of a superior overseas haven in an attempt to justify their decisions to leave home. By the same token, they may define an overseas haven rife with difficulties and problems when they attempt to prove their assumed success will require they be 'real' men. In either case their motives and creations depend on their purpose at the time. The returning migrant must accomplish the reverse of what his "country cousin" does if he is to explain his own actions. If the researcher assumes that one, and only one, reality exists, either the prospective or the returning migrant is deluding himself or lying to his peers. The researcher can not have it both ways.

In addition, as I pointed out in Chapter Seven, actors do not possess a really useful data base from which to make their decisions. They do use what information they have, but they use it in "strange" ways. They are forced to prepare plans based on their knowledge at a given moment. When their information is faulty they are forced to
"fill in" the "holes" with creations of what seems possible, likely, desirable, or even hopeful. In each case, they create a constantly changing picture of life at home, of life overseas, and of acts they will have to carry out to achieve their goals. Also, shifting systems of relevances make a single reality meaningless from the point of view of the social scientist. Each day, as each new problem confronts the potential migrant, he must recreate his world over again as he needs it to be. What is unimportant, or unforeseen, today may require definite action tomorrow. Plans that could not have been made before a certain situation became known, or perceived, must now be made and carried out using the stock of knowledge now at hand. The prospective migrant must shift his system of relevances, and with it his conceptions of the world, to accomplish his goals. His once monolithic reality of migration will have become cracked by the requirements of action.

Second, the researcher must assume he may not be able to reconcile the different "real" worlds in which his subjects seem to exist. He may only be able to give accounts of them. Like the local analyst, he must recognize the possibility that more than one explanation for a course of actions exists. Indeed, several contradictory explanations may satisfactorily account for all the data. In that case, which is correct? They may all be correct. Just as the migrant must live with the ambiguities of more than one possible reality, the researcher, and the local analyst, must live with the reality of multiple explanations. The migrants and returnees whose stories were presented in each of the eight cases in Chapter Six gave reasonable accounts of their actions. Each account explained all the facts. Each explained a reality. Yet, the eight local analysts' analyses also explained all
the facts. They, too, gave reasonable accounts of actions. The analysts' accounts were different, but they were just as complete as the migrants'. Were they any less true because they were not autobiographical? Could the analysts not "really" know what motivated the migrants? An easy answer would be that the migrants know their own minds better than the local analysts do. However, that glosses over the difficulty that other people use and accept the local analysts' accounts as if they were true and as if they were just as good as, if not better than, the migrants' accounts. Residents are willing to act on what may be nothing more than fancy. Indeed, each person creates his own truth based on what he knows. With that situation, the idea of a single reality, with a single set of causes, and a single set of explanations, can not be defended. The solution appears to be more of a problem. Like the migrant, the social scientist may be forced to accept an ambiguous world. Perhaps no one theory may account for migration. The Grenada evidence points in that direction.

One Solution for Grenada

Grenada presents laboratory-like conditions for studying the creation and transmission of knowledge. Soon after I arrived in Hillbay, I realized I had an excellent opportunity to recast my original formulation, without destroying the thrust of the project. I could study migration from another point of view. I could question the processes residents use to help create, and support, potential migrants' acts. In liming, I found a forum in which migration information, and facts, are created and transmitted. Liming takes the place of more formal educational institutions. It is related to the creation and transmission of information in several ways. Most important for migrants,
liming affords the only chance they have to discuss migration—even if only in passing or as it is related to other topics under discussion. During interactions, potential migrants can learn by observing others, by testing their own theories with people who are critical of everything. In a sense, liming serves as a graduate seminar in theory formation. Statements, projects, plans, and facts are put forward and criticised freely. In the process, the potential migrant can learn some of the things everyone believes will help him be a success. The implicit rules for interactions insure that everyone will have his chance to speak. The potential migrant has the opportunity to express himself and to hear from his critics. Unless he wishes to appear a fool, he will plan his statements carefully, and make sure he has enough information to back them up. In doing so, he will clarify his own thoughts, and will be in a position to understand (other things being equal), and learn from, others. Since everyone desires a satisfactory outcome to each event, the potential migrant can be fairly sure he will hear some conclusion. Acting in the natural attitude of everyday life he will not question the reality of what he hears, but in any case he will still have some information (however faulty) upon which to base his thoughts and acts. Whether the conclusions the limers reach are valid or not is unimportant. The conclusions are true for now. They will be accepted until something better, or more useful, is required.

Through his experiences as a limer each potential migrant also learns about manliness. Having that self-identification, as much as any piece of concrete information, can insure that the potential migrant can feel he may be a success. Manliness also shapes liming interactions. The potential migrant is forced to act as others expect. If
he can not learn what everyone takes for granted as the natural attributes of a man, he can never hope to learn all that will be necessary to become a successful migrant. Beliefs about manliness instruct the potential migrant on what he must do if he wants to be considered a success by others. He will be forced to learn what is expected of him at home and overseas. This training, the migrant is forced to realize, will come in handy in a strange country. In turn, his success at proving he is a 'real' man and then a successful migrant also serves to validate the system. Success enhances the value of manliness.

Manliness and liming are central to Grenadian migration. A 'real' man, a consummate limer, will be a successful migrant. With his friends' help he will be able to create the information, and make the plans, he will need to get him overseas safely and to insure his success. With their help he will be able to create and test the various realities he believes he will encounter. He will be able to rehearse, in phantasy, his plans and acts. He will be prepared for the unknown—as far as he is able to foretell it—as by having lived through it before, in phantasy. Obviously his phantasies will be defective in many ways, based as they are on his knowledge at the time of their creation, but they may serve to sharpen his anticipations. Whether or not he is ever in the position to make use of the realities he and his friends have created is unimportant. He will be prepared for whatever comes his way. At least, he and his friends will believe he is prepared.

Suggestions for Further Study

One solution, or at least part of a solution, for the Grenada problem is that people migrate because they want to. That, of course, is not a very satisfying conclusion. Something does push them, or pull
them, away from their island. However, the "something" differs from case to case and from time to time. One can look for a cause, or a constellation of causes, but the search will be relatively fruitless. Once someone has found all the possible reasons Grenadians give to explain why they choose to leave, or return to, the island he will have to classify them. For simplicity's sake he will limit himself to a small number of categories of causation—perhaps five categories. In the process he will have removed the Grenadians from his study and will have replaced them with case numbers, or just numbers. He will be able to quantify his data and use it to generate further hypotheses he can test. He will have succeeded in duplicating any one of a number of statistical studies (for example Otterbein 1966 or Smith 1962b), using his own data. In the process he will have learned, or taught, relatively little about Grenadian realities. That which he has taught will consist, in the main, of the subjective, impressionistic material he uses to introduce his statistics. The numbers themselves, and any significance they might have, could have been drawn from anywhere for all they tell about Grenadians.

My bias—my prejudice—should now be obvious. Quantitative studies are probably useful for some aspects of social anthropology. Where they fit they should be used. But when one is dealing with mental phenomena, such as the causes of migration, they are out of place. Each migrant may weigh data that are amenable to enumeration and statistical analysis. In the end, however, the migrant's mind, not the numbers it manipulates, is the important thing. One must know what factors a potential migrant considers, but more important he must know how the potential migrant considers them. Mental ethnographies, and ethnologies
based on those ethnographies, will yield more information—perhaps more reluctantly—than statistical analyses of survey-gathered data.

Two fields of enquiry seem most important if an "outsider" is to understand Grenadian, and other, migration. I am afraid, however, that my first suggestion is rather negative. I believe one of the least profitable ways of looking at migration is to study migrants as normative actors who make reasoned decisions intended to maximize their chances of attaining their goals. Migration studies that attempt to use the mechanistic ideas of transformational grammar theory to explain the processes taking place in peoples' minds, by using electronic computers, or other mechanisms, to "model" human thought seem doomed to failure. That approach, which seems to be gaining popularity, must fail for several reasons. First, as I have shown, when one makes a model of human thought he must account for built-in irrationality. He must include some kind of random number generator to create "wild cards"—thoughts, false starts, incorrect information, mistakes, and the possibility of a "what the hell" attitude—that he, or the migrant, can not predict. Second, the modeler must be able to account for chance in the external conditions. The migrant can, and does, operate in an infinitely contingent world. The model must be able to do the same. Third, he must include in the model's lexicon of motives, opportunities, situations, and outcomes, a "fuzzy factor." By fuzzy factor I mean some way of blurring everything. Whereas the model usually operates on clear-cut information, the potential migrant seldom has anything so definite upon which to work. If the modeler insists he can accomplish that end by building in a system of relative values, he is deluding himself. Values, like everything else, are neither stable nor exact. They
change over time and across contexts. Finally, the modeler must build some sort of context defining mechanism into his model. The model must be able to "do option two" in conditions "X, Y, and Z." However, context is never definite or unquestionable for a human. The context defining mechanism, in itself, may be impossible to create because people, the model for the model, constantly renegotiate context. It is never set and immutable: on the contrary, context negotiation is a constant activity.

I have not brought up Burling's problem of "God's truth or hocus-pocus" (1964) because it may be a pseudo-problem in this case. If the modeler says he will create a model that will do certain things, and then does so, he has accomplished his goal. Nothing was said about psychological validity. My argument is not with the psychological validity of such models, but with the apparent difficulty of building one, and its limited utility once it is constructed. What, after all, does such a model tell anyone about migration? If the modeler then insists his model reflects what goes on in a migrant's head, I would agree with Burling. Even if he could prove his model did simulate what one person thought (that person, of course, being the modeler, not some migrant) I would be correct in claiming he had spent an inordinate amount of time giving a very detailed ethnographic account. To be of much general use he would have to give similar accounts of many migrants' mental processes if he wanted to explain migration in general. Only from these, with all their inevitable differences, and contradictions, could he build a general theory.

If an anthropologist, or other theorist, insists on building models perhaps he would be better off if he followed the lead of the
sociologists who call themselves ethnomethodologists (cf. Garfinkel 1967; Douglas 1970; Cicourel 1973). Using migration-related interactions and acts the modeler can attempt to explain how migrants make sense of the world in which they live and operate. Once the theorist abandons the idea of a normative actor—a judgmental dope—he may be able to construct an action model that may account, in part, for peoples' accounts even if it can not account for peoples' thoughts.

The main ingredient that seems to be lacking from most studies of Caribbean migration, and studies of migration in general, is an Anthropology of Knowledge. The idea for such a study is neither new nor revolutionary. E. E. Evans-Pritchard's study of Azande "witchcraft, oracles, and magic" (1937) is a classic example of what could be done. In that work Evans-Pritchard presented a clear, detailed ethnography of Azande practices. His analysis showed how those practices were shaped into a coherent system of beliefs that could account for all contingencies. Nothing similar has been published for the topic of migration.

In the case of migration the anthropology of knowledge could include several topics. It could show how information about migration is generated. It could show how actors maintain the fiction that they understand, and are in agreement about, the mysterious world around them. It could show how actors rationalize, or explain, using whatever systems they use, that which they do not understand, or that which they have never encountered. Finally, it could show the role of language, and related phenomena, in the creation and transmission of such knowledge.

My final suggestion is that students of migration pay more attention to the world views of the people they study. In that, most have
fallen down. What is the world view of a specific society? How does the world view affect migration, thought about migration as a valued goal, or the desire to return home after one has been a migrant for a certain period of time? In addition, one must also study the effect migration has on the world view of the society he studies.

In this dissertation I have attempted to take a non-traditionalist view of migration. I have not followed all my own suggestions because, at the time I did the research, I was not aware of all the problems I have subsequently discovered. My own stock of knowledge was defective. Were I to begin over again I, too, would create a different reality than I have created here.
APPENDIX ONE

RACIAL CLASSIFICATION IN GRENA DA

The Grenadian population consists of the descendents of European, East Indian, and Negroid peoples who have arrived on the island since 1650. Europeans account for approximately one per cent of the population, Indians for four per cent, and Negroids and "mixtures" for ninety-five per cent. In all probability very few individuals are "pure" anything, although some residents claim specific people are "pure" white, black or Indian.

Residents distinguish three phenotypic races as the base of their classificatory scheme. The system can best be represented as a continuum. Whites are at one end of the racial continuum, black-white mixtures (called "red") are next, followed by blacks, black-Indian mixtures (called "dōgla"), and finally, "pure" Indians. Each individual's racial type is based on the selective application by the classifier of such subjective criteria as skin color, hair type, nose type and stature. Skin color varies from "pure" white to "pure" black with various shades in between (racial adjectives are: whitish, reddish/whitish, reddish, red, reddish, dark red, Creoleish, and blackish--the last two being interchangeable). Hair varies from "good" hair to "bad" hair. "Pure white hair"--fine, straight brown or blonde hair--is the best and

---

1 The original Carib Indian inhabitants were destroyed by the French. The few Caribs found on the island today--a fraction of one per cent of the population--are immigrants from other islands.
"nigger hair"—coarse, curly, black hair—is the worst. Nose types range from "good" to "bad" with good being a straight, high-bridged, thin rose and bad being a "mashed," flat, broad nose. Stature ranges from tall and thin to short and thick. The former is good, the latter is bad.²

Each individual is classified according to the four characteristics. In addition, socio-economic position may be taken into account. A wealthy black man whose color and features would otherwise be considered "bad" may be classified as "reddish" (which is better than black) because of his socio-economic position. Another factor confounding the classification may be the classifier's knowledge of an individual's ancestors' "races." The child of two red individuals may be called "re reddish" even if he or she is darker than one usually accorded that description. On the other hand, one can hear a resident comment: "I surprised two red people could birth such a nigger."

In this work I have followed the residents' classifications whenever possible. In cases where an individual can be classified as one of two or more types I have chosen the "superior" type, as the residents themselves do. For example, if a man can be described as either Creoleish or reddish I have called him reddish.

²One individual whom everyone regards as exceptionally ugly was described in the following terms: "He a short, thickish, nigger fellow with bad hair. One thing is he have a good nose. Only trouble, it must have fell down one time. Looks like he sleeping on he face and he mash up he nose. He not careful he could stifle in he sleep."
APPENDIX TWO

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASS IN GRENADA

Grenadians are profoundly conscious of relative class differences. Perhaps that condition stems from their English background in which class, like race, was worn on one's "sleeve." In any case, although they constantly concern themselves with discussions of class and class difference they make few attempts to define the concept in any rigorous way. M. G. Smith (1965b:Chapters 1 and 2) found that each informant he interviewed had a different notion of which individuals—from a prepared list known to all his informants—belonged in which classes. As a general rule, but "accordin'," class is defined by noting a person's race, family background (his ancestors), economic position (both current and historical) and the people with whom he socializes.

Until the Second World War Grenadians distinguished three classes: upper, middle (both were "big men"), and lower ("common people"). The upper-class was composed of estate owners or planters, big businessmen and most middle and upper level civil servants. Nearly all of the members of that upper-class were white. The middle-class consisted of middle and lower level civil servants, policemen and nurses, white collar workers, shop owners and some of their more responsible clerks, and the personnel of the school system. Most members of the middle-class were non-whites; many were "whitish" or "red" but the majority were Creole. The lower-class consisted of everyone else—over ninety per cent of the population. It was almost entirely black and
Indian.  

Since the Second World War the class structure has become less rigid. The upper-class is still almost entirely white. What were the "lower fringe" of the old elite have become the upper-middle-class. That class consists of darker skinned people who have amassed relatively large amounts of money (or agricultural lands) during their own lifetimes. It includes doctors, lawyers, upper level civil servants, politicians, some union leaders and "new" estate owners--those who have bought their estates from the older "plantocracy." The middle-class still includes many civil servants, upper level teachers, higher ranking police officers, nurses, shop owners and some of their clerks. Some farmers with moderately sized holdings (between ten and fifty acres) are also members of the middle-class. Although they make their living from the soil they have others to do the actual work. The lower-middle-class contains the "lower fringe" of the old middle-class. It includes some teachers, lower ranking police officers, some nurses, shop and other clerks, prosperous small farmers and wealthy fishermen. The lower-class still contains the bulk of the population (perhaps eighty to eighty-five per cent). It includes small farmers, agricultural workers, most fishermen and all the unemployed.  

As a general rule, the higher one's class the lighter one's skin. In recent years the strict correlation between skin color and

---

1 The white residents of Mt. Moritz were the only whites in the lower-class. Most were small traders, sailors and farmers whose socio-economic position was similar to that of the "red legs" of Barbados.

2 Thomas Fraser's description of St. Vincent class structure (Fraser 1973:3) gives similar information for that island. His description could equally well apply to Grenada were it not for the inclusion of the small Portuguese minority.
socio-economic class has weakened. The trend may have been sparked by
two related economic factors. More members of the lower-classes have
been able to demand and get higher wages. With them they were able to
acquire the outward signs of economic progress. Automobiles are still
relatively scarce (of approximately 5000 registered motor vehicles on
the island 4000 are automobiles) but many people, even members of the
lower-class, have electrical appliances and gas stoves. Almost everyone
has a radio (most households have a large "radiogram," and many individ-
uals have their own small, transistor radios) and the majority of house-
holds with children have record players. With wage increases came wage
differentiation that enabled some to dispose of a larger part of their
incomes on non-subsistence items than others. The professions and
upper level civil service jobs have proliferated, enabling more people
to earn relatively high wages.

The second factor is the increase in dollar value of cash remit-
tances from household members living overseas. Before 1940 relatively
few households received more than $5.00 to $10.00 E. C. per month in
remittances. Today the average household receives from $5.00 to $15.00
per week in remittances. Many households with more than one member liv-
ing overseas receive as much as $25.00 per week. The householder who
receives $20.00 per week is able to save or spend at least $10.00 per
week on items he would not otherwise have been able to afford. The
additional income puts many of the traditional trappings of the middle-
class within the reach of the traditional lower-class.

As with racial classifications, socio-economic class is assigned
subjectively. One man, or one household, may be classified differently
by different individuals. I have tried to use the most generally
accepted classification applied to each individual I discuss. In cases where a problem arose I either took the majority classification or used my own judgment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE #1</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>COUNTRY CHosen</th>
<th>YEAR LEFT</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>AGE THEN</th>
<th>YEAR RETURNED</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ASSETS THEN</th>
<th>ASSETS NOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>'73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>'73</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50's</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50's</td>
<td>'71</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>U/M</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'51</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>'65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>'69</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>'73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20's</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>'71</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X,5</td>
<td>X,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>'46</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>X,5</td>
<td>X,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>'69</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>'67</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>'68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>'72</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>'56</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>'61</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>'67</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE #</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>COUNTRY CHosen</td>
<td>YEAR LEFT</td>
<td>REASON</td>
<td>AGE THEN</td>
<td>YEAR RETURNED</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>ASSETS THEN</td>
<td>ASSETS NOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>'31</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>'42</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>'46</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>'48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>'67</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>'70</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50's</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Emp./Prop.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50's</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Emp./Prop.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60's</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'20's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20's</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>U/M</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40's</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>U/M</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40's</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp./Prop.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60's</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'20's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20's</td>
<td>'20's</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60's</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'20's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20's</td>
<td>'20's</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>L/M</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>'71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>'72</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>'72</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U/M</td>
<td>Can./Eng.</td>
<td>'44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>'52</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U/M</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>'60</td>
<td>Emp./Prop.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>U/M</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>'65</td>
<td>Emp./Prop.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'69</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>'69</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX THREE—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE #</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>COUNTRY CHOSEN</th>
<th>YEAR LEFT</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>AGE THEN</th>
<th>YEAR RETURNED</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ASSETS THEN</th>
<th>ASSETS NOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>'73</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X, 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>U/M</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'56</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>'42</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>'45</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'58</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>'72</td>
<td>Prop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>'63</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>'69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>'55</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>'67</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>'74</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unemp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>'61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>'66</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>'70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>'71</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**  (1) Case numbers assigned during research, are not the same as those in Chapter Six.  (2) Exact ages or best estimates.  ? = unknown.  (3) W = white; R = red; B = black; D = Dogla; I = Indian.  (4) U = upper; U/M = upper-middle; M = middle; L/M = lower-middle; L = lower.  (5) ? = unknown.  (6) 1 = Economic Betterment; 2 = Education/Trade; 3 = Wanderlust; 4 = Present Political Situation; 5 = Other.  (7) NA = not applicable; ? = unknown.  (8) Position before migrant departed: Emp. = employed; Unemp. = unemployed; Prop. = proprietor; Student = student.  (9) 1 < $1000; 2 < $5,000; 3 < $10,000; 4 > $10,000; 5 > $50,000; X = irrelevant; Y = still away.
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