



Journal of
Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology

January/February, 2016

Economic Nomads:
A Theoretical Deconstruction of the Immigration Debacle
Brian G. Sellers, Eastern Michigan University
Bruce A. Arrigo, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Abstract

The resurgent hysteria surrounding the illegal immigration issue in the United States is grossly distorted by myths circulated via mass media and ambitious politicians. Among these are the myths that illegal immigrants do not pay taxes, are highly involved in crime, threaten available jobs, undermine American values, and are a drain on social services. Irregular immigration is a multi-dimensional problem whose analysis requires a critical re-reading so that attention to several of the problem's under-examined and thus under-theorized spheres of influence (i.e., the symbolic, linguistic, material, and cultural realms) can be better specified and more fully interrogated. This article endeavors to undertake such a provisional task. In so doing, the article intends to resituate the illegal immigration debate within a theoretical framework that both de/reconstructs the various spheres of constitutive influence that form, reform and discursively reify this debacle. As we demonstrate, reliance on an interdisciplinary approach to and an integrative assessment of these influences yields a more complete portrait of the immigration issue.

Keywords: Illegal immigration, social control, neoliberalism, globalization, transnationalism, cosmopolitanism, state sovereignty, labeling

Contact:

Brian G. Sellers, Ph.D.
Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology, & Criminology
Eastern Michigan University
712 Pray-Harrod
Ypsilanti, MI 48104
bseller3@emich.edu
734-487-1217

Economic nomads: A theoretical deconstruction of the immigration debacle

Currently, the United States of America is host to an estimated 10-12 million unauthorized immigrants (Tichenor, 2008). Nongovernmental sources suggest that this number is actually larger given that efforts to accurately measure the number of illegal immigrants in the U.S. are flawed and can only provide an approximation (Nadadur, 2009). Additionally, Hispanics have surpassed African Americans as the largest minority population in the U.S. (Buckler, Unnever, & Cullen, 2008). In recent years, the U.S. has militarized its borders, enacted restrictive immigration policies, and some locales in the American Southwest have passed legislation guaranteeing severe penalties for illegal immigrants.

The hysteria surrounding the immigration issue has been enhanced by myths circulated by the media and politicians. Among these are the myths that illegal immigrants do not pay taxes, are highly involved in crime, and are a drain on social services (Tichenor, 2008). On the contrary, 2002 Census Bureau data revealed that in that year roughly 3.8 households headed by illegal immigrants produced \$6.4 billion in Social Security taxes (Wilson, 2009). Furthermore, in 2006, the Immigration Policy Center reported that if the 1.4 million undocumented immigrants were not in Texas, the state would have lost \$17.7 billion in state revenues (2007, p. 3). Moreover, nativist fear-mongering neglects to point out that undocumented immigrants pay not only payroll and income tax but also sales, excise, and property taxes (Wilson, 2009). In fact, 90% of wages earned by illegal immigrants are spent in the U.S. (Nadadur, 2009). When it comes to whether illegal immigrants take advantage of public services, a 2000 Health Affairs study found that illegal immigrants are far less likely to use any health-care service for fear of being discovered and deported (Berk, Schur, Chavez, & Frankel, 2000). In regard to crime, media reports grossly misrepresent the criminality of undocumented immigrants. For instance, less than 6% of prisoners are foreign-born and only a small fraction of that group is in the U.S. illegally (Golash-Boza, 2009). Perhaps more intriguing are the practices of Sheriff Joe Arpaio in Maricopa County, Arizona. Arpaio has used state laws to require any victim or witness reporting a crime to prove their immigration status (Golash-Boza, 2009). As a result illegal immigrants rarely, if ever, report crimes; therefore, their victimizations go uninvestigated by Arizona law enforcement.

Regardless of the fact that these popular myths surrounding illegal immigration have been debunked by scholarly studies, restrictive immigration policies still remain and new laws are still being drafted. With the upcoming 2016 presidential election, some politicians have once again unearthed these erroneous myths to cultivate nationalistic pride, bigoted fear, and ethnocentric rhetoric for political gain. Concerns for racial profiling, hate crimes, and violations of Fourteenth Amendment rights have brought the larger immigration debate to the forefront. In order to understand the current dilemma over illegal immigration, one cannot rely merely on a single theory. Instead, an interdisciplinary and integrative approach is required so a more complete portrait of the immigration issue can be painted.¹ This article endeavors to undertake such a provisional task in hopes of situating the debate over illegal immigration within a more comprehensive theoretical framework that both de/reconstructs the various spheres of constitutive influence that form, reform and discursively reify this debacle.

¹ Integrative and interdisciplinary theorizing in criminology is not new (e.g., Barak, 2009; Robinson 2003; Walsh & Ellis, 2006). What is new is the emphasis placed on multi-dimensional analysis as a basis to critically re-problematize the otherwise static (as opposed to dynamic) construction of the social person. This includes the unexamined (and thus under-theorized) possibilities in the phenomenology of perception, choice, and action. For recent applications of multi-dimensional analysis in criminology, see, Arrigo and Bersot (in press) and in socio-legal studies, see, Arrigo and Trull (2015).

Theoretical Approach

Hyper-vigilant responses to illegal immigration are rooted in a number of socio-cultural forces or spheres of influence that condition, and thus control, the structuration (Giddens, 1984) of the social person (i.e., self/society mutuality). In order to examine the harm that follows from excessive investments in such structurations, the theoretical concepts that give meaning to this debilitating condition of control necessitate de/reconstruction. Four spheres of mutually dependent and overlapping influence can be identified. These include the cultural, material, linguistic, and symbolic realms. Each sphere of influence helps to “co-produce” the self/society mutuality (i.e. social person). On the one hand, co-production refers to the constitutive composition of the dynamic social person whereby bodies of knowledge elucidate the hidden meaning of politically-motivated symbolism that justifies harm (Henry & Milovanovic, 1996). On the other hand, co-production draws attention to the re-constitutive effects of the sociological imagination and its capacity to awaken individuals to the complexity of systemic and structural harm-generating/sustaining forces at play, including one’s interactive contribution and interdependent connection to them (Arrigo & Milovanovic, 2010; Giddens, 1984; Mills, 1959) Diagram 1 details the function of these interconnected forces and positions their meaning within anthropological, economic, social, political, criminological, and philosophical theory.

The four interdependent spheres of influence include shared history and space (Cultural realm); political economy and an ethic of control (Material realm); politically-charged rhetoric surrounding issues of sovereignty, space, and citizenship (Linguistic realm); and derogatory labeling (Symbolic realm). Combined, these spheres of influence generate the *socius* (society + I + us) (see Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, 1987) wherein the self/society mutuality (the twin dynamics), which embodies the human agent and the larger structural and/or organizational forces, are intimately connected to the panoptic culture of control that perseveres. Individuals are situated within a larger societal context imposing a culture of control, which entails the ‘digital self’ (Baudrillard, 1983), the replication of surveillance (Foucault, 1973), the reconfiguration of system-reinforcing narratives (Derrida, 1977, 1978), and the psycho-dynamically derived political-economic forces that nurture and sustain them all (Fromm, 1994). The diagram represents a perpetual feedback loop whereby the four spheres and the twin dynamics interact fluidly such that each inform and contribute to the composition of the others. Directional arrows signify this process-oriented movement and they (these arrows) reveal the possible paths that structurate the conditions of control and that make possible their dis/re-assembly. As we argue, these conditions underpin the constitutive mapping of illegal immigration. In what follows, we explain each sphere guided by critical theory and grounded in historical context.


The Cultural Sphere

The U.S. and Mexico have endured a tense relationship with each other for over 150 years. This historical relationship is rooted in international war, the loss of major land holdings, the exploitation of Mexican workers, vast economic and political problems, and a host of U.S. policy shifts that have only exacerbated the divisiveness present in current U.S.-Mexican relations. The blood split, the denial of equitable economic and social rights, and the transnational harm imposed on the weaker of these nations has situated the issue of illegal immigration in a larger historical context by which class conflict should be investigated to better understand the cultural and geographical ties that intertwine these two economically interdependent nations.

Prior to the mid-1800s, Mexico proudly claimed the territories of modern-day California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and parts of Wyoming, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Texas. Early

Westward expansion settlers, from the U.S., settled in these Mexican lands. These hundreds of thousands of American settlers were provided free land under the agreement that they would obey Mexican law and eventually apply for Mexican citizenship (Organista, 2007). While only some

DIAGRAM 1:
DECONSTRUCTING ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION



Note. Adapted from Arrigo and Milovanovic (2010, p. xiv) and Arrigo (2010).

settlers complied with these requests, the majority of American settlers entered Mexico illegally with no intention of applying for Mexican citizenship (Organista, 2007). How ironic it is that the current immigration debates conveniently ignores this historical fact. Nonetheless, the activities of early American immigrants on Mexican lands later proved an ulterior resolve to satiate desires of manifest destiny. Therefore, rather than acquiesce to Mexican immigration laws, these pioneers sought to settle the land on their own terms and take it by force if necessary.

Unsurprisingly, the conflict over rights to land led to bloodshed and warfare. The Texas Revolution of 1836 was sparked by the Battle of the Alamo, which later led to the defeat of Santa Anna at the Battle of San Jacinto (Organista, 2007). Britain, France, and the U.S recognized the newly independent Republic of Texas. However, efforts by Texans to join the U.S. instigated the Mexican government, which in turn threatened military action if the U.S. attempted to annex the territory (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). The 1845 annexation of Texas subsequently resulted in President James K. Polk mobilizing U.S. troops at the Rio Grande boundary, whereby this provocation swiftly initiated the Mexican-American War (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007; Organista, 2007). Outmatched and outnumbered, the resource-depleted Mexican army was decimated by the much larger American forces. The 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the war and coerced Mexico to surrender the territories that now make up the current American Southwest (Organista, 2007; Wilson, 2009). Approximately 75,000 to 100,000 Mexicans living in these areas instantaneously became American citizens by default and were consequently subjected to harsh property taxes that many were unable to pay leading to numerous land seizures leaving them dispossessed (Organista, 2007). The national status of this entire population of Mexicans (i.e., newly classified Chicanos) was suddenly changed; however, they continued to maintain kinship and friendship bonds to their country of origin even when faced with hostile, discriminatory laws and practices under the new governance of the U.S. (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007).

Thus, the American Southwest is a geographic space commonly shared by both of these societies and shaped by the cultural influences of each over time. While both Mexican and American governments throughout various points in history claimed this region, the land still remains intimately tied to members of both societies. In other words, whether it was American immigrants living in Mexico or Mexican immigrants living in America, the land of this region was worked and occupied by both and continues to be presently. As such, cultural customs and traditions (e.g., cuisine, music, literature, art, and architecture) from these societies have been shared and enjoyed by individuals living in this region. Of course a national border arbitrarily separates the land between these two nation-states, but it does not restrict cultural influences communicated through human interaction and a shared past.

Therefore, diverse people are capable of experiencing common issues and problems that transcend time and space if they are willing to search for commonalities that do not restrict lived experience to only individual identities but extend them to a larger collective existence. This cosmopolitanism (see Beck, 1992; Delanty, 2009, 2006) enables the individual to retain cultural roots in his or her country of origin while endeavoring to adopt aspects of other cultures so that one may live through a more enlightened global perspective. Hence the individual is no longer bound by local or national habits or prejudices that foster mistrust, racist ideologies, and nativism, which are grounded on ignorance and a lack of historical perspective (Alarcon & Novak, 2010). People are blinded to such a perspective when they are raised in societies where prejudice (i.e., an arbitrary belief or feeling toward an ethnic group or its individual members) is built into the culture as a normative notion of what 'ought to be' (Alarcon & Novak, 2010, p. 98). In such social environments, individuals are socialized to adhere to behaviors or norms defined by members of the in-group in comparison to those prevalent among the out-group.

The U.S. is an Anglo-dominant culture preoccupied by notions of immigrant assimilation or acculturation, which are resistant to a critical cosmopolitan imagination (Delanty, 2006, 2009) necessary to realize global and collective group existence. As a result, many Americans approach the

issue of immigration through the lens of various threat hypotheses commensurate with xenophobic and prejudicial notions of foreigners as “others” in need of control. There are several such hypotheses: (1) economic threat hypothesis, (2) the culture threat hypothesis, (3) the core American values hypothesis, (4) the ethnic affect hypothesis, (5) the culture affinity hypothesis, (6) the contact hypothesis, and (7) the group threat hypothesis.

The economic threat hypothesis claims that individuals who perceive illegal immigration as a threat to American jobs and the American tax system, whereby immigrants will steal jobs from otherwise worthy American workers while neglecting to pay taxes necessary for the social security system are more likely to support enhanced control measures (Binder, Polinard, & Wrinkle, 1997; Buckler, 2008; Citren, Green, Muste, & Wong, 1997). Similarly, the culture threat hypothesis affords the logic that people who fear that immigrants will undermine the existing social order and moral standards are also more likely to support enhanced controls on immigration (Buckler, 2008; Chander & Tsai, 2001; Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996). Additionally, the core American values hypothesis suggests that those scoring high on levels of individualism and symbolic patriotism are more likely to emphasize concerns for better immigrant control strategies (Buckler, 2008; Pantoja, 2006) The ethnic affect hypothesis argues that people who maintain negative or stereotypical attitudes toward migrant groups are more likely to be in favor of restrictive immigration policies (Buckler, 2008; Citren et al., 1997; Golash-Boza, 2006). The cultural affinity hypothesis maintains that the more acculturated Hispanics become to American society the more likely they are to reflect the same values and attitudes that Whites have regarding immigration policy (Branton, 2007; de la Garza, 1985). Conversely, the contact hypothesis suggests that individuals who have had contact with recent migrants are less likely to be supportive of harsh immigration laws (Rothbart & John, 1993). On the other hand, the group threat hypothesis holds that individuals with increased contact to minority racial and ethnic groups will perceive them as a threat and garner greater support for stricter immigration control (Blumer, 1958; Kinder & Mendelberg, 1995).

A recent study found support for the economic threat, cultural threat, ethnic affect, core values, and cultural affinity hypotheses, but did not find support for the contact hypothesis (Buckler, Swatt, & Salinas, 2009). Such findings reveal the ethnocentric approach that many Americans take in regard to immigration policy. Furthermore, empirical support for these prejudicially-charged hypotheses reflects the overemphasized presence of individualism which clouds peoples’ ability to situate themselves within the larger self/society mutuality via a culturally cosmopolitan outlook on the world and the human condition. The lack of vision and reflection enables the necessary conditions for a hyper-vigilant risk society to exist.

C. Wright Mills’ *Sociological Imagination* (1959) elucidates the fact that the everyday monotony of one’s life is clouded by an overall inability to overcome troubles predominantly limited by the immediate constraints of a job, one’s family, and one’s neighborhood, whereby the resulting sense of powerlessness renders the individual trapped and incapable of overcoming her everyday obstacles, let alone worry about the larger interplay between individuals and the society at large. The preoccupation with daily interpersonal struggles often distracts the individual from truly seeing or understanding the larger picture. As a result, the milieu of helplessness that engulfs the individual reflects a deeper inability to cope with the reality that structural forces underpinning his or her exploitation are beyond one’s control.

Thus, change presents a unique opportunity for people. The hyper-reality of our ever-changing world has outpaced peoples’ ability to situate themselves with the evolving values and standards of human decency appropriate for the times (Sellers, 2015). In fact, this phenomenon leaves most in fear of change because newer, uncharted paths are ambiguous and may cause individuals to question past, commonly held value systems (Sellers, 2015). Traditional values, which are cherished, are felt to be threatened and unnecessarily so. People are simply overwhelmed by the complexity of systemic problems and rather than embracing change, people cling to often antiquated beliefs that stand as hallmarks of past conservative views (Sellers, 2015). This regression in

enlightened thought dominates the current period in the human condition, whereby people are inundated with numerous sources of information but lack the quality of mind to help them use the information to develop the evolved reasoning necessary to achieve lucid and cogent summations of what is actually going on in the world. Simply put, we must elevate our thinking.

It is in this dynamic that Mills (1959) acknowledges the sociological imagination, which enables a person to better understand how people surrender to a false consciousness of one's social position. Such an approach requires us to comprehend our placement in the world by focusing on that which makes us feel uneasy so that we may rid ourselves of indifference and become active agents, involved in the public issues of our time. In other words, we must combat our comfort zones, which are blanketed in cognitive dissonance, and make a conscious effort to understand our own experiences and gauge our fate. Only by knowing the chances of all individuals in similar circumstances can one truly be awakened to his or her personal chances in the period at hand. Inherently, the individual shapes her society just as it shapes her.

The intellectual journey that Mills (1959) speaks of requires one to grasp the intersection of biography and history within a greater societal context. Thus, a life without reflection (e.g., social inquiry and/or critique) is incomplete and void of personal growth. In order to become imaginatively aware, we must inquire about the structure of society, how society's components work, how these mechanisms are changing, how does this current societal structure stand in human history, what varieties of people are prevalent in this current society, what types of human nature are revealed, and what is the meaning of human nature? Such queries are postulated in hope of grasping an understanding of what is going on in the world. Only by achieving this new way of thinking can the individual become awakened to a more fruitful self-consciousness and a mentality capable of deciphering, assessing, and comprehending adequate summations of reality. Thus, our current time is undergoing a period of uneasiness and indifference. Those unfortunate ones who are indifferent to the challenges social change presents may actually be worse off because their apathy blinds them and possibly condemns them to a perpetual malaise of inaction.

The Material Sphere

In order to understand the current tide of xeno-racism undergirding the debate on immigration, we must unearth the material basis by which historical conceptions of "the other" are actualized and further utilized by the elite to sustain power and privilege (Weber & Bowling, 2008). Thus, market-based forces are also at the root of the current dilemma and maintain a historical relevance as modern neoliberal capitalism continues to undergo its globalized transformation. Where there are markets for capital, there are also markets for labor that equally succumb to fluctuations in capital accumulation, shifts in economic growth, and power dynamics. To better articulate this phenomenon, one must once again refer to history, place the discussion within a social context, and offer a Marxist critique of political economy while exposing the economically-driven manipulation of our current risk society.

The 20th Century was marked by many periods of Mexican labor migration in response to market needs in the U.S. Between 1910 and 1920, while Mexico underwent its own revolution, the U.S. federal authorities lifted immigration restrictions so Mexicans could enter and perform farm-related work due to the agricultural labor shortage caused by U.S. entry into World War I. Similarly, improvements in the canning and shipping technologies resulted in government authorities permitting unfettered Mexican immigration in order to provide cheap labor to the developing Southwestern U.S. in the 1920s. This policy contradicts the aims of the Immigration Act of 1924, which sought to bar immigration from Asians and southern or eastern Europeans. Mexican labor was cheaper and much needed in the southwest. The 1928 law surrounding "the National Origins-Mexican Quota situation" revealed that America, as a Western power, wanted to be a White civilization but reluctantly had to rely on cheap and mobile Mexican labor to continue to develop at

the rapid pace it desired. However, the Great Depression era and its related contractions in capitalism's growth resulted in Congress passing legislation that made undocumented immigration a felony offense and massive deportation programs, under the pseudonym of "repatriation," led to the scapegoating of Mexican immigrants for the country's economic problems. However, entry into World War II in the 1940s, once again, caused labor shortages in U.S. agricultural markets, which led to a bi-national labor agreement with Mexico called The Bracero Program (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007, p. 106; Organista, 2007, p. 193; Tichenor, 2008, pp. 43-45).

The Bracero Accord was negotiated under the promise that the U.S. would provide wages, living conditions, workplace safety, and medical services comparable to standards native workers enjoyed, while the Mexican government administered the recruitment and contracting of Mexican laborers (i.e., braceros; Tichenor, 2008). However, the protections promised to Mexican workers under the accord were never honored and braceros received negligible wages and were forced to survive in substandard living conditions (Tichenor, 2008). The Bracero Program was intended to be temporary, but it remained in operation well into the 1960s while roughly 4.2 to 4.5 million Mexican workers were imported to the U.S. (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007; Tichenor, 2008). The Bracero Program was even able to overcome labor union pressure from the American Federation of Labor (AFL) that claimed Mexican braceros and unauthorized immigrants had "depressed wages and destroyed working conditions" (Tichenor, 2008). In spite of such efforts from labor lobbies, the powerful interests of the farming industry allowed the Bracero Program to remain.

It was not until 1964 and 1965 that broad sweeping immigration reform was enacted under the Presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson. Among these reforms, the Bracero Program was terminated and the Immigration and National Act was successfully amended so that numerical limits were placed on immigration from the Western Hemisphere (i.e., Mexico in particular), which forced Mexicans to compete over scarce visas (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007; Nadadur, 2009; Tichenor, 2008). Regardless of these changes, Mexican workers continued to cross the border for work opportunities. As a result, the unauthorized labor market simply shifted to a de facto guest worker program centered on the circulation of undocumented labor, and it became so prolific that by the end of the 20th century two-thirds of all Mexicans knew someone who had been in the U.S. and approximately 60% were socially connected to someone in the U.S. (Massey, Durand, & Malone, 2002).

The 1970s and 1980s proved to be tumultuous times for both the U.S. and Mexican economies. In the U.S., stagflation resulted in a wave of plant closings resulted in millions of manufacturing jobs being exported or simply eliminated in an effort to obtain realignment of power between workers and investors because there were massive declines in investment opportunities in the U.S. (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). This globalized effort to seek investment in new markets unveiled an underlying principle in neoliberal capitalism. Capitalists invested in the size of industry but not in labor. When the rate of profit fell, capitalists merely shifted and invested in new markets (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). Globalization opened markets and made such transitions more readily available to capitalists and their interests. The globalization of markets will be critiqued further in subsequent areas.

In an attempt to improve its international credit, the Mexican government engaged in massive increases in government spending that led to trade imbalances, an out-of-control deficit, and a devaluation of the peso by the late 1970s (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). Mexico discovered vast reserves of oil, yet its over-investment in oil infrastructure quickly led to bankruptcy when the price of oil plunged on the international market by the 1980s (Organista, 2007). Thus, the financial institutions of both America and Mexico needed new investment outlets and economic strategies to overcome the economic dilemmas of the 1970s and 1980s. U.S. financial institutions sought the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to act as an international instrument through which structural adjustments could be administered throughout Latin America to bolster free trade, enable economic recovery, and establish the development of transnational corporations (Fernandez-Kelly &

Massey, 2007). It was under these new conditions of globalization and free trade that NAFTA was made possible.

However, in 1986, immigration policies started to tighten in the U.S. even though Mexico entered the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) under strong encouragement from the U.S. (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). Most intriguingly, while American officials overtly sought to integrate markets for goods, capital, information, raw materials, and services, the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) prevented the integration of Mexican and American labor (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007; Organista, 2007; Tichenor, 2008). Suddenly, U.S. immigration policy shifted from one of tolerance to one of repression (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). While trade began to increase between Mexico and the U.S., the borders started to militarize on the American side. The American policies sent a message that while the U.S. was willing to allow capital markets to be fused, they were not going to accept the integration of labor markets (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007).

Regardless of U.S.-imposed immigration restrictions, the Salinas administration desperately attempted to revitalize the troubled Mexican economy by privatizing the banking system, selling government firms, deregulating markets, and repealing Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution which eliminated the *ejido* system that gave land to peasants involved in subsistence agriculture (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). These and similar neoliberal reforms and policies were applied throughout Latin America to solve the financial problems resulting from the external debt crisis of the 1980s (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). Furthermore, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was perceived as a mutually beneficial treaty that would not only facilitate trade but also expand opportunities for capital investment (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007; Organista, 2007).

An elite class of investors from both the U.S. and Mexico desired the implementation of NAFTA. A close network of U.S. bankers, politicians, lobbyists, and corporate representatives supported the passage of NAFTA because they wanted to achieve financial hegemony throughout the hemisphere while increasing market investment opportunities (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). On the other hand, a similar group of large commercial interests, young public officials, and young elite business professionals in Mexico supported NAFTA in hope that it would successfully integrate Mexico into the global economy through trade liberalization and a reconfiguration of Mexico's authoritarian state (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). The interests of labor unions, public interest organizations, small businesses, and the working class in general were not consulted in the drafting and passage of NAFTA.

Unfortunately, the capitalist reshuffling resulting from NAFTA led to the subsequent failure of many of the goals it sought to achieve. First of all, deregulation of agriculture, the selling of land to foreigners, withdrawal of farm subsidies, and the opening of markets to the U.S. and Canada only increased the number of displaced workers in Mexico (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007; Organista, 2007). In addition, privatization of factories, railroads, airlines, and other government-owned businesses also resulted in massive layoffs of Mexican workers (Organista, 2007). While both U.S. and Mexican politicians viewed NAFTA as a way for Mexico to export only goods and not people, this goal largely failed (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). Restrictive immigration policies could not coexist with NAFTA-styled free trade (Organista, 2007). Consequently, liberalizing trade while forcing laborers to remain fixed in space led to increased illegal immigration into the U.S. (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007).

By ignoring international labor mobility, both the U.S. and Mexico neglected to take the appropriate steps necessary to equalize economic development among member countries and especially promote job creation for displaced Mexican workers (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey, 2007). In fact, harsh immigration policies were ineffective. When workers in Mexico or other Latin American countries (e.g., El Salvador) could not find work locally due to neoliberal privatization, they migrated to the U.S. in search of employment so they may provide for their families back home (Molina, 2008).

This form of transnationalism is an outcome of neoliberal globalization and it has sociocultural effects on the individual, the family, and society at large. Transnationalism is an anthropological framework used to explain how current migration flows created a new process by which immigrants can stay linked to their home places while forging multiple new relationships in their host country such that cultural and geographic borders can be transcended by “transborder bridges” (Molina, 2008, p.270). Thus, the immigrant must adapt to sociocultural conditions and institutions in the U.S. while also maintaining commitments to her family at home, which can lead to household restructuring resulting in a transnational family flexible to the effects of globalization (Molina, 2008). Hence, the material sphere interacts and influences the cultural sphere in such a manner.

Why would the U.S. place such tight controls on immigration if its economy benefited from cheap foreigner labor in the past? To understand the rationale behind enhanced border control and restrictive immigration policy by the U.S. in light of the globalizing liberalization of capital markets, one must critically apply dual labor market theory complimented by Marxist economic theory. Dual labor market theory argues that the labor market becomes segmented because employers predominantly use capital and primary labor as opposed to secondary labor to cope with the uncertainties of the economy (Nadadur, 2009). Therefore, two tiers of labor are developed, dividing workers into either the primary or secondary sectors of labor. The primary sector consists of “capital intensive” workers who are typically costly to train, acquire, and lose because they are highly skilled, require more pay, and demand job security and upward mobility (Nadadur, 2009). On the contrary, the secondary sector consists of workers who are unskilled, face job insecurity, receive low wages, and entertain little prospects of upward mobility (Nadadur, 2009). The division of labor into these very distinct sectors is a predictable outcome resulting from a shift to neoliberal capitalism in the 1970s from a previously Keynesian model that was preceded by a Fordist model.

Under the Fordist model of production, the manufacturing industry was paramount, welfare policies were extensive, unemployment was low, and labor was rigid (De Giorgi, 2007). The Fordist conception of work was defined as being full-time and lifelong, and so social citizenship extended to workers exhibiting these employment characteristics (De Giorgi, 2007). The shift to neoliberal capitalism fragmented labor as a result of seeking investment in alternative markets. Manufacturing was moved abroad, increasing the service sector’s role in the U.S. economy to roughly 80%. As such, the secondary labor force was formed and the model of production reflected service sector jobs, high unemployment, increasing labor flexibility, work insecurity, widespread social vulnerability, welfare reform, and rising income inequalities (De Giorgi, 2007; Nadadur, 2009). This shift to neoliberal capitalism, the reduction of the welfare state, and the division of the labor market created a new working poor, a social underclass faced with social exclusion because it did not represent the Fordist conception (De Giorgi, 2007; Nadadur, 2009). Economic forces seeking to accumulate capital created a growing surplus population of laborers situated in an unstable services sector where jobs are only temporary and wages are perpetually low creating an atmosphere of competition among the working poor and underclass. As a result, the surplus population goes into crisis and must be controlled by enhanced surveillance and punitiveness since past welfare safeguards have been dismissed (De Giorgi, 2007). One must note that this shift occurred at approximately the same time that the U.S. and Mexico were enduring economic crises and sought neoliberal reforms through a global, liberalized market in order to recover.

Thus, dual market theory, viewed through a Marxist lens, reveals that neoliberal capitalism perpetuated increased economic inequality in developed nations by accelerating the creation of two-tiered domestic economies segmented into the well-paid professionals and the less-well or poorly paid service workers (Michalowski, 2007). These neoliberal developments enabled capitalists to manipulate the production process and maximized the accumulation of capital by growing the service sector where wages could be greatly suppressed, the size of the welfare state could be

decreased, and investment opportunities on global markets could be established to weather future economic crises.

Accordingly, cheap labor from Mexico is no longer necessary. The American service sector does not need to grow larger to maintain wages at such a low level. Manufacturing jobs are rare and predominantly occupied by members of the primary labor sector. Mexican immigrants who enter unauthorized are forced to compete for positions in hospitality, restaurants, custodial management, retail, and other “under-the-table” forms of work in the domains of construction, agriculture, and sanitation. The presence of unauthorized immigrant workers in the U.S. secondary labor sector only increases the size of the surplus population that must be controlled by the growing penal state. Since the welfare state has withered and can no longer rectify the social ills associated with capitalism, authorities are forced to resort to either the correctional industrial complex or strict deportation policies to maintain social control.

The economic need for control over surplus populations requires the manipulation of fear by the elite to garner popular support for the punitive and restrictive response the powerful deem necessary in order to immobilize illegal immigration (Weber & Bowling, 2008; Welch, 2003). Thus, the media and politicians are needed to shape public opinion regarding immigrants such that labels and rhetoric are utilized in an effort to dehumanize and alienate those categorized “illegal” as dangerous and risky others in need of control and social exclusion from society (Cavadino & Dignan, 2006; Welch, 2003). Therefore, the linguistic and symbolic spheres are enlisted to reinforce the dynamic forces at play within the material sphere. It is in this economically and politically driven climate of the risk society that a distorted utilitarian ethic of control is propagated to enforce the greatest happiness principle (Mill, 1957) for a privileged few at the expense of the displaced, individual immigrant worker. Under such an ethic, the rights of the individual versus the rights of the group are balanced (Arrigo, Bersot, & Sellers, 2011; Sellers & Arrigo, 2009). Similarly, the rights of the non-citizen are weighed in relation to the rights of the citizen, which often results in the further plight of the disadvantaged (Henry, 2009).

The Linguistic Sphere

The linguistic sphere surrounds the realm of politics, where political rhetoric, legal discourse, and the law shape the public’s epistemological understanding by disseminating a favored knowledge regarding the threat posed by the vulnerable, troubled, and distressed individuals of society who live along its margins (e.g., illegal immigrants). Neoliberal globalization has positioned the issue of space as a political category at the center of the debate. Along with space, the struggles for nation-states to retain sovereignty in a globalizing world have relegated irregular immigrants to a state of limbo whereby the law is ambiguous and often arbitrarily applied. In fact, the declining relevance of space and nation-states in the newly globalized world draws the concept of citizenship into question. Moreover, national citizenship is currently used as a tool of inclusion or exclusion, which necessitates a dialogue regarding the need for universal citizenship and human rights in order to overcome the human suffering resulting from neoliberal globalization.

Space, or place, is considered by Auge (2000) to be relational space where people are connected historically to the space they occupy or traverse. As mentioned in the previous section on the cultural sphere, Mexicans and Americans are historically connected to the land of the American Southwest. Auge (2000) describes space as being tied to identities, relationships, and a storyline, which can then trace these relationships overtime. In the discussion at hand, space has a political character such that a piece of land becomes a spatial culmination of a state’s power, identity, and autonomy (Schinkel, 2009). When the boundaries of this space and their relevance are threatened, the state responds protectively to sustain its sovereignty as a symbolic fortress repelling unwanted invaders or transgressors. Presently, nation-states fear that the “fortress might crumble in the currents of globalization” (Schinkel, 2009, p.800).

The transition to a post-Cold War liberalized global economy has lifted spatial constraints in a never seen before era of globalization, which consequently spawned international irregular immigrants whose presence challenges and threatens the existence of nation-states and their sovereignty (Brubaker, 1989; Schinkel, 2009). Indeed global neoliberal capitalism threatens the reach and relevance of the nation-state, and increased irregular migration draws the very notion of the nation-state into question (Robinson, 1998; Sassen, 2003a, 2003b; Schinkel, 2009). The mere economic activity and global transactions at play practically render the traditional notion of the state outmoded (Schinkel, 2009). Host countries of irregular immigrants are forced to grapple with issues of autonomy and identity while faced with an evolving need for a “global organization of collective wants” (Schinkel, 2009, p.782). Hence, the relevance of space, as political category defined by territorial boundaries, is slowly undermined by the liquid interconnectedness of capital markets, communications, information, transportation systems, and irregular migrations of dispossessed and displaced laborers (Bauman, 2000, 2001; Schinkel, 2009). Irregular immigrants, as a byproduct of neoliberal capitalism, are globalized version of the reserve workforce (Albrecht, 2002).

The stringent immigration policies currently backed by the U.S. and other Western nation-states are a resistant response to globalizing forces articulating how states are willing to redefine themselves so they may maintain political autonomy via geographical identity while continuing to benefit economically from global neoliberal arrangements. These policies and practices represent efforts to fashion legislation that will tighten controls over “the stateless” within the state (Schinkel, 2009, p.785). As history has revealed, movements of surplus populations are typically perceived as threats to order, and they often are met with harsh resistance aimed at defending existing geographical, legal, and social boundaries (Weber & Bowling, 2008). Political rhetoric is also tailored to demonize illegal immigrants² so that their suspect mobility can be scrutinized and laws can gain public backing. Rhetoric and the symbols and language it uses will be discussed later in regard to the symbolic sphere.

In a globalized world, the traditional concept of citizenship and the rights of full membership to a society are being reexamined, which subsequently places the concept of nation-state in peril (Henry, 2009). Harsh immigration policies allow the state to reinforce the legitimacy of national citizenship in hope of preventing a transition to global citizenship whereby rights are tied to humanity instead of nationality (Henry, 2009). Thus, national citizenship becomes the tool by which individuals are either included or excluded from society (Schinkel, 2009). It is by the legal classification of citizen that a nation-state can dictate where a person appropriately belongs or even exists in the eyes of the law. As such, nations are able to render economic immigrants stateless, and thus, lawless as well as outside the legal protections reserved for those who belong (Schinkel, 2009; Weber & Bowling, 2008). States traditionally control their subjects through nationalized citizenship (Schinkel, 2009). However, this misguided approach to immigration legislation (e.g., Arizona SB 1070) neglects to take into account reality that the U.S. Constitution grants rights to all persons and not just citizens (Michalowski, 2007).

This method is inherently obscure because it allows a nation-state to veritably claim a person has rights as a citizen in one geographic location but not in another. Therefore, the universality of

² Currently, Europe is responding to its own Immigration concerns as mass migration of refugees from Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan continues to unfold. While the issues of immigration in Europe are definitely worthy of investigation, such an undertaking would require more in-depth comparative analyses beyond the scope of our investigation of illegal Mexican immigration into the U.S. Indeed, future analyses of immigration problems by different nation-states are warranted, which might amplify our own theorizing and unearth some interesting and alternative forms of assessment regarding the U.S. “immigration debacle.”

basic human rights is undercut and denied in order for sovereign states to maintain autonomy. The ethics of normative values hold that a state should safeguard the rights of humanity and not simply its own citizens (Henry, 2009). Otherwise, for sovereignty to survive under the current logic, it becomes necessary for nation-states to transform into more punitive societies operating under the logic of divisive politics that reify dichotomies (e.g., inclusion/exclusion, legal/illegal, integrated/non-integrated, citizen/non-citizen; Schinkel, 2009). Furthermore, an immigrant's mobility rights are also shaped by such dichotomies. Bauman (1998) addressed the inequalities in mobility by defining two post-modern types: (1) the welcome tourist and (2) the unwelcome vagabond. Tourists are welcome because they are financially independent, travel for leisure, and will stimulate the host state's economy, while the vagabond are fiscally liable, travel because they must, and are perceived to be a drain on the welfare system (Bauman, 1998).

Politicians and media pundits greatly benefit by espousing hate-filled rhetoric with the motive of political gain, enhanced ratings, and profit. Propagating myths and hate-filled rhetoric allows political figures to dehumanize immigrants so they become the target of law enforcement investigation with the support of the public (Golash-Boza, 2009). Therefore, politicians can successfully advance the agenda of the larger polity. The narrative these political figures construct is one promoting xeno-racism while successfully marginalizing and silencing the voice of the economic nomad, the dispossessed immigrant, and the stateless being. Chief among the messages this agenda entails is the objective of conflating illegal status with criminal status (Golash-Boza, 2009). The symbolic connotations behind the use of such labels will be discussed elsewhere; however, politicians utilize such tactics to promote "get tough" policies geared toward reducing illegal immigration.

A brief look at past and current pieces of legislation reveals exclusionary motives with undertones of bigotry. In 1994, California's Proposition 187 created a state-run system meant to screen individuals for proof of citizenship in order to prohibit illegal immigrants and their children from using health care, public education, and other social services (Golash-Boza, 2009; Henry, 2009). Fortunately, this draconian piece of legislation was ruled unconstitutional by a federal judge; however, its legacy lives on in Arizona's SB 1070 which allows law enforcement to make contact with any individual and request proof of immigration status while only requiring reasonable suspicion by the officer (Arizona SB 1070). Similar to Prop 187, a federal judge blocked the Arizona law citing violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, especially in regard to the potential racial profiling such a law would permit (Chin, Hessick, Massaro, & Miller, 2010). As mentioned above, the rights protected by the U.S. Constitution are afforded to all persons regardless of citizenship (Michalowski, 2007). However, numerous policy makers and public figures continue to support hyper-vigilant statutes designed to alienate and punish those unable to prove citizenship. This dilemma reveals a quintessential need for a dialogue to be initiated around the issue of universal human rights. The fact that rights are limited by geographic location suggests that people still have a long way to go if the standards of human decency are ever going to progress.

The Symbolic Sphere

The social constructs, depictions, and labels ascribed to the prevailing notion of irregular immigrants promote derogatory images that distort the American public's perception which can and often does result in drastic and often dehumanizing institutional responses. Social stigma is powerful and its application can misrepresent reality and even mobilize the masses toward supporting malicious and debilitating laws. The current debate over illegal immigration is wrought with deviantizing and stigmatizing language aimed to instigate a moral crusade against a perceived imminent threat posed by an invading enemy. Given American's infatuation with patriotic nationalism and fetishism of war it is no wonder that illegal immigration has been framed as a battle between American citizens and illegal aliens who threaten our way of life. Thus, it is the realm of the image

that inundates the public with the propaganda necessary to enforce the goals of the elite in an effort to contain risk and perceived societal dangers imposed by suspect groups. It is in this orchestrated manner that risk society is actualized.

Labels, as a form of negative societal reaction, can be assigned to individuals or a group of individuals who have violated or have been perceived to violate socially accepted norms. The label ascribed to the subject becomes a reflection of how society views the person or group of interest. Labels as symbols are meant to interact with behavior to give it meaning. Often the label can become so stigmatizing and abrasive in its application that the suspected deviant behavior does not have to be concurrent in order for stereotyping and prejudice to be cultivated. In fact, applied often enough, the label by itself can be adequate to merit social exclusion of the stigmatized without the alleged deviant behavior actually being confirmed.

Howard Becker's (1963) labeling theory conceptualized the notion of moral entrepreneurship. Becker defined moral entrepreneurs as people attempting to promote the acceptance and enforcement of a particular set of social norms. Those who violate these rules are seen as deviant or outsiders. Hence, deviance is socially constructed and in-group out-group biases are at play. When moral entrepreneurs establish new rules, they inherently create a new class of deviants, a new group of outsiders who can become the subject of ridicule. Of course those in power hold the positions necessary to tailor laws and social norms reflective of their own interests at the expense of the powerless.

In regard to labels given to immigrants, a host of connotations become relevant depending on the label. For instance, the label of "illegal alien" is extremely negative in connotation in suggests that the individual or group is not only criminal but also foreign (Schinkel, 2009; Wilson, 2009). The image of criminal other instilled by this label is meant to drum up fear and suspicion. Traditionally, the criminal label has been tied to racial and ethnic minorities, and thus, in the case of illegal aliens, the label often becomes synonymous with criminal enemies of color (Michalowski, 2007). It is the term "illegal" that is most often applied to immigrants by the media, politicians, and the public more generally. The rarely used label of "unauthorized immigrant" takes a more neutral connotation suggesting his or her presence is simply not official (Wilson, 2009). However, "unauthorized" also is associated with poverty, low skills, low levels of education, and demand for social services (Foner, 2008). Similarly, the label "undocumented immigrant" is considered to be partisan because it suggests that only paperwork is at issue and the person's presence is acceptable minus this minor caveat (Wilson, 2009). Undocumented is perhaps more commonly applied by employers willing to benefit from the immigrant's cheap labor but not averse to his or her immigration status. Other numerous labels abound (e.g., irregular immigrant, economic nomad, transnational citizen, etc.); however, the three described above are the most commonly used and are frequently utilized to convey images of good versus evil or positive versus negative (Wilson, 2009).

The mere attachment of a label to a person or group does not mean the societal response is universal. When considering the various positions people may take in regard to accepting socially prescribed labels and the negativity affixed to them, one must understand the predominant political stances. Certainly, numerous ideologies and perspectives are relevant here, but for the purposes of this discussion the focus will be on only two: (1) conservatives and (2) liberals. Conservatives tend to endorse a "metaphor of moral strength" whereby "nation-as-family" is given highest priority and concerns for national boundaries are imperative (Wilson, 2009, p. 137). Conversely, liberals tend to endorse a "moral metaphor of empathy" so that fairness is paramount in the treatment of the outsiders (Wilson, 2009, p. 137).

Given these divergent perspectives regarding the labeling of illegal immigrants, Wilson (2009) developed a typology by which to classify moral entrepreneurs concerned with the issue of the undocumented. Wilson's typology consists of three broad categories that include groups crusading against outsiders as well as groups defending the rights of the labeled. Nativists are the first category and this group includes nationalists who are ethnocentric and/or racist anti-immigrant

groups. The economic are classified as the second category, which consists of economically interested groups who support immigrants but treat them as a commodity. Moral entrepreneurs in the economic group are typically pro-immigration in times of economic expansion but swiftly become anti-immigration in times of economic recession. Humanitarian is the final category, which includes pro-immigrant groups promoting humanitarian, religious, and legal concerns.

Nativists are individuals or groups representing nationalism taken to its logical extreme (Wilson, 2009). Members of the nativist category perceive immigrants predominantly as criminal or enemy others and desire to expel them from the host country. Examples of nativist groups include the Federation of American Immigration Reform (FAIR) and the Minutemen Project (Wilson, 2009). Economic moral entrepreneurs are a complex group with fickle opinions regarding immigration. The economic category typically includes employers who benefit from low-wage immigrant labor and unions who desire their membership (Wilson, 2009). However, as mentioned before, members of the economic category shift support to or away from immigrants according to the waxing and waning of the economic cycle. Finally, the humanitarian groups are interested in promoting universal human rights for all immigrants. These groups, such as Humane Borders and No More Deaths, lobby for pro-immigration legislation, organize marches and demonstrations, and provide material or medical aid to immigrants crossing the border (Wilson, 2009).

Among these groups, nativist moral entrepreneurs are aggressively taking vigilante positions against immigrants (Michalowski, 2007; Wilson, 2009). To them, the illegal or undocumented immigrant is nothing more than an “enemy other” who poses a threat to national security (Michalowski, 2007). The language and metaphors employed by nativists are meant to dehumanize immigrants so it is easier to deny them human dignity and rights (Golash-Boza, 2009; Michalowski, 2007; Wilson, 2009). After 9/11, an all-out war on illegals has been waged not only by the U.S. government but also by average citizens responding to fears of insecure borders, international terrorism, and economic uncertainty (Michalowski, 2007; Wilson, 2009). The American fetishism with war and the militarization of national borders is expected given the recognition of this preoccupation with warfare. Just as America declared a war on poverty, crime, drugs, and terror, we cannot expect the approach to immigration to be nothing less than a paramilitary operation. Even border patrol programs are given names such as Operation Hold-the Line or Operation Gatekeeper. A wall has been constructed, drone aircraft police the skies, Minutemen watch with binoculars and high-powered rifles, and billions of dollars are spent on combating a foe desperately trekking across an unforgiving desert terrain, armed only with jugs of water and the clothes on their backs, who all the while are hoping they will survive this treacherous journey in order to gain a better life in America.

Conclusions

The cultural sphere, as the realm of cosmopolitanism, reveals how a commonly shared geographic space and history allows for cultural interactions to be celebrated, while enabling the individual to pursue a larger collective existence. Of course, for such a realization to occur, the self-reflective individual must become imaginatively aware of the intersection of biography and history within a greater societal context. Only then can the person shed her false consciousness and achieve one’s globally minded potential. Without such a transformation, the interconnection between shared space and time are overshadowed and evidence of human suffering is no longer illuminated. The complex nature of the cultural is natural because it mirrors the overlapping character of the self/society mutuality. Thus, cultural aspects are not easily teased apart, but their existence precedes their measurement.

The material sphere encompasses the realm of capital and the role political economy occupies as humans interact with the structural nexus. Here the desire for accumulation of the material distorts the individual’s state of being (Fromm, 1976) as well as her ability to become self-actualized as a truly flourishing form of the self/society mutuality. Structures of neoliberal capitalism

merge and unleash the free flow of market forces, yet restrict and immobilize economic nomads who are left vulnerable, exposed, and stateless. Under the conditions of neoliberal reform, the segmentation of labor markets renders these displaced and disposed migrants situated perilously within a service sector economy that no longer needs nor wants them. Indeed, their presence only expands the ever-growing surplus population that exists along society's margins. This reserve army of laborers poses a potential threat to the existing order. Thus, an ethic of control is enforced so that powerful interests may prevail and hostilities remain horizontal among the underclass, never to shift vertical against the elite. This ethic legitimates techniques of control, confinement, and social exclusion. It is in this atmosphere of unbridled material accumulation where human interests are sidelined and selfish pursuits are paramount. Only by placing the tide of neoliberal globalization under a radical lens can one begin to surmount the wave of oppression and repression disparate economic forces reproduce throughout history.

The linguistic sphere houses the realm of politics where hate-filled rhetoric, partisan legal discourse, and misguided legislation write the narrative by which the public's epistemological understanding is informed by a favored knowledge regarding the threat posed by the vulnerable, troubled, and distressed individuals who live on the margins of society. Intriguingly, the political dialogue reveals weaknesses in the fortress of the nation-state. The currents of globalization threaten to erode the state's sovereignty at its foundations, as territorial domains, defined by boundaries, are no longer relevant. As a form of resistance to these forces, the nation-state utilizes the mechanism of national citizenship in order to reify the identity and autonomy of the state as it braces against the surge of globalizing forces. Within this nefarious strategy, citizenship and membership become tools of inclusion/exclusion and consign the economic nomads of this era to a perpetual state of limbo, where law and its protections are suspended, ambiguous, and capriciously applied. From this torrent of competing forces, issues of universal citizenship and human rights emerge. Drawing on the self/society dynamic, the cosmopolitan traveler awakens to a world at odds with itself. Recognition of this paradox is not only overwhelming but also all-consuming. It is in this turmoil that the person must endeavor to unite rather than exclude, bridge rather than divide, relate rather than segregate.

Finally, the symbolic sphere is the realm of the image enriched by language, labels, and symbols. However, the debate over immigration is shrouded in social stigma resulting from negative societal reaction to misrepresentations of reality. This misinformation is espoused by politically and economically motivated figures occupying positions of power and prestige. Prejudicial labels are ascribed to those defined as "outsider" or "other." These unfortunate outcasts are demonized and dehumanized by xeno-racist groups committed to their elimination. As such, this form of labeling desensitizes people to those whom they do not understand and unwarrantedly fear. Fear, as the leverage of the bigot, wields a powerful ability to pry the individual from the larger collective to which she is intimately connected. Fear corrodes the solidarity binding the self/society twin dynamics and refocuses attention to risk and its management. Predictably, the calculus of risk manifests in times of instability and uncertainty. It is out of fear that hyper-vigilance and violence materializes in its ugliest of forms, warfare. The fetishism of war is employed to satiate primal desires to inflict harm on those perceived as outside the domain of societal norms. These "enemy others" personify risky and suspect groups who must be combated so the proper order can be maintained. Thus, inundated with this hyper-reality of information and vicious game of risk, the sociologically awakened person must transcend divisive forces that intend to deny dignity to those judged as the undeserving "other."

References

- Albrecht, H.J. (2002). Fortress Europe?—Controlling illegal immigration. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 10(1), 1-22.
- Arrigo, B. A., and Milovanovic, D. (2010). Introduction: Postmodern and post-structural criminology. In B. A. Arrigo and D. Milovanovic (eds.). *Postmodernist and post-structuralist theories of crime* (pp. xi-xxiv) Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Arrigo, B. A. (2010). De/reconstructing psychological jurisprudence: Strategies of resistance and struggles for justice. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 6(4), 363-396.
- Arrigo, B.A., & Bersot, H.Y. (in press). Revolutionizing academic activism: Transpraxis, critical pedagogy, and justice for a people yet to be. *Critical Criminology: An International Journal*.
- Arrigo, B. A., Bersot, H. Y., & Sellers, B. G. (2011). *The Ethics of total confinement: A critique of madness, citizenship, and social justice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Auge, M. (2000). Airports, in S. Pile and N. Thrift (eds.) *City A-Z* (pp.8-9). London: Routledge.
- Barak, G. (2009). *Integrative Criminology*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983). *Simulations*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *The individualized society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Becker, H.S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Berk, M., Schur, C., Chavez, L., and Frankel, M. (2000). Health care use among undocumented Latino immigrants. *Health Affairs*, 19(4), 51-64.
- Binder, N.E., Polinard, J.L., & Wrinkle, R.D. (1997). Mexican American and Anglo attitudes toward immigration reform: A view from the border. *Social Science Quarterly*, 78, 324-337.
- Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Psychological Review*, 1, 3-7.
- Branton, R. (2007). Latino attitudes toward various areas of public policy—The importance of acculturation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 60, 293-303.
- Brubaker, R.W. (1989). *Immigration and the politics of citizenship in Europe and North America*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Buckler, K.G. (2008). Public opinion on illegal immigration: A test of seven core hypotheses. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 31, 112-147.
- Buckler, K.G., Swatt, M.L., & Salinas, P. (2009). Public views of illegal immigration policy and control strategies: A test of the core hypotheses. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 317-327.

- Buckler, K.G., Unnever, J., & Cullen, F.T. (2008). Perceptions of injustice revisited: A test of Hagan et al.'s comparative conflict theory. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 31, 36-58.
- Cavadino, M. & Dignan, J. (2006). Penal policy and political economy. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6, 435-456.
- Chander, C.R., & Tsai, Y.M. (2001). Social factors influencing immigration attitudes: An analysis of data from the General Social Survey. *Social Science Journal*, 38, 177-188.
- Chin, Gabriel J., Hessick, Carissa Byrne, Massaro, Toni M. and Miller, Marc L., A Legal Labyrinth: Issues Raised by Arizona Senate Bill 1070 (August 15, 2010). *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal*, 2010; Arizona Legal Studies Discussion Paper No. 10-24. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1617440>
- Citren, J., Green, D.P., Muste, C., & Wong, C. (1997). Public opinion toward immigration reform. *Journal of Politics*, 59, 858-881.
- de Giorgi, A. (2007). Toward a political economy of post-Fordist punishment. *Critical Criminology*, 15, 243-265.
- de la Garza, R.O. (1985). Mexican Americans, Mexican immigrants, and immigration reform. In M. Glazer (Ed.), *Clamor at the gates* (pp.93-105). San Francisco: Institute of Contemporary Studies.
- Delanty, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1): 25-47.
- Delanty, G. (2009). *The cosmopolitan imagination: the renewal of critical social theory*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anit-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, J. (1977). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Espenshade, T.J., & Hempstead, K. (1996). Contemporary American attitudes toward U.S. immigration. *International Migration Review*, 30, 535-570.
- Fernandez-Kelly, P. & Massey, D.S. (2007). Borders for whom? The role of NAFTA in Mexico-U.S. Migration. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 610, 98-118.
- Foner, N. (2008). Immigration policy: Bringing in the city, state, and region. *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*, 5(2), 65-69.

- Foucault, M. (1973). *Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Fromm, E. (1976). *To have or to be*. New York: Continuum.
- Fromm, E. (1994). *Escape from freedom*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of a theory of structuration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2006). Dropping the hyphen? Becoming Latino(a)-American through racialized assimilation. *Social Forces*, 85, 27-55.
- Golash-Boza, T. (2009). A confluence of interests in immigration enforcement: How politicians, the media, and corporations profit from immigration policies destined to fail. *Sociology Compass*, 3(2), 283-294.
- Henry, C. (2009). The political science of immigration politics. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 19, 690-701.
- Henry, S. & Milovanovic, D. (1996). *Constitutive criminology: Beyond postmodernism*. London: Sage Press.
- Immigration Policy Center. (2007). The economic impact of immigration. <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org>.
- Kinder, D.R., & Mendelberg, T. (1995). Cracks in American apartheid: The political impact of prejudice among disaggregated Whites. *Journal of Politics*, 57, 402-424.
- Massey, D.S., Durand, J., & Malone, N.J. (2002). *Beyond smoke and mirrors: Mexican immigration in an age of economic integration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Michalowski, R. (2007). Border militarization and migrant suffering: A case of transnational social injury. *Social Justice*, 34(2), 62-76.
- Mill, J. S. (1957). *Utilitarianism* (O. Piest, Ed.). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing (Original work published 1861).
- Mills, C.W. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Molina, R. S. (2008). Modes of incorporation, social exclusion, and transnationalism: Salvadoran's adaptation to the Washington, DC metropolitan area. *Human Organization*, 67(3), 269-280.
- Nadadur, R. (2009). Illegal immigration: A positive economic contribution to the United States. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(6), 1037-1052.
- Organista, K.C. (2007). Mexican migration for dummies: What social workers and the public need to know. *Journal of Ethnic & Culturally Diversity in Social Work*, 16(3), 189-198.

- Pantoja, A. (2006). Against the tide? Core American values and attitudes toward U.S. immigration policy in the mid-1990s. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32, 515-531.
- Robinson, M. (2003). *Why Crime? An Integrative Systems Theory of Antisocial Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robinson, W.I. (1998). Beyond nation-state paradigms: Globalization, sociology, and the challenge of transnational studies. *Sociological Forum*, 13(4), 561-94.
- Sassen, S. (2003a). Embedding the global in the national: Implications for the role of the state. In R. Robertson and K.E. White (eds.) *Globalization: Critical concepts in sociology, Vol. II: The nation-state and international relations* (pp. 177-188) London and New York: Routledge.
- Sassen, S. (2003b). The state and globalization. *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, 5(2), 241-249.
- Sellers, B. G. (2015). Community-based recovery and youth justice. *Criminal Justice & Behavior: An International Journal*, 42(1), 58-69. doi: 10.1177/0093854814550027
- Sellers, B.G. & Arrigo, B.A. (2009). Developmental maturity, adjudicative competence, and adolescent transfer: An ethical and justice policy inquiry. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 99(1): 435-488.
- Schinkel, W. (2009). 'Illegal aliens' and the state, or: Bare bodies vs. the zombie. *International Sociology*, 24(6), 779-806.
- Tichenor, D.J. (2008). Getting the full picture: Immigrant social rights, subnational politics, and the mobilization of noncitizens. *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*, 5(2), 77-81.
- Tichenor, D.J. (2008). Strange bedfellows: The politics and pathologies of immigration reform. *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*, 5(2), 39-60.
- Trull, L., & Arrigo, B. A. (2015). U.S. Immigration policy and the 21st century conundrum of 'child saving': A human rights, law and social science, political, economic, and philosophical inquiry. *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society*, 66(1): 179-225.
- Weber, L. & Bowling, B. (2008). Valiant beggars and global vagabonds: Select, eject, immobilize. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12(3), 355-375.
- Walsh, A., & Ellis, L. (2006). *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Welch, M. (2003). Force and fraud: A radically coherent criticism of corrections as industry. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 6(3), 227-240.
- Wilson, T.D. (2009). Anti and Pro-immigrant entrepreneurs: Labeling theory revisited. *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 34(2), 135-154.