

## Reconfiguring Race and Gender in the War on Terrorism

In 2002, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) filed suit against the Denver Police Department (DPD) in federal court on behalf of several hundred political activists who had been forging transnational ties with impoverished people around the world. Among these activists were members of the Chiapas Coalition, a nonprofit group that promotes peaceful resolution of ongoing conflicts in the Mexican state by facilitating fair trade networks and educational exchanges. According to the DPD, these activists warranted surveillance as “criminal extremists” who posed “threats to the state.” To safeguard the American homeland against this perceived threat, U.S. citizens were subjected to heightened police scrutiny and sustained monitoring of political activities that are supposed to be protected under First Amendment guarantees of freedom of assembly and expression. DPD dossiers prepared on these citizens—including more than ten thousand individuals and three thousand organizations—were classified as intelligence files and shared with more than two dozen local and federal law-enforcement agencies.

In March 2002, I was contacted by an attorney with the ACLU of Colorado and informed that my name appeared in criminal intelligence records maintained by the DPD in association with the Chiapas Coalition. The intelligence file that included my name (and listed other members of this organization) officially (and erroneously) designated us as “Criminal Extremists” who were part of an organization dedicated to “the violent overthrow of the Mexican government” (see Figure 1.1).

## Person File Report

Anna Sampaio

### Description(s)

Date	Gender	Nationality	Race	Religion	Sexual Orientation	Disability	Deceased Date
02/02/2000			White				

Date	Ht	Wt	Eye Color	Hair Color	Hair Type	Hair Length	Facial Hair	Complexion	Teeth	Build
02/02/2000	0	0								

Date	Notes
02/02/2000	

Scars, Marks, Tattoos, Oddities

### Note(s)

- Listed as contact for Chiapas Coalition.

### Business Associations

### Case Associations

### Group Associations

Chiapas Coalition (Member) - Direct Relationship 02/02/2000  
 Type: Criminal Extremist G  
 Notes: Group dedicated to overthrow of Mexican government, claiming government abuse of workers. Has hel ...

### Incident Associations

### Location Associations

1522 Lafayette Denver (Resides) - Direct Relationship 02/02/2000  
 Type: Residence  
 Description:  
 Comments: Phone subscribe to [REDACTED] Listed phone number for [REDACTED] and contact for Chiapas Co ...

1052 S High Denver (Resides) - Direct Relationship 02/02/2000  
 Type: Residence  
 Description:  
 Comments:

### Person Associations

[REDACTED] - Direct Relationship 02/02/2000  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED] - Direct Relationship 02/02/2000

Figure 1.1

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

The gross misrepresentation of the group, whose actual mission was “working towards a peaceful resolution to ongoing conflict in Chiapas, Mexico,” included the perverse targeting of a seventy-two-year-old Franciscan nun, among other individuals.

While the Chiapas Coalition had participated in forms of civil disobedience, we were a motley compilation of students, academics, faith-based workers, and local activists—resembling thousands of other peaceful community-based organizations across the country. Our work typically took the form of lectures, workshops, fair trade symposia, press conferences, rallies, and occasional protests (typically at either the local branch of the Mexican consulate or the state capital). In short, the activities of the group were neither “criminal” nor “extreme” but rather peaceful and executed with the most diligent planning to ensure that no harm to individuals or property occurred. In fact, in years of working with the organization, I witnessed only one occasion in which members were arrested when they interrupted a luncheon hosted by the governor of Colorado on September 17, 1999, to challenge the promotion of a new trade office and the expansion of free trade between Colorado and Mexico.<sup>1</sup>

The ACLU’s initial investigation into these “spy files” revealed that the Denver Police Department had produced and stored more than 3,500 similar criminal intelligence files in a newly formed electronic database. Included in this compilation were files on the American Friends Service Committee, a Nobel Peace Prize–winning Quaker service organization, as well as Amnesty International and the American Indian Movement; individual files targeted Winona LaDuke, George Carlin, Russell Means, Bishop Desmond Tutu, and many others.<sup>2</sup> The files documented a wide array of information, including membership in organizations, attendance at events, “opinions” of groups and individuals (in many cases characterized inaccurately), physical descriptions, home addresses, license-plate numbers, credit information, and photographs and video recordings of targeted individuals and their “associates” at organizational meetings, protests, workshops, and similar events.

The discovery of these files and the concerns raised regarding violations of civil liberties and unwarranted scrutiny were accompanied by vehement assurances from local law enforcement that no other files existed, that these files were a “mistake,” that they had never been shared with other law-enforcement agencies outside Denver, and that they would be quickly purged.<sup>3</sup> However, months of additional investigation uncovered six full-length filing cabinets filled with more hard-copy files, bringing the total number of criminal intelligence files to approximately thirteen thousand (ten thousand files on individuals and three thousand files on organizations). More importantly, the content of the files revealed that the spying was largely directed at ethnic and racial minority activists and organizations working

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

within Latina/o, American Indian, and African American communities. As such, the files were invasive, comprehensive, and gathered without reasonable suspicion of an actual threat, and they brought together an expansive security apparatus with a systematic program of racial and ethnic profiling.<sup>4</sup>

Shortly after the discovery of the files, the ACLU of Colorado filed a federal suit against the city and county of Denver that was settled in 2003.<sup>5</sup> The case uncovered the DPD's extensive use of intelligence officers, undercover operatives, and informants to collect information without the standards of "reasonable suspicion," "probable cause," or any other legitimate law-enforcement purpose. In a glaring attempt to subvert the case, one DPD intelligence officer composed a memo suggesting that bureau personnel destroy or take home files to prevent "the inevitable lawsuits" by "radicals."<sup>6</sup> Even more alarming were revelations that, far from being confined to the local police department, the files were regularly shared with agencies across the country, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and more than two dozen local and regional law-enforcement units. Moreover, the files were shared without ensuring that these agencies would guard against the further disclosure of the information or that the promulgation of the information would not result in harm to the people profiled.<sup>7</sup>

For me and other individuals targeted in the files, the revelation and the news that those files had been shared so widely created a number of obstacles. In addition to dramatically chilling our free expression and criminalizing our protected expressive activities, the label of "Criminal Extremist" placed unwarranted scrutiny on our daily activities and cast suspicion on our personal and professional contacts. In my own work with documented and undocumented immigrants and in my travels to parts of Mexico, already heavily scrutinized by state and local law enforcement, this kind of branding was politically dangerous and professionally obstructive. Whatever trust and confidence I had worked to build over the years, whatever "insider status" I had gained through careful cultivations of mutually respectful relationships—relationships central to my ethnographic work and to my own location within these communities—were suddenly subverted.<sup>8</sup>

On a broader scale, these actions foregrounded a troubling surge in securitization efforts across the country that were deeply racialized and coded in the language of "protecting the homeland." Although the ACLU discovered the files in 2002, the preponderance of these files were created and disseminated by local law enforcement *prior* to the events of September 11, 2001—prior to the massive expansion of law-enforcement powers enabled via the USA PATRIOT Act, the creation of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), or amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

paved the way for domestic spying operations. These actions demonstrate a rapid ascension in state authority, even before 9/11, and how shifts in law enforcement, and especially immigration enforcement, occurred before those attacks. The case also demonstrates the shifting relationships between local, state, and federal law enforcement and the rise of regional associations, such as Joint Terrorism Task Forces (JTTFs) and local “fusion centers,” which figured centrally in the collection and dissemination of information. Finally, the case illustrates the change in public discourse and the logic of security that increasingly cast immigrants, activists, and those engaged in transnational politics as potential enemies of the state, thereby fueling law enforcement’s ability to target political and racial minorities for scrutiny, harassment, apprehension, and imprisonment with virtual impunity.<sup>9</sup>

This ascension in state authority and racial targeting by law enforcement was dramatically accelerated with the onset of the war on terrorism after 9/11. A 2010 report from Glenn Fine, the inspector general of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), documents abuses between 2001 and 2006 within the FBI as it targeted activist organizations engaged in peaceful, nonviolent work for investigation and scrutiny, resulting in several innocent people being placed on the domestic terror watch list for years and former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller lying to Congress about the nature of the investigations. The unwarranted scrutiny of such groups as Greenpeace, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), the Thomas Merton Center, the Catholic Worker Movement, and other peace organizations began prior to 9/11 but mushroomed into a wide-ranging probe that continued for years under the guise of national security.<sup>10</sup>

Surveillance programs begun under the George W. Bush administration were embraced and expanded under President Barack Obama’s administration, enabling the federal government to collect and scrutinize telephone calls, e-mails, chat messages, videos, photos, stored data, file transfers, videoconferences, and log-ins of foreigners and Americans.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, local law enforcement extended these domestic spying initiatives through the collection of “suspicious activity reports” that were regularly shared with federal agencies (including the FBI and the JTTF) through information clearinghouses, such as seventy-two “fusion centers” established around the country.<sup>12</sup>

Few actions underscored the intensification of state scrutiny after 9/11 more poignantly than the series of domestic operations intended to identify and remove terrorist threats from within the country. Specifically, in 2002—the same year the DPD spy files were uncovered—under the direction of the newly created DHS, a host of operations were announced that united federal agencies with state and local law enforcement. Invoking the nomenclature of foreign military operations, these new initiatives includ-

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

ed “Operation Tarmac,” “Operation Community Shield,” and “Operation Wagon Train” and relied upon existing federal and state statutes in coordinating a massive effort to root out terrorist threats to the country and secure the nation.

“Operation Tarmac” was one of the earliest coordinated operations after 9/11 and provided a model for the structure and impacts of subsequent undertakings. This operation was a joint effort between the DHS, the DOJ (including the U.S. Attorneys Offices), the Department of Transportation, U.S. Customs, the Social Security Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, and other agencies, targeting “persons of unknown origin” working at airports and other federally secured facilities around the country.<sup>13</sup> These investigations often extended to the thousands of service workers employed in hotels, restaurants, and other industries adjacent to these buildings.<sup>14</sup> By January 2003, more than 750,000 employment records at more than 1,900 airports, businesses, and federal facilities had been scrutinized, resulting in the detention and arrest of several thousand individuals. Most of these people were janitors, members of cleaning crews, and food-service workers, the vast majority of whom were Latina/o immigrants (including Mexican, Central American, and South American immigrants) arrested for using false identification. While U.S. attorneys referred to the operation as “a highly effective weapon in the domestic war against terrorism,” the DHS and the U.S. Attorneys Offices have since confirmed that *not one* of the immigrants detained or deported as part of Operation Tarmac had any relationship to terrorist activity.<sup>15</sup>

These federal initiatives continued to proliferate, with the most high-profile operations targeting employers suspected of hiring large concentrations of unauthorized workers. In accordance with his belief that “illegal documents are not only used by illegal migrants, but they are used by terrorists who want to get on airplanes, or criminals who want to prey on our citizens,” DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff launched “Operation Wagon Train” in 2005 to protect the United States by verifying the nationality and immigration status of employees.<sup>16</sup> A coordinated operation involving multiple federal agencies and local law-enforcement departments, Operation Wagon Train investigated persons suspected of using fraudulent identification for employment. This new operation, which targeted thousands of employees in various manufacturing plants throughout the country, including pallet plants in California, meat-packing plants across the Midwest, and fisheries on the East Coast, resulted in a disproportionate level of detentions, arrests, incarcerations, and deportations of Latina/o immigrants who were working in these industries. In the largest raid executed under Operation Wagon Train, which targeted Swift and Company meat-packing plants in six states throughout the Midwest, 1,282 individuals were apprehended, all of whom

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

were unauthorized Latina/o immigrants.<sup>17</sup> As with Operation Tarmac, Operation Wagon Train yielded no actual evidence of terrorist activity or persons with links to terrorist organizations.

Collectively, each of these cases—from the DPD spy files to the Operation Wagon Train raids—rests upon a process of racialization produced in relationship to the surge of state authority that blurs the boundaries of citizenship, immigration, and national security concerns. In the case of Operations Tarmac and Wagon Train, this increased state authority disproportionately affected Latina/o immigrants. Moreover, justifications for the raids regularly conflated apprehended immigrants with terrorists, despite the absence of any evidence to that effect. However, the extent to which Latinas/os have been targeted by the state as potential terrorists is not restricted to these operations. Immigration legislation passed since 2001 reflects an increasingly restrictive agenda aimed at curtailing the resources, rights, and mobility of immigrants, more than half of whom are from Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean.<sup>18</sup> This legislation and the aforementioned domestic raids trade on racialized depictions of Latina/o immigrants as foreign and threatening, while these same populations are subjected to terrifying forms of ethnic intimidation, harassment, abuse, and discrimination. In short, through the war on terrorism, Latinas/os have increasingly become “potential terrorists” even as they are being terrorized by the state.<sup>19</sup>

Understanding this process and its specific impacts on Latina/o immigrants requires more than a singular attention to patterns of discrimination based on forms of ethnic or racial identity. Borrowing from work in feminist theory, critical race studies, and intersectional analysis, my argument in this book rests upon an understanding of race as a process constructed and executed in relationship to the state and civil society and affected by its operation in relationship with other forms of marginalization. In other words, racialization entails

a configuration of social, cultural, and political processes by which specific perceived visible differences are imbued with racial significance and meaning that then are incorporated as racial hierarchy both within macro level economic, state, and cultural institutional structures and within the interstitial nodes of quotidian experiences and relations taking place in the sites of civil society.<sup>20</sup>

As discussed in Chapter 3, Latinas/os have been historically constructed as “perpetual foreigners” through a process of racialization, thereby legitimating their political marginalization, excluding them from institutions of public life, and making them vulnerable to restrictive immigration policy



## Excerpt • Temple University Press

and enforcement.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, this enduring construction as “aliens,” regardless of nativity or immigration status, has evolved since the mid-1990s, shifting with the intervention of new discourses and technologies of power surrounding “security” and especially with the emergence of a national security regime such that Latinas/os are increasingly positioned by the state as not just foreigners but potential terrorists.

As with other processes of domination, the particular manifestations of racialized marginalization are mediated, altered, negotiated, reconfigured, and informed by intersecting modes of subordination and require an analysis attuned to these simultaneous forms of difference to thoroughly explore changes in immigration politics. While others, including Leo Chavez, Alfonso Gonzales, Joseph Nevins, and Raymond Rocco, highlight the important intersections of racialized immigration policy and practices in the United States and the way these confluences have helped neoliberalism and globalization expand material inequality within Latina/o immigrant communities, their research leaves unexamined the way that racialization and gendering processes have operated in tandem to construct Latina/o immigrants as potential terrorists and to legitimize their terrorization via restrictive state practices.<sup>22</sup> Nor has there been detailed examination of the experiences of Latinas and Latinos within the war on terror and a national security regime that calibrates the degree of threat posed in relation to the racialized and gendered positions of particular “foreigners.”

Thus, for example, while the domestic operations described above were deeply racialized, frequently overlooked are the ways in which men’s *and* women’s bodies also became an important site of enforcement. A 2011 report from the Warren Institute found that 93 percent of immigrants detained in conjunction with the initial phase of large-scale military-style raids and roundups intended to identify and remove potential terrorists were Latinos.<sup>23</sup> However, as the raids shifted from secured and sensitive facilities to commercial employment and residential locations, Latinas became increasing targets, and the number of Latina immigrants detained and imprisoned or deported proliferated. These apprehensions were not isolated incidents: More women and parents with children were detained as the scale of immigration raids expanded, particularly after the launch of Operation Return to Sender and the Secured Communities Program.<sup>24</sup> As the number of apprehensions and detentions escalated, and particularly as more women were held in detention facilities for processing and deportation, reports of gendered violence in the forms of sexual harassment and abuse also increased. The ACLU documented close to two hundred allegations of sexual abuse of immigrants between 2007 and 2010, including sexual assaults by officers working in the detention facilities. In 2014, tens of thousands of mothers



## Excerpt • Temple University Press

with young children and unaccompanied minors fleeing violence from their home countries in Central America and seeking refuge in the United States faced prolonged detention and even deportation, despite the presence of a credible threat to substantiate their fears. As such, both men's *and* women's bodies became the locus upon which shifts in immigration legislation and national security initiatives were executed. Understanding the full extent of their marginalization means understanding how their racialized subordination intersected with the particular vulnerabilities of women and children within Latina/o communities, redefining their lives and their futures in the United States.<sup>25</sup>

Another important way that gender and race intersected in the context of these enforcement initiatives was through the creation of new legislation weaving together expansions of gender-based rights, particularly protections, access, and opportunities for immigrant women and children, with increased scrutiny of immigrants. Here the analysis of race and gender shifts from *subjects* to the racialization and gendering of *legislation* and to a process of unmasking and denaturalizing language in legislation that intensifies the proliferation of raids and roundups. The Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 provides the best example of this intersection of racializing and gendering in legislation tied to the raids. The act extends protections, rights of admission, and legalization to immigrant women and children who have been victims of sexual assault or trafficking in the United States, yet it simultaneously extends the ability of local law enforcement to act as immigration agents, a key feature of the surge in raids and roundups.

Yet another important intersection occurs in the production of new knowledge and discourse animating the federal government's rapid expansion of security. In particular, the national security regime has relied heavily on the production of security discourse founded upon racialized fears and gendered logic of protection to legitimate aggressive military mobilizations abroad and restrictions at home. This particular discourse of masculine protection and racialized demonization not only appears in public declarations, proclamations, and press releases from the DHS to the executive branch but has equally foregrounded shifts in legislation, executions of large-scale raids, surges in immigrant scrutiny and detention, and systematic abridgements of civil liberties for immigrants and citizens alike. In short, framing the war on terror and particularly the production of "securitization" as a knowledge project, race and gender figure prominently in the production of meaning and especially in "truths" proffered by the state to legitimate and expand its authority. Here gender and race are taken as elements of interpretation as opposed to as descriptors of particular subjects, attitudes, or identities.

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

In this way, racialization not only signifies embodied subjects but equally serves as an important heuristic tool that opens the door to new questions and analyses in immigration politics and policy.

In short, the rise of the security state and the attendant war on terrorism has been deeply racialized, but this process of racial construction, articulation, and execution has been intricately woven together with multiple configurations of gender and subordination that necessitate a more nuanced intersectional analysis. Of particular significance to this study is the expansion of race and gender scholarship, which has developed conceptual tools emphasizing *racialization and gendering processes*. Drawing upon this recent scholarship, I view race and gender as important forms of organization and identity but equally as ways in which difference is constructed, expressed, negotiated, and embodied through complex interactions with political institutions and processes. As new knowledge about immigration and securitization policies and practices in the twenty-first century is produced, discourses and articulations of race and gender play a central analytical role.

This book examines the rise of the national security state as a powerful discursive regime. It illuminates significant legislative and policy shifts pertaining to immigration since 9/11, giving particular attention to the way these processes are racialized and gendered. It investigates how Latinas/os have been affected by these changes. This book probes the inequitable burdens imposed on Latina/o immigrants by recent securitization measures that appear to be racially neutral but in reality work to rearticulate and reinscribe forms of racial and gender hierarchy. Moreover, this book demonstrates how the ascendance of this security state has served as a template to scrutinize, harass, and encumber immigrants while also reconfiguring citizenship. Overall, my aim in this book is conceptual (focusing on developing a framework for analyzing current immigration politics informed by race and gender) and empirical (using this framework to document particular impacts of securitization and the war on terror on Latina/o immigrants and citizens, demonstrating powerful effects on fundamental aspects of citizenship as well). Each of the individual chapters addresses key theoretical, conceptual, and empirical issues essential to immigration and securitization studies.

In Chapter 2, I present a theoretical framework that treats the war on terror and the surge of securitization as a knowledge project. My goal is to make visible the tacit presuppositions of the national security state through the use of intersectional analysis. Rather than accepting the state's construction of the terrorist threat at face value, this chapter situates homeland-security measures in relation to long-standing processes of racialization and gendering that create and legitimize hierarchies among citizens. Drawing upon critical race and gender theory, I analyze shifts in securitization and immigration politics since 9/11 in terms of competing logics of protection-

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

ism and demonization that mobilize fear to legitimate heightened modes of surveillance and control. I show how new domestic-security measures construct internal enemies predicated on ethnic and racial profiling to justify the rapid expansion of state authority. Posing as protectors of the nation, local, state, and federal agencies develop a paternalistic relationship with certain residents even as they demonize others as illegitimate predators. These two dynamics—protection and demonization—are neither incongruent nor diametrically opposed. On the contrary, they are intertwined, simultaneously feminizing the legitimate citizenry (rendering them silent, docile, and subservient) while racializing Arab, South Asian, and Latina/o citizens and noncitizens as terrorists.

Although the state's response to 9/11—specifically, the war on terrorism—has profoundly reconfigured immigration politics as well as the rights and opportunities of immigrants in the United States, these shifts have not occurred in a vacuum. To contextualize the war on terror and the shifts in immigration policies and practices, Chapter 3 examines the history of constitutional provisions and federal and state statutes that have circumscribed the lives of Latinas/os throughout the twentieth century. While much of the book focuses on the contemporary national security regime, this chapter focuses on the past—namely, the racialization of Latinas/os within U.S. immigration politics, demonstrating key continuities over the course of the twentieth century. In particular, I trace significant political and economic changes that opened, closed, or reconfigured borders while expanding or contracting immigrants' rights and ultimately redefining Latina/o immigrants as burdens and threats to the country. Rather than treating the aftermath of 9/11 as an exception, this chapter ties the war on terror and the shifts in immigration under the national security regime to a longer trajectory of racialization, paying particular attention in the last section to the escalation of border enforcement, the passage of federal anti-terrorism legislation, and renewed restrictions on immigrants' rights at the state and national levels. By paying close attention to similarities and differences, this chapter assesses exactly what is new in recent immigration policies and what is tied to a much longer tradition of racialization in the construction of citizenship and national identity.

Chapter 4 focuses on the public laws passed by Congress in the seven years after 9/11, closely examining manifestations of racialization, securitization, and restriction within immigration legislation passed during the 107th, 108th, 109th, and 110th sessions of Congress. A comprehensive review of all immigration-related legislation passed by Congress in this period reveals particularly disturbing patterns in the framing of immigration policy. Restrictions abound, with the most common types of legislation coalescing around five central themes: increasing the scrutiny of immigrants (including

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

policing and scrutiny related to immigrants' work authorization); expanding the possibilities for detentions, arrest, and/or deportation; militarizing the southern border between the United States and Mexico; increasing restrictions and/or constraints on federal services and benefits to immigrants; and empowering or extending the capacity of local law enforcement to execute greater levels of investigation, review, apprehension, and/or cooperation with federal immigration authorities. Moving beyond the discursive intersections of race and gender that foreground the legislative shifts, this chapter also examines complicated weavings of race and gender rights, resources, opportunities, and constraints occurring through specific legislation, particularly the passage of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 and the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2003.

The final portion of Chapter 4 examines in detail those laws that have simultaneously expanded state authority while having the most negative impact on Latina/o immigrants—specifically, the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001, the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005. It provides a comprehensive and systematic review of immigration legislation, documenting shifts in immigration law and policy leading to the construction of Latin/o immigrants as security threats as well as new layers of restriction aimed at this population.

Congressional legislation may extend the reach of the state, but the full effects of legislative initiatives turn on implementation. Chapter 5 examines the execution of recent immigration laws that link multiple federal and local agencies in cooperative ventures. In particular, through archival review of newspaper reporting from 2001 to 2010, I examine the proliferation of immigration raids and roundups. While the use of raids for large-scale immigrant removal is not new, efforts since 9/11 have been concentrated in three areas: airports and federally secured facilities, employment sites, and residential raids targeting fugitive absconders. I examine each of these areas, how they are linked to previous raids, and their impacts on Latina/o immigrants.

Although these new initiatives use language that is often race-neutral, they trade upon fear of potential terrorism to legitimate the formation of a masculinized protector embodied in the national security state that overrides long-standing separations of power and jurisdiction between federal, state, and local governments as well as constitutional guarantees of citizens and permanent residents. In tracing how the logic of racialized fear and masculinized protection plays out in particular implementation efforts, I show these policies' disproportionate racial effects, as Latinas/os have been detained, apprehended, deported, arrested, fined, and otherwise encumbered through these operations. Chapter 5 contributes to research that docu-

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

ments how state action that appears to be race-neutral can, in fact, contribute to the production and institutionalization of troubling racial and gendered hierarchies that negatively affect Latina/o communities.

*Terrorizing Latinas/os* addresses the effects of securitization and immigration policy on various cohorts within Latina/o communities in the United States—including documented and undocumented migrants—but it equally examines changes in citizenship that have emerged in relationship to shifts in immigration politics. In Chapter 6, I examine the broader shifts in citizenship signified in the cases of three natural-born U.S. citizens: John Walker Lindh, Yaser Hamdi, and José Padilla. As discussed in Chapter 2, securitization constitutes more than just a defensive strategy or bureaucratic organization—it is a politically and socially constructed discursive regime that informs policy and strategy but, more importantly in our current context, is also centrally constitutive of community, political identity, and citizenship. Chapter 6 extends the analysis to consider how fundamental rights, values, and conceptions of citizenship were sacrificed in the context of mounting securitization. With growing frequency, the terrorizing restrictions applied to immigrants in the years after 9/11 were applied to the most protected class of persons in the United States—namely, natural-born citizens. Moreover, this slippage from constructing immigrants as terrorists to terrorizing citizens was not accidental. On the contrary, the national security state engaged in a parallel process of racial demonization and de-Americanization, ultimately stripping detainees of legal protection and political agency while publicly appealing to a masculinized discourse of protection. Highlighting the cases of Lindh, Hamdi, and Padilla, this chapter points to a systematic erosion of due process, representation, and political agency as the efforts to expand the security state increased. I trace shifts in meaning and in the construction of citizenship in the context of the discursive regimes of racialized demonization, masculinized protectionism, and securitization.

Although Chapter 6 focuses on the responses of the national security regime in the specific cases of Lindh, Hamdi, and Padilla, these cases also illuminate shifts in the boundaries of citizenship, as the language associated with the purported dangers posed by immigrants is transferred to discussions of citizens. In short, as the state broadened its definition of “enemies” in its war on terrorism, the boundaries between citizen and immigrant blurred. Just as the structure and administration of immigration politics shifted within the war on terror, generating harm to thousands of immigrants far removed from any actual terrorist activity, so too have the boundaries of citizenship been fundamentally reconfigured, undermining key features of democracy for all Americans.

This book ends with an examination of immigration reform under the Obama administration, contrasting the promise of hope and change articu-

## Excerpt • Temple University Press

lated in his presidential campaign with the effects of his policies on Latinas/os. Chapter 7 considers how the potential for change stagnated as deadlock in Washington became a hallmark of the Obama era. Despite the tenuousness of immigration politics in this moment, I analyze how the politics of immigration under the Obama administration compares with not only the promises made during the campaign but also the record of the Bush administration. Turning from federal to state politics, I examine the shifting racialization and gendering of discourses on immigrants embedded in restrictive legislation in such states as Arizona, which have reignited racialized fears and traded upon gendered stereotypes. This final chapter revisits changes to immigration politics occurring in the context of securitization and the ascension of the national security regime, analyzing the degree to which these changes have expanded or abated under the Obama administration and exploring the prospects for reform and restructuring in light of these changes.