



La Gran Marcha: **Anti-Racism and Immigrants Rights in Southern California**

Jenna M. Loyd¹

Department of Geography, Syracuse University
144 Eggers Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244-1020 USA
Email: jloyd@maxwell.syr.edu

Andrew Burridge

Department of Geography, University of Southern California,
416 Kaprielian Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0255 USA
Email: burridge@usc.edu

Abstract

Millions of people across the United States took to the streets in spring 2006 to protest repressive immigration legislation, demand just immigration reform, and seek justice in daily life. This article has two aims. First, we seek to intervene in the popular immigration debate, which denies racism and claims to be concerned only with law-and-order. Second, we analyze (im)migration politics in relation to national racial formations. That is, racialized immigration policies do not exist apart from a racially stratified citizenry. We rely on the concept of social death to trace state policies of immigration and criminalization as key sites of interracial and transnational struggles against racism and for justice and liberation. Thus, we seek to elucidate possibilities for anti-racist alliances and social change. We conclude with a discussion of the ways in which we see the immigrants rights movement connecting with other struggles for social justice, and the implications that

¹ © Jenna M. Loyd and Andrew Burridge, 2007

concepts of national racial formation and social death have for the movement against global apartheid.

KEY WORDS: immigrants rights, racism, national racial formation, social death, criminalization, militarization, United States

“Immigration politics also surfaced in California’s gubernatorial race ... with Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger renewing his support for the civilian Minuteman border patrols at a campaign stop to showcase his Latino supporters in a Mexican restaurant in Lynwood.”

– Watanabe and Finnegan (2006)

“Amnesty from what? We die in the desert, we die in the workplace, and we sacrifice our lives for our families’ survival – why should they ‘forgive’ us? I prefer to describe our struggles as a fight for the rights of residency and mobility, and for demilitarization of borders.”

– María Jiménez in Khokha (2001)

Introduction

In December 2005, the United States House of Representatives passed the Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act (HR 4437), also known as the Sensenbrenner Bill. An ‘enforcement only’ bill offering no ‘amnesty,’ it promises to turn the presence of illegal aliens² into an aggravated felony, make humanitarian assistance of illegal aliens a felony offense, build a 700 mile wall along the U.S.-Mexico border (with provisions for planning a wall along the Canadian border), and authorize police officers to act as immigration agents, among other provisions. In popular understanding, the problem of immigration is unrestricted flows of Mexican migrants, not racism, but Sensenbrenner’s message was not lost on millions of immigrants and their supporters who took to the streets across the nation to protest the bill in spring 2006.

² Illegal alien is a term with a specific legal history that Mae Ngai (2004) traces exquisitely. Contesting the racist connotations of the term had led to the widespread use of the term ‘undocumented immigrant,’ which suggests the illegitimacy of criminalizing an entire class of people. We follow the usage of undocumented, and use the term illegal when discussing legal constructions and anti-immigrant discourses.

These nationally coordinated demonstrations were the result of years of grassroots organizing efforts for legalization (see Appendix B for some of these organizations). We are honored to have been part of this movement in Southern California,³ a place with a long and intense history of struggle over racism and immigration. At heart, we see the immigrants rights movement as a struggle against racism – particularly discriminatory and deadly immigration policies and the increased labor exploitation they create – and for justice in daily life in the United States. National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights’ ([NNIRR](#)) vision for a “fair and just immigration reform” (see Appendix A) illustrates what is needed to transform the disempowering and dehumanizing ties that currently bind immigrant and non-immigrant communities.

In this article, we rejoin Laura Liu’s (2000) call to place the study of racism within geographers’ study of immigration. Over the past ten years, grassroots organizers in immigrant communities also explicitly have framed their organizing around racial discrimination rather than immigrants rights per se (Quiroz-Martinez, 2001). Two overarching practical questions structure our discussion. First, how can we intervene in the popular immigration debate, which denies racism and claims to be concerned only with law-and-order and its twin, national security? The Schwarzenegger epigraph illustrates the extent to which law-and-order and racism widely are regarded as incommensurable rather than deeply interrelated. Second, what are the practical implications of thinking about (im)migration politics in relation to national racial formations? These questions – and the theoretical framework we use to help answer them – emerged from our participation in the movement, underscoring Linda Peake and Audrey Kobayashi’s conclusion that “participation ... is a fundamental method of antiracist research” (2002, 55).

While apparently neutral, technologies of law-and-order establish categories of humanity that produce – and justify – disenfranchisement and vulnerability for entire groups of people. These technologies, then, are not separate from efforts to create an enduring racial hierarchy in a nation where racism is officially over (cf. Gilmore, 2002b). Law-and-order – both in terms of the progressive militarization of the U.S.-Mexico border and criminalization of non-citizen and citizen communities of color – is the strong-armed flipside of the racist animus fueling the destruction of the U.S. welfare state. To situate this analysis, we will describe our experiences during the spring 2006 mass mobilizations, outline the theoretical framework we developed, provide an historical analysis of the current movement within the context of U.S. racial formations, and conclude with potential connections between the immigrants rights movement and other movements for

³ During spring 2006, Jenna Loyd was living in Los Angeles and working as a lecturer in Women’s Studies at California State University, Fullerton.

social justice. Hyperlinks within this text lead to images, websites, and video clips activists or we have produced.

La Gran Marcha

We caught the first of the spring protests in Chicago's Loop, which coincided with the Association of American Geographers annual meeting (Bauder, 2006). Days later we were back in Los Angeles to experience the city's largest protest to date. Between 500,000 – 1 million people converged on the historic downtown core and City Hall on March 25, 2006 in response to the Sensenbrenner Bill (for superb images of recent protest actions in the region, see L.A.-based photographer, Peter Holderness's [website](#)).⁴ The protest was so large that [Broadway](#), a boulevard lined by gorgeous Art Deco movie houses, was unable to cope with the sheer numbers of marchers, leading to a secondary route down the adjacent Spring Street. Earlier media skepticism regarding the turnout was quickly quashed as sometimes deafening chants of “¡[Si se puede!](#)” could be heard throughout downtown. We had learned about the event in Chicago and from local posters, but were instantly struck by the sea of white that marchers' identical shirts formed. How was this symbolic display of peace mobilized? There was clearly a whole set of Spanish language media outlets that we were not tapped into, and whose strength would remain evident throughout the spring. The event was remarkable with entire families walking together, jubilant call-and-response chants from one spot in the crowd to another that brought marchers together, and no police arrests. The prominence of U.S. and other Mexican and Central American flags being carried became central to assessing the meaning of the day (Gorman, 2006). Was this movement fundamentally about claiming nationhood, or was it about gaining legal status and protections? Opponents of the movement soon asked why *these* non-citizens should be able to claim civil rights and appeal to the national immigrant origin story.

Student Walkouts and Continued Demonstrations

Immediately following the historic march, students in Los Angeles – and soon throughout the Southwest – joined in protest by walking out from their schools. The media were quick to dismiss the student actions, labelling them poorly organized, whilst also suggesting that the students did not actually understand what they were protesting, or that they were merely out to skip class (Hernandez, 2006). Some students were subjected to lockdowns, truancy citations, and other police ‘crack downs’ after the initial walkouts (Suarez and Kennedy, 2006). Others in the media berated the students for carrying Mexican flags arguing that most of them had not even been to Mexico, and largely missed the point made

⁴ Thank you to Jake Peters for bringing Peter Holderness' work to our attention.

by many students that they were carrying flags on behalf of their parents or other family members.

Whilst at the Lineae Terrarum border studies conference at University of Texas, El Paso, Andrew witnessed another student [walkout](#), which prompted similar media coverage along the lines that ‘students should be back in school learning.’ These sentiments were supported by Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, who met with students who had walked many miles from their schools in East L.A. to protest at City Hall. But what did the students have to go back to? Graduation rates within the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) are the sixth worst in the U.S.; only approximately 44 percent of high school students have graduated over the past four years (Rubin, 2006). One sympathetic substitute teacher noted, “I think the walkouts are likely to be much more educational than sitting in a classroom ... [that] has no books and/or no regular teacher as many classrooms in LAUSD do” (Anon., 2006).

As momentum built nationwide for the April 10 National Day of Action for Action for Immigrant Rights, we learned that a middle school student organizer of the walkouts, Anthony Soltero, had shot himself after the vice principal of his school threatened him with fines for truancy and imprisonment. Anthony’s death added a special poignancy to that evening’s [vigil](#) in front of La Placita (Our Lady Queen of Angels) in downtown Los Angeles, a prominent church in the 1980s sanctuary movement for Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees.⁵ The [crowd](#) of some 10,000 was noticeably more mixed ethnically and just as [diverse](#) in age and gender as attended La Gran Marcha. The sense of camaraderie remained palpable, and as the light faded, the mood became more festive and the street vendors’ trade in bacon dogs – a downtown L.A. delicacy – was brisk.

[Students](#) continued their organizing, partly in response to Anthony Soltero’s tragic death, and took to the streets on April 16 in an organized march. While the turnout was much smaller (estimated between 6,000 and 10,000), the police presence was noticeably more prominent and menacing. The march concluded at City Hall with speeches from youth and student activists, live music, and key figures from the 1968 school walkouts (‘blowouts’) in East Los Angeles, which also had protested racist schooling conditions (Muñoz, 1989). Throughout these actions, young people made strong use of the internet site, [MySpace](#), and text messaging to organize themselves (Gold, 2006).

Attention soon turned to the May 1 [Great American Boycott](#) and general strike, also dubbed ‘A Day Without an Immigrant’ in reference to the 2004 mockumentary, ‘A Day Without a Mexican.’ The day highlighted support from

⁵ Thank you to Micol Seigel for bringing this history to our attention.

organized labor, which has grown over the past five years and represents an historical turn-about in the position of many unions. As the day approached, modest divisions within the movement became evident with some prominent political, religious, and media figures advising people *not* to boycott or strike for fear of a backlash. Jenna canceled class so she and Andrew could hold a teach-in, and we immediately could judge the success of the day by how light the commute traffic was while driving from Los Angeles to Fullerton. We organized the teach-in around the failed policy and human tragedy of militarizing the border, and disputing some of the common statistical myths used to justify anti-immigrant political positions. In this and other community venues, discussion often led to assertions of ‘I’m not a racist, I just support law-and-order in immigration,’ which led us to interrogate the connection between law-and-order, nationalism, and racism.

After the teach-in, we drove through L.A. neighborhoods where for entire blocks storefronts were shuttered, some of which had posted [signs](#) in solidarity. As we walked to MacArthur Park for the 3 PM march down Wilshire Boulevard organized by [MIWON](#) (Multi-ethnic Immigrant Worker Organizing Network), thousands of people from the downtown noon march (organized by the boycott advocates) joined the rally by foot. (MIWON has been holding May Day celebrations of immigrant workers for years.) The sheer numbers of people gathered offered scant evidence of division, and instead labor leader Delores Huerta’s sentiment of “do what you feel comfortable doing” seemed to prevail (quoted in Martinez, 2006). Marchers shared news from strike actions nationwide: Tyson Foods and Cargill shut down meat processing plants across the country, fields were left unpicked throughout the state, truck traffic from the Los Angeles and Long Beach ports was at a virtual standstill, and activists successfully shut down the Tijuana-San Diego border crossing (Tobar and Sánchez, 2006; see [San Diego IndyMedia](#) for a media clip). The scale of the marches illuminated the collective power that had already been mobilized, but the question now turned to how the movement would form connections with other sectors in order to shift the prevalent meaning of immigration as a threat to the nation, and articulate it as a movement for justice.

Citizenship, Social Death and National Racial Formations

How is racism organized as a form of national belonging in a nation where racism is officially over? We use Michael Omi and Howard Winant’s (1994) theory of ‘racial formation’ to specify the historical process through which racial categories and hierarchies are produced and contested. It is through situated ‘projects’ that historically and geographically specific racial hierarchies become more or less hegemonic. We rely on personal participation, mainstream and activist media, and scholarly literatures in order to intervene in popular and scholarly debates over immigration and racism by tracing the ways in which

technologies of social death that produce “differential inclusion” (Espiritu in Pulido, 2006, 24) are key aspects of the project to create an enduring national racial formation.

Broadly stated, the current popular debate over immigration is framed in terms of the liberal trope of assimilation or discourse of national security and law-and-order. These terms are not exclusive. Both rely upon a citizen/illegal or citizen/non-citizen dualism, which are fundamentally productive of nationalist categories and discourses. The discourse of assimilation – as in debates over ‘English only’ language policy – reproduces the commonsense that the U.S. is a ‘nation of immigrants’ who share liberal citizenship and equality, while simultaneously betraying the reality that formal citizenship does not equate with full social membership. Likewise, the idea that the U.S. is a nation of citizens committed to the “rule of law” is not new (Sarat, 2005), but over the past 40 years it has become a principle part of the project to re-forged an enduring hierarchical racial formation in response to the upheavals of the 1960s wrought by antiracist mobilization and post-1965 immigration liberalization alike. September 11 marked a consolidation of popular support for ‘homeland security’ and tougher immigration enforcement. Efforts to ‘defend’ home, community, and homeland have become crucial sites where the project to create a particular national racial formation have been focused.

We emphasize the ways in which citizenship is important to the project of establishing a *national* racial formation for three reasons. First, worldwide national racial formations were created through specific histories of colonialism, imperialism, and capitalist economic integration. U.S. immigration policy, too, was historically founded through racist exclusions and inclusions (Almaguer, 1994; Ngai, 2004). That is, “racism is a naturalization process through which people become Americans” (Carbado, 2005, 637). At the same time, national racial projects are advanced and contested in relation to racial projects in other nations (Seigel, 2005). These colonial and anti-colonial histories can help to inform and clarify the global scope for anti-racist activism that can work across existing citizen/non-citizen divides and national boundaries. Likewise, immigration has the potential of altering existing racial formations, such as displacing the regional white-black hierarchy in the South (Winders, 2005). Second, citizenship is a category that creates hierarchies both within and between racial/ethnic groups. For example, U.S. immigration policy discriminates between Haitian and Cuban refugees, while the term ‘illegal’ is often deployed as a racial invective to refer to people of Mexican descent who are regarded as illegitimate residents of the nation, regardless of citizenship status.

Third, while citizenship is often regarded as a “priceless possession” because it promises “the right to have rights” (Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren in Ngai, 2004, 229), legal citizenship does not fully mark social inclusion.

Racialized immigration policies do not exist apart from a racially stratified citizenry. The extent to which groups are included in society – what Yen Le Espiritu calls “differential inclusion” (in Pulido, 2006, 24) – is a key way in which racial formations become hegemonic. Inclusion can refer to senses of cultural belonging or unassimilable difference, as Asian groups have been regarded historically, and to legal differentiations established among groups of citizens, as for African Americans under Jim Crow (Almaguer, 1994; Ngai, 2004). In each case, the work of differential inclusion is secured through the production of social death.⁶ Social death – the lack of full personhood and participation in social and political life – marks a condition of unfreedom that produces more of the same. Formal citizenship and criminalization are key technologies of social death that produce diminished freedom of movement, legally disrupted kin ties, disenfranchisement and abject political voice, curtailed job opportunities, and restricted claims on the social body for basic life needs.

The concept of social death is important for understanding racism for two reasons. First it moves from ethnicity-based arguments to focus upon the political apparatuses that make racial hierarchy seem natural. The unassimilable difference of Japanese Americans became justification for their internment during World War II, while more recently the presumption of terrorism has justified racial profiling and the forced registration with the Department of Homeland Security of Muslim and Middle Eastern men. Likewise, ‘black criminality’ is a category of social death that “sanctions the frisking of African Americans. Simultaneously, the practice of frisking ... reifies black dangerousness: black people must be dangerous given the extent to which the police frisk them” (Carbado, 2005, 649). Second, social death enables and justifies “state-sanctioned and/or extra-legal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerabilities to premature death” – what Ruth Wilson Gilmore reminds us is racism fundamentally (2002a, 261). Thus, ‘illegal’ is not simply a legal category, but a racial one, evidenced by the legitimacy of deaths of immigrants crossing the border: they were illegal, so they are to blame for their own deaths (cf. Gilmore, 2002a). Technologies of social death become commonplace, that is, they are implemented in different nations to the same effect (cf. Balibar, 2004). In sum, the concept of social death allows us to see the *continuities* of state policies of immigration and criminalization as key sites of interracial and transnational struggles against racism and for justice and liberation.

⁶ The centrality of social death for understanding how racism works is indebted to Ruth Wilson Gilmore, who builds upon Orlando Patterson’s (1982) *Slavery and Social Death*.

“So Who’s Gonna Build [the Wall]?”⁷

The wry query ‘Who’s gonna build the wall?’ highlights the ways in which fortified borders and the rage of national security displaces questions of labor and works to make migrant workers still more vulnerable to exploitation. The current nativist panic over immigration is directed overwhelmingly, though not exclusively, against Mexican migrants (for select historical background, see Saxton, 1971; Daniels, 2004; *International Migration Review*, 1978). Thus, it is important to discuss the reciprocal relations between the racialization and fortification of the Southern border. The border is an ideologically charged site where diverse desires for nationalist exclusion, homeland security, and law and order are concentrated, and thus where significant and visible battles are being fought. Most importantly, the discussion of immigration into the U.S. and other nations across the globe needs to be humanized, which we help to do by questioning the logic of fortification, and the rising numbers of deaths it produces (Nevins, 2003).

The launch of Operation Gatekeeper in 1994 was not the first effort to ‘secure’ the U.S.-Mexico border, but since then there has been a significantly heightened fortification of the boundary (Nevins, 2002; Nevins, 2003; Ngai, 2004). Many commentators have noted the paradox that Operation Gatekeeper and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect in the same year. At the same time, though, the borderlands are a site of intense intercultural mixing, with differing forms of capital, goods and cultural traits cross the border both south and north with growing ease (Heyman, 1999). Don Mitchell (2002), thus, describes the borderlands as a “contradictory dialectic landscape” where controlled cross-border movement of certain people and increased flow of capital and goods is a necessary part of global economic integration. In such a landscape:

cities like San Diego and Tijuana are more integrated than they have ever been, even as the boundary between them is hardened. The border is a defensive landscape par excellence precisely because its function is not only division but also, as importantly, integration (ibid., 383).

This ‘defensive landscape’ has become “perhaps the most militarized frontier between two nations at peace [sic] anywhere in the world” (Massey, 2006).

The evidence that fortifying *la frontera* does not reduce movement across borders and leads to less circular migration, and thus permanent settlement, has not gained traction in the immigration debate, underscoring the way in which failed

⁷ Alvaro Andrade quoted in Ferguson (2006).

policies of law-and-order are used as evidence for the need for more of the same (Dowty, 1987). In 2001, approximately 286 million people legally crossed the border between Mexico and the United States. No one knows exactly how many undocumented immigrants enter the United States each year. Official estimates put the number of crossings from Mexico at around 350,000 people per year, although others suggest a figure between 400,000 and 500,000 (Passel, 2006). Although predominantly from Mexico, undocumented migrants come from many places. In 2002, the United States Border Patrol apprehended undocumented migrants from 51 different countries in Tucson (Baum, 2004, 2; Dear and Burrige, 2005). Some of the fastest growing non-Mexican immigrant groups hail from Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, and Honduras (Chu, 2005).

Until recently, large numbers of undocumented crossers were apprehended around the four urban ports of entry: Tijuana, Nogales, El Paso, and Brownsville (Dear and Burrige, 2005). In response, the U.S. government and U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) have set about fortifying these areas. The current fencing around Tijuana/San Ysidro and Ciudad Juárez/El Paso has been tripled and fortified using surveillance cameras, motion sensors, lighting and border patrol agents. In an effort to quell criticism within the Republican Party, President Bush, who supports a guest worker program, decided to deploy approximately 6,000 National Guard troops to the border over the summer (Nicholas, 2006). Undocumented migrants have moved away from these areas and begun crossing in more remote regions, such as the deserts of Arizona. As a result, the number of deaths from exposure and drowning has increased from 57 in 1994 to 422 in 2003 (Zeller, 2001; Kraul, 2004).

Dehumanization of border crossers is the flipside of militarization of the border. Among the most disturbing examples is the crackdown on humanitarian work. Shanti Sellz and Daniel Strauss, working for the humanitarian aid organization [No More Deaths](#), were arrested by the U.S. Border Patrol for transporting three men in critical condition to a nearby hospital. Gustavo Soto, a Border Patrol spokesman, explained to the *L.A. Times* that, “The Border Patrol has never told them that they can’t provide humanitarian aid ... But once they begin transporting the aliens in furtherance of their illegal entry, then they are breaking the law” (Marosi, 2005b). Humanitarian aid workers are also frequently demonized by anti-immigration advocates who say they are promoting illegal migration by simply leaving water for those crossing. Humanitarians say they are now less likely to transport migrants desperately in need of medical attention to hospital for fear of prosecution. The Sensenbrenner Bill promises more attacks on humanitarian workers by criminalizing such aid.

Karl Eschbach and colleagues' study of the increased deaths in the border region in the three years following Operation Gatekeeper concluded that the United States Border Patrol's policies have “generally ignored the human costs of

undocumented migration” (1999, 430). Seven years later, their prediction that the numbers of deaths would increase has proven correct, and their pointed ethical questions continue to confront the deadly effects of social death:

How many migrants’ deaths are acceptable to the United States in its quest to enforce its borders? ... Is the United States showing the same respect and concern for the value of the life of undocumented migrants that it does for its own citizens (1999, 452)?

In the broad public debate on immigration, however, the discussion of the 'human costs' of fortifying national borders is occluded, or at best given a passing mention. A common refrain that defers a nation's responsibility for its deadly policies is to blame those involved in the smuggling of migrants for the migrants’ deaths (Hayter, 2001; Nevins, 2003; Sharma, 2005), a position that obscures the fact that immigration policies themselves create dangerous passages and demand for human traffickers. Indeed, Joe Nevins (2003) and Nandita Sharma (2005) place responsibility for these deaths on nation-states and conclude that only by confronting immigration policies that prevent free movement of people across borders will migrant deaths end.

Militarization of the border also diminishes quality of life for residents living in borderlands communities. [Border Action Network](#) documented on both sides of the Arizona-Mexico border a pervasive Border Patrol presence, including racial profiling, erosion of democracy, abuse of power and a sense of USBP immunity, sexual assault, and excessive force (Allen, 2004). This report is not the only record of infringements by the USBP (see for example Marosi, 2005b), but speaks to the ways in which systematic police misconduct is made possible by, and enforces, social death for an entire group of people regardless of citizenship status.

Policing also extends throughout U.S. territory, and indeed into Mexico, while the U.S. enjoins Canada and Mexico to create ‘Fortress NAFTA’ (Klein, 2003). In 2004, the Department of Homeland Security (the new administrative home of Customs and Border Patrol, formerly Border Patrol, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, formerly Immigration and Naturalization Services) established a “deep-repatriation program” to begin ‘voluntary’ deportations by air, returning border crossers to their hometowns in Mexico instead of merely dropping them in border towns across the line (Alonzo-Zaldivar, 2004; Kraul, 2004). In the year since La Gran Marcha, there has been a series of high profile immigration raids in communities across the entire country, which many immigrants rights activists claim to be politically motivated to renew fear in immigrant communities. The USBP has also broadcast Spanish-language [commercials](#) – one of which depicts a funeral, and the other a graveyard haunted by those who did not survive the border crossing – on Mexican television stations warning of the dangers of

crossing the border (Marosi, 2005a). These advertisements do not mention that the USBP was responsible for their production.

Defending Home and Community

The overwhelming popular focus on the border and border security obscures the significant policing resources, legal apparatuses, and anti-immigrant campaigns within the nation, which work to create a particular national space and racial formation. Sensenbrenner represents the most recent instance of a trend toward criminalizing non-citizens. The categories of legal and illegal immigrants were put into place in the 1920s, while it was only the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) that made it a crime to work without papers (Khokha, 2001; Ngai, 2004). But since the mid-1990s anti-immigrant rage, the civil rights of immigrants progressively have been diminished (Jonas and Tactaquin, 2004). In 1994 California voters passed Proposition 187 barring illegal immigrants from all public services, and in 1996 Congress passed two major pieces of legislation that “stripped immigrants and asylum seekers of many basic legal rights” and created a broad range of deportable offenses, which are enforceable retroactively (ibid., 69). Since 9/11, immigrant rights have continued to be whittled away explicitly in the name of homeland security; significant numbers of people from South Asian, African, Asian, and Latin American communities alike have been detained and deported (Nopper, 2003; Maira, 2004; Human Rights Watch, 2004, 140-176). “As of early 2004, over 60,000 immigrants (mostly legal residents) had been held for over two years, and up to 70% of them were deported *for immigration violations unrelated to terrorism*” (Jonas and Tactaquin, 2004, 78). The “dehumanizing conflation of immigrants with terrorists” (ibid., 77) is a clear way in which technologies of social death create a nationalist boundary that is simultaneously racial.

Border security is accompanied by local battles to ‘defend’ home and community. Suburban Home Depot parking lots, city parks, and schools have become key sites in the creation of what Mike Davis and Alessandra Moctezuma (1999) refer to as “crabgrass apartheid.” It is in these sites that anti-immigrant activists seek to show the dangerous effects of lawless borders on once upstanding, now beleaguered communities, thereby binding the meaning of select communities to the identity of the nation. Members of the Minuteman Project (and an all lady trio of campy followers, Gilchrist’s Angels) have moved from patrolling the border to policing day laborer sites in cities far removed from the border (Delson, 2006; Mucha, 2006).⁸ The battle has been particularly fierce in Costa Mesa, Orange

⁸ The Minuteman Project is not the first of its kind. In the late 1970s, the Ku Klux Klan with the leadership of Tom Metzger, who remains an active white supremacist in Southern California, and David Duke organized vigilante border patrol efforts (Omi and Winant, 1994, 118; Center for New Community, 2005).

County, which became the first city in the nation to train its police officers to enforce migration status, leading to fears of increased racial profiling and the retirement of the police chief in the fray (Delson, 2005; Pasco, 2006). The city also shut down its day laborer center and dismantled its human relations committee (Goffard, 2006). In San Bernardino, activists placed an initiative on the city ballot for November, 2006 that would ban day laborer centers, penalize employers who hire undocumented workers, and ban landlords from renting within the city. Similar laws have already been passed in Hazleton, Pennsylvania, and Riverside, New Jersey (Barry, 2006; Capuzzo, 2006).

The effort to create a crabgrass apartheid has been especially heated in the mass-mediated hotbed of anti-immigrant organizing of Southern California – featuring [California Coalition for Immigration Reform](#), [Voices of Citizens Together/American Patrol](#), [Save Our State](#), and Tom Metzger’s [White Aryan Resistance](#). These groups receive uncritical media coverage arguably because they self-consciously frame their activism as patriotic duty to uphold the laws of the land (*Rights on the Line*, c. 2005). Privileged ideas of nation are thereby incommensurable with racism, reproducing the commonsense that racism is an historic injustice without organized expression today. Anti-immigrant groups have also worked to create a “wide tent” grassroots image (Riccardi, 2006; Mitchell, 2006) that obscures the strong financial, ideological, and personnel ties among different anti-immigrant groups, and the extensive involvement of white supremacist organizations.⁹

Of course, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger’s vocal support of Minuteman vigilantism, despite their ties with white supremacists, contributes to widespread denials of racism. At a campaign stop meant to highlight his Latino supporters, he told the audience: “I support any time that a civilian wants to go and do the job that law enforcement cannot do” (Watanabe and Finnegan, 2006). Schwarzenegger went on to explain that he opposed the carrying of weapons, while simultaneously commending their initiative: “But I have, for instance, in my house – for years and years – I’ve hired private security to take care of my house, because I’ve felt the police could not really cover every single house and protect the children and families” (ibid.).

⁹ One man, John Tanton, is responsible for founding or funding some *thirteen* prominent anti-immigration groups, including [FAIR](#), [U.S. English](#), [Center for Immigration Studies](#), [ProjectUSA](#), [NumbersUSA](#), and [Californians for Population Stabilization](#) (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2002; Barry, 2005b). For all their efforts to veil racism by foregrounding assimilationist or Malthusian postures, the involvement of organized white supremacist groups such as the [Council of Conservative Citizens](#) – a reincarnation of the White Citizens Councils formed after the 1955 *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling – is not difficult to find (Center for New Community, 2004; International Relations Center, 2004).

The notion that homes and children are threatened by immigration is a central assertion of anti-immigrant organizers that has been given official legitimation by the governor of California, and which has found broader currency in the contention that communities and quality of life are being eroded by immigrants. One Arizona founder of Mothers Against Illegal Aliens explained that she feared for her children's future in a country 'dominated' by Mexican immigrants, a prospect she described as "genocide" (Riccardi, 2006). In another example, a pair of Minuteman activists recently staged a "patriotic wedding" and rally (LadyCalif, 2006). The couple had met during a border patrol action and "found their dedication to protecting the United States sovereignty and their love of country brought them together" (ibid.). Love of country and family become the righteous means through which a national racial project can be advanced without reference to race per se.

Despite the benefit of uncritical media treatment, anti-immigrant groups have not been able to unilaterally set the terms of inclusion and community. From the moment of their formations, Save Our State demonstrators and Minutemen activists, who have attempted to make inroads into Southern California communities, have been repeatedly rebuffed by far greater numbers of [counter-demonstrators](#) who refuse these groups' claims that racism is not at issue (see CBS News for mainstream news [coverage](#) of same protest). The apparent alliance between [Jim Gilchrist](#) and African American homeless advocate [Ted Hayes](#) has been widely debated within the African American community, and their appearance together in the black Los Angeles neighborhood of Leimert Park was widely interpreted as a shallow attempt to divert charges of racism (cf. So, 2006). Furthermore, in Chicago significant multi-racial/ethnic alliances have been forged; the large Polish community there strongly backed efforts to secure local officials' support for legalization, a position the city council voted for unanimously in 2000 (Khokha, 2001). Finally, one of the strongest examples of opposition to 'crabgrass apartheid' as a manifestation of the national racial formation can be found in the city of Maywood, located just south of Los Angeles. Maywood is 96 percent Latino and has declared itself a 'sanctuary city,' disavowing the categories of legal and illegal, and refusing to enforce legislation promised by Sensenbrenner. Coachella, California has since followed suit (Becerra and Winton, 2006; Berger, 2006). Sanctuary cities are key political spaces in the united struggle against crabgrass apartheid and global apartheid.

Racism and the Fiscal Turn

The claims that communities and homes are under siege go hand in hand with the argument that immigrants burden [health](#), education, and welfare services, overwhelm understaffed police forces, lower school test scores, and disrupt cohesive communities. Such claims were prominent in the campaign for Proposition 187 (Calavita, 1996), and continue to be invoked even though

historians and social scientists have flatly refuted their validity. The fiscal turn in the immigration debate recenters the argument on apparently neutral statistics, which still undergird explicitly racialized efforts to defend home, community, and homeland. For this reason, opposing the argument that immigrants are a fiscal drain has been an important aspect of immigrants rights strategy, but it has made for strange bedfellows. Immigrants rights groups, industry associations, organized labor, and free market think tanks all point to the economic and tax contributions that immigrant workers make (Barry, 2005a). Let us examine just three sets of debated figures: numbers of immigrants, fiscal costs, and health care. First, historian Roger Daniels has rejected the Malthusian ‘flood’ analysis that underlies questions of assimilation: “The commonly held perception that America is receiving an unprecedented proportion of immigrants is false” (2004, 4).¹⁰ Second, the National Academy of Sciences documented in 1997 that immigrants contributed \$80,000 more in taxes than they would receive in services over the course of their lifetime (League of United Latin American Citizens, n.d.; National Immigration Law Center, 2004). Furthermore, an unintended consequence of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), which required employers to gather Social Security numbers from all employees, is the \$7 billion *annual* subsidy of the Social Security Administration contributed by undocumented workers (Porter, 2005). Third, the “widely held assumptions that immigrants are consuming large amounts of scarce health care resources are invalid” because immigrants’ per capita health expenditures are 55% lower than US-born individuals (Mohanty et al., 2005, 1437).

But don’t these numbers serve to shore up the old capitalist work ethic and justify neoliberal austerity (work the hardest for the least pay, thrifty health care spenders) rather than humanize the debate as immigrant advocates seem to hope? Despite the alternative truth claims these figures establish, they do not easily counter the greater ‘truth’ that immigration is out of control. That is, the “war on unauthorized immigrants overlaps considerably with the conservative-led onslaught against the poor (rather than against *poverty*)” (Nevins, 2002, 118). The singularity of this war is part of the ideological project to justify drawing lines of social death as efforts of national and personal responsibility. The claim that the nation cannot afford to support non-citizens obscures the reality that it does not care for all of its citizens, which in turn offers further evidence to enforce differential citizenship.

¹⁰ In 2000, 11.1 percent of the U.S. population was foreign born, compared to 14.7 percent in 1890 or 1910, two high points of unrestricted European immigration (ibid., 5). The broadly accepted figure of 11.1 million undocumented immigrants, produced by the [Pew Hispanic Center](#), would translate to 3.7 percent of the U.S. Census Bureau estimated 2005 population (Passel, 2006). What is more, of the undocumented immigrants within the country, 45% are visa overstayers, and only 17% of these are from Mexico (Weissert, 2006).

Countering the fiscal fetishism of anti-immigrant advocates means placing such arguments within the four decade effort to dismantle the welfare state. Pressure from the civil rights and welfare rights movements of the 1960s forced the government to create a more racially equitable system, but white voters regarded equity as special treatment (Quadagno, 1994). Conservative politicians rhetorically began drawing a connection between welfare profligacy and disorder in the streets and on campus, which was the product of concerted anti-racist and anti-war organizing. Congress issued rounds of revanchist welfare cuts beginning in 1967, and the New Right came to power nationally some 13 years later on twin law-and-order and anti-welfare planks. Thus, they successfully rearticulated racial animus against welfare into the apparently neutral ‘balanced-budget conservatism’ (Calavita, 1996; Huber and Espenshade, 1997) by using code words such as ‘big government’ (Omi and Winant, 1994, 123-124). In this way, the New Right tilted the legitimacy of the state firmly in the direction of internal militarization and away from racial reconstruction and the war on poverty (Cloward and Piven, 1968; Gilmore, 1998). The numbers of people jailed or imprisoned nationwide has grown from approximately 200,000 in the early 1970s to over two million today (The Sentencing Project, 2005). Thus, dismantling the welfare state began as, and remains, an effort to assert white hegemony over a threatened national racial formation.

President Bill Clinton took up the (non-neutral) themes of welfare reform and law-and-order, and passed a series of far-reaching bills that worked to produce social death, predominantly for groups of color, by stripping civil rights and social protections. First, the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act, known as ‘welfare reform,’ successfully united antagonisms against apocryphal figures of the black welfare queen and profit-seeking immigrant lured to the generous U.S. welfare state, and turned the modest entitlement into a program with only five years of eligibility. Passed soon after Proposition 187, it went far beyond California’s piece of legislation by denying benefits to *all* non-citizens, including refugees (Jonas and Tactaquin, 2004, 69). According to welfare rights activist Rini Chakraborty, the Act served as a “real wake-up call for immigrants” on issues of racial discrimination because they experienced “oppression that is not based on immigration status” (in Quiroz-Martinez, 2001). But the exclusionary net was cast too wide. “Backlash against the original law forced the federal government to restore food stamps and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) to children, elderly, and disabled immigrants” (Kaushal, 2005, 60). The effect of welfare reform for citizens and non-citizens alike was to push welfare recipients into the waged workforce, regardless of family obligations or whether jobs paid a living wage (Jones-DeWeever, Peterson and Song, 2003; Kaestner and Kaushal, 2005). Second, Clinton signed the Illegal Immigrant Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) and the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA), which brought the categories of immigrant and criminal into convergence. Apparatuses of differential inclusion that effectively mandate low-

wage work and are buttressed by a repressive lock-down regime, then, bind the fates of people of color within the U.S., regardless of citizenship (Bohrman and Murakawa, 2005).

Dangers and Opportunities

The threat of mass criminalization highlighted the powerful ways in which immigration policy works to disempower entire groups of people. But the mass demonstrations held in the weeks surrounding La Gran Marcha signaled the growing power to oppose discriminatory policies and demand justice. This is where the immigrants rights movement and corporate immigration lobby part ways. In this final section, we briefly address two political opportunities created by the immigrants rights movement and some of the dangers associated with each: the reinvigoration of the labor movement and a left class politics, and the struggle against criminalization and for the possibilities of living.

A Conservative Labor Metaphysic and Crisis of Social Reproduction

The immigrants rights movement has brought to the fore the reality that immigration policy works to “restrict [people’s] freedom once they are *within* nationalized labour markets” thereby rendering migrants more vulnerable to exploitation (Sharma, 2006, 25). However, the broader point has yet to be made that all workers’ relative powerlessness is produced at least partly through increasing some workers’ vulnerabilities to exploitation through technologies of social death (cf. Greenhouse and Leonhardt, 2006). The pervasive pickets proclaiming ‘We Built This Country’ confront how discrimination makes some people’s work less valuable (Petras, 2006), but the notion that hard work should be the marker of American citizenship treads on dangerous ground. First, this labor metaphysic is also shared by business interests, and thus obscures the decisions made by powerful corporations, backed by the state, that undermine working conditions and organized labor worldwide. Second, the ‘hard work and thrift’ model of immigrant success obscures the history of genocide and slavery in the production of the current national racial formation (Banks, 2006). As Mai Ngai observes, “The myth of ‘immigrant America’ derives its power in large part from the labor that it performs for American exceptionalism” – namely the nation’s liberal premise of democracy and equal citizenship (2004, 5). Third, Laura Liu argues that the thesis that immigrants and African Americans compete for the same low waged jobs rests on “claims that immigrants are able to survive the global economic shifts that supposedly explain their presence in the USA in the first place. But this survival is often cast as either the ‘bootstrapping’ success of hardworking immigrants taking jobs from ‘native-born’ workers, or the result of African American urban residents’ failure to work as hard as immigrants do” (2000, 172).

Advancing a people's politics of labor would mean breaking with the corporate-friendly, racialized labor metaphysic that has long been used to discipline the working class, by denigrating those who *refuse* to work jobs that don't pay, and overlooking those who *organize* to make those jobs better. If one looks at the jobs lost to African Americans in the 2001 economic recession – public sector, manufacturing, unionized – one sees a picture of capital and a politically austere state who sacked workers “too used to high wages, too likely to form unions” (Bacon, 2004; also see Leondar-Wright, 2004). That is to say, while the issue of black joblessness must be addressed, it must be done so within a framework that discusses the ways in which racial discrimination disciplines different groups of workers differently. When it comes to *anti-racist* organizing strategies, the point of organizing should not be competing over who gets to do low wage jobs,¹¹ but collective empowerment because for U.S.-born and immigrant workers alike “wage suppression is fundamentally tied to low status and power” (Catanzarite, 2003, 90). Building collective power and dismantling disabling barriers form aspects of [UNITE HERE](#) strategy and Houston, Texas Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee's HR 092, Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act of 2005 (Bacon, 2005). As labor activist David Bacon (2005) writes, “The key is prohibiting discrimination – against immigrants because of their status and vulnerability, and against displaced workers, by enforcing job creation and affirmative action as national policy.” Reinvigorating the labor movement in a way that attends to issues of racism can also mean organizing the unemployed, demanding well-funded education and social welfare programs, and advancing a new movement for affirmative action.

Finally, hard work cannot form the basis for claims to citizenship and social worth because it denies humanity to those groups of people whose work is not recognized, namely women, to those who cannot work, and to those whose unemployment is a result of racism. Parting ways with a racialized labor metaphysic opens the possibility of creating a people's class politics that can recognize the work and “necessity of social reproduction” (Katz, 2001).¹²

¹¹ There is an ongoing debate over whether immigrants compete with or complement U.S.-born low-waged workers of color. For overviews of the competition and complementarity debates, see Catanzarite (2004) and Linton (2002).

¹² When we look at the sectors that employ undocumented immigrant workers nationwide – construction (25%-36% of workforce depending on job), agriculture (29%), meat processing (27%), landscaping (25%), garment and textile making (26%) – we see the work of creating and providing daily necessities for living (Peterson and Simon, 2006; Streitfeld, 2006). These jobs form the bottom end of a decades-long trend toward economic polarization, which has been more pronounced in California than the rest of the nation, and particularly so in Los Angeles (Milkman and Dwyer, 2002). The Los Angeles County informal economy is considered the largest in the nation with an estimated 679,000 workers, or 15% of the workforce (Flaming, Haydamack and Joassart, 2005, 30-31). The informal economy is a result of neoliberal economic policies that fuel

Emphasizing immigrant thrift and minimal impact on public services celebrates a neoliberal utopia, but does nothing to advance claims on the social wealth that are due all humans. Instead of holding corporations to the same standard of good fiscal citizenship – corporate income tax receipts have declined from 27.5% of total federal receipts in the 1950s to 9.6% in the 2000s (Friedman, 2003) – the least powerful groups are blamed for innumerable social, economic, and ecological problems. Thus, organizing that privileges people’s everyday needs to those of the capitalist economy *per se* – asserting a people’s economy – offers the possibility of a progressive class politics that is anti-racist, feminist, and transnational (Women of Color in the Global Women’s Strike and Global Women’s Strike, 2006). In stark contrast to the apparent neutrality of balanced budget conservatism, such an analysis shows how justifications for the privatization of social reproduction are part of the project of producing national racial formations.

Ningun Ser Humano es Illegal

Common protest pickets – ‘No Human is Illegal’ or ‘I am not a criminal’ – seek to deny collective dehumanization, and underscore the premise that claims for legalization are not fundamentally claims of exclusive national allegiance, rather full personhood (cf. Coutin, 2003a). But simply claiming that one is law-abiding has not stopped the decades-long tendency toward criminalization, nor does it decriminalize immigration (criminalization produces criminals, after all), nor does it confront the reality that the law is not just. Thus, Jane Bai and Eric Tang argue that “state violence – in the form of policing, detentions, and prisons – has become a crucial arena for the immigrant rights movement. The ... movement can ill-afford to view state violence as peripheral to its longtime core issue, legalization of the undocumented” (2002). Confronting state violence in the form of criminalization may open the way to critiquing all immigration controls as forms of state violence.

Antiracist solidarities for justice and liberation potentially uniting immigrant and U.S.-born communities of color can be forged in opposition to shared conditions of social death. Anti-immigrant Congressman Dana Rohrabacher (R-Dana Point, Orange County) provides one vivid example. Asked how he would resolve the labor shortage if immigration were restricted, he answered, “Let the prisoners pick the fruits” – a telling spin on the old class war invective ‘let them eat cake’ (CBS/AP, 2006). If we look more closely, the struggle against criminalization of entire groups of people – seen through the 1980s asylum movement and the contemporary prison abolition movement – confronts the conditions of social death that are productive of premature deaths (Gilmore, 2002b;

displacement and the dissolution of social supports (Parreñas, 2005, 27), while simultaneously serving as the means of subsistence for workers and consumers alike.

Coutin, 2003b). Los Angeles-based Central American Resource Center's ([CARECEN](#)) 1988 'No Human Being is Illegal' campaign was part of their broader effort to first end deportations of Salvadoran refugees and secure a legal status in the United States, and second to expose and put a halt to U.S.-backing of military operations in [El Salvador](#) (Coutin, 2003a). Each demand was necessary to save lives. Likewise, the prison abolition movement shows how relying on prisons as a solution to social problems exploits and widens the gap between legal citizenship and social inclusion for communities of color, hardens the boundaries between deserving and socially dead people (immigrants and U.S.-born alike), and does nothing to make places safer or lives longer (Gilmore and Mahoney, 2005).

Thus, Ruthie Gilmore (2006) concludes that a commitment to anti-racist organizing should not proceed from the premise "they should be civilly dead and not us, but there should be no civil death." Such a principle can link immigrants rights groups with an array of social justice movements, including prison abolitionists, welfare rights activists, queer activists, and education equity activists. In turn, these movements point to the necessity of decriminalization and demilitarization as a common strategy of securing money for meeting human needs rather than producing more deaths. Activists are already making these connections. For instance, the transnational [Global Women's Strike](#) shows the class-based continuity among property crimes, prostitution, and the illegalization of movement was produced by the 'criminalization of survival.' Likewise, stronger connections between the [antiwar](#) and immigrants rights movements can be forged when the connections between imperial war (and proxy wars), exploitation, impoverishment and migration are made (Ruder and Mejia, 2006). The nativist scapegoating of immigrants can be confronted when one sees that "it's really the war[s] that's siphoning tax dollars" (Ferguson, 2006).

Conclusion

Americans who smart at charges of racism should support non-racist migration reform. Militarizing the border will not secure it and will only increase deaths (Nevins, 2002). Employer sanctions merely increase vulnerability to exploitation and decrease wages, thus reinforcing the relative powerlessness of immigrant and U.S.-born workers (Bansak, 2005). Tremendous legal fees, a racially inequitable refugee system, and very long wait for legal immigration make for *de facto* class and racial discrimination. United States social, [economic](#), and military policies should be closely examined for the role they play in fueling displacement and migration, and changed. But the rub to this proposition, of course, is what we might call the wages of citizenship, after W. E. B. Du Bois and David Roediger. The project of securing home and homeland from threatening

criminals and illegals is one that valorizes the production of social death by also producing the identity of a beleaguered, but law-abiding citizenry.

Where does that leave immigration legislation? Since the spring 2006 mobilizations, there has been a series of comprehensive immigration bills that promise to do more than militarize and criminalize immigrants. Key features of the bills have included a temporary guest worker program a shift away from family-unification policy to points-oriented policies that privilege well-educated workers; three tiers of immigrants based upon numbers of years within the country, forcing those in the U.S. for two years or less to leave; more ICE agents and prison space for immigrants; and more border hardening. June 2007 saw the failure of a prominent compromise bill. Anti-immigrant forces denounced the bill with the sturdy shibboleth ‘amnesty,’ while the reaction of immigrants rights groups was mixed. Some mourned the passing of an important political opportunity, while others rejected the legislation because it would increase already unworkable, exploitative, and deadly enforcement measures, create more loopholes for deportable offenses, and negate existing family-oriented policy. It now seems clear that serious action on comprehensive immigration reform will not happen until after the 2008 campaign season. In the meantime, local struggles continue in the streets and government buildings, many with an immediate focus on trying to stop immigration raids.

The mass immigrants rights mobilizations of spring 2006 are part of the grassroots movement against ‘global apartheid,’ a term that draws clear attention to the transnational racialized boundary between the Global North and Global South that is being drawn with immigration policies. Worldwide, the movement has reopened the debate over the moral and political imperative to abolish border controls prohibiting the movement of peoples.¹³ Etienne Balibar (2004) has claimed that struggles over immigration are struggles over the content of democracy. Interrogating continuities produced by technologies of social death among different racialized groups within the U.S. amplifies *criminalization* as a crisis of democracy. Thus, the struggle against global apartheid does not stop at borders, but sees borders as another apparatus of social death that makes some groups of people’s lives more vulnerable to premature death.

Who can or cannot be part of a nation-state and under what circumstances is part of the legacy of colonial and post-colonial relations and racial hierarchies. The concept of national racial formation – including specific histories of differential inclusion and apparatuses of social death – can be used by researchers and activists to understand the transnational deployment of these apparatuses, and the

¹³ The ‘open borders’ literature is large and growing. For a good start, see Hayter (2001), Sharma and Wright (2002), Wright (2003), Bauder (2003), and Sharma (2006).

interrelations between mobilizations confronting specific nation-states' policies. How are national racial projects advanced in conjunction with one another, and where are the disjunctions of global apartheid (cf. Seigel, 2005)? The concept of national racial formations allows us to see that the neoliberal crisis of the welfare state, in the United States at least, is perhaps better understood as a racial project. Likewise, the movement against global apartheid reveals law-and-order as pivotal to the transnational resolution of global economic change. At the same time, localized struggles over the meaning of home and community are crucial sites in the project to create and undermine national racial formations, and hence global apartheid. In the end, we look to Maywood and ask, how might a network of sanctuary cities form the transnational grounds of political and caring communities committed to livelihoods for all?

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Harald Bauder, Wendy Cheng, Becky Dolhinow, Micol Seigel, and Vincent Stephens for their keen engagement and helpful suggestions.

References

- Allen, Jennifer. 2004. *Justice on the Line: The Unequal Impacts of Border Patrol Activities in Arizona Border Communities*. [Accessed June 8, 2006]. Available from: www.borderaction.org/resources.php.
- Almaguer, Tomás. 1994. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Alonzo-Zaldivar, Ricardo. 2004. U.S., Mexico OK deportation by air. *Los Angeles Times* June 9, A11.
- Anon. 2006. My experience substitute teaching during the walk outs. [Accessed March 27, 2006]. Available from: www.indymedia.org.
- Bacon, David. 2004. Black/migrant rivalry for jobs can be eased. *ZNet* August 25. [Accessed June 7, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=6100>.
- Bacon, David. 2005. Uniting African-Americans and immigrants. *The Black Scholar* Summer. [Accessed June 6, 2006]. Available from: <http://dbaon.igc.org/Imigrants/2005uniting.html>.
- Bai, Jane, and Eric Tang. 2002. The war at home: National targeting of noncitizens takes on new dimensions. *ColorLine*. April 30, 28+.

- Balibar, Étienne. 2004. *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Trans. James Swenson. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Banks, Andre. 2006. The price of the ticket. Applied Research Center. <http://www.arc.org/content/view/432/1/>.
- Bansak, Cynthia. 2005. The differential wage impact of the Immigration Reform and Control Act on Latino ethnic subgroups. *Social Science Quarterly*. 86, 1279-1298.
- Barry, Ellen. 2006. City vents anger at illegal immigrants. *Los Angeles Times* July 14, A1+.
- Barry, Tom. 2005a. The immigration debate: Politics of class and corporations. *Americas Program, International Relations Center* August 9. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: <http://americas.irc-online.org/am/224>.
- Barry, Tom. 2005b. Immigration debate: Politics, ideologies of anti-immigration forces. *Americas Program, International Relations Center* June 17. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: <http://americas.irc-online.org/am/652>.
- Bauder, Harald. 2003. Equality, justice and the problem of international borders: The case of Canadian immigration regulation. *Acme* 2, 167-182. [Accessed April 28, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.acme-journal.org/vol2/Bauder1.pdf>.
- Bauder, Harald. 2006. And the flag waved on: Immigrants protest, geographers meet in Chicago. *Environment and Planning A* 38, 1001-1004.
- Baum, Dan. 2004. The man who says keep out. *Los Angeles Times Magazine* March 17, 9-17.
- Becerra, Hector, and Richard Winton. 2006. Hate mail, threats probed in Maywood. *Los Angeles Times*. Jul. 13, B1+.
- Berger, Rose Marie. 2006. Sanctuary movement on the rise. *Sojourners* July. [Accessed Aug. 11, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=magazine.article&issue=Soj0607&article=060742f>.
- Bohrman, Rebecca, and Naomi Murakawa. 2005. Remaking big government: Immigration and crime control in the United States. In, Julia Sudbury (ed.),

- Global Lockdown: Race, Gender, and the Prison-Industrial Complex*. New York: Routledge. pp. 109-126.
- Calavita, Kitty. 1996. The new politics of immigration: 'Balanced-budget conservatism' and the symbolism of Proposition 187. *Social Problems* 43, 284-305.
- Capuzzo, Jill P. 2006. Town battling illegal immigration is emptier now. *New York Times* July 28, B1+.
- Carbado, Devon W. 2005. Racial naturalization. *American Quarterly* 57, 633-658.
- Catanzarite, Lisa. 2003. Occupational context and wage competition of new immigrant Latinos with minorities and Whites. *The Review of Black Political Economy* Fall, 77-94.
- Catanzarite, Lisa. 2004. Immigration, union density, and brown-collar wage penalties. *The State of California Labor* 4, 107-130. [Accessed June 6, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.iir.ucla.edu/scl/pdf/scl2004ch4.pdf>.
- CBS/AP. 2006. 'Let the prisoners pick the fruits'. CBS News March 30. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/03/31/politics/main1459355.shtml>.
- Center for New Community. 2004. Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). Center for New Community. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.newcomm.org/fair2004.pdf>.
- Center for New Community. 2005. Shell Games: The "Minutemen" and Vigilante Anti-Immigrant Politics. Center for New Community. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.buildingdemocracy.org/shellgames.pdf>.
- Chu, Henry. 2005. Journey into U.S. turns deadly for Brazilians. *Los Angeles Times* July 1, A5.
- Cloward, Richard A., and Frances Fox Piven. 1968. The poor against themselves. *The Nation* November 25, 558-562.
- Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2003a. Cultural logics of belonging and movement: Transnationalism, naturalization, and U.S. immigration politics. *American Ethnologist* 30, 508-526.
- Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2003b. *Legalizing Moves: Salvadoran Immigrants' Struggle for U.S. Residency*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

- Daniels, Roger. 2004. *Guarding the Golden Door: American Immigration Policy and Immigrants Since 1882*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Davis, Mike, and Alessandra Moctezuma. 1999. Policing the third border. *ColorLines* Fall. [Accessed June 22, 2006]. Available from: http://www.arc.org/C_Lines/CLArchive/story2_3_08.html.
- Dear, Michael, and Andrew Burrige. 2005. Cultural integration and hybridization at the U.S.-Mexico borderlands. *Cahiers de Geographie du Quebec* 39, 20-39.
- Delson, Jennifer. 2005. Immigrant plan wrong, activists say. *Los Angeles Times*, Apr. 19.
- Delson, Jennifer. 2006. 3-Woman campaign targets day labor. *Los Angeles Times* April 3, B1+.
- Dowty, Alan. 1987. *Closed Borders: The Contemporary Assault on Freedom of Movement*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Eschbach, Karl, Jacqueline Hagan, Nestor Rodriguez, Rubén Hernández-León, Stanley Bailey. 1999. Death at the border. *International Migration Review* 33, 430-454.
- Ferguson, Sarah. 2006. A day without gringos?. *Counterpunch*, May 5. [Accessed May 25]. Available from: <http://www.counterpunch.org/ferguson05052006.html>.
- Flaming, Daniel, Brent Haydamack, and Pascale Joassart. 2005. *Hopeful Workers, Marginal Jobs: LA's Off-the-Books Labor Force*. Economic Roundtable. [Accessed May 22, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.economicrt.org/download/form.html>.
- Friedman, Joel. 2003. The decline of corporate income tax revenues. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. [Accessed June 7, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.cbpp.org/10-16-03tax.pdf>.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 1998. Globalisation and US prison growth: From military Keynesianism to post-Keynesian militarism. *Race & Class* 40, 171-188.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2002a. Race and globalization. In, R. J. Johnston, Peter J. Taylor and Michael J. Watts (eds.), *Geographies of Global Change: Remapping the World*, Second ed. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 261-274.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2002b. Fatal couplings of power and difference: Notes on racism and geography. *The Professional Geographer* 54, 15-24.

- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2006. California: "The biggest prison building project in the history of the world" – Why?. lecture delivered at California State University, Los Angeles, April.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson, and Josef Gregory Mahoney. 2005. YBE interviews Ruth Wilson Gilmore. *Your Black Eye*. 1. [Accessed June 6, 2006]. Available from: http://www.yourblackeye.org/1Q05/Gilmore_YBE_Interview_1Q05.html.
- Goffard, Christopher. 2006. Costa Mesa's border heat puts a chill in its Latinos. *Los Angeles Times* February 25, A1+.
- Gold, Scott. 2006. Student protests echo the '60s, but with a high-tech buzz. *Los Angeles Times* March 31.
- Gorman, Anna. 2006. Flag's meaning is in the eye of the beholder. *Los Angeles Times* March 29.
- Greenhouse, Steven, and David Leonhardt. 2006. Real wages fail to match a rise in productivity. *New York Times* August 28, A1+.
- Hayter, Teresa. 2001. Open borders: The case against immigration controls. *Capital & Class* 75, 149-156.
- Hernandez, Daniel. 2006. What adults don't get: Inside the minds of student marchers. *L.A. Weekly* April 7-13, 18+.
- Heyman, Josiah. 1999. Why interdiction?: Immigration control at the United States-Mexico border. *Regional Studies* 33, 619-630.
- Huber, Gregory A., and Thomas J. Espenshade. 1997. Neo-isolationism, balanced-budget conservatism, and the fiscal impacts of immigrants. *International Migration Review* 31, 1031-1054.
- Human Rights Watch. 2004. *Human Rights Watch World Report 2004: Human Rights and Armed Conflict*. Human Rights Watch. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: <http://hrw.org/wr2k4/download/wr2k4.pdf>.
- International Migration Review. 1978. Illegal Mexican immigrants to the U.S. *International Migration Review* 12, 469-613.
- International Relations Center. 2004. Federation for American Immigration Reform. *Right Web Profiles*. [Accessed. May 22, 2006] Available from: <http://rightweb.irc-online.org/profile/1467>.

- Jonas, Susanne, and Catherine Tactaquin. 2004. Latino immigrant rights in the shadow of the national security state: Responses to domestic preemptive strikes. *Social Justice* 31, 67-91.
- Jones-DeWeever, Avis, Janice Peterson, and Xue Song. 2003. *Before & After Welfare Reform: The Work and Well-Being of Low-Income Single Parent Families*. Institute for Women's Policy Research. [Accessed Aug. 31, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/D454.pdf>.
- Kaestner, Robert, and Neeraj Kaushal. 2005. Immigrant and native responses to welfare reform. *Journal of Population Economics* 18, 69-92.
- Katz, Cindi. 2001. Vagabond capitalism and the necessity of social reproduction. *Antipode* 33, 709-728.
- Kaushal, Neeraj. 2005. New immigrants' location choices: Magnets without welfare. *Journal of Labor Economics* 23, 59-80.
- Khokha, Sasha. 2001. Paper chase: Sasha Kokha reports from inside the fight for legalization of undocumented workers. *ColorLines* July 31, 26+.
- Klein, Naomi. 2003. The rise of the fortress continent. *The Nation*. January 16. [Accessed August 10, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20030203/klein>.
- Kraul, Chris. 2004. Illegal immigrants receive a one-way ticket to Mexico. *Los Angeles Times* July 13, A1.
- Ladycalif. 2006. [Minuteman wedding and rally - Los Angeles, CA July, 8, 2006](#). June 30. *Free Republic*. [Accessed July 15, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1658826/posts>.
- League of United Latin American Citizens. n.d. The truth about undocumented immigration. League of United Latin American Citizens. [Accessed April 28, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.lulac.org/advocacy/issues/immigration/truth.html>.
- Leondar-Wright, Betsy. 2004. Black job loss déjà vu. *Dollars & Sense* 253. [Accessed June 6, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2004/0504leondar.html>.
- Linton, April. 2002. Immigration and the structure of demand: Do immigrants alter the labor market composition of U.S. cities?. *International Migration Review* 36, 58-80.

- Liu, Laura Y. 2000. The place of immigration in studies of geography and race. *Social & Cultural Geography* 1, 169-181.
- Maira, Sunaina. 2004. Youth culture, citizenship and globalization: South Asian Muslim youth in the United States after September 11th. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 24, 219-231.
- Marosi, Richard. 2005a. Border Patrol tries new tune to deter crossers. *Los Angeles Times* July 4.
- Marosi, Richard. 2005b. Samaritans say they haven't crossed a line at the border. *Los Angeles Times* July 22.
- Martinez, Elizabeth (Betita). 2006. Latinos create a new political climate. Immigrant Solidarity Network. [Accessed May 28, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.immigrantsolidarity.org/cgi-bin/datacgi/database.cgi?file=Issues&report=SingleArticle&ArticleID=0538>.
- Massey, Douglas. 2006. The wall that keeps illegal workers in. *New York Times* April 4, A23.
- Milkman, Ruth, and Rachel E. Dwyer. 2002. Growing apart: The 'new economy' and job polarization in California. *The State of California Labor 2002*, 1-31. [Accessed June 6, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.iir.ucla.edu/scl/pdf02/scl2002ch1.pdf>.
- Mitchell, Don. 2002. Cultural landscapes: The dialectical landscape - recent landscape research in human geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 381-389.
- Mitchell, John L. 2006. Foes of illegal immigration see support growing. *Los Angeles Times* May 16, B2.
- Mohanty, Sarita A., Steffie Woolhandler, David U. Himmelstein, Susmita Pati, Olveen Carrasquillo, and David H. Bor. 2005. Health care expenditures of immigrants in the United States: A nationally representative analysis. *American Journal of Public Health* 95, 1431-1438.
- Mucha, Zak. 2006. Kick 'em out and keep 'em out. *Chicago Reader* March 10, 1+.
- Muñoz, Carlos, Jr. 1989. *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement*. London: Verso.
- National Immigration Law Center. 2004. Facts about immigrant workers. National Immigration Law Center. [Accessed June 6, 2006]. Available from:

http://www.nilc.org/immsemplymnt/wrkfrc_dev/factsimmworkers_041504.pdf.

- National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights. 2006. National statement to support human and civil rights for all immigrants and to oppose compromise immigration reform proposals. National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights. [Accessed May 26, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.niirr.org/projects/immigrationreform/statement.htm>.
- Nevins, Joseph. 2002. *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the 'Illegal Alien' and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary*. New York: Routledge.
- Nevins, Joseph. 2003. Thinking out of bounds: A critical analysis of academic and human rights writings on migrant deaths in the U.S.-Mexico border region. *Migraciones Internacionales* 2, 171-190.
- Ngai, Mae M. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nicholas, Peter. 2006. Gov. to send 1,000 National Guard troops to the border. *Los Angeles Times* June 2.
- Nopper, Tamara Kil Ja Kim. 2003. Black immigrants are prime targets for deportation. *The Black Commentator* Sep. 4. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: http://www.blackcommentator.com/54/54_guest_immigrants.html.
- Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. Second edn. New York: Routledge.
- Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2005. *Children of Global Migration: Transnational Families and Gendered Woes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Pasco, Jean O. 2006. City's border push sparks outcry. *Los Angeles Times* January 4.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. 2006. The size and characteristics of the unauthorized migrant population in the U.S. Pew Hispanic Center. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from: <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/61.pdf>.
- Patterson, Orlando. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Peake, Linda, and Audrey Kobayashi. 2002. Policies and practices for an antiracist geography at the millennium. *The Professional Geographer* 54, 50-61.

- Peterson, Jonathan, and Richard Simon. 2006. Affected industries clamor for consideration. *Los Angeles Times* April 6, A11.
- Petras, James. 2006. The rise of the migrant workers' movement. *Counterpunch* May 3. [Accessed May 26, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.counterpunch.org/petras05032006.html>.
- Porter, Eduardo. 2005. Illegal immigrants are bolstering Social Security with billions. *New York Times* April 5, A1+.
- Pulido, Laura. 2006. *Black, Brown, Yellow, and Left: Radical Activism in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Quadagno, Jill. 1994. *The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Quiroz-Martinez, Julie. 2001. Missing link: Julie Quiroz-Martinez discusses the urgency of connecting immigrant rights to racial justice. *ColorLines* July 31, 17+.
- Riccardi, Nicholas. 2006. Anti-illegal immigration forces share a wide tent. *Los Angeles Times* May 4, A1+.
- Rights on the Line: Vigilantes on the Border*. c. 2005. American Friends Service Committee, WITNESS, American Civil Liberties Union. Film Available from: <http://www.afsc.org/immigrants-rights/rightsontheline/default.htm>.
- Rubin, Joel. 2006. Study slams LAUSD grad rates. *Los Angeles Times* June 20 [Accessed June 20, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-062006grad.1.5356464.story?ctrack=1&cset=true>.
- Ruder, Eric, and Camilo Mejia. 2006. War and immigrants rights: 'It's the same system behind both injustices'. *Counterpunch* April 29/30. [Accessed May 26, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.counterpunch.org/ruder04292006.html>.
- Sarat, Austin. 2005. At the boundaries of law: Executive clemency, sovereign prerogative, and the dilemma of American legality. *American Quarterly* 57, 611-631.
- Saxton, Alexander. 1971. *The Indispensable Enemy: Labor and the Anti-Chinese Movement in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Seigel, Micol. 2005. Beyond compare: Comparative method after the transnational turn. *Radical History Review* 91, 62-90.

- Sentencing Project, The. 2005. Incarceration. The Sentencing Project. [Accessed August 31, 2006]. Available from:
http://www.sentencingproject.org/issues_01.cfm.
- Sharma, Nandita. 2005. Anti-trafficking rhetoric and the making of a global apartheid. *NWSA Journal* 17, 88-111.
- Sharma, Nandita. 2006. *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of 'Migrant Workers' in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sharma, Nandita, and Cynthia Wright. 2002. Open the borders!. *New Socialist Magazine* 37. [Accessed June 21, 2006]. Available from:
<http://www.newsocialist.org/magazine/37/article02.html>.
- So, Hemmy. 2006. Minuteman caravan gets testy send-off. *Los Angeles Times* May 4, B1+.
- Southern Poverty Law Center. 2002. The puppeteer. *Intelligence Report*. [Accessed May 25, 2006]. Available from:
<http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?pid=183>.
- Streitfeld, David. 2006. Immigrant bill's benefits may be elusive. *Los Angeles Times* April 1, A1+.
- Suarez, Kelly-Anne, and J. Michael Kennedy. 2006. Student walkouts continue; officials vow crackdown. *Los Angeles Times* March 28.
- Tobar, Hector, and Cecilia Sánchez. 2006. Migrants' boycott plan is crossing the border. *Los Angeles Times* April 27, A1+.
- Watanabe, Teresa, and Michael Finnegan. 2006. Rove tells of 'shared values' with Latinos. *Los Angeles Times* July 12, B2.
- Weissert, Will. 2006. Millions of visa overstays overlooked. *Associated Press* [Accessed June 5, 2006]. Available from:
<http://www.freewmexican.com/news/44641.html>.
- Winders, Jamie. 2005. Changing politics of race and region: Latino migration in the US South. *Progress in Human Geography* 29, 683-699.
- Women of Color in the Global Women's Strike, and Global Women's Strike. 2006. For May 1, 2006, "A day without an immigrant": Women say "capital travels freely - why not people!". Global Women's Strike.
<http://www.globalwomenstrike.net/English2006/May1Immigration.htm>.

Wright, Cynthia. 2003. Moments of emergence: Organizing by and with undocumented and non-citizen people in Canada after September 11." *Refuge* 21, 5-15. [Accessed June 21, 2006]. Available from: <http://www.yorku.ca/crs/Refuge/Abstracts%20and%20Articles/Vol%2021%20No%203/wright.pdf>.

Zeller, Tom. 2001. Migrants take their chances on a harsh path of hope. *New York Times* March 18, 14.

APPENDIX A:

“What We Want: Fair and Just Immigration,” National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, April 2006

Fair and just immigration reform means:

- Genuine legalization and opportunities to adjust status for all undocumented immigrants, including youth and farmworkers;
- Preservation of due process, including restoration of access to the courts and meaningful judicial review for immigrants;
- No indefinite detention or expansion of mandatory detention;
- No expansion of guest worker programs;
- No more wasted resources allocated to further militarize our borders and that contribute to the crisis of human rights and lives in the border regions;
- An end to employer sanctions and electronic worker verification systems;
- The strengthening and enforcement of labor law protections for all workers, native and foreign born;
- No use of city, state or other government agencies in the enforcement of immigration law;
- No more criminalization of immigrants, or their service providers;
- Expansion of legal immigration opportunities, support for family reunification and immediate processing of the backlog of pending visa applications; [and]

- Elimination of harsh obstacles to immigrating, including the HIV ban, “3 and 10 year bars,” and high income requirements for immigrant sponsors (National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, 2006).

APPENDIX B: Activist Organizations Online

Below is an annotated list of websites – by no means exhaustive – that represents various activist groups working against the U.S. militarization of the border, including church organizations, youth movements, and humanitarians. Also listed are several websites containing information regarding publications concerning the U.S.-Mexico border. At the time of writing all website links were correct and in operation.

Cross Border Network (www.crossbournetwork.org)

The Cross-Border Network seeks to organize for social and economic justice, by developing relationships with workers and communities across borders, particularly focusing on *maquiladora* workers in Mexico.

CITTAC (www.cittac.org)

“The Workers’ Information Center (CITTAC) is a non-governmental organization of women and men from Baja California, Mexico that promotes, publicizes, supports and accompanies workers’ struggles – especially within the *maquiladora* industry – to better their labor and living conditions, defend their human rights (especially those related to labor and gender), and create autonomous and democratic organizations.”

Tours of the border and *maquiladora*’s are organized by the Red Maquiladora Network and involve visiting CITTAC. Email maquilatijuana@earthlink.net for more information.

Delete the Border (www.deletetheborder.org)

Deletetheborder.org is an online community with the goal of nurturing a global network of movements against borders, focusing predominantly on the San Diego/Tijuana region, and was begun by the Organic Collective (<http://organiccollective.org>).

This Tuesday (<http://thistuesday.org>)

“This Tuesday is a collaborative effort of dozens of groups collaborating on a transnational platform around the struggles of migrant and contingent workers from different parts of the world.”

Mexico Solidarity Network/Red de Solidaridad con Mexico

(www.mexicosolidarity.org)

The Mexico Solidarity Network struggles for democracy, economic justice and human rights on both sides of the US-Mexico border, and is a grassroots-based organization dedicated to profound social change that challenges existing power relationships and builds alternatives.

Coalición de Derechos Humanos/Alianza Indígena sin Fronteras (Coalition of Human Rights/Indigenous Alliance without Borders)

(<http://www.derechoshumanosaz.net>)

“a grassroots organization which promotes respect for human/civil rights and fights the militarization of the Southern Border region, discrimination, and human rights abuses by federal, state, and local law enforcement officials affecting U.S. and non-U.S. citizens alike.” This site also includes a page with up to date recordings of border crossing-related deaths in Arizona.

No More Deaths (www.nomoredeaths.org)

Comprises “a diverse coalition of individuals, faith communities, human rights advocates, and grassroots organizers who have joined together to work for justice along the U.S.- Mexico border.”

Border Angels (www.borderangels.org)

Founded by Enrique Morones in 2001, Border Angels is a non-profit organization that seeks to stop unnecessary deaths of individuals traveling through the Imperial Valley desert areas and the mountain areas surrounding San Diego County, and other places along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Border Action Network (www.borderaction.org)

Border Action Network was founded in 1999 to organize for human rights, civil rights and environmental protection on the Arizona-Mexico border. They are a grassroots, membership-based organization that works with southern Arizona and northern Sonora border communities. Relying on community organizing, leadership

development and policy advocacy, Border Action Network is building a movement demanding dignity, rights and healthy communities on the US-Mexico border.

No Border Network (www.noborder.org)

“www.noborder.org was launched as the website of the noborder network in 2000. The site was used to publish information about the activities and campaigns of the noborder network and to bundle information on migration related events, developments and actions in Europe...it continues to be maintained as a repository of information on migration related events, developments and actions in Europe and beyond.”

San Diego Indymedia (<http://sandiego.indymedia.org/en/border/archive>)

A collection of articles regarding the border from various websites.

Mexico-North Research Network, Inc., ‘U.S. Immigration Debate Core Documents – 100 Online Documents’

(<http://www.unomaha.edu/ollas/immigrationdocuments.html>)

A selection of core documents regarding the U.S immigration debate from a wide array of sources.