

<b>Reserve Number: E21</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	Bazgan, Nicoleta
<b>Course:</b>	MLL 603
<b>Date Off:</b>	End of semester

*Examining the Rhetoric and Actions of Various Groups Involved in the Current Debate on Immigration through Chomsky and Wallerstein.*

Electronic

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or electronic reproductions of copyrighted materials. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or electronic reproduction of copyrighted materials that is to be "used for...private study, scholarship, or research." You may download one copy of such material for your own personal, noncommercial use provided you do not alter or remove any copyright, author attribution, and/or other proprietary notice. Use of this material other than stated above may constitute copyright infringement.

Heather Thompson Henke  
Scholarly Paper  
April 6, 2006

*Examining the Rhetoric and Actions of Various Groups Involved in the Current Debate  
on Immigration through Chomsky and Wallerstein*

**Introduction**

The role of anti-immigrant groups and anti-immigrant legislation has taken many forms and been directed at a diverse number of groups throughout the history of the United States. Current anti-immigrant sentiments are strong and although other immigrant groups, notably Arabs and Muslims, are also targets of anti-immigrant rhetoric and actions, immigrants from Latin and South America, especially those from Mexico, continue to receive harsh treatment. They have become the scapegoats for many societal problems within the United States including: negative economic impact on state governments, stress on public services, threats to national or cultural identity, and threats against national security. In 2004 and 2005 anti-immigrant stances gave birth to two seemingly disparate groups along the Arizona border: the Minuteman Project and the supporters of Proposition 200. These groups do not operate or exist in isolation. The ideas they espouse are echoed throughout the country and some would argue have been important catalysts in the debate on immigration that has captured the attention of the public and of the government, including the formation of a splinter group, Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, President Bush's plan for immigration as well as bills presented in the House, H.R. 4437, and in the Senate, S.1033. Analyzing the rhetoric used in the immigration debate through the ideas presented by Chomsky and Wallerstein allows one to understand that, although relying on different methods, many of the groups share essential attitudes, employ similar narratives used by previous anti-immigrant

movements, and are constructed upon tenets that are inherently flawed and racist in nature.

### ***Methodology***

To best understand the significance of these groups and the debates that are taking place regarding immigration policy, it is important to place them into a historical and current context. There is a rich body of literature that describes and critiques attitudes by United States' citizens and trends in immigration policy by the United States' government. Wallerstein's ideas concerning culture one and two as well as the symbiotic pair of universalism and sexism/racism will be useful in identifying how and why the supporters of Proposition 200, the Minuteman Project, the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, and supporters of stricter, more punitive immigration laws, as suggested by H.R. 4437 feel threatened by undocumented workers from Mexico. The specific language used in the debate by all participants is important because it helps to identify the doxa from which these individuals and groups are operating. Chomsky and Wallerstein's theories regarding capitalism and the flow of wealth will be useful in examining the narratives these groups use to justify their actions. Much of the rhetoric and propaganda, although not all to the same degree, put forth by the Minuteman Project, Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, supporters of Proposition 200, H.R. 4437, President Bush's plan, and S.1033 echo sentiments established by previous anti-immigrant movements and are part of a recurring wave of negative attitudes toward immigrants.

### ***Literature Review***

*Overview of The Minuteman Project and The Minuteman Civil Defense Corps*

The Minuteman Project was originally conceived as a grass roots organization of citizens who voluntarily patrolled sections of the Arizona and Mexico border. Jim Gilchrist, one of the original co-founders of the group, described them as, “Americans doing the jobs congress won’t do [while] operating within the law to support enforcement of the law” (Minuteman Project 2005). Their website from 2005 boasted of the diversity in their group and insisted that they were not an anti-immigrant or racist group. The primary goal, as stated in 2005, of the Minuteman Project was to assist the U.S. department of Homeland Security by observing and reporting illegal activity along a stretch of the Arizona/ Mexico border. They protested the lack of action by congress and the current administration to better protect the border and felt that illegal immigrants were a threat to Americans and dilute voting rights (Minuteman Project 2005).

In the middle of 2005 the group’s founders, Chris Simcox and Jim Gilchrist, had a falling out which resulted in the splintering of the group. Jim Gilchrist kept the name the Minuteman Project and is now the leader of that group while Chris Simcox took charge of the new group with the name Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. Gilchrist now defines his group as a “citizens’ Vigilance Operation monitoring immigration, business, and government”(Minuteman Project 2006). The updated website still puts a heavy emphasis on the idea that this is not a racist or an anti-immigrant group. The scope of group has expanded beyond mere observation into true political action against open borders and illegal immigration. After recent marches in major cities protesting the House bill H.R. 4437, Gilchrist encouraged people in his group to: “go to Washington and protest, close down Wall Street, call Senators and Congressmen and complain, start a “Minuteman Chapter” in your area and organize to take back America, [and] financially support the

brave Minutemen and Minutewomen in their struggle” (Minuteman Project “Occupying Army” 1-2). The group emphasizes in 2006 that they are not a violent group and are seeking a “peaceful and respectable resolve to the chaotic neglect by members of our local, state, and federal governments charged with applying U.S. immigration law” (Minuteman Project, “About” 1).

Like Jim Gilchrist, Chris Simcox has maintained the basic tenor from the original group and has also expanded the scope of the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. His group has the responsibilities to observe, report, record, and direct Border Patrol or other law enforcement agencies to suspected illegal aliens or illegal activities (Simcox “Standard Operating Procedures” 1). Both groups have extended border operations to neighboring states and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps is also monitoring sections of the northern border. Both groups, although still intent on protecting and securing America’s borders, are broadening their mission to protest and fight against illegal immigration and the myriad of problems they believe stem from this situation, including protesting at day laborer sites. The idea that problems with illegal immigration is not confined to border states is essential to their expanded mission and has resulted in recruiting new members to start chapters throughout the country (Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, Minuteman Project 2006).

### ***Overview of Proposition 200 and its Influence on New Legislation***

Proposition 200, also called the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act, was an Arizona ballot initiative that passed in the 2004 election. It aims to improve homeland security and decrease the use of public services by undocumented immigrants. In the proposed amendment, the state highlights the motivation for Proposition 200:

“illegal immigration is causing economic hardship,” “illegal immigration is encouraged by public agencies that provide public benefits,” and “illegal immigrants undermine the security of our borders and demean the value of citizenship” (Arizona Secretary of State 1). Proposition 200 passed by a vote of fifty-five percent of Arizona citizens and will ensure that in the future all people will have to show evidence of citizenship before voting and prior to applying for and receiving certain public benefits. The language in the proposition will also hold government employees responsible for checking for valid proof of citizenship and for reporting immigration law violations to the government. A failure to report an immigration law violation will result in a class 2 misdemeanor (Arizona Secretary of State 14).

Proposition 200 is a two pronged piece of legislation: the goal of the first part is to ensure that only legal citizens vote and the second dealt with who could receive certain public services. The former was tested for the first time in the local elections of March 2006. Leading up to the elections the state dedicated a considerable amount of resources to educate the public about the new rules and what forms of identification would be acceptable, a total of eleven possible forms are included on the list (Benson 1). A possibly confusing aspect of the law is that a voter without the proper identification would be allowed to cast a provisional ballot, but would need to return within 72 hours with proper identification for the ballot to be counted. These provisional ballots could require a lot of time and resources to count. According to Deputy Director of Election Linda Weedon, the 70,000 provisional ballots in Maricopa County from the 2004 elections required 70 people working 15 hours a day for 10 days to count (Benson 2). Even with this education campaign advocates for voters with limited English skills were

concerned about voters feeling confused and intimidated and worried that if they were asked to return with additional identification they would simply leave without casting a ballot (Benson 2).

The second part of the bill has yet to be enacted because the vague language of the bill has propelled lawsuits from both sides of the issue. Proposition 200 didn't specify which services were to be denied to undocumented immigrants and according to the Attorney General's Office in Arizona the measure only applies to welfare benefits. (Díaz "Bill to Cut Migrant Benefits" 1). Attorney General Goddard later clarified that Proposition 200 would apply to two utility programs, a program for the visually impaired, and another one for the disabled. He stated that Proposition 200 would not limit an undocumented immigrant's ability to receive free school lunches, immunization, and library cards (González 1-2). Immigrant Advocates such as Steven Reyes, an attorney with the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, have tried to get Proposition 200 thrown out, but the courts have decided it is constitutional. Steven Reyes believes that Proposition 200 "discourages qualified immigrants from seeking public benefits they are entitled to receive" (Díaz "Judge Dismisses Lawsuit" 1). The provision requiring people to report immigration law violations or face a class 2 misdemeanor has not yet been tested because this section is tied to the benefits portion of the proposition. Supporters of Proposition 200 have also been active with lawsuits because they believe that the Attorney General stripped the spirit from the law and want to see Proposition 200 applied on a much wider scope. Randy Pullen, a very vocal supporter of Proposition 200, argued that it should apply to all state and local benefits including: public housing, food assistance, college tuition, and employee benefits (González 1).

The debate over Proposition 200 continues to stoke the immigration debate in Arizona and has had an influence in other states and some would argue on a national level. Supporters of Proposition 200 were pleased and perhaps emboldened by the results of the 2004 election and began putting forth new legislation to further restrict access of services to undocumented immigrants. Tom Boone, a Republican Representative of Arizona, sponsored H.B. 2030 that would ban undocumented immigrants from child-care subsidies, adult education classes, public housing, utility subsidies, family literacy classes, and from attending state universities and community colleges unless they paid out of state tuition. A portion of this proposal was approved by the House bill 2264, insisting that they pay out of state tuition, a difference of up to \$10,000 a year for the state universities. (Díaz “Bill to Cut Migrant Benefits” 1).

Outside of Arizona the passing of Proposition 200 has also been noticed. Tom Tancredo, a Republican Representative from Colorado and a very vocal opponent of illegal immigration, praised the bill and claimed that it has changed the debate on the floor of the Senate (Casey 1). Other states are also paying close attention to Proposition 200 and to the lawsuits being filed against it. Protect Arizona Now, a major supporter of Proposition 200, has been contacted by other states to form similar organizations (Protect Arkansas Now) and has moved to create a national organization (Protect America Now). There are also at least three dozen grass roots anti-immigrant groups working with FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform), who gave a lot of monetary support to the Proposition 200 campaign (Wingett 1).

***Overview of H.R. 4437, President Bush’s Immigration Plan, and S.1033***



The House bill H.R. 4437, or Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, was originally introduced by F. James Sensenbrenner a Republican from Wisconsin and since passing in the House in December has been at the center of the debate on immigration. The bill is viewed by many as a hard line approach to immigration and deals mostly with punitive actions against the violators of the law and measures to enhance border security while rejecting calls made by President Bush for a guest-worker program (Weisman "Senators Back Guest Workers" A1). In Title I, Securing United States Borders, the bill calls for an increase in the number of full time inspectors, increase and use of canine teams, use of unmanned drones to patrol the boarder, and erecting physical barriers along part of the U.S. /Mexico border (H.R. 4437 17,256). This bill would make it a felony to be an illegal immigrant in the United States or to knowingly assist an illegal immigrant come to or reside in the United States. Title II, Combating Alien Smuggling and Illegal Entry and Presence, of the bill goes into great detail of how this section of the bill could be violated and in what manners those violations would be punished (H.R. 4437 31-66). The bill also dedicates a lot of language to describe the process an individual would need to go through to be eligible to work and how employers would verify that eligibility. Essentially, all employers would have to verify the legal status of any new employee prior to hiring and that of any current employee within three years of the enactment of the bill. The idea is that the Secretary for Homeland Security will have a phone and an electronic database that employers could consult for verification of legal status (H.R. 4437 187). The bill has the support of Jim Gilchrist, founder of the Minuteman Project and that of Tom Tancredo, Republican Rep. from Colorado. Both of these men are very vocal opponents of legislation that would give

more rights to undocumented immigrants (Gilchrist “Turning up the Heat” 1, Murray and Reid A01).

President Bush has parted company with some in the Republican Party who are promoting the House bill without incorporating a guest-worker program. President Bush insists that a temporary worker program is a way to fill the job vacancies that exist in this country for positions that Americans are not applying for while maintaining control over who is entering the country (Reuters). President Bush outlines his plan for immigration reform in the Fact Sheet: Securing America Through Immigration Reform. He insists that immigration reform must begin with securing the border and has promised to “return every illegal entrant caught crossing the Southwest border with no exceptions,” increase resources on the border including manpower, technology, and constructing physical barriers to entry. He also promises to work with Congress to reform immigration law, improve worksite enforcement, and to create a job program to match willing workers with willing employers for jobs that Americans aren’t willing to take. He stresses the point that the program would not provide amnesty and that the workers would only be able to stay for a fixed time period (Office of the Press Secretary “Fact Sheet” 1-2).

Although S.1033 recently fell apart on the Senate floor, it is important to consider it and the impact it has had and will continue to have on the immigration debate (Associated Press). The bill, S.1033 Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act, introduced in the Senate by Edward Kennedy and John McCain looked at undocumented immigration from the need of protecting our borders while simultaneously recognizing the need to deal with the estimated 11 million undocumented individuals who are already residing in the United States. The bill provided for more resources to secure the boarder

and also provided a path to citizenship, a component not included in President Bush's plan. To become a "citizen the undocumented workers would need to prove that they have been in the country for five years, pay a \$2000 dollar fine, back taxes, learn English, undergo a criminal check and remain working for 11 years" (Weisman "Senate GOP Deal" A18, S.1033). The bill also described the steps one would need to take if they have been residing in the United States for less than five years and wished to continue working here on a legal basis as well as the process for receiving a temporary worker visa for individuals working in sectors of the economy where the need for workers is high, such as in low paying agricultural and service industry jobs (S. 1033). The bill gained the cautious support of some immigrant advocates (Democracy Now 4) and raised the ire of groups like the Minuteman Project, who in response to the proposed legislation posted on their website, "The despicable political acts committed by a long string of blind politicians are nothing less than political prostitution painting America a whoring nation..." (Minuteman Project "America on Notice" 1).

### *Overview of Anti-immigrant Sentiment in the United States*

The Minuteman Project, Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, supporters of Proposition 200 and H.R. 4437 are comprised of citizens who have recently taken actions and espouse viewpoints against undocumented immigrants. They are not unique in their goals or motivation and echo attitudes and actions taken against immigrants, especially those from Mexico, to the United States in the past. There are several common narratives that are presented by groups and individuals with parallel goals to those of the above groups, they include four main arguments: illegal immigrants cause economic hardships for the state, illegal immigrants are entering the United States for access to public

services, not for jobs, they represent a threat to the “American identity”, and illegal immigrants are a threat to national security. Wilson argues in “Anti-Immigrant Sentiment and the Problem of Reproduction/ Maintenance in Mexican Immigration to the United States” that “in the absence of a common external enemy ... the immigrant other becomes scapegoated as the common enemy responsible for all manner of social and economic ills” (204).

The perceptions that engulf immigrants, especially those who enter without documentation, are frequently based off poor information, a lack of understanding of the situation, and prejudice. Kenneth K. Lee in Huddled Masses, Muddled Laws analyzed public opinion polls on illegal immigration and found that from the early eighties until the mid-nineties over half of the population viewed illegal immigration as a major problem and/or a very important issue and believed the United States should make a concerted effort to stem the tide of illegal immigration (29 -30). After the terrorist attacks in 2001 and following a barrage of media attention, the percentage of adults concerned about immigration, undocumented and documented, has climbed. Results from an October 2001 Gallup/CNN/USA Today poll concluded that fifty-eight percent of the public also believed that immigration (not just undocumented) should be reduced (Hines 45). According to a CBS News poll in October of 2005, 75 percent of adults believe that the United States is not doing enough to prevent illegal immigrants from entering the country (Branigin 2). Joe Feagin notes that media coverage helps construe people’s attitudes toward immigration and that in the late 1980s and early 1990s the media presented a biased view of immigration with more emphasis on illegal immigrants. Not surprisingly, he found that a survey from 1993 showed that two thirds of the people

polled believed that most immigrants are in the United States illegally. Feagin puts the number of illegal immigrants at less than a quarter of all immigrants (31). More recently it has been impossible to not notice the media attention paid to the debate on immigration. There are articles in major newspapers, radio and television talk show hosts are filling the air waves with their ideas, and issues of undocumented immigration has even made its way onto popular television shows like "Law and Order." All of these media outlets help mold the opinions that people have regarding immigration, and some of the sources are less than reputable.

The historical relationship that the United States has had with Mexican immigrants is that they have been treated like commodities. They are recruited in times of prosperity to help stoke the economic machine of capitalism and cruelly discarded in times of economic downturn via government policies such as forced repatriation during the Great Depression, Operation Wetback in the 1950s, the Bracero program from the 1940s until the mid-1960s, and the failed attempt to enforce proposition 187 (Carrasco 199, Wilson 5, LoBreglio 935-938). Although Mexican workers, documented and undocumented are recruited by businesses in the United States, there is a strong perception that these workers cost the states more than they contribute and take away jobs from U.S. citizens. This argument is countered by many researchers who argue that undocumented immigrants provide the backbone for many service industries, construction, and agricultural jobs and that they add to the economy as a whole, even when adjusting for social costs that the states pay. (Feagin 30, Chavez 70, Nagengast 3, LoBreglio 952). Muller argues that the nativist fear of losing jobs to immigrants does not play out very well in the modern economy because immigrants both take and create new

jobs (107 –108). Hines points out that in the economic boom of the 1990s an unlikely alliance between industry, labor and the immigrant community formed because of the recognition that immigrants filled needed jobs in service industries and other sectors of the economy. Labor changed its historically anti-immigrant attitude and started having drives in the immigrant community. She even highlights Alan Grennsman's opinion that "increased immigration would help labor shortages in the United States" (41).

The argument of job loss that creates economic hardship on states is coupled with the idea that illegal immigrants are costing the state dearly by using public services such as welfare, public education, and health care services. Chavez and Hines illustrate how this idea fueled the proponents of California's Proposition 187 and other political platforms calling for a restriction of services. Proposition 187 claimed that undocumented workers were entering the United States in search of public services and proposed denying all public services to these individuals, except for emergency healthcare, with the contingency that once the care was given the undocumented worker would be reported to the INS ("Immigration Reform" 64, Hines 40). Many researchers emphasize the fact that usage of social services by documented and undocumented immigrants is very low and that the services which are available to these individuals are underutilized due to fear of deportation (Kandel 253-254, Sanchez 1021, Chavez "Immigration Reform" 71). 1996 was witness to welfare reform and changes in immigration policy which further reduced the number of people, documented and undocumented, using state public services (Kandel 255). However, the public perception remains strong and some people refuse to believe that undocumented immigrants from Mexico and other Spanish speaking nations are not putting an incredible strain on state economies.

The third narrative that is common to most anti-immigrant sentiments is the idea that the “new” immigrants are outside of the *we* that is used to refer to who is and who is not an American, and are changing the *American Identity* and the *American Way of Life*. The American identity that is referred to excludes many citizens of the United States and only leaves room for the “Euro-American, English-Speaking culture” (Chavez “Covering Immigration” 8, Rodríguez 227-228). The desire to define the United States as a country with a single monoculture is ugly and results in incredibly racist suggestions. For example, in 1994 Senator Craven, a Republican from California, revealed his racist attitudes when he proposed, “that the [California] state legislature should explore requiring all people of Hispanic descent to carry an identification card that would be used to verify legal residence” (Chavez “Immigrant Reform” 62). Sanchez points out similar racist and nativist views when referring to Alien Nation where Brimelow, the author, claims that recent immigration is likely “to transform- and ultimately, perhaps, even to destroy... the American nation” (1013). The rhetoric of people with anti-immigrant and specifically anti-Mexican attitudes consistently frame the undocumented workers as a threat and use words with negative connotations such as alien and illegal to emphasize the idea that they are outside of the *we* that constitutes U.S. society and culture (Rodríguez 232). The symbolic violence directed at this group is also found in references to the undocumented workers, as illegals, as hordes of people, as part of a flood or an infestation in the United States and peppered with stereotypical images of Mexicans being lazy, welfare cheats, and drug runners (Nagengast 2, Rivera-Batiz 485).

The threat against the *American identity* is coupled with the increasing fear that exists in the United States regarding national security. Part of having a safe nation is

having secure borders, and no border seems to threaten national security more than the border with Mexico. In “Immigrant Reform and Nativism,” Chavez points out the fact that undocumented immigrants are often portrayed or referred to as the enemy and protecting the U.S.- Mexico border is often couched in terminology reminiscent to that used when fighting a war (67). Other researchers point to opinions that the border is out of control and incredibly porous, thus allowing all sorts of unwanted people in: drug dealers, terrorists, and undocumented workers (Rodríguez 228, Nagengast, 2).

The call to protect the borders of the United States has grown stronger since the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and it seems that people are willing to allow violations of human rights in order to feel more secure. Prior to the terrorist attacks, there was momentum for liberalizing immigration laws and working in cooperation with Mexico, but after the attacks the country quickly called for more restrictions on immigration (Hines 44). The militarization of the border patrol not only affects undocumented workers, it affects anyone who is suspected of being an undocumented worker. This suspicion often rests on one of two factors, the person in question is or appears to be someone of Hispanic descent and/or whose primary language is Spanish. This idea was tragically demonstrated in 1997 when a young man was shot and killed by United States Marines as he was tending his family’s sheep on their property near the border. He was a United States’ citizen and was viewed as a threat because he was near the international border, alone at dawn, presumed to be a drug runner, and most importantly was of Mexican heritage (Nagengast 1). LoBreglio also references instances where racial profiling is used at a distance of more than a 100 miles from the U.S/ Mexico border where “Mexican-



looking” people have been singled out for searches and seizures without a warrant (943-944).

***Analysis of the Rhetoric from the Immigration Debate***

The four narratives: negative impact on state economies, use of social services, threat to national identity, and threat to national security, established by previous anti-immigrant arguments are reiterated and reinforced by the language of the Minuteman Project, Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, and supporters of restrictive and punitive legislation found in Proposition 200 and H.R. 4437. The rhetoric found in President Bush’s plan and S.1033 also fits into some of the narratives, although the general tone is distinctly less anti-immigrant than that of the other groups. In the literature posted on their 2005 web site the Minuteman Project only made vague references to the economic cost of undocumented workers and focused on identifying how undocumented immigrants threaten national identity and national security. In 2006 the Minuteman Project and Minuteman Civil Defense Corps shifted from vague language to alarmist language concerning the economic, cultural and security threats that undocumented immigrants pose for the citizens of the United States. Proposition 200 touches on all four narratives with special attention to economic costs of and use of public services by undocumented immigrants. H.R. 4437 concentrates most of its energy on the last narrative, threat to national security, but does not discount the other narratives. President Bush’s plan for immigration reform recognizes the need for workers, but simultaneously gives tacit acceptance of the narratives from which its rationale is based. At first glance S. 1033 does not fit very well into most of the narratives because the tenor of its arguments moves away from the alarmist and apocalyptic language employed by other

groups. However, it does acknowledge three of the narratives to varying degrees: the cost of social services for illegal immigrants, threat to national identity, and the threat to national security.

***Analysis of the Economic Burden and Threat to Social Services Rhetoric***

The Minuteman Project's 2006 web site warns its readers that, "unchecked immigration is destroying America and devastating the American worker" and that "We [the illegal immigrant] demand your rights! We demand your jobs! We demand your future!" ("Turning Up the Heat " 1, Gilchrist "Occupying Army 1"). The language used by the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps is just as apocalyptic with the intention of convincing their readers that illegal immigrants come to "exploit economic opportunities while proudly proclaiming their allegiance to foreign powers" ("Secure Our Borders" 1). The Minuteman Civil Defense Corps' intention is to frighten American citizens into action and threaten that if they do not act soon the prosperity and lives that they have become accustomed to will be swallowed by an illegal, invading horde when they pose questions like, "Tired of illegal aliens taking jobs away from American citizens, hearing about our schools and hospitals being over run and under funded due to illegal aliens?" ("Arizona Chapter- Day Labor" 1). The threat to the economic well being of the states and nation is very powerful because it conjures up images of recession and depression that would devastate the economic security of most Americans.

Proposition 200 also plays off this fear and a closer examination of the full title, The Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act, offers insights into the existing doxa of the supporters of the proposition. The phrase "Arizona Taxpayer" is very important because it implies that undocumented immigrants do not pay any taxes. Undocumented

immigrants do pay some taxes on both a local and state level and Kandel points out that migrants are “less likely to file tax returns, thus when it comes to reclaiming overpayments, most migrants will never collect” (253). The proposed Senate bill also accepts the premise that undocumented immigrants do not pay taxes and have received public services at the cost of American taxpayers. A requirement of changing their status seeks to remedy this situation and is outlined in Section 702, “[the] alien shall establish the payment of all Federal Income taxes owed for employment” for a minimum of five years of employment (S.1033 112). The section does not explain if these individuals would be charged late fees or if they would be eligible for refunds.

The second part of the full title of Proposition 200 is equally important to scrutinize. The phrase “Citizen Protection Act” is rather vague. It does not explain from what the citizens of Arizona are in need of protection. It simultaneously implies that the non-taxpayers, defined as the undocumented Mexican immigrants, are not in need of protection and therefore are part of the problem and/or must be abusing the services that citizens pay for. The introduction to the proposition clearly identifies that the “state finds that illegal immigration is causing economic hardship to this state” (Arizona Secretary of State 1). No references are included to explain how the state reached this conclusion, what studies were conducted, or what research was reviewed. This biased language echoes that of previous anti-immigrant theories that take the economic burden undocumented immigrants pose to a state’s economy as a widely accepted fact.

The economic burden of undocumented immigrants is also represented in the argument that these individuals are entering the United States to take advantage of public services. The Minuteman Project, although primarily focusing on threats from

undocumented immigrants in other arenas, also noted on their “Standard Operating Procedures” page from 2005, that is reprinted almost word for word in the “Standard Operating Procedures” page of the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps web site, “[illegal immigrants] wish to take advantage of a free society” (Minuteman Project 2005, Simcox 1). Similar to the escalation of language accusing illegal immigrants of taking away jobs, the Minuteman Project and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps have ramped up the accusations of coming to the United States with the intention of receiving unlimited benefits, including the rights of American Citizenship, without taking on the responsibilities that come with being part of a society. An example of this fervent language is clear when Minuteman Project outlines what is at stake for the citizens of the United States:

The education system is being destroyed by anti-American teachings that encourage the destruction of the constitution. The health system is crumbling under the pressure of the weight of millions of illegal aliens who refuse to assimilate into America unlike the tens of millions of legal immigrants who happily joined the American spirit and celebrated the American culture (“America on Notice 1”).

Blaming undocumented immigrants for state economic hardships as a result of an abuse of public services is a rallying cry to fight against the perceived influx of undocumented workers.

The state of Arizona finds that “illegal immigration is encouraged by public agencies within this state that provide public benefits without verifying immigration status” (Arizona Secretary of State 1). As a result of this finding all citizens applying for certain public services and registering to vote will need to show proof of citizenship (2). This attitude is reiterated in the 2006 debate over the provisions of the proposition. Republican Rep. Russell Pearce of Mesa states, “Arizonans shouldn’t have to pay for

folks here illegally” and “You [undocumented immigrant] can’t come here illegally and expect free stuff” (Díaz “Bill to Cut Migrant Benefits” 1). The language included in the proposition was very vague and which public services could be denied without proper evidence of one’s citizenship was never defined in the original bill and is still being fought over a year later by the opponents and proponents of the bill (González 1). Individuals on both sides listed a wide array of services that would be affected and neither group is in agreement with the other’s assessment of the expanse of the proposition (Arizona Secretary of State 4-13).

Supporters of Proposition 200 have a lot in common with supporters of H.R. 4437. Tom Tancredo helped to pass the House Bill and for frustrated and scared suburbanites and rural residents he is a hero who takes their fears seriously. These people believe with full confidence that “undocumented, mostly Hispanic workers are taking jobs that ought to go to citizens, flooding schools and boosting the crime rate, and that the country’s open borders pose a security threat” (Murray and Reid A01). President Bush also recognizes the burdens that illegal immigration can impose on local governments. In a speech given last November in Tucson, Arizona he stated that he “understood, as a former Texas governor, the pressures that illegal immigration can impose on local schools and taxes, and how criminals who are involved in immigrant-smuggling can bring crime to our neighborhoods and dangers to our highways” (Stout 1). He doesn’t clearly articulate what those pressures are, but accepts the strain on public services and the threat to national security as logical by products of undocumented immigration.

As presented in the literature review, the immigration reform laws and the welfare reform act from 1996 already bar most immigrants, documented and undocumented, from

many public services. Wilson offers a review of these restrictions, “illegal immigrants are excluded from welfare benefits except for emergency medical aid, short-term in-kind disaster relief, in-kind community services and public health immunizations and treatment of communicable disease” (201). However, as in previous anti-immigrant arguments, some members of the public, represented by groups such as: Protect Arizona NOW, Yes on Proposition 200, and Russell Pearce 2004, strongly believe that undocumented workers are illegally using public services, including welfare, and therefore costing the state a substantial sum (Arizona Secretary of State 4-6). The idea that individuals are sneaking across the border for access to public services is one of the narratives often employed by anti-immigrant groups and it is very effective. It makes many citizens feel angry that they are unfairly paying for other people to receive free services while simultaneously putting a strain on the organizations that are meant to serve the needs of U.S. citizens.

***Analysis of the Threat to National or Cultural Identity and to Security Rhetoric***

To understand what constitutes the national or cultural identity of The United States one must first understand the identity of the undocumented immigrant, who is excluded from the national identity. Undocumented workers do not have the power to create their own identity because they are not part of the dominant elite. Their identity is dictated and constructed by the dominant culture by employing words with negative connotations and relying on ugly stereotypes to describe these individuals. The most important clue to the anti-immigrant sentiment that a group or an individual holds is the name or names that are assigned to the undocumented worker. Insistence on using the expressions “illegal immigrant” or worse, “illegal alien,” or “alien,” or the most derisive

form “illegal,” where the adjective has replaced their humanness and they are identified by a status that has been imposed upon them, automatically dehumanize these people and paint undocumented immigrants as criminals and as an entity that is drastically different than the cultural identity claimed by members of the dominant culture in the United States. As Chavez demonstrates in Covering Immigration, there is a heavy reliance on flood imagery (“Covering Immigration” 73-74) when describing negative immigration viewpoints. Words and phrases such as: “mobs, aliens, lawless hordes, alien armies, throngs of alien bullies, stream across, devour, plunder, menace of tens of millions of invading aliens, tidal wave, and criminal” pepper the Minuteman Project, Minuteman Civil Defense Corps and the arguments in favor of Proposition 200 and H.R. 4437 (Minuteman Project 2005, Minuteman Project 2006, Arizona Secretary of State 3-6, Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, Murray and Reid). Roberts argues that some European-American, English speaking citizens equate American culture with their own culture and that the *new immigrants* will not and cannot fit into that context. She argues that these individuals ignore the role of pluralism in forming the American identity and insists that the “concern about immigrants’ threat to national cohesion is actually a form of racial prejudice and domination” (211).

Undocumented workers are not responsible for major economic problems and suggesting this scenario masks the sentiments felt, but perhaps not openly expressed, by anti-immigrant groups that these *new immigrants* pose a threat to the cultural identity of the nation and/or state. The threat to the dominant culture by undocumented immigrants is also a major point for the Minuteman Project and for the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. They want to spread the message that not only are new people coming to our

country who don't share the same history and values as the current citizens (dominant, European, English speaking culture), but that the new undocumented immigrants mean to permanently change the national identity. After the protest marches led in opposition to bill H.R. 4437, the Minuteman Project referred to the undocumented immigrants and their supporters as, "Demons of disorder and intimidation that will certainly strip all Americans of their Bill of Rights"(Illegal Alien Armies March 2). The Minuteman Civil Defense Corps also responded negatively to the march and insisted that the immigrant aliens were "demanding the right to cross our borders unchecked, colonize these United States, flying foreign flags, and turning Old Glory upside down" (Secure Our Borders 1). The irrational fear felt by citizens who are swayed by arguments like those above was summed up by Michael Scherer when he reported on a Minuteman rally held in Tombstone, AZ, "Now they felt their country was changing around them. The government was allowing a trampling of the law, a dilution of American culture, and a burgeoning of the welfare state" (2).

The feelings of insecurity and fear of an identify shift in the country was also evident in Steven Schreiman's, the director of the Maryland chapter of the Minuteman explanation for why he joined the group. He stated that he felt insecure in his neighborhood where he saw an abnormal number of Latino people, who were obviously not legal citizens mulling about (Cruz). He gives no explanation as to why he believed they were not legal citizens or why he felt insecure. He does not describe them threatening him or engaged in any illegal acts. One must draw the conclusion that he based this decision solely on their physical characteristics and that he felt uncomfortable because his neighborhood was changing from a predominantly white one to a more



diverse one. This rhetoric betrays the basic principle supposedly held by Minutemen of not being anti-immigrant or racist. According to the 2000 census, Mr. Schreiman's neighborhood probably has been changing because Mexicans now compose 30 percent of all foreign-born people in the United States (LoBreglio 934). However, this new reality is not a welcome addition to the vision Schreiman has of the American Identity. Jim Gilchrist, the leader of The Minuteman Project, also belies the tenets of his own group when he claims to not mind the diversity of races, but can't tolerate the diversity of cultures. He says, "I saw the country change literally overnight into a foreign country. The Fourth of July was not being celebrated, but Cinco de Mayo was. All the billboards would be in foreign languages. It's not just Spanish. It's Korean" (Scherer 4). In Gilchrist's world there is no space for the new immigrants in the national identity because they are outside of the dominant culture.

The threat to cultural identity is delineated by the strong language of H.R. 4437 which calls to make anyone residing, attempting to enter, or aiding an individual to gain entrance or to remain in the United States without proper documentation guilty of committing a felony. The authors of the bill never refer to these individuals as undocumented workers, undocumented immigrants, or even illegal immigrants. They always use the term "alien." (H.R. 4437). By consistently referring to these people as aliens (448 times in a 257 page document) the authors of the bill automatically put them outside of the group that constitutes the identity of the United States. In voicing his support for H.R. 4437, Tom Tancredo described his fear that the tide of immigration from Mexico and Central America would change the character of the country (Murray and Reid).

In a speech delivered at the Davis-Monthan Air Force Base last November, President Bush demonstrated that he also takes the stance that people who enter the country illegally are outside of the *we* that constructs the national identity, “America has always been a compassionate nation that values the newcomer and takes great pride in our immigrant heritage. Yet we’re also a nation built on the rule of law. And those who enter the country illegally violate the law” (Office of the Press Secretary “President Bush Delivers Remarks” 2). President Bush does not refer to these undocumented workers by the insulting terms of illegals or aliens, but they are illegal immigrants and their status of being outside of the law excludes them gaining a place in the identity of the United States despite the fact that their labor has helped to shape the nation’s identity for many years.

In sharp contrast to H.R. 4437, the Senate bill had been praised as legislation that recognized the 11 million undocumented workers residing in the United States. In many ways it strove to give undocumented workers more rights and protections, but it did consistently refer to them as aliens and a key provision of the bill revealed that, despite a more liberal leaning, it too relied on the threat to our cultural identity. A requirement for people seeking citizenship is that they must learn English and have an understanding of the history and government of The United States (S. 1033 113). This proposal was greatly favored over the House’s bill by immigrant advocates, but it still clung to an insistence on assimilation, rather than a broadening of the definition of what constitutes the American identity. Although learning English must be admitted as being advantageous for these individuals, it should not be a determining factor in obtaining citizenship.

The final narrative used by anti-immigrant groups is the threat to national security. Threats to national security are intertwined with threats to cultural identity

because those threatening to change the cultural identity of the United States are also perceived as individuals who threaten the physical safety of the country. This narrative is prevalent in the rhetoric used by supporters of H.R. 4437, S. 1033, President Bush's plan, Proposition 200, and by the Minutemen. It is common for anti-immigrant groups to employ rhetoric about porous borders and to use military and/or patriotic language to describe their actions and beliefs.

The threat that porous borders presents is taken very seriously by the now defunct Senate Bill, Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act, by the House Bill, Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, by President Bush's plan for immigration reform, and Proposition 200. The language used in both of these bills is remarkably similar and both call for boosts in funding for personnel, ground and aerial technology, and training for the Northern and Southern borders as well as other ports of entry (H.R. 4437, S. 1033). One important difference is that the House bill supports the building of a 700-mile wall on the Southern border (Murray and Reid). President Bush's plan also calls for increasing manpower on the border, deploying new technology, and constructing physical barriers to entry (Office of the Press Secretary "Fact Sheet" 2). An argument used in presenting Proposition 200 was that the state finds that "illegal immigrants undermine security of our borders" (Arizona Secretary of State 1). The supporters of Proposition 200 hope that it will serve as a wake-up call for Americans to "defend our sovereignty, the Constitution, and save the Republic from this massive invasion" (Wingett 1). H.R. 4437 foots the penalty in Proposition 200 to a felony level crime to enter or be in the United States as an illegal alien or to help anyone enter or stay in the United States who is known to be an illegal alien (H.R. 4437 31-66). The call

for an increase in resources and harsh penalties for illegal entrance result from the belief that the border can be controlled and that the country is in a very precarious situation due to illegal immigration. H.R. 4437 harkens back to the language from the Wetback Act of 1952 that “aimed to discourage illegal Mexican immigration by criminally sanctioning anyone who smuggled or harbored aliens” (LoBreglio 937). The title of the new act, Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, is not as offensive or jarring as the one from 1952, but the consequences of breaking the law are actually harsher.

The security threat represented by uncontrolled borders is taken very seriously by the Minutemen. All members of the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps take a pledge promising to fight for borders that are only open to those who have a legal right to enter and who have met all the criteria to do so (“Pledge” 1). Members of both the Minuteman Project and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps are very dedicated to the security of the borders and have expanded the original border watch from Arizona to include the 4 other southern states that share a border with Mexico and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps has even expanded their sentry of border watchers to the northern border with Canada (Minuteman Project 2006 1, Simcox “Secure Our borders” 1). The Minutemen believe that without criminal checks there is an imminent danger to all Americans. They rely on inflammatory rhetoric and fears about terrorist attacks to stress the idea that it is not just people seeking work who are entering undetected. In the “Senate Judiciary Hearings” article posted on the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps’ website Chris Simcox stated, “God only knows whether any terrorists carrying biological, chemical or nuclear agents have snuck into our country, because the federal government surely does not” (1).

Dependence on military and patriotic language and images is common in narratives arguing that the sovereignty and security of the state is being threatened. This style of language is used liberally by both Minuteman groups. The title of both groups conjures up ideas of strong patriotic links and there are many references to the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, Uncle Sam, and Samuel Adams. Their websites are also decorated in Red, White and Blue, eagles, and other patriotic imagery. The Minuteman Project and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps' websites compare their actions to those of the original Massachusetts Minutemen. On the 2005 Minuteman Project, Gilchrist glorifies the task he and his volunteers are undertaking by referring to it as a "grassroots effort to bring Americans to the defense of their homeland" (Minuteman Project 2005). Questioning what the homeland needs to be defended against is important, and although never clearly spelled out on the 2005 website, the 2006 version and that of the splinter group make it very clear that they are defending the homeland against invading alien armies of illegal immigrants (Simcox "Illegal Alien Mobs" 1-2, Minuteman Project "Occupying Army" 1, Gilchrist "Illegal Alien Armies 1"). In the "Standard Operating Procedures" section of the Minuteman Project's 2005 website, and the identical article on the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps website, argue that "nothing short of military intervention will cease the flow" of illegal immigrants from Mexico to the United States (Minuteman Project 2005, Simcox 1). One of the group's original goals was to assist the United States' Department of Homeland Security and in the "Standard Operating Procedures" section, in and of itself a military reference, there are references to the war on terrorism such as, "shock and awe" and how the members of the Minuteman

Project will use this tactic when they approach illegal immigrants entering the United States. (Minuteman Project 2005).

Both Minuteman groups are currently relying on military language to argue that the United States is under attack by foreign forces. They make references to being colonized and having its territory invaded by foreign occupiers. In a style that would befit a fire and brimstone preacher Jim Gilchrist presents the threat:

The U.S. has never seen such foreign invasion of its territory since the occupation by Great Britain, which preceded the Revolutionary War... Now we are occupied by an army of some 30 million non-citizens, illegal alien invaders who perversely place demands on U.S. citizens. If these demands are not met, will anarchy and insurrection follow? Are we on the cusp of a national disorder not seen since the Civil War? ("Illegal Alien Armies March" 1, Simcox "Illegal Alien Mobs" 1, Minuteman Project "America on Notice" 1-2).

Gilchrist's language suggests the dire situation he believes the country to be in. In an attempt to augment the fears of American citizens he grossly exaggerates the number of undocumented immigrants from 11 or 12 million to 30 million. Steven Schreiman, Director of the newly formed chapter of the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps in Maryland, relied heavily on military language in a short film posted on line via the Washington Post. In his speech to fellow Minuteman he thundered, "They've [illegal immigrants] already invaded. Taken Beachheads and are moving inland. We [the legal citizens of the United States, or at least the Minuteman] are actually at war" (Cruz). Invoking militaristic and patriotic language is essential to the arguments that these anti-immigrant groups have. It is imperative that the American public fear for their safety in order for them to join with the ranks of these groups.

Rhetoric from supporters of Proposition 200, H.R. 4437, President Bush's plan, the Minuteman Project, the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, and some of the aspects of

S. 1033, demonstrates that these groups do not take neutral stances against immigration and in fact, despite their claims, are representatives of anti-immigrant attitudes and actions held by some citizens in the United States. These groups echo the four main narratives of previous anti-immigrant groups. However, they also share a new narrative that was not readily seen in the previous literature regarding anti-immigration: the idea that the steps they are taking and ideas which they extol are moderate and reasonable responses to what they view as the very serious illegal immigrant problem.

The Minuteman Project opens every page on their website with the disclaimer that it “has no affiliation with, nor will accept any assistance by or interference from separatists, racists or supremacy groups or individuals, no matter what their race, color, or creed” (Minuteman Project 2005). The Minuteman Civil Defense Corps mimic the words of the original group by stating in their pledge that “there is no tolerance among Minutemen for racism or bigotry- E Pluribus Unum” (Simcox 1). Both groups try to promote this idea by comparing themselves with other groups seeking justice, such as the Civil Rights Movement. The Minuteman Project has usurped the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., “We can transform bleak and desolate valleys into sunlit paths of joy, and bring new light into the dark caverns of pessimism.” in promoting their cause (Minuteman Project 2005). Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. would certainly be angry to know his words that inspired people to fight against racism have been misappropriated by and misapplied to a group that does not promote pluralism and equality, but seeks to maintain power and use undocumented immigrants as scapegoats for societal problems. They want to convince supporters of the group and the public at large that the group represents many

more people than their actual membership shows and that they are making strides in solving the illegal immigrant problem:

If you choose to make the sacrifice and become the active majority rather than the silent majority, you will have accomplished more in one month than the sum total of all your years of complaining and demanding action from your public servants who seem more interested in working for people from other countries than they are in working for us (Minuteman Project 2005).

Supporters of Proposition 200 also claim that the ideas in the Arizona taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act are moderate and reasonable. Arguments in favor of the proposition rely on expressions such as, “reasonable measure, and common sense, logical, moderate measure that merely enforces the law” (Arizona Secretary of State 5). The rhetoric they used to support the proposition was intended to show the citizens of the United States that they are not members of an extremist party, but everyday people who just want to make their country safe.

### ***Analysis of the Immigration Debate via Wallerstein and Chomsky***

Supporters of Proposition 200, H.R. 4437, the Minuteman Project, the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, and to a lesser extent President Bush’s plan and S.1033 clearly can be included on the list of groups that promote anti-immigrant sentiment, albeit cloaked in language that tries to convince the public of their reasonable stances on undocumented immigration. Analyzing the tenets of their beliefs and ideas for solutions to the problem of undocumented immigrants through the theories of Wallerstein and Chomsky, especially those focusing on the role of capitalism and the importance of culture, will demonstrate that these tenets and solutions are inherently flawed and racist in nature.

One of the primary narratives is to insist that undocumented immigrants are an economic burden on the state. Examining this claim through the lens of Wallerstein



allows one to realize that it is not the undocumented immigrants who benefit at the cost of the state, but rather, the state that benefits at the cost of the undocumented immigrants. Supporters of groups like Proposition 200, H.R 4437, the Minuteman Project and Minuteman Civil Defense Corps often neglect the role the capitalist system plays in the immigration of workers, both documented and undocumented. Wallerstein describes capitalism as an “interstate system” not as a “world empire” where “separate states,” in this case countries, “control the means of violence” (35). This means that there are economic forces, much larger than individual desire, serving as catalysts for undocumented immigrants to seek jobs in the United States. Wallerstein also argues that another contradiction in the capitalist system is that it searches for an endless accumulation of economic capital and puts “pressure on all direct producers to work more and to be paid less” (36). Undocumented workers, especially those from Mexico are lured to the United States because of the “underemployment in Mexico means they are willing to take jobs with pay and working conditions that very few American workers would take” (Rivera-Batiz 497). Undocumented workers in the United States help fulfill the need for an “endless accumulation of economic capital” because their legal status can be taken advantage of by corporations and individuals and they are therefore paid considerably less than documented immigrants or citizens to do the same work. Chomsky describes this situation as a “welfare project for the rich and powerful” (17).

The argument for better border control is usually made in an effort to control undocumented immigration and to protect the nation, but the control of the border also affects the flow of capitalism. Defending the flow of wealth is essential for maintaining the power the United States holds over other nations. The language in the Senate bill S.

1033, Subtitle A – Border Security and Strategic Planning, fully recognized the need to protect the capitalist system when stating that border control must happen in a way where “trade and commerce of the United States is not diminished by efforts, activities, and programs aimed at securing the homeland” (S.1033 17). This goal of protecting the economic interests of the United States, although not openly discussed by the other groups analyzed in this paper may trump in importance the other goals of immigration reform. Chomsky takes this position further and argues that people’s fear over the security threat is actually a fear to the economic threat, when he claims “Security threat, referring to anything that might infringe upon the rights of US investors” (38).

Wallerstein and Chomsky also look at the flow of wealth in the system of capitalism and describe how the wealth is returned to a dominant elite. Chomsky describes how the British colonies made Britain incredibly wealthy but did not improve the economic situation for most of the colonists who were responsible for creating the wealth (11-12). Although Mexico is not and has never been a colony of the United States, the comparison is still appropriate because Mexico provides the United States with many important resources essential for stimulating and maintaining the capitalist system. Mexico not only serves as a geographical location where U.S. companies operate below costs than those in the United States, sending the majority of the wealth out of the country, it also provides the United States with resources, immigrants (documented and undocumented) included, that the United States uses to replicate its position of wealth. Chomsky explains that in the New World Order, “Latin America is to provide resources and a favorable business and investment climate” (30). In his next chapter he expands on that idea by stating that the “South is assigned a service role: to provide resources, cheap

labor, markets, opportunities for investment, and lately, export of pollution” (33). In other words, the natural wealth and resources of Mexico are not being used to improve the country’s level of wealth but to sustain the wealth of the United States. Wallerstein describes this as a “polarizing system” where the “increase in wealth has been going to only a small proportion of the world’s population” (37).

The lopsided development of the border has benefited the United States and acts as a safeguard for maintaining the vast differences that exist in the living standards between Mexico and the United States (Roig-Franzia 1). The authors of H.R. 4437 emphasize the idea that restrictions and enforcement on the border must not jeopardize the economic benefits that the United States receives from Mexico. This attitude is demonstrated in Section 102, National Strategy for Border Security, where the authors of the bill are seeking means to control the border while ensuring “that the free flow of legitimate travel and commerce of the United States is not diminished by efforts, activities, and programs aimed at securing the international land and maritime borders of the United States” (H.R. 4437 11). The authors of the bill are not concerned about the wealth or benefits that Mexico could receive from trade and commerce and strictly view this agreement between the two countries from the perspective of what is best for the interests of the United States. Arguments that invoke narratives claiming illegal immigrants are causing economic problems do not take into account the pull of capitalism on these workers nor the fact that these workers contribute positively to the economy and receive less in return for their efforts than their documented and citizen counterparts. These arguments also ignore the reality that the flow of wealth is in one direction, toward the United States and away from Mexico.

Once the arguments made by Wallerstein and Chomsky regarding the role of capitalism are understood, it is easy to see why a simple solution, like militarizing the border or denying public services, has not been and will not be successful in stopping undocumented workers from entering and residing in the United States. LoBreglio uses the example of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act from 1996 as an example. The primary goal of the act was to reduce the number of undocumented immigrants crossing into the United States. There were provisions for increased funding at the border, new sanctions for smuggling and hiring illegal immigrants, revisions in the deportation procedures, and restrictions of the benefits undocumented workers could receive. The act resulted in record numbers of deportations, but did little to actually stop illegal immigration or the number of illegal immigrants entering the country (940). This act failed, as so many others did, because it ignored the magnetic pull of capitalism on the system of immigration.

The other major narrative used by anti-immigrant groups to decry the arrival of new, undocumented immigrants is they are a threat to the nation's identity and to the nation's security. Analyzing these stances via Wallerstein's theories of culture one and two, the symbiotic pair of universalism and racism/sexism, the hierarchy of power, and the power of patriotism allows one to understand how many anti-immigrant tenets are truly racist in nature. Chomsky bolsters many of Wallerstein's arguments in his chapter, "The Contours of World Order," through real world examples and analyses of the capitalist system, including the United States' policies in the Middle East and Latin America (34, 40).

Many groups and individuals involved in the current debate on immigration rely on a distinction between *us* and *them* to justify their actions and ideas. Many anti-immigrant movements discuss the *new* immigrants in negative terms and reserve a place of honor for the earlier European immigrants (Chavez "Covering Immigration" 8). Wallerstein describes this distinction between the immigrant groups as culture usage two, where one group is "genetically or culturally inferior to another group" (43). As examined in the analysis of the rhetoric section, supporters for H.R. 4437, Proposition 200, and the members of both Minuteman Groups repeatedly use language that alludes to the inferiority of this new group of immigrants. For example, Tom Tancredo clearly separates the new immigrants, referring specifically to those coming from Mexico, as being different from previous immigrant groups and feels that the immigrants of today no longer feel the need to assimilate (Scherer 3). He views their presumed lack of desire to assimilate as a negative trait that pushes them outside of cultural identity and into an inferior category.

Another way of denying the new immigrants access to join the cultural identity is by putting them outside of the *we* that is fighting for the citizens of the United States. Anti-immigrant groups use the plural possessive adjective *our* to distinguish themselves from another group, the undocumented immigrants from Mexico and are claiming the international border as their own. The Minuteman Project describes itself as a "citizens' neighborhood watch along **our** (emphasis added) border" (Minuteman Project 2005). The Minuteman Civil Defense Corps deployment for April is called "Secure **Our** Borders" (1). According to "findings and declarations" by the state of Arizona, "illegal immigration ... undermines the security of **our** (emphasis added) border and demeans the

value of citizenship” (Arizona Secretary of State 1). Similar language can also be found in arguments voiced by others in the immigration debate.

Chomsky illuminates the fact that negative feelings and images toward Mexico and Mexicans have been part of the dominant culture’s doxa for many years when he cites Walt Whitman’s attitudes about “miserable, inefficient Mexico” (26). The Minutemen, supporters of Proposition 200, H.R. 4437, and President Bush’s plan Minuteman Project and Proposition 200 rely on this technique when separating themselves from the undocumented immigrants. One of the most forthright ways they do this is by always referring to undocumented immigrants in negative terms, including: aliens, illegal immigrants, and illegals, and on the insistence that they are a threat to the nation. Supporters of S.1033 used the term alien consistently through the language of the act, but also pushed for more freedoms for and protections of undocumented workers. Despite the calls for a path to citizenship and a genuine desire to help the 11 million undocumented workers in the country, the language of S.1033 still separated the undocumented immigrants from the dominant culture and was only willing to accept them if they learned English. A more subtle way the hierarchy of culture two is reproduced is by examining the motivation behind legislation such as Proposition 200 and H.R 4437. Undocumented immigrants are already denied access to public welfare and the proposition does not define what additional public services are to be denied to them. However, it clearly states that people who do not report suspected violations of immigration law will be charged with a level two misdemeanor. The penalties for helping an illegal alien enter or remain in the country are augmented in H.R 4437 to the level of a felony. These punitive actions suggest an attitude of “if you’re not with us, you’re against

us” and serves to strengthen the power position of the elite. Wallerstein explains that the capitalist world economy thrives in part because of the concept of culture usage II “as the justification of the inequities of the system, as the attempt to them unchanging in a world which is ceaselessly threatened by change” (39).

Wallerstein’s explanation of the hierarchy of power that exists between cultures and the symbiotic pair of universalism and sexism/racism helps to explain why the groups from the United States are in the power position to dictate how and by whom the border is to be used, “It is precisely because there is in reality a hierarchy of states within the interstate system and a hierarchy of citizens within each sovereign state that the ideology of universalism matters” (43). A blatant example of the hierarchy of power and of universalism and sexism/racism comes from the Minuteman Project’s “Standard Operating Procedures” page. The Minuteman Project took a great deal of care in trying to establish the idea that their group is mainstream, humanitarian, diverse, and not racist, but under the description of Night Missions, their true feelings are revealed, “We [the people in charge of the volunteers] will try to rotate them [night vision goggles] from location to location so everyone gets in on the fun ... let them [undocumented Mexicans] proceed past you while remaining silent, or, turn on a flashlight, inquire as to who is there and watch them scatter” (Minuteman Project 2005). Clearly, this kind of behavior, hunting humans for sport, is not directed at people who the volunteers would view as their equals. The volunteers of the Minuteman groups, and supporters of Proposition 200, H.R. 4437, and to a somewhat lesser degree the supporters of President Bush’s plan and S. 1033, believe that their actions are protecting the United States from outside threats and would

---

probably consider themselves akin to the “guardians of the world order [who] must be ever alert for signs of irresponsibility” (Chomsky 43).

The final narrative that is employed by anti-immigrant groups is the threat against national security. Wallerstein explains that patriotism can be a very strong unifier and “has quite often been reinforced by or transformed into racism (jingoist chauvinism, opposition of the citizen to the stranger or immigrant) and sexism” (47). Supporters of Proposition 200, H.R 4437, and members of the Minuteman groups clearly feel threatened by the undocumented workers, and these sentiments are not based on real threats to the economy, but on racist ideologies. Chomsky describes how the power of the enemy is often exaggerated and how people trying to “convince themselves of the justice of their actions” rely on two pretexts, “self-defense and benevolence” (75). Since their inception in 2005 the Minuteman Project, and now joined by the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, has highlighted the fact that they are taking these actions as a way to protect the country, but it is actually a way to protect themselves and their ideals as to what constitutes America. In 2006 the language the Minutemen espouse has increasingly relied on the need to defend the country from foreign invading armies while promoting the idea that they are peaceful groups that do not condone racial intolerance or the mistreatment of individuals (Minuteman Project 2005, 2006, Minuteman Civil Defense Corps). The language from the Minuteman Pledge taken by members of the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps illustrates Chomsky’s point:

Minutemen promise to raise our voices—on cellular phones along the borders of America and in the halls of Congress—in the defense of the rule of law. The American people are firm but fair, and we share their great compassion for the many powerless victims of cruel, illegal human trafficking and labor exploitation. But we also support our citizens’ adamant rejection of the blatant disregard for our laws and ordered liberty



represented by the U.S. government's failure to secure our borders, enforce our nation's sovereignty and end the flood of illegal trafficking into American territory (1).

This language is effective and very clever. Without paying attention a reader could easily miss the clues that this group is masking its true anti-immigrant feelings and just focus on the patriotic message of defending the United States, or worse, a reader without knowing more about this group could be duped into accepting the idea that this group is concerned for the victims of illegal immigration. Both Minuteman groups, supporters of H.R 4437, Proposition 200, and President Bush's plan employ these pretexts in their rhetoric, they argue that they are impatient for the government to take action to secure the borders and that they must defend themselves against the influx of alien masses.

### ***Conclusion***

Concern for security, national and cultural, and for economic stability, either through the shifting of jobs to undocumented immigrants or the cost of supplying public services to undocumented immigrants are the main focal points of the current immigration debate. Rhetoric from the Minuteman Project and Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, supporters of Proposition 200 and H.R. 4437 clearly places them on the same continuum as other anti-immigrant groups, despite their protests that they do not harbor negative attitudes toward immigrants. Their ideas fit with the four main narratives used by previous anti-immigrant groups. Insights from Wallerstein and Chomsky help to illuminate the fact that not only are the tenets for their organizations based on racial intolerance the solutions they offer for stopping the flow of undocumented workers are not plausible due to constraints of the capitalist system which serves as a catalysts for the migrations of many workers. Supporters of President's Bush plan and for S.1033 are

---

placed in a somewhat different category because they recognize the need to address the 11 million undocumented residents who are already living here. They would probably argue that their concern for these undocumented immigrants stems from humanitarian sources, the real reasons for their motivations may be to preserve the workings of the capitalist system. They have offered some added protections for these individuals, S.1033 considerably more so than President Bush's plan, but they still heavily rely on the narratives of other anti-immigrant groups, especially the threat to cultural identity and national security. The United States has a dark history of discrimination against various immigrant groups and that intolerance has certainly been carried into the twenty-first century.

### Bibliography

Arizona Secretary of State. 2004 Ballot Propositions: Proposition 200. Sep: 2004.

8 May: 2005 <http://www.a/sos.gov/election/2004/info>

Associated Press. "Immigration Bill Falls Victim to Politics." New York Times

Online Edition. 8 Apr. 2006. 8 Apr. 2006

<http://www.NYtimes.com/apoline/us/Ap-Immigration.htm>

Benson, Matt. "Election Day to Put New Voter-ID Laws to Test." The Arizona

Republic Online Edition. 5 Mar. 2006. 1-3. 6 Apr. 2006

<http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0305electionchanges0305.html>

"Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005."

H.R. 4437. The Library of Congress Thomas. 4 Apr. 2006. 1-256.

[http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/F?c109:1:/temp/~c109KtK2WY:e1218)

[bin/query/F?c109:1:/temp/~c109KtK2WY:e1218](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/F?c109:1:/temp/~c109KtK2WY:e1218)

Branigin, William. "Bush Advocates Border Enforcement, New Immigration

Plan." Washington Post Online Edition. 28 Nov. 2005. 28 Nov. 2005

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/28/AR2005112800067_pf.html)

[dyn/content/article/2005/11/28/AR2005112800067\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/28/AR2005112800067_pf.html)

Carrasco, Gilbert Paul. "Latinos in the United States: Invitation and Exile."

Immigrants Out!. Ed. Juan F. Perea. New York: New York UP, 1997. 190-204.

Chavez, Leo R. "Immigration Reform and Nativism." Immigrants Out!. Ed. Juan F. Perea. New York: New York UP, 1997. 61-77.

Chavez, Leo R. Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation. Berkely: U of California P, 2001.

Chomsky, Noam. Year 501. Boston: South End Press, 1993. 1-95.

Cruz, Ben de la "Fight Over Day Laborers Shifts to MD." Washington Post. Newsweek Interactive. 6 Mar. 2006. 4 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/video/2006/03/06/VI2006030601002.html>

Democracy Now. "Between 500,000 to 2 Million Take to the Streets of L.A. to Demonstrate Against Anti-immigrant Bill." Democracy Now. 27 Mar. 2006. 3 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.democracynow.org/print.pl?sid=06/03/27/1449257>.

Díaz, Elvia. "Bill to Cut Migrant Benefits." The Arizona Republic Online Edition. 25 Mar. 2005. 1-2. 4 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0325english-benefits25.html>.

---. "Judges Dismiss Lawsuit to Stop Prop. 200." The Arizona Republic Online Edition. 10 Aug. 2005. 1-2. 4 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0810Prop200ruling10.html>

Feagin, Joe R. "Old Poison in New Bottles: The Deep Roots of Modern Nativism." Immigrants Out!. Ed. Juan F. Perea. New York: New York UP, 1997. 13-43.

Gilchrist, James. "Illegal Alien Armies March on U.S. Cities." Minuteman Project. 27 Mar. 2006. 5 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.minutemanproject.com/news/?p=16>

Gilchrist, James. "The Minuteman Are Turning Up the Heat on Washington-Again!" Minuteman Project. 20 Mar. 2006. 5 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.minutemanproject.com/news/?p=11>

González, Daniel. "Prop. 200 Backers Renew Battle to Expand Scope of Law." The Arizona Republic Online Edition. 25 May 05. 1-2. 4 Apr. 06  
<http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0525prop200appeal.html>

Hines, Barbara. "So Near Yet So Far Away: The Effect of September 11<sup>th</sup> on Mexican Immigrants in the United States." Texas Hispanic Journal of Law & Policy. 8.1 (2002): 37-47.

Kandel, William A. "A Profile of Mexican Worker in U.S. Agriculture." Crossing the Border: Research from the Mexican Migration Project. Eds. Jorge Durand and Douglas S. Massey. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004. 235-264.

Lee, Kenneth K. Huddled Masses, Muddled Laws: Why Contemporary Immigration Policy Fails to Reflect Public Opinion. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998.

LoBreglio, Kiera. "The Border Security and Immigration Improvement Act: A Modern Solution to a Historic Problem?" St. John's Law Review. 78 (2004): 933-963.

Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, Inc. The official Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. 5 Apr. 2006. <http://www.minutemanhq.com>

---. "Arizona Chapter- Day Labor Sites Demonstration." The Official Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. 5 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.minutemanhq.com/state/read.php?chapter=AZ&Sid=2>

---. "The Minuteman Pledge." The Official Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. 4 Apr. 2006 <http://www.minutemanhq.com/mmpledge.php>

Minuteman Project. Minuteman Project. 8 Apr. 2005. 11 Apr. 2005  
<http://minutemanproject.com>

Minuteman Project. Minuteman Project. 20 Mar. 2006. 4 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.minutemanproject.com>

---. "About the Minuteman Project." Minuteman Project. 2006. 5 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.minutemanproject.com/Aboutmmp.html>.

---. "America on Notice: Occupying Army demands more from their captives!!" Minuteman Project. 1 Apr. 2006. 4 Apr. 2006  
<http://www.minutemanproject.com/news/?p=19>

---. "Occupying Army makes their demands!" Minuteman Project. 29 Mar. 2006. 5 Apr. 2006 <http://www.minutemanproject.com/news/?p=17>

Muller, Thomas. "Nativism in the Mid-1990s" Immigrants Out!. Ed. Juan F. Perea. New York: New York UP, 1997. 105-118.

Murray, Shailagh and T.R. Reid. "Turning In to Anger on Immigration."

Washington Post Online Edition. 31 Mar. 2006: A01. 3 Apr. 2006

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp->

[dyn/content/article/2006/03/30/AR2006033001837\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/30/AR2006033001837_pf.html).

Nagengast, Carol. "Militarizing the Border Patrol." NACLA Report on the

Americas 32.3 (1998): 37-43. PAIS International. EBSCOhost. U of

Maryland Lib., College Park. 9 Apr. 2005 <http://weblinks3.epnet.com>

Newton, Casey. "Colo. Legislator Applauds Proposition 200." The Arizona

Republic Online Edition. 20 Jan. 2006. 1. 6 Apr. 2006

<http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0120capitol->

[tancredo20.html](http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0120capitol-tancredo20.html)

Office of the Press Secretary of President George W. Bush. "Fact Sheet: Securing

America through Immigration Reform." White House President George

W. Bush. 28 Nov. 2005. 6 Jan. 2006.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/print/20051128->

[3.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/print/20051128-3.html).

---. "President Bush Delivers Remarks on Border Security and Immigration

Reform." White House President George W. Bush. 28 Nov. 2005. 6 Jan.

2006. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051128->

[7.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051128-7.html)

Reuters. "Immigration Reform Proposals." Washington Post Online Edition. 27

Mar. 2006. 3 Apr. 2006 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp->

[dyn/content/article/2006/03/27/AR2006032701201\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/27/AR2006032701201_pf.html).

Rivera-Batiz, Francisco L. "Underground on American Soil: Undocumented Workers and US Immigration Policy." Journal of International Affairs. 53 (2000): 485-501.

Roberts, Dorothy E. "Who May Give Birth to Citizens? Reproduction, Eugenics, and Immigration." Immigrants Out!. Ed. Juan F. Perea. New York: New York UP, 1997. 205-219.

Rodríguez, Néstor P. "The Social Construction of the U.S- Mexico Border." Immigrants Out!. Ed. Juan F. Perea. New York: New York UP, 1997. 223-243.

Roig-Franzia, Manuel. "Down on the Border, 'La Linea' Isn't So Clear." Washington Post Online Edition. 30 Mar. 2006: A04. 3 Apr. 2006  
[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/29/AR2006032902228\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/29/AR2006032902228_pf.html)

Sanchez, George J. "Face the Nation: Race, Immigration, and the rise of Nativism in the Twentieth Century America." International Migration Review. 31.4 (1997): 1009-1030. Social Science Abstract. JSTOR. U of Maryland Lib., College Park. 8 Apr.2005 <<http://www.jstor.org>>.

Scherer, Michael. "Scrimmage on the Border." Mother Jones. 30.4 (2005): 50-57. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO host. U of Minnesota Lib., Minneapolis. 4 Apr. 2006 <http://web22.epnet.com>

"Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act." S. 1033. Library of Congress Thomas. 4 Apr. 2006. 1-150 <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/F?c109:1:/temp/~c109BWJ316:e132533>.



Simcox, Chris. "Illegal Alien Mobs Take to the Streets." The Official Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. 5 Apr. 2006

<<http://www.minutemanhq.com/mail/032806/>>.

---. "Minuteman Civil Defense Corps 'Secure Our Borders' Campaign April 2006." The Official Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. 4 Apr. 2006

<http://www.minutemanhq.com/mail/033006a/index.php#az>

---. "Standard Operating Procedure for Minuteman Civil Defense Corps." The Official Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. 5 Apr. 2006

<<http://www.minutemanhq.com/hq/sop.php>>.

Stout, David. "Bush Presses Tougher Measures on Illegal Immigration." The New York Times Online Edition. 28 Nov. 2005. 28 Nov. 2005

[www.nytimes.com/2005/11/28/politics/28cnd-bush.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/28/politics/28cnd-bush.html).

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World- System." In Mike Feathersone, Global Culture. London: Sage, 1990. 31-55.

Wilson, Tamar Diana. "Anti-Immigrant Sentiment and the Process of Settlement among Mexican Immigrants to the United States: Reflections on the Current Wave of Mexican Immigrant Bashing." Review of Radical Political Economics 31.2 (1999): 1-26. Alternative Press. First Search. U of Maryland Lib., College Park. 9 Apr.2005

<<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science>>.

---. "Anti-Immigrant Sentiment and the Problem of Reproduction/Maintenance in Mexican Immigration to the United States." Critique of Anthropology

20.2 (2000): 191-213. Alternative Press. First Search. U of Maryland Lib.,  
College Park. 8 Apr. 2005

Weisman, Jonathan. "Senate GOP Deal on Immigration Bill Likely." Washington  
Post Online Edition. 6 Apr. 2006: A18. 6 Apr. 2006  
[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-  
dyn/content/article/2006/04/05/AR2006040502038\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/04/05/AR2006040502038_pf.html).

---. "Senators Back Guest Workers: Panel's Measure Sides With Bush."  
Washington Post Online Edition. 28 Mar. 2006: A01. 4 Apr. 2006  
[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-  
dyn/content/article/2006/03/27/AR2006032700684\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/03/27/AR2006032700684_pf.html).

Wingett, Yvonne. "Prop. 200 Spurs Efforts Nationwide: Groups Seek to  
Duplicate Migrant Law." The Arizona Republic Online Edition. 24 Jan.  
2005. 1-2. 4 Apr. 2006  
<[http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0124prop200-  
america24.html](http://www.azcentral.com/specials/special29/articles/0124prop200-america24.html).>