

# HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE BRIEFING 1:

## Arizona's Immigration Law – S.B. 1070

Society for Applied Anthropology – [www.sfaa.net](http://www.sfaa.net)

JOSIAH HEYMAN

### Overview

Arizona law S.B. 1070, as amended by H.B. 2162 (S.B. 1070 henceforth), presents applied social scientists, and the publics with which they are connected, with several important issues. The core issue is that unauthorized migrants, and the communities that include them (which are often heavily Latino, but also African, Caribbean, and Asian) will be subject to intensified surveillance by state and local police, and criminal arrest, detention, and penalty as consequences. Interior policing as opposed to border policing of immigrants and deportation of unauthorized people by the federal government has roughly quadrupled in the last half-decade. Such deportations are disruptive of families and communities, and should be a concern of applied social scientists even when done by the federal government. But S.B. 1070 expands this concern to the much more pervasive interaction between state and local police and immigrant-heavy communities. It constitutes a key emergence point in the diffusion of a state and local enforcement approach to immigration restriction, previously approached mainly as a federal issue.

S.B. 1070 also raises the issue of the overlap in the U.S. imagination and in policing practice between Latino identity, phenotypes, and “illegalness,” even when unjustified by actual citizenship and immigration status. It signals the continuing importance of addressing migration issues, in the face of delays in passing federal comprehensive immigration reform legislation and the hidden issue of human and civil rights in border and immigration enforcement. At the same time, it is inappropriate to use the national failure to pass comprehensive immigration reform to excuse Arizona for the sorts of laws it passes and actions in some cases it tolerates. Finally, anxieties about the U.S.-Mexico border, realistic and imaginary, substantially motivated the passage of S.B. 1070, point toward the need for engagement with border issues.

### S.B. 1070 Basics

S.B. 1070 is a complex law, with a number of unprecedented elements. The most important component is that it creates an Arizona state crime of being undocumented that is parallel to, but different from the federal administrative violation of unauthorized status and the crime of



Photo: Louie Gilot/Border Network for Human Rights (BNHR) - Sympathy protest about S.B. 1070, May 1, 2010, El Paso, Texas.

entry without inspection. Specifically, for any non-citizen not authorized to be in the United States, it is an Arizona state crime to fail to carry a federal immigration document issued to the person or to fail to register under a specific federal statute. By making this an Arizona crime, it gives probable cause for Arizona state and local police to make immigration-status based warrantless arrests.

The law gives the police specific mandates to enforce this law. The police must make efforts to determine the immigration status of anyone they have reasonable suspicion of being undocumented, when lawfully stopping, detaining, or arresting a person, except when that would interfere with an investigation. In other words, police (given a set of subjective suspicions) must inquire into immigration status. In any sort of enforcement, with limited exceptions for investigations, even if the underlying encounter has nothing to do with immigration. Many police departments previously had policies or practices of not inquiring into immigration statuses when that was irrelevant to the violation or situation at hand. When the person is arrested under S.B. 1070, their immigration status must be determined before they can be released. An Arizona driver's license is presumptive evidence of authorized or citizen status. Any violation that can lead to federal administrative deportation is grounds for warrantless criminal arrest in Arizona.

In developing the “reasonable suspicion” of undocumented status needed to detain a person to determine their actual immigration status, officers may not consider race, color, or national origin except to the extent allowed by the United States or Arizona constitutions. However, courts have allowed race/ethnicity to be elements of just such reasonable suspicion for immigration violations, though not exclusively so (e.g., supposed racial appearance plus clothing, vehicle, language, non-verbal behavior, etc). State and local agencies are disallowed from restricting enforcement of immigration laws, enforceable by private lawsuits. Private lawsuits can overturn community-chosen local policies delineating a line of separation between police activities and immigration enforcement.

S.B. 1070 also makes it a crime for non-authorized immigrants to work or solicit work, a parallel set of crime to federal laws. It makes a crime of such persons hiring or being hired if the new employee enters a car that is blocking traffic. These provisions are aimed at day laborers, although they cover a wider range of people and situations. The bill makes human smuggling an Arizona crime in addition to already being a federal crime, using fairly specific language. Finally, when a non-citizen who is unlawfully present is discharged after conviction of a crime, federal authorities must be notified.

### **Historical and Contemporary Contexts**

The modern U.S.-Mexico boundary was established in 1848-1853 by a U.S. war of aggression. Mexican-origin populations were stranded north of the border, including in Arizona, as well as many autonomous Native American peoples. Starting with the era of intensive capitalist development in the late 19th century, northward migration from Mexico to the U.S. has been nearly constant, due to the unceasing labor demand from the colossus of the north. What has changed are U.S. policies toward these migrants, and their treatment in the law.

In the late nineteenth century, a series of key court decisions established the precedence of the federal government over state and local governments in immigration and naturalization. After a period when migration from Europe and Asia was largely halted by highly discriminatory quotas, the “new immigration” started in 1965. U.S. legal immigration from Latin America, Asia, and elsewhere grew because of changes begun that year in visa allocation, while unauthorized migration (mostly from Mexico) grew because of the termination of the 1942-1965 “Bracero” guestworker (legal, temporary migration) program.

An immigration reform in 1986 attempted to stop unauthorized migration by legalizing some of the resident un-

authorized population and by penalizing employers of unauthorized workers. The latter measure was little enforced and the 1986 legislation did not solve the problem of future flows. Employment demand in the United States and imbalanced, disruptive development in sending nations combine to drive migration. Inequality between the global North and South, radical changes caused by globalization, illusory dreams of income and consumption, and increasing linkages in a connected world all promote migration. The network connections of families and friends bring loved ones to be with economic migrants. Legal visas are unavailable for most unskilled workers, despite the economic circuits, while family reunification visas are badly backlogged for a number of nations, especially Mexico. Legal migration is thus an option for many people, but not for numerous others. Arguably, the economy of U.S. border states has benefitted from inexpensive Mexican labor, documented and undocumented, and from extensive commerce with Mexico. The U.S. side of the migration process, such as labor demand, is deeply embedded and largely unmarked, while the costs, suffering, dangers, and most of the legal penalties, are born by the unauthorized migrants, who are visible and stigmatized.

Unauthorized migration thus has continued to the present. At this time, the best estimates are that there are about 12 million unauthorized persons in the United States, roughly 4% of the U.S. population. The unauthorized population in Arizona grew rapidly in the 2000s, to an estimated 500,000 (of a state total of 6.6 million). This was during a period of overall rapid population growth in and internal migration toward Arizona (2000-2008 growth of 31%), creating a boom construction sector, in turn employing many migrants. About 59% of the U.S. unauthorized total are from Mexico; however, the overall size of this population, the proportion from Mexico, and the proportion who enter without inspection through the southwestern border (as opposed to those who overstay visitor and other visas) is lower than the usual image in the public mind (e.g., only about 60% of all unauthorized migrants go through the border with Mexico). Currently, legal immigration flows outnumber unauthorized entrances. Invasion or flood metaphors are thus inaccurate.

From 1993 onward, there has been a huge buildup of federal immigration enforcement at the southwest border, including an increase of the Border Patrol to 20,000 officers and approximately 700 miles of wall. Surveys in Mexico of past and future migrants show that this enforcement does not deter people from attempting the crossing and that prior to 2009, did not successfully halt their ultimate entry. Since 2009, unauthorized flows have slowed, but it is unclear if this is because of slumping U.S. job

markets or that for the first time, border enforcement has worked. One effect of the changes in enforcement after 1993 has been to displace the unauthorized entrances along the border, in particular to Arizona, which has become a focal point of dangerous modes of entry (walking across deserts and mountains), human smuggling, temporary shelter, and transportation to other states. Meanwhile, a comprehensive immigration solution like that of 1986, but without some of its obvious flaws, has repeatedly been proposed in Congress but has failed to pass.

State and local actions against unauthorized migrants re-emerged during the 1990s, focusing in particular on preventing unauthorized people and their families (often with U.S. citizen children) from accessing health and other social services. Such laws were passed, but have been struck down repeatedly. In the 2000s, an organized initiative began to write more sophisticated laws on a national basis, but to diffuse them to each individual state legislature and some municipal governments. This initiative's key organization is the Immigration Law Reform Institute, especially law professor Kris Kobach, who substantially drafted Arizona's legislation. Related legislation previously passed in Arizona in 2007, penalizing businesses that employ the unauthorized through denials of business licenses among other measures (similar laws were enacted in Oklahoma). These laws have mostly been sustained in courts (since they focus on clearly state domains, such as licenses, though some Oklahoma provisions were struck down) but they have rarely been enforced.

Although many laws penalize both migrants and those that hire them, migrants are far more powerless than members of the dominant society (i.e., actual businesses) within the unauthorized migration system. In the meantime, local police and sheriff's departments in Arizona (and other locations) have approached immigrants in very different ways, but one noticeable actor has been Maricopa County (Phoenix area) Sheriff Joe Arpaio, who has conducted street sweeps and other roundups of Latinos in order to identify unauthorized migrants to be held for deportation. S.B. 1070 would legalize the arguably extra-legal operations of Mr. Arpaio.

## **Positions and Arguments Concerning S.B. 1070**

### **Arguments in Favor**

There are three main arguments in favor of S.B. 1070. First, the bill targets migrants who are "illegal" in federal law simply by mirroring this in state law. The migrants themselves have chosen of free will to migrate without permission; it is their fault and responsibility. Illegality is a state of disorder and needs to be expelled from society

(this focuses on the status of migrants and leaves aside the role of hosts in the migratory process). The applicability of state law to this matter of public policy is, however, in dispute. Migrants entering without inspection at a border are committing a federal crime but unauthorized status inside the United States is an administrative violation, enforceable by removal. Arizona created state criminal statutes based on the latter federal definitions of status; either the existence of a federal administrative parallel is sufficient grounds to justify a state criminal law or it is reason to reject the law as violating the precedence of federal laws in matters of immigration. Courts will have to decide this matter of "pre-emption."

Second, Arizona has become an intensive entrance and transit corridor for both people and drugs, due to diversion from other parts of the border. Areas of the state near the border are overwhelmed by human pedestrians and off-road vehicles, with damage to ranches and other properties. The situation has also bolstered smuggling organizations. An effect has been the increased presence of armed smugglers, stash houses, car chases, and people being held for ransom (reported in the press as kidnapping). The public perceives there to be a wave of crime and disorder, the reality of which is discussed below.

Third, the failure to pass comprehensive immigration reform at the federal level, which presumably would reduce the volume of unauthorized migration, has been presented as a justification for S.B. 1070 or a lesson to be taken from it (the states will become restless if we do not finally pass such a bill). Likewise, the continued unauthorized border crossings show that the border is not completely controlled. (The existing level of effort, however, is enormous—\$11 billion budgeted dollars and 20,000 Border Patrol officers, mostly at the southwestern border, and 700 miles of wall—which suggests that this dominant political symbol of "border control" may never be possible in reality.) It is not clear that this justifies a state measure aimed at migrants rather than politicians, or that the promoters of S.B. 1070 in Arizona would actually support comprehensive immigration reform as proposed nationally. The national failure to enable many people to migrate legally and openly, however, is undeniable. Somewhat related to that, national polls find S.B. 1070 or related policies to have majority support; the majority of whites support it, but African Americans and Hispanics do not. It is an approach to the migration issue that does have a popular, if divided, constituency.

### **Arguments Against**

The criticisms of the law are many. Parts of the law face legal review in the courts. The matter of federal pre-

emption is mentioned above. Another legal concern is equal protection under the law. This matter may take time and experience to judge, but it is serious. The concern is that the "reasonable suspicion of being unauthorized" provision presents the possibility that Mexican-appearing people will be disproportionately detained for identification (either at the time of stop by the police or held until identification can be supplied, as required in the law). This is the concern with racial profiling. Such profiling would occur even though apparently "Mexican" people (whatever that really is, given anthropological rejection of simplistic categories of biological race) can be U.S. citizens, legal permanent residents, visitors, or unauthorized migrants. In other words, the mandated police process of "reasonable suspicion" leading to people being detained for long periods of time pending document checks will result distinguishing out and treating differently a specific class of people (apparent "Mexicans") from all people of whatever legal status and nationality. The arguments that this will not happen are two-fold. First, the reasonable suspicion is only to be exercised when the police are already lawfully stopping, detaining, or arresting a person, and thus in principle not to be used to pick people up arbitrarily. However, pretext lawful stops are a common tool of some police (e.g., driving "unsafe for conditions" and "noisy parties," inhibiting social gathering), as are unannounced checkpoints. In a state where the Maricopa Sheriff's department already treats Mexican-origin people unequally before the law, using such pretexts, sweeps, and so forth, concern that this provision will be null seems appropriate in many (but not all) areas.

Also, the law specifies that the police may not consider race, color, or national origin except to the extent allowed by the United States or Arizona constitutions. As pointed out above, this is ambiguous, because court decisions have allowed space for profiling of apparent national origin in immigration enforcement, in specific ways. Furthermore, legal provisions are one thing; police practice is another, in a state where a major law enforcement agency (the Arizona Department of Public Safety) agreed to a federal-court mandated consent order to cease and desist from racial profiling (U.S. District Court, Arizona, #CIV 01-01463 PCT-JAT). Most incidents of deviation from formal legal standards are not actually checked in courts because of the cost of lawyers and difficulty of accessing legal redress. This is not to say that most police departments will violate the letter or spirit of these provisions, but that there are units in Arizona in which we have reason not to have confidence. On a related matter, U.S. citizens do not currently need to carry identification (versus the various categories of legal immigrants and visitors); this law may



*Photo: Louie Gilot/BNHR - Protester using symbolism of American nationalism and law and order. May 1, 2010, El Paso, Texas.*

particularly impact Hispanic citizens, and may result in the introduction of a universal national identification system so such people can demonstrate their lawful presence. So, the question is, do we want a national ID?

Disrupting the relationships between local police and immigrant-heavy communities is a serious concern with this law. Community policing means developing relations of trust between police officers and community members, whatever their immigration status, so that people will speak honestly with police, report crimes, be forthcoming about issues like domestic violence, provide information on organized criminal activities (e.g., drug smugglers and enforcers), and so forth. Immigrants, even unauthorized ones or people with unauthorized migrants in their families, often develop meaningful relations of trust with police officers and departments, resulting in reduced crime rates. This is because immigrants understand that local officers do not enforce federal immigration laws. When local officers are required to enforce such laws, the relation of trust will be broken. For this reason, the Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police opposed S.B. 1070, as did a coalition of the chiefs of police of many of the major jurisdictions in the United States. More widely, several ma-

major police organizations have issued policy statements calling for clearly separating immigration enforcement as a federal matter from local policing, at least before arrest and conviction (the Major City Chiefs of Police; the Police Foundation). In addition to concerns about disrupting police-community relations, police departments are concerned about lack of officer familiarity with complex immigration laws and regulations, liability for accidental errors and officer misconduct, time spent in immigration questioning and processing that is not spent on other crimes, and the potentially huge municipal costs of detention and processing. Federal immigration authorities receive specialized training that local officers do not. They are developing a training program for local police now.

The fear of crime that helped promote S.B. 1070 did not have an empirical basis in reality. Crime (especially violent crime) has declined in Arizona in recent years. Border communities, with densest flow of the unauthorized migrants going through them, have remarkably low crime rates. The Associated Press reports that the four big cities with the lowest rates of violent crime are all in border states (San Diego, Phoenix, El Paso and Austin), and the border city of El Paso, with over 750,000 population, has had one homicide in the first half of 2010. Drug violence, though raging just across the boundary in Mexico, has not spilled over at all to U.S. border communities. It is the case that human and drug smuggling brings a particular brand of violence to Phoenix, a key transit point, but this has not spread beyond narrowly defined domains (e.g., holding smuggled migrants for payoffs, a form of kidnapping). Immigrants are the main victims in such cases, so that addressing the crimes by arresting the category of victims seems perverse. More generally, immigrants (including unauthorized migrants) have significantly lower age and gender-specific crime rates than U.S. citizens.

Specific prejudices against Mexico and Mexicans intersect with a widespread sense of fear and anxiety. Fear of immigrant crime and border violence are exacerbated by the media, in particular its tendency toward reporting the exciting (and thus frightening) "event of the moment," regardless of actual causes, patterns, or frequencies. Such representations play on the key symbol of the border as protection from external danger and disorder. Key Arizona politicians running for or holding elective office (Governor Brewer, Sheriffs Arpaio and Babeu, etc.) are also responsible for stirring up fear, often providing the media with unsupported "facts" and divisive rhetoric. The Pima County (Tucson area) Sheriff, Clarence Dupnik, expressed this pointedly: "this is a media-created event. I hear politicians on TV say that the border has gotten worse; well the face of the matter is that the border has never been

more secure." Fear of social change, and desire for walls (physical and metaphorical) to block such change, are fundamental drivers of reaction against migration.

Concern about state and local budget expenditures for social services is an important force driving state and local immigration-restriction laws and ordinances. This is not directly expressed in S.B. 1070, unlike some other laws (e.g., Proposition 187 in California); however, it certainly is present in the politics surrounding it. There are two lines of analysis of this topic: the net fiscal balance of tax revenues and costs, and more broadly, the net economic contributions and costs of immigrants, and feelings about who deserves social redistribution such as health services or public education. The former are highly technical questions, heavily influenced by data estimates and modeling assumptions. The general pattern of studies is that all effects are modest in every direction, and do not justify extreme measures. The federal government receives the main fiscal surplus, states generally run a surplus also, and the main fiscal loss is to municipalities and school districts, where limited services are provided. Unauthorized immigrants do pay taxes, particularly ones that benefit states and municipalities (sales taxes, property taxes as homeowners or indirectly as rent). Income taxes are ambiguous; some unauthorized migrants work off the books (as do many citizens and legal residents), but many others do have federal and state income taxes withheld, often via false social security numbers that result in large unclaimed surpluses going to the government (it is estimated that unauthorized migrants have made most of the enormous, half-trillion dollar contribution to Social Security via incorrect numbers, so they cannot receive money in the future despite their contributions). Likewise, careful studies have found that unauthorized immigrants are a net economic benefit, but this is inequitably distributed; and that low skilled Latino, U.S. citizen or legal resident workers are the most negatively impacted by competition from the unauthorized workers, whom they actually support in polls and in community organizations. Thus, although it may be convenient to scapegoat unauthorized migrants for the collapse of the real estate bubble in Arizona and elsewhere, and the economic effects of that collapse, this is badly misplaced. In the longer run, immigrants, as young adults who work at a high rate, as well as being homeowners and taxpayers of the future, are crucial to maintaining the demographic balance of earners and receivers in our contemporary, low-birth rate society.

Deservingness or not, belonging or not, are of course key topics for anthropologists. The core issue is the distinction between legal status and actual participation. Unauthorized migrants participate in our lives, and we in theirs.



*Photo: Louie Gilot/BNHR - Protestor linking racism and criminality, May 1, 2010, El Paso, Texas.*

They work in businesses that we own, or from which we purchase goods and services, and this applies both directly (e.g., at many restaurants) and indirectly, as part of the entire web of the economy. They live in houses and apartments that we rent out, even sell, and which are located in our neighborhoods and wider urban systems. Their children attend schools with our children, and they become our high school and college students. Their careful law-abidingness accounts for much of the increasing safety of our communities. Demographically, they renew our populations, and personally, bring the joy of children and youth to an aging society. Legality, however, draws an absolute line of separation across these bonds of interchange, sociality, and mutual recognition as humans and community members. Legality, as we have seen, is desired by almost all the unauthorized, but for most of them impossible to obtain, unless and until we have comprehensive reform. Therefore, illegalization creates a group of less-than-people in the midst of the “real” human beings. The question is, do unauthorized migrants deserve emergency medical services or K-12 public education, two services that by law and court decision are open to all, unlike most public benefits, even at this time not received by unauthorized people; conflicts over even these minimal entitlements drive intense desires either to drive out such non-beings or to make them absolutely abject, absolutely deprived. The existence of this debate signals a possible tendency toward apartheid. Unauthorized or temporary migrants are an “outsider-inside” population. They are “inside” when working, but are outsiders as far as social belonging. This possible apartheid is reinforced by the slippage from the explicit criterion of legality to the unspoken racism in the assumption that all “illegals” are “Mexicans” and many “Mexicans” are “illegal.”

## **Implications for Applied Anthropologists and other Applied Social Scientists**

Laws and ordinances of various sorts aimed at unauthorized migrants are spreading across U.S. states and localities. Responding to such initiatives is an important task for applied social scientists—indeed, beyond responding to them, we should be anticipating and forestalling them. This points to collaborative work with communities. Alliances need to be developed with immigrant community members and organizations, and supportive institutions, including ones that previously had not necessarily been considered relevant, such as local police departments. The applied social science should emerge from the needs of specific alliances and situations; it can include elements such as research, synthesis of existing research sources (policy briefs), content and issue analysis, public education in ways that resemble existing teaching, other forms of communication, meeting with elected officials, and so forth. It also draws us into public policy at all levels, including municipal, state, federal, and even transnational policy (as we work with migrant political organizations across borders).

The state and local initiatives are an attack on the whole life of people. Federal enforcement is comparable, of course, insofar as it involves the absolutely drastic act of removal, but the panoply of proposed state and local laws specifically aim to disrupt or deprive people of many different features of daily life, including employment, housing, transportation, health, business ownership, education, and so forth. They aim to eliminate or severely restrict the normal functions required of existence. While an interpretation that such laws attack the reproductive dimensions of immigrants as opposed to affecting the labor supply is too simple—since there are laws attacking employment and seeking arrest and removal altogether—it does capture an important tendency in recent proposals. That is to attack immigrants’ “being here,” in a community, the totality of life. Arguably, the goal of such laws is to drive away these stigmatized insider-outsiders by harassing them, by making their lives insecure, miserable, impossible.

It therefore seems central that we work collectively to defend a positive vision of productive, satisfying, dignified, and contributive community life on the part of all persons, citizens, legal immigrants, and unauthorized immigrants. A vision of shared community seems fundamental here. I have previously called this mutual moral recognition, a recognition of what we give and get from each other in our communities. Anthropologist Jeffrey Cohen in a perceptive comment on S.B. 1070, suggests that S.B.

1070 reduces wide issues of migration and immigration law reform, involving many actors and forces, to an isolated group, migrants, a targeting that makes an already vulnerable group even more vulnerable. As he suggests, we need to push the debate toward deeper issues, including global connections and the economics of migration, and issues of the moral economy (e.g., open, fair, dignified labor). It is also important to make the public aware that this is a shared issue, not just an immigrant or even Latino issue; that we all benefit from equal protection and fair policing.

Various sorts of stigmas and invidious distinctions are raised by S.B. 1070. The legal/unauthorized distinction is, of course, obvious in the bill, and is discussed above. On the other hand, the bill hides its racism, in particular in the clause against racial or national origin profiling (readily enough bypassed by an outrageous police unit like the Maricopa County Sheriff's Department). Yet among a large segment of the U.S. population—though by no means all—Mexican is identical with foreigner with illegal alien (speaking here of symbols, and not realities). There is a nativist and also skin color-racist hostility to Mexican-origin people in some corners of the United States, just as the Mexican-origin population of the country grows in size and importance. We have seen this before, in hateful reactions to the Irish, Chinese, southern and eastern Europeans, and others. Other elements of prejudice, including a horror of poor, working people, and fear of women, children, and demographic change, also have to be confronted. Yet the other side of this great struggle is advocacy for immigrants, as symbolized by Emma Lazarus's poem inscribed on the Statue of Liberty. To advocate for an ample, inclusive, and creative vision of the American community, one that benefits from adding new peoples and demands for new opportunities and rights, is a vital task at this time. U.S. history demonstrates the practical worth and humanistic beauty of this inclusive vision.

Certainly, we know far more about immigrants than hosts, which hobbles our ability to understand and contribute to the public debate. Difficult as it may be, we need to understand better the people who respond to immigrants with powerful emotions and viewpoints of rigid exclusion, and to be comprehensive, also those in the host community who are folk cosmopolitans, who reach across such

would-be distinctions. It appears from the timing of S.B. 1070 (though not all such state and local initiatives) that scapegoating was key; Arizona is one of the states most badly impacted by the bursting of the real estate bubble and the human suffering of mortgage foreclosures. Obviously, in a rational view, unauthorized immigrants had almost nothing to do with this. But we need to recognize, understand, and fend off scapegoating. Also, anxieties about the U.S.-Mexico border are central to S.B. 1070. Much better understanding of how to fight back against the powerful distortions induced by the news media, perhaps in collaboration with communications scholars and professionals, is called for.

A symbolic analysis of border fears is unavoidable and necessary; the border readily represents the boundary between safe interior and threatening exterior (especially in a period of corrosive globalization), and people and other materials that cross such a symbolic border are dangerous and polluting matter out of place. Though largely unrelated to migration, a violence-producing, ineffective drug policy makes things worse, and needs also to be addressed. Such conceptual frameworks are hard to resist, but that must be done if we are to have realistic and humane relations with Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. The first step is envisioning the border, together with immigrant communities, as the future of us all. It is indeed a good future.

*Josiah Heyman is Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Sociology and Anthropology Department, University of Texas at El Paso. His scholarship on border and immigration enforcement issues, as well as other aspects of anthropology, includes three books and over fifty scholarly articles and book chapters. He has done ethnographic field research with officers of U.S. border agencies, as well as other regional topics. He is a member of the Border and Immigration Task Force and President of the Board for the Border Network for Human Rights, and was former chair of the SfAA Public Policy Committee. His vision of positive, practical alternatives to current migration policies can be found in his book, Finding a Moral Heart for U.S. Immigration Policy (American Anthropological Association, 1998).*

*These issue briefings are commissioned by the SfAA's Human Rights and Social Justice Committee in an effort to educate our members, our students, and the general public on timely matters relating to social justice or human rights. It is the hope that policymakers, media, and the general public will come to appreciate an anthropological perspective on contemporary issues. If you are interested in writing a policy briefing please contact the HR/SJ committee chair Mark Schuller at mschuller@york.cuny.edu.*

## FOR FURTHER READING:

### GENERAL RESOURCE WEBSITES:

<http://www.altoarizona.com/> (Alto Arizona—action against S.B. 1070)  
<http://www.bnhr.org/> (Border Network for Human Rights)  
<http://www.borderaction.org/web/index.php> (Border Action Network)  
<http://frontera.nmsu.edu/> (Border news service, with archives)  
<http://lib.nmsu.edu/subject/bord/> (Comprehensive border-related links and bibliography)  
<http://www.dhs.gov/> (Department of Homeland Security)  
<http://www.migrationinformation.org/> (Migration Information Source)  
<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/> (Migration Policy Institute)  
<http://www.immigrationforum.org/> (National Immigration Forum)  
<http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/> (Immigration Policy Center)  
<http://www.pewhispanic.org/> (Pew Hispanic Institute)  
<http://www.race-talk.org/?cat=1332> (Race Talk blog, organizing immigrants category)

### SPECIFIC TOPICAL WEBSITES:

#### (1) Texts of S.B. 1070 and H.B. 2216

<http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/sb1070s.pdf>  
<http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/hb2162c.pdf>

#### (2) Legal analysis of S.B. 1070

Chin, Gabriel J., Hessick, Carissa Byrne, Massaro, Toni M. and Miller, Marc L., Arizona Senate Bill 1070: A Preliminary Report (June 8, 2010). <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1617440>

#### (3) State and local immigration initiatives

<http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?TabID=756&tabs=951,119,851>  
[http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/statelaws\\_home.cfm](http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/statelaws_home.cfm)

#### (4) Economic effects of unauthorized migration

Hanson, Gordon H., "The Economics and Policy of Illegal Immigration in the United States," University of California-San Diego and National Bureau of Economic Research, December 2009  
<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/Hanson-Dec09.pdf>

Hinojosa-Ojeda, Raúl "Raising the Floor for American Workers: The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform," <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/01/pdf/immigrationeconreport.pdf>

#### (5) Fiscal benefits and costs, services used/not by unauthorized migrants

<http://www.ncsl.org/IssuesResearch/Immigration/StateStudiesOnFiscalImpacts/tabid/17271/Default.aspx>

Griswold, Daniel, "The Fiscal Impact of Immigration Reform: The Real Story," *Free Trade Bulletin*, No. 30, May 21, 2007, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/ftb/FTB-030.pdf>

#### (6) Separating Local Police from Immigration Policing

<http://www.policefoundation.org/pdf/strikingabalance/Role%20of%20Local%20Police.pdf>  
[http://www.houstontx.gov/police/pdfs/mcc\\_position.pdf](http://www.houstontx.gov/police/pdfs/mcc_position.pdf)  
[http://www.leei.us/main/media/AACOP\\_STATEMENT\\_ON\\_SENATE\\_BILL\\_1070.pdf](http://www.leei.us/main/media/AACOP_STATEMENT_ON_SENATE_BILL_1070.pdf)

#### (7) Immigration and Crime

Rumbaut, Rubén G., "Undocumented Immigration and Rates of Crime and Imprisonment: Popular Myths and Empirical Realities," Appendix D in The Police Foundation, *The Role of Local Police: Striking a Balance Between Immigration Enforcement and Civil Liberties*. <http://www.policefoundation.org/pdf/strikingabalance/Appendix D.pdf>

Mendoza, Martha [Associated Press], "US-Mexico border isn't so dangerous," June 3, 2010.

<http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/2010/06/03/20100603mexico-border-not-so-dangerous.html>

#### (8) Unauthorized migration and health issues

<http://accessdeniedblog.wordpress.com/>



## **PRINT SOURCES:**

- Andreas, Peter, Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000).
- Chavez, Leo R., Shadowed Lives: Undocumented Immigrants in American Society (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 1998).
- Cohen, Jeffrey, "Regardless of our stance on immigration, the SB1070 is unconstitutional," blog posting at Race Talk, <http://www.race-talk.org/?p=4217>
- Coleman, Mathew, "What Counts as Geopolitics, and Where? Devolution and the Securitization of Immigration After 9/11." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 99: 904 – 913, 2009.
- Coleman, Mathew, "Immigration Geopolitics Beyond the Mexico-US Border," Antipode 38: 54-76, 2007.
- De Genova, Nicholas, and Nathalie Peutz, eds., The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).
- Dunn, Timothy J., The Militarization of the U.S.-Mexico Border, 1978-1992: Low-Intensity Conflict Doctrine Comes Home (Austin: CMAS Books, University of Texas at Austin, 1996).
- Dunn, Timothy J., Blockading the Border and Human Rights: The El Paso Operation that Remade Immigration Enforcement (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009).
- Rubio Goldsmith, Pat, Mary Romero, Raquel Rubio-Goldsmith, Manuel Escobedo, and Laura Khoury, "Ethno-Racial Profiling and State Violence in a Southwest Barrio," Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies, 34: 93-123, 2009.
- Heyman, Josiah McC., Finding a Moral Heart for U.S. Immigration Policy: An Anthropological Perspective (Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association, 1998).
- Heyman, Josiah McC., "Constructing a Virtual Wall: Race and Citizenship in U.S.-Mexico Border Policing," Journal of the Southwest 50: 305-334, 2008.
- Hing, Bill Ong, Ethical Borders: NAFTA, Globalization, and Mexican Migration (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2010).
- Lamphere, Louise, ed., Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
- Maril, Robert Lee, Patrolling Chaos: The U.S. Border Patrol in Deep South Texas (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2004).
- Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Nolan J Malone, Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002).
- Nevens, Joseph, Operation Gatekeeper: the Rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the Making of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary (New York: Routledge, 2002).
- Núñez, Guillermina Gina, and Josiah McC. Heyman, "Entrapment Processes and Immigrant Communities in a Time of Heightened Border Vigilance," Human Organization 66: 354-365, 2007.
- O'Leary, Anna Ochoa, "The ABCs of Migration costs: Assembling, Bajadores, and Coyotes," Migration Letters 6: 27-36, 2009.
- O'Leary, Anna Ochoa, "Arizona's Legislative-Imposed Injunctions: Implications for Immigrant Civic and Political Participation," <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/news/docs/ochoa%20tucson1.pdf>
- Spener, David, Clandestine Crossings: Migrants and Coyotes on the Texas-Mexico Border, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.
- Staudt, Kathleen Tony Payan, and Z. Anthony Kruszewski. eds., Human Rights Along the U.S.-Mexico Border: Gendered Violence and Insecurity (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009).
- Unterberger, Alayne, ed., NAPA Bulletin, Number 31 [Invisible Anthropologists: Engaged Anthropology in Immigrant Communities], September 2009.
- Varsanyi, Monica, Taking Local Control: Immigration Policy Activism in U.S. Cities and States (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010).
- Vélez-Ibáñez, Carlos G., Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996).
- Zolniski, Christian, Janitors, Street Vendors, and Activists: The Lives of Mexican Immigrants in Silicon Valley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).