

It's a Go for Sheriff Joe: He's getting ready to arrest immigrants

(Feb 9 2007)

We're moving into a new phase of the war against immigrants in Maricopa County, AZ. Please pay attention to this issue. Arpaio has it out for immigrants.

Officers get nod to train to enforce immigration laws¹⁰⁹

Sheriff Joe Arpaio received the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors' blessing on Wednesday to train up to 160 officers to enforce federal immigration laws.

Arpaio said the officers will be used to arrest suspected undocumented immigrants and turn them over to the federal government. A small but growing number of law enforcement officials in the United States have asked for similar training. Critics contend that local officers doubling as immigration agents could undermine public safety by making immigrants reluctant to report crimes and could lead to racial profiling.

Federal officials could finalize the agreement within days, with the hope of starting the four- to five-week training for the first group on Feb. 27.

Let us not forget where Arpaio is coming from:

Although the details are still being worked out, Arpaio did not rule out the possibility that deputies could use their expanded authority to question people about their immigration status during traffic stops and infractions as minor as "spitting on the sidewalk."

"Any time we come across an enforcement action and we find there are illegals present, then we will put our federal authority hat on and we will arrest them," Arpaio said. "I will do anything I can to fight this illegal-immigration problem, and this is one more step."

There needs to be heavy grassroots opposition to this. Now. Immigrants are already targets of harassment, arrest, detention, and deportation, but this will give the cops even more jurisdiction.

End Notes:

¹⁰¹ www.azcentral.com/news/articles/0201eloyshot0201-ON.html

¹⁰² www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/0130statewide-militia0130.html

¹⁰³ azleg.gov/MembersPage.asp?Member_ID=77&Legislature=48

¹⁰⁴ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/06/44033.php

¹⁰⁵ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/San_Francisco_Vigilance_Movement

¹⁰⁶ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lattimer_Massacre

¹⁰⁷ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ludlow_massacre

¹⁰⁸ deletetheborder.org/node/1938

¹⁰⁹ www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/local/articles/0208B1-update0208.html

ANTI-IMMIGRANT HYPOCRISY

**Selections to Expose & Oppose
Legislation, Law Enforcement,
and Vigilantes
from deletetheborder.org/chaparral**

during the zoot suit riots.

We need to pay close attention to this militia thing.

More Immigrants Shot, Killed/Injured in AZ (Feb 9 2007)

More immigrants were shot at this week, following an attack by men in camouflage and berets that left a man dead and another wounded on January 27th. This latest incident, which occurred yesterday northwest of Tucson, came one day after a robbery of 13 immigrants close to the border.

On Thursday, gunmen shot at a northbound pickup truck headed north on a dirt road, some 10 to 12 miles south and west of the Silver Bell copper mine. The gunfire forced the truck, carrying nine or 10 undocumented immigrants, to stop - and killed a man and a 15-year-old girl in the back seat, while wounding a woman and two other men, one fatally.

Authorities have not determined who the gunmen were. They and the immigrants' driver, believed to be a smuggler, and a guide remained at large.

In only one of four news stories I read on this latest shooting did a journalist link the shooting that occurred under two weeks ago. I honestly wouldn't be surprised if it was vigilantes/racists, but i also acknowledge that a situation has been created where all sorts of crime occurs related to smuggling and drug trafficking, so i would have no way of knowing what happened. However, all of these issues- even the fact that immigrants die of the heat or of lack of water or of cold while crossing the desert- are related. They're related because immigrants are seen as exploitable and disposable.

Border "security" has created a situation where people have to cross dangerous terrain. Border crossers are desperate and others can profit from taking advantage of them- charging high prices, and often not following through, sometimes stealing even more money and ditching the immigrants. Women's bodies are targets of some of the coyotes' exploitation as well. There are plenty of honest well-meaning coyotes, but plenty of shitty ones too, the latter given free reign because of the desperation that has been caused by the mexican and u.s. governments, corporations, and capitalism in general. Therefore, even if it was not white vigilante-types who shot at the immigrants (although from all the hate speech i've seen i really wouldn't be surprised if it was), their deaths are still on their hands. Instead of fixing the root of the problem, their "solution" is to call people names, turn them into criminals (by creating more laws), make them more desperate, and more exploitable, and therefore more disposable. They're making it okay for immigrants to die. It makes me really sick.

For updates on local (Maricopa County, AZ) and national news, plus more commentary, see <http://deletetheborder.org/chaparral>

All writing by sallydarity
sallydarity@yahoo.com

Further resources:
deletetheborder.org
nooneisillegal.org
organiccollective.org/writing.html
www.immigrantsolidarity.org

No Border Camp info and zine: deletetheborder.org/node/1631

Jaggi Singh: No One is Illegal audio:
www.g7welcomingcommittee.net/mp3/jaggi_singh_noi.mp3

Books:

No One is Illegal by Mike Davis and Justin Akers Chacón
Communities Without Borders By David Bacon

technology, a bill that would make it so undocumented immigrants could be charged with trespassing, and he was also behind the REAL ID act. Here's some text from the article about the militia:

Arizona may become one of the growing number of states to create its own home-grown security force, manned by citizen volunteers and deployed by the governor to deal with emergencies. It's a version of a state militia, separate from the Arizona National Guard but available to assist Arizonans in dealing with natural disasters, terrorist attacks or other emergencies... But coming at a time of heightened tensions over Arizona's border with Mexico, some critics feel it is the state's attempt to create its own border patrol. Others say the force is not necessary, noting that the National Guard already exists to deal with state emergencies. Other critics say it would add another layer of law enforcement, requiring an undetermined amount of money from the state budget. State Sen. Jack Harper, a Republican from Surprise, said Monday that Arizona needs its own force to cope with emergencies when the National Guard is co-opted by the federal government. Twenty-two states already have organized such a force, Harper said.

This may also be an attempt to legitimize and sanction vigilantes such as the minutemen. Indeed, is it not likely that a number of these folks would love to become members of an official state-sponsored militia with all the funding, authority, and technology that comes with it? Just like "[tarantulas](#)"¹⁰⁴ of Sheriff Joe Arpaio's posse was recruiting for anti-immigrant people to join the posse.

I've mentioned this before, but a good source of information on the history anti-immigrant vigilantes/militias/posses is the first part of the book "No One is Illegal" by Mike Davis. I'm convinced that giving such people/groups the authority of being state-sanctioned is possibly even more dangerous than not, despite the fact that they have to be more accountable to the state. Of course, we can already look at the abuses of power by law enforcement and military against indigenous, black, immigrant, and other people in history and the present.

Check out the [San Francisco Vigilance Movement](#)¹⁰⁵, [Lattimer Massacre](#)¹⁰⁶ [the Ludlow Massacre](#)¹⁰⁷, for more examples of posse/militia attacks on workers/immigrants.

Of course, non-state-sanctioned folks are also dangerous, as we can see by the recent attack on immigrants and the man driving the truck they were in (see [this post](#)¹⁰⁸).

And of course we must also see the overlap of people playing different roles within and outside of their jobs, such as the history of cops by day participating in kkk actions by night. Or the sailors/marines who attacked chicanos

Contents:

Open Letter: Border discussion needs more direct opposition	3
The Raids	4
Why I'm doing this	5
If they were really concerned about the law...	6
Who Defines the Immigration Debate?	7
You're illegal or not depending on which law you break...	9
The Invasion, Racism, English-only and Attrition	11
"Nation of Laws" and the immigrants' rights advocates who embrace the idea	13
Citizenship, Whiteness, and the Dangerous Direction of Anti-Immigrant Legislation	14
On "The Terrorists Who Aren't on the News"	17
Sexual Assault in Mexico, on the Border, and in the U.S.	19
Rights and the Anti-Immigrant Movement	24
Anti-Immigrant Folks and the New Slave-Trade	26
Why I Call it Racism	28
The Complexity of the Border Patrol Agents' Sentence	31
The Drug-Smuggler Stereotype	33
Deputy shoots policeman, immigrant gets deported... What?	34
Immigrants kicked out on their asses in several towns	35
Immigrant faces up to 4 years for conspiracy	36
Sheriff Joe Arranging for Police to Enforce Immigration Laws	37
Victory for Undocumented Immigrants in Arizona!	38
Hey Sheriff Joe, Are you just sending a message or just doing your job?	39
Immigrants Held Without Bail in Maricopa County	39
Sheriff Getting Closer to Federal Immigration Law Enforcement	40
Anti-Immigrant Extremists and Institutional Racism: Contrasts and Crossover	42
Watch out Kingman Arizona	44
OOPS! Racist AZ politician "accidentally" sent out article from National Alliance	45
Border Guardians to Burn Mexican Flag in Phoenix	46
Protesting Racists is Fascist behavior?	48
Notes/Websources	50
The Latest:	
Immigrants Shot at in AZ	52
Promoter of State Militia Linked to Anti-Immigrant Bills	53
More Immigrants Shot, Killed/Injured in AZ	55
It's a Go for Sheriff Joe: He's getting ready to arrest immigrants	56

Open Letter: Border discussion needs more direct opposition (October 1 2006- Pre-blog)

Right now it is crucial that we discuss what is going on and what we can do about it. I constantly think about what in the future I will wish I had done during this time period to confront the racism and state repression against undocumented immigrants. It's not just about my feelings of personal responsibility, but that people's lives and dignity are at stake right now.

Grassroots groups and individuals are struggling right now to build their movement. The larger movement has, in many ways, been co-opted by power-hungry politicians and folks who may care about their undocumented brothers and sisters but are more interested in buying in to the american way of life than undermining the racist capitalist order. For many, this is about survival. We have to think of ways to create a movement that can help people survive at the same time as promoting resistance to the pressure to assimilate and hope for conformist pay-off.

There are various ways in which people have been active on some level in the immigrants' rights movement, whether fighting against anti-immigrant legislation, trying to prevent the deaths of folks crossing the border, trying to educate folks about their rights, doing legal observing when the minutemen are doing their patrols, watching the cops when folks are getting harassed by them, trying to educate the public about the realities of immigrants' lives, etc. Much of this seeks to appeal to the average citizen. Often activists maintain the stance that what they're doing (legal observing, protesting, educating, etc.) is legal and morally right and that any decent person who believes in american justice and democracy should be able to see that. We're supposed to say that we're not FOR illegal immigration, we're not FOR breaking the law (and we often won't call the law wrong or racist), but that we support human and civil rights for all people. This is justified because it is the average white american citizen that we are fighting over, and it seems like the minutemen are winning. My mom, despite being rather apolitical, repeats the same bullshit she hears on the news, which is often coming directly from minutemen and anti-immigrant politicians. Racist myths about the criminal-mindedness of undocumented immigrants, their reasons for coming to the u.s., the extent to which they benefit from citizens' tax dollars, are all being taken as facts by much of the u.s. population, it would seem. Not to mention the purposeful ignorance of our foreign policy, NAFTA, the history of u.s. relationship with mexico, and the difficult long process of becoming legal citizens, that allows u.s. citizens to easily scapegoat the immigrants.

However, just as the mexican/mexican-american wavers of the american flag have been forced, in order to appeal to the average white american citizen, to say "See, we love america and its democracy, we respect its laws. We just want our human/civil rights," whether they believe it or not (and I'm not saying many don't), grassroots and radical activists have also tended to tone down their beliefs about the laws, the government, capitalism, workers' ex-

and shirts, authorities said.

Norris, 46, of Eloy, was fatally shot and 19-year-old Andres de Jesus, from Oaxaca, Mexico, was shot in the leg during the attack, authorities said.

"They told them to get down to the floor and then they shot and everyone started running," said Alejandro Ramos, a spokesman with the Mexican Consulate in Tucson, from the immigrants' reports.

"They didn't take anything. It's pretty strange. We aren't sure who (the attackers) are."

The teen, who authorities originally said was 12 years old, was released Thursday from a Tucson hospital and taken to a hospital in Nogales, Sonora, Mexico, Ramos said. He had been separated from his wife during the attack, who Ramos said was just found at about 5 p.m. Thursday and will be reunited with her husband.

Johnson said due to the large amount of blood found in the back of the pickup, a third victim may have also been shot but has not been found.

The four suspects were wearing military-style berets, one red and three black, and green camouflage pants and shirts, authorities said. Three of the suspects are described as White and one Hispanic, who spoke limited Spanish, authorities said.

Most of the undocumented victims fled from the attack, but authorities were able to talk to five witnesses, ages 14 to 24, who helped produce a sketch of one of the attackers, Johnson said. ([Source](#)¹⁰¹).

What's more worrisome is that Arizona may start up a citizen militia. I'm going to work on a separate post on that.

Promoter of State Militia Linked to Anti-Immigrant Bills (Feb 2 2007)

I just read today about some efforts to set up a state militia in arizona. Apparently a number of other states already have similar militias. The idea is that a militia would be able to help with emergencies. It's pretty obvious from the article, [Security force for state debated](#)¹⁰², that the focus is on the border. Currently we have the national guard down at the border because governor napolitano declared a "state of emergency", which the national guard is somehow supposed to fix. Because of a recent incident where armed people approached the national guard from the mexico side of the border, forcing the national guard to retreat, some anti-immigrant folks are riled up about some supposed security threat.

So I looked into the guy, AZ senator jack harper, who's pushing these bills that would create a state militia. Sure enough, he's sponsored a number of bills that would make it harder for undocumented immigrants to live here, many of which Russell Pearce has been involved with. To name a few (which i found [here](#)¹⁰³), he sponsored a bill that would make it so foreign ids would not be considered valid id, a bill that would make undocumented immigrants ineligible for workers' compensation, a bill to put more money towards border

⁷² deletetheborder.org/node/1797
⁷³ kvoa.com/Global/story.asp?S=5811677
⁷⁴ www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/0113Immigrationdeputies.html
⁷⁵ deletetheborder.org/node/1722
⁷⁶ www.youtube.com/watch?v=nrFMTUPCC3I
⁷⁷ www.phoenixnewtimes.com/Issues/2006-07-20/news/Bird.html
⁷⁸ www.saveourstate.org/forums
⁷⁹ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/06/44033.php
⁸⁰ dneiwert.blogspot.com/2005/08/minutemen-home-for-extremists_08.html
⁸¹ www.splcenter.org/intel/news/item.jsp?aid=13
⁸² www.youtube.com/watch?v=o8buTOWjAD4
⁸³ deletetheborder.org/node/1671
⁸⁴ www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/29/AR2005092902126_pf.html
⁸⁵ www.youtube.com/profile?user=BudThePatriot
⁸⁶ www.azcentral.com/news/articles/1010pearce-ON.html
⁸⁷ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Wetback
⁸⁸ http://www.kpho.com/iteam/9528678/detail.html
⁸⁹ www.splcenter.org/intel/news/item.jsp?aid=54
⁹⁰ subwaycanaries.blogharbor.com/blog/GlennSpencer/_archives/2006/7/29/2152215.html
⁹¹ www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?aid=671
⁹² www.panleft.org/screen.php?videoSrc=warden_assault.mov
⁹³ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/11/52145.php
⁹⁴ phoenixinsurgent.blogspot.com/2006/11/racist-vigilantes-intimidate-latino.html
⁹⁵ freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1613659/posts
⁹⁶ deletetheborder.org/node/1610
⁹⁷ www.americanthinker.com/articles.php?article_id=5952
⁹⁸ www.floppingaces.net/category/immigration/
⁹⁹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fascism
¹⁰⁰ www.infoshop.org/inews/article.php?story=20061017110316910

The Latest: (added after most of this was already formatted)

Immigrants Shot at in AZ (Feb 2 2007)

I'm really upset by this. Although i can't know what happened, based on the direction i'm seeing things go, i am assuming these were anti-immigrant folks who fired upon immigrants and the man who was driving the truck. What's curious is that the driver, who i don't believe was an immigrant, was killed while the others (that they know of) were injured or unharmed.

Authorities are searching for four men who attacked 12 undocumented immigrants, killed an Eloy man and shot a teenager, Pinal County Sheriff's Office officials said.

Authorities said David Norris Jr. was driving a pickup truck containing 12 illegal immigrants late Saturday in an Eloy farm field when four heavily armed men in a white full-size van began firing on them.

All four men were wearing military-style berets, camouflage pants

plotation, rights to land, etc., in our activism. When I was a legal observer, I was told that in that position, I was to be neutral- only concerned about people's rights being abused. Although I respected that and felt that what legal observers were doing was important, I felt very conflicted about the fact that there was a lack of stated opposition by many people who were obviously opposed to what the minutemen were doing. Similarly, I have the utmost respect for the work that No More Deaths does, but they have chosen to stay out of politics. This helps protect them- Daniel and Shanti probably would not have gotten their charges dropped so easily if No More Deaths took a vocal stance against the border.

I believe there's plenty of room for all this legal, often apolitical activism, as well as for the american-flag waving mass marches for immigrants' rights. But it is crucial for there to be more direct opposition to american foreign policy and globalization, exploitation of workers, la migra, racial profiling by the police, the minutemen and other racist scumbags, etc. If we express this direct opposition on a larger scale than we already are, we can change the landscape of the discussion. Without our push for true freedom, the end of capitalism, the end of white supremacy, particularly in the discussion on immigration, we cannot expect it to happen. Without it also, the current activism can be seen to be the anti-american, lawless force, which makes the democrats' efforts look like a true compromise, despite the fact that their solutions in the congress and senate are nearly or completely as bad as the republicans'. As long as their solutions are seen as reasonable pro-immigrants' rights reform, it is likely to bring more people away from demanding better.

Those of us who are willing to make the direct oppositional approach to the issue of immigration need to discuss how. If we're not talking about strategy, we're not going to accomplish anything. How do we build solidarity with immigrants and all other people affected by immigration policy? How do we convince white and other citizens to change their minds about all these issues surrounding immigration? How do we work on the larger goals beyond that at the same time? In what ways are we limited and not limited by organizing in legal apolitical or "neutral" groups? No matter how the strategizing happens, I hope it starts happening more starting right now.

The Raids

I decided to keep track of immigration raids that occurred since the start of my blog. There were nearly a dozen in just the past few months, the 2 of the last 3 being some of the largest in history.

Mid January: Over 700 people were taken into federal custody, more than half of them were already in jails. Everyone was in the L.A. area. 30 in the Balitimore area.

Mid December: Over 1,200 people were arrested in a raid of a meat packing plant in 6 states.

Mid November to Early December: 12 arrested in an ICE raid in Hellerton,

PA, 6 at an Atlanta airport, over 200 in NYC and NJ, more than 30 in North-
ern Kentucky, 16 people in Quad Cities, IL
Early November: Over 12 in Saratoga Springs
Late October: 36 in Chicago & suburbs, 14 in Houston
Mid October: 28 in Florida, 6 in Yuma, AZ
That's over **2,260** people in 4 months. We need to be aware of what's going
on. Undocumented immigrants are being made to be afraid just for being
here. This sort of thing mustn't continue.

Why I'm doing this (Oct 13 2006)

My main goal in doing this blog is to get the word out about what's going on
around immigration (particularly in maricopa county, az) and expose anti-
immigrant sentiment for what it truly is. By doing this, i hope that more peo-
ple will get involved to undermine the efforts at keeping people divided, pow-
erless, stripped of their dignity, and worse.

I especially want to get more white people (non-white citizens also have the
power to take this on) in the fight for immigrants' rights, because we're in the
position to respond to those who are trying to preserve "our culture" by not
only asking "whose culture?" but also exposing them and opposing anti-
immigrant folks as the racist scum that they are. We need to communicate to
other people who feel threatened by this so-called "invasion" about what's
really going on here. Way too many people actually think that there is some
level of legitimacy to their movement. **We need to delegitimize them.** We
can shift the focus from scapegoating immigrants to placing the blame where
it should be: on capitalism and our government.

We need to undermine the idea that white people and citizens are more enti-
tled to a first world country than anyone else (particularly because it was
built on genocide, slavery, exploitation of working people in general, war, and
exploitative economic/foreign policy. This sense of entitlement has perpetu-
ated racism in general for a long time. We also need to destroy the concept of
whiteness, although i can't tell you exactly how (various people have ideas,
but i'm not sure, see [noel ignatiev](#)¹ for one). We can, for one, reject and op-
pose the idea that people need to assimilate. There's an interesting section of
this academic paper that talks about [Defining a White Man Through His
Work](#)² (you'll have to scroll down about half-way to find it), which i want to
develop my thoughts on further.

We need to be more than allies- we need to act in solidarity with people who
are affected by these efforts to gain or maintain power. We can talk to our
friends, family, co-workers, neighbors, and other acquaintances about immi-
gration issues. We can show our faces at rallies, even document and perhaps
prevent harassment and brutality by vigilantes, counter-protesters, and cops.
I'll share more ideas later.

¹⁸ <http://aca.demic.udayton.edu/race/01race/white11.htm>
¹⁹ www.kingmandailyminer.com/main.asp?SectionID=13&SubSectionID=18&ArticleID=10676&TM=61798.05
²¹ academic.udayton.edu/race/01race/white11.htm
²² www.alternet.org/story/43182
²³ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/03/37873.php
²⁴ deletetheborder.org/node/1393
²⁶ www.southendpress.org/2005/items/8762X
²⁷ www.infoshop.org/inews/article.php?story=20061120004428138
²⁸ www.narconews.com/Issue41/article1831.html
²⁹ www.narconews.com/Issue41/article1796.html
³⁰ www.narconews.com/Issue41/article1802.html
³² www.youtube.com/watch?v=WOIMYhRF-dY
³⁴ tianews.com/tianews/breaking/04-10-06/LaineLawlessStatement.htm
³⁵ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/11/52714.php
³⁶ youtube.com/watch?v=nrFMTUPCC3I
³⁷ youtube.com/watch?v=o6x1t8ej-Tk
³⁸ deletetheborder.org/node/1731
³⁹ phoenixinsurgent.blogspot.com/2006/04/racist-jet-set-rusty-childress-and.html
⁴⁰ www.saveourstate.org/forums/index.php?showtopic=19199
⁴¹ www.saveourstate.org/forums/index.php?showtopic=14688
⁴² www.saveourstate.org/forums/index.php?showtopic=19310&pid=1050003588&st=0&#ntry1050003588
⁴³ www.saveourstate.org/forums/index.php?showtopic=18137
⁴⁴ www.saveourstate.org/forums/index.php?showtopic=9051
⁴⁵ <http://www.saveourstate.org/forums/index.php?act=Print&client=printer&f=35&t=105>
⁴⁶ www.youtube.com/watch?v=9ftxLucV2vg
⁴⁷ www.youtube.com/watch?v=-zLBL0zOiJM&mode=related&search=
⁴⁸ www.youtube.com/watch?v=9ftxLucV2vg
⁴⁹ www.dailybulletin.com/search/ci_4141723
⁵⁰ washingtontimes.com/national/20061221-112655-3776r.htm
⁵¹ www.youtube.com/watch?v=H8xLd5YTYtE
⁵² observer.guardian.co.uk/world/story/0,,1962643,00.html
⁵³ www.phoenixanarchist.org/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=436&mode=thread&order=0&thold=0
⁵⁴ www.azstarnet.com/allheadlines/150301
⁵⁵ www.nwanews.com/adg/News/171390/
⁵⁶ www.infoshop.org/inews/article.php?story=20061031204722716
⁵⁷ www.infoshop.org/inews/article.php?story=20061031153744327
⁵⁸ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/06/44033.php
⁵⁹ www.azcentral.com/news/articles/1020smuggling1020.html
⁶⁰ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/04/41017.php
⁶¹ arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/06/44373.php
⁶² www.youtube.com/results?search_query=arpaio&search=Search%22
⁶³ www.azcentral.com/news/articles/1123smugglingsuit.html
⁶⁴ kvoa.com/Global/story.asp?S=5722636
⁶⁵ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I0oqk88NYk>
⁶⁶ www.youtube.com/watch?v=dDW5nudAc84
⁶⁷ www.azcentral.com/news/articles/1206smuggling12060.html
⁶⁸ www.azstarnet.com/allheadlines/158989
⁶⁹ www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/local/articles/1213B1-update1213.html
⁷⁰ deletetheborder.org/node/1773
⁷¹ illegalimmigrationjournal.com/spotlight/andy.cfm?id=16

boils down to a hate crime. ([Source](#)⁹⁸)

Saying the n-word and saying it with "house" in front of it are two very different things to me, but maybe that's just because i've read [Malcolm X](#) and other radical black writings. Of course, as a white person, i wouldn't say either one, but i think a person of color and especially a black person is likely justified in saying such a thing about a guy who's working with white racists against mexican immigrants.

The fact that Gilchrist and his supporters bring up this n-word issue is another example of how these bozos huff and puff about hate speech against jews (see [my post on Russell Pearce's National Alliance email](#)) or black people, but they can still talk all the shit they want on "illegal aliens". It's hypocritical.

Another silly quote from "[The Fascists Among Us](#)":

And the mob posing as an audience comprised those who despise such individuals: leftists. Leftists who did the Brownshirts proud.

Yeah right, like brownshirts would be in favor anti-racists confronting racists. Anyway, read more of that article if you want to get an idea of the nutty ideas that some conservatives have.

I haven't really studied much about fascism, but was interested to find the definition on [wikipedia](#)⁹⁹ as:

Fascism is a radical political ideology that combines elements of corporatism, authoritarianism, nationalism, militarism, anti-anarchism, anti-communism and anti-liberalism.

I don't even feel like I have to examine this definition as it relates to anti-racist protesters. You want to see fascism? Try [this](#)¹⁰⁰.

Notes/Websources:

¹ racetractor.org/abolish.html

² academic.udayton.edu/race/01race/white11.htm

³ <http://www.dissidentvoice.org/Apr06/Santos07.htm>

^{4&6} www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=06/06/26/1349239

⁵ deletetheborder.org/node/1289

⁷ www.nytimes.com/2005/04/05/business/05immigration.html?ex=12703536

^{00&en=78c87ac4641dc383&ei=5090&partner=rssuserland}

⁸ www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/dec95sklar.htm

⁹ www.lycaelum.org/drugwar/DARKALLIANCE

¹⁰ www.azcentral.com/news/articles/1027official-english1027.html

¹¹ www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/tesol/official/restrictionism.htm

¹² www.infoshop.org/texts/immigration.html

¹³ www.numbersusa.com/interests/attrition.html

¹⁵ www.splcenter.org/intel/news/item.jsp?aid=54

¹⁶ www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-0610150356oct15,1,5722281.story?coll=chi-news-hed,

¹⁷ <http://phoenixinsurgent.blogspot.com/2006/09/diseases-of-slavery-and-white.html>

If they were really concerned about the law... (Oct 10 2006)

I don't believe for one second that most of the anti-immigrant folks are only concerned about the law.

Here's an example from one of my favorite local minutemen, Stacey O'Connell:

People that sneak into our county do not belong here and should be deported at all costs. We are a nation of laws and we demand that our governments on all levels enforce them. Once an illegal alien crosses our borders illegally, it perpetuates a whole series of other crimes while in the USA...

It's incredibly typical of the arguments i regularly hear. On arizona indymedia in response to statements like this from O'Connell and others, i have posed the question, "What about people who don't make complete stops at stop signs? What about white collar crimes? What about people in the military and the border patrol who are breaking laws?"

That's why i appreciated seeing an opinion column on azstarnet.com that brought that last question up.

And as it turns out, we didn't need to block the southern border to keep us safer and free of potential criminals; all we needed to do was take a deeper look inside our own immigration and border-patrol agencies to find some homegrown criminals.

Our Congress didn't do it. Our Homeland Security is doing it but not telling us about it. So, thank God for good journalists. The Associated Press reported at the end of September that in the past 12 months, dozens of immigration and customs employees across the country have been arrested or sentenced on corruption-related charges.

Officers were involved in everything from smuggling to drug trafficking to selling fake documents and issuing legal residency to those who did not qualify. At least nine immigration officers or Border Patrol agents have been linked to corruption on the California border, and 10 at the Texas border, according to the AP report. But the problem is a lot more widespread than that.

Here's a small glimpse of what's going on in our law-enforcement agencies: Border Patrol agent David Duque faces up to 15 years in prison after he pleaded guilty to accepting bribes in exchange for legal documents. He sold fake passports, birth certificates and Social Security cards. He even received \$5,000 to allow a cocaine shipment through the Texas border.

Also in Texas, customs agent Fabian Solis was sentenced to three years in prison for conspiring to allow the entrance of undocumented immigrants by smugglers. He allowed at least 219 immigrants to be smuggled and received \$300 for each.

On the California border, Mike Gilliland was a bit more expensive. He allegedly charged \$1,500 a head for immigrants smuggled across the border, with as many as four cars holding up to 10 passengers crossing through each night, according to the investigation.

In Tampa, Fla., customs agent Rafael Francisco Pacheco was sentenced to

seven years behind bars for accepting almost \$18,000 from a drug trafficker and writing a letter requesting visas for the drug trafficker's wife and daughter. Source: AZStarNet.com

And it goes on.

Here's her conclusion:

There are bad apples everywhere, you say? Sure there are. But these are not small, isolated incidents. According to the news reports, more than 600 criminal investigations of immigration employees nationwide have been launched this year alone.

It is not easy to weed out corruption at any level, whether it's corporate America, the halls of Congress or even our law-enforcement agencies. But when it's happening, the American people have a right to know about it, particularly when those who are supposed to protect the country are conspiring to break the law, motivated by greed alone. Immigrants are not asking to illegally buy their way into our country; what they want are fair laws that will allow them to legally be part of our society.

For real. You might be interested to read some of the comments to her article at regulus2.azstarnet.com/comments/index.php?id=150301

I also particularly like this article by Juan Santos, written several months ago, but still completely relevant. [Immigration: A Nation of Colonists and Race Laws](#)³.

The US occupation of most Native land and all of the occupied sections of Mexico is illegal. The presence of the conquering people, the usurpation of the land itself is illegal. The colonists themselves are illegal aliens.

But, for the Right, it's not really about some imaginary adherence to a just, neutral system of "law."

It's about race law and white privilege.

And race law, codified on paper or not, is deeply codified in white people's expectations about their place in society, and some of them are getting dangerously edgy about having "their" land -- their turf -- stepped on by Brown people.

The fact that the law is trotted out as something objective, just, and void of any racial context is something that cannot be tolerated. The law can be and often is racist.

The more we can expose this and the fact that minutemen and other anti-immigrant folks claim they're only concerned about the law but clearly are concerned with much more, and incidentally not concerned with laws broken by government employees, the more we can break down the illusion that these folks are just concerned responsible non-racist citizens.

Who Defines the Immigration Debate? (Oct 20 2006)

Apparently "polar opposite views on how to handle [immigration]" is code for polar opposite views on how to restrict the rights of immigrants.

tional rights to march, which they actually do. Denying rights to people who do have those rights shows a blatant endorsement for further discrimination. She rightly points the finger at (or rather just passingly *mentions*) "greedy corporations and traitorous politicians" yet, like all anti-immigrant folks, chooses to scapegoat and target undocumented immigrants with their accusations, hate speech, and discrimination. By the way, despite what Laine says, the american citizen has *not* become the new underclass in america. Are undocumented immigrants who not only live in poverty but have very few rights invisible? They must be to her. Are the u.s. millionaires not american citizens? What she says doesn't even make sense. If she's talking about the working class american citizen, then she must acknowledge that the disempowerment can not be corrected by kicking out immigrants. Corporations would just move more jobs out of the country and pay shit wages.

Update: to see a report-back, picture and video from arizona indymedia go to arizona.indymedia.org/news/2006/12/53515.php

Protesting Racists is Fascist behavior? (Oct 17 2006)

I was going to say "I can't believe Jim Gilchrist and his supporters would say that the protestors who took the stage at Columbia University were against free speech or that they are fascists." But then i realized i do believe it. It's pretty typical if you think about it. In some ways it's even funny. We laughed at [Gilchrist on Democracy Now](#)⁹⁶ because he's so ridiculous. And he's exposed as a liar. The video clearly showed that the people who went up on stage were just unveiling their banner and some were chanting- then they were violently attacked by others. Of course I'm sure the mainstream media isn't showing the same footage that DN showed, because after all, what interest do they have in the truth?

I was driven to write about this issue because i came across [this article called "The Fascists Among Us"](#)⁹⁷. Here's a tidbit filled with lies and exaggerations:

The speakers had been invited to the university in the name of intellectual debate and free expression. Some of the audience, however, would have none of it. Intolerant of the views being aired, they shouted-down the speakers and repeatedly called one of the black representatives "nigger." Then, in a final fit of hatred and rage, in quintessential Brownshirt style, they stormed the stage violently, squelching voices that would have contributed to a fruitful exchange of ideas.

Okay, the n-word thing. It didn't make sense to me, because the students were protesting racism, so why would they use the n-word. First, i always consider that something can be said that does not represent the rest of the group- since i've been at a number of protests where things have happened that i don't agree with. But my first instinct was to not believe it. I couldn't find anything from the protesters about this accusation, but i did find this:

During the interview they tell Larry that they are consulting with a law firm about a suit against the University and the protestors. Marvin, who is black, and was called a "house nigger" amongst other names, believes it

You can read a bunch more about Laine [here](#)⁹⁰. I noticed a few other women who appear to be lesbians involved in the anti-immigrant movement. What is up with this? Makes me want to start a group called Queers Against Racist Lesbians. Who's in?

Two: **Roy Warden**, violent racist nut who has harassed catholic churchgoers during services...

"You people don't seem to understand forbidden territory, whether it's a child's anus or the American border! You just want to push on in, don't you?" he screamed, his face flushed with anger. "We are going to be driving you back to Mexico real goddamn soon!" Spit flew from his mouth. "Get used to it! My name is Roy Warden, and I burn Mexican flags!" ([splcenter.org](#))⁹¹.

You can see him in [this video](#)⁹² screaming and threatening the life of a videographer during one of the border guardians' protests.

He was also involved in the latino voter intimidation that occurred in tucson last month. More on that [here](#)⁹³ and [here](#)⁹⁴.

Here's another quote:

"I am empowered to use deadly force to protect my own life. Now this is what it's gonna mean. It's gonna mean I'm gonna have a perimeter, I'm gonna speak through a loudspeaker down in the barrio, any place I want, and if people try to kill me, try to overrun my position, I will discharge a shotgun in their face!"

I think he's trying to cover his ass in the case that he shoots someone, but I think he's leaving a trail of evidence of premeditation. This guy is a bomb waiting to go off.

Three: **The Rhetoric**

This is tricky. I found the text of the speeches of Roy Warden and Laine Lawless at [this website \(third post from the bottom\)](#)⁹⁵. It's not typical of the anti-immigrant rhetoric. It would appear on the surface to show concern for the plight of the undocumented immigrant. But beneath it is a lack of respect for human beings, much less solidarity with them in their needs to survive. There is no acknowledgement of the U.S. government or economy's responsibility for the poverty in Mexico. If Warden really believed in the Zapatistas'/ Marcos's cause, he would not have the attitudes about the benevolence of the U.S. that he does. In addition, where's his solidarity with the people fighting in Oaxaca? Warden's statements about oppression in Mexico are nothing more than condescending. He may truly be concerned about the apparent contradiction of waving the flag of the country that failed you, but his attitudes about his audience are clearly inconsistent. He does not seem open to other reasons why Mexicans might wave the Mexican flag that may be beyond his understanding.

Laine Lawless claims that undocumented immigrants don't have constitu-

Last Wednesday night near Phoenix, an immigration debate was held at which 300 people attended, paying \$5-15 to get in. One guy basically says we need a guest worker program and the other basically says we need to keep the immigrants out. I wasn't there, but I did a tiny bit of research on the people who were debating and then read an article later on.

[Steve Camarota] argued that the economy would improve if the United States made life hard enough for illegal immigrants to persuade them to go home, something they are loath to do considering their access to America's generous welfare state.

The one thing the experts agreed on was the lack of support in the general population for temporary-worker programs. For Griswold, this has been a historical trend with little bearing on reality. Camarota said that politicians would be foolish to "alienate" a large portion of the population by forcing this policy.

Gee, I wonder if they brought up big corporations' role in the lack of good-paying jobs. I wonder if they discussed capitalism. I wonder if they talked about the concept of a permanent underclass.

This was not a true debate. It perpetuates the idea that immigrants do not deserve certain rights. I get so frustrated with the idea that people who are for guest worker programs are seen as "pro-immigrants rights". It's confusing, because, like I mentioned before, I witnessed people shouting "si se puede, con McCain"- and I believe that many of the people who attended that rally were sincerely for immigrants' rights. But as time went on, more grassroots activists have distanced themselves from the so-called leadership of the local "immigrants' rights" movement because of their ties to the democratic party and because a lot of them are just politicians. Nativo Lopez has some interesting things to say on this issue.

Prior to the Easter recess, we spoke, and I had mentioned that we had tremendous fears the Democrats would try and cut a deal behind the backs of the immigrant movement that had risen up throughout the United States, and certainly that happened. ([Source](#))⁹⁶...

The Republicans and the Democrats--these phonies will jostle and juggle over who will be the majority in Congress to continue to deny the rights of all working people. Because let us remember that with the Democrats controlling Congress and a Democratic president, they absolutely refused to reform federal labor law in America to allow workers to organize unions with no impediments.

So they're no better than the Republicans in power. In fact, they do a better job than the Republicans to prevent the working class to truly be free in America.

Our struggle today is to eliminate all the illusions in these Democrats and their auxiliary organizations and some of the union leaders. ([Source](#))⁹⁷. We're absolutely opposed to guest worker programs. They seek to perpetuate a servitude. There's no reason in the world why a person should be a con-

tract laborer in the United States. That program actually exists in the United States, something like 40 to 60 individuals working under a current program that would be expanded under the Senate version of the immigration bill, and we think that truly does undermine native labor. Those workers should be accorded legal status, and it's shameful that there are some unions, like the international -- the SEIU, the United Farm Workers, UNITE HERE, those particular unions, for example, support a guest worker program. They're living under some illusion that they will be able to obtain contracts to represent these workers and receive dues moneys from those members to fill the coffers of those unions. (Source⁶).

You're illegal or not depending on which law you break... (Oct 23 2006)

Why is a person considered illegal? It seems it is because they have done (or continue to do) something illegal.

So are the following people "illegals"?

People who...

- smoke pot
- skip out on jury duty
- lie on tax forms
- abuse prescription drugs
- don't make complete stops at stop signs
- speed while driving
- park illegally
- shoplift
- embezzle money
- don't pay their employees at least minimum wage
- don't make sure their employees' working conditions are up to code?

Why aren't employers who hire illegal immigrants called illegals also? I would argue that this designation is meant to set undocumented immigrants apart from others in order to disempower them and to enable others to scape-goat and hate them more "justifiably". It's much harder to call the haters racists if they hate the people because they're criminals, not because of the color of their skin or where they're from (although there certainly are plenty of people who are open about the latter).

However, the fact that undocumented immigrants are identified as illegals when prescription drug abusers, for example, are not, says something about what laws people choose to put a value on.

What damage does entering the country illegally (and/or staying illegally) do? Let's separate ethics and justice from law- because they're not the same thing. The answer is obviously complicated. You have some who would say that undocumented immigrants are taking advantage of social services, but then [some who say](#)⁷ because of all the social security taxes taken out of undocumented immigrant workers' paychecks, it has contributed to a huge

ments are very similar between "non-racist" anti-immigrant folks (politicians, minutemen, etc.) and open racists, that's why this booo occurred. Pearce even pasted in the link to National Alliance's website. National Alliance is a known hate group, although i'm sure if i wasn't concerned with racism i would have never heard of it.

This kind of situation, as well as the types of remarks i mentioned is why i don't give these so-called non-racist anti-immigrant folks who claim they're only concerned about the law (oh, and the preservation of "our culture") the benefit of the doubt anymore. They can attend the rallies and read messageboards where there exist many hateful remarks but yet still associate with the groups and individuals from whom they come. Maybe they're even the ones saying the hateful things and yet they can somehow still convince themselves they're not racist (do they actually believe it?).

And I will say that it is more complicated than racism, but that is a definitely a factor (i'll probably say more about that later). I'm hesitant to shout "racist" when it's much more complicated than that, but I will use the word singularly and simply nonetheless because of the power of the word. I just think we should examine it further and make it more clear to them and to others who aren't as involved in this issue why this is racism and explain how it's interlocking with class and xenophobia and all these other things. This is not only so that our message is more clear to others, but so that we cannot be written off as "playing the race card".

Interestingly, Russell Pearce sent out his email in response to the support he got because of the backlash he got for a comment he made about bringing back "[Operation Wetback](#)⁸⁷". People shouted "racist" because he used the word "wetback" even though, as he claims, he only used it to name the program that was in effect in the 1950's. I think it's certainly worth calling him racist for promoting that program, but not for simply using it in reference to piece of history. It's positive that because of this issue, the media has discussed to some extent the problem of racial profiling and the fact that many people deported in Operation Wetback were not illegal immigrants at all.

Border Guardians to Burn Mexican Flag in Phoenix (Dec 15 2006)

A tucson-based group called the Border Guardians are holding a protest that involves burning the mexican flag in phoenix this saturday. I've had a special fascination with the Border Guardians for a few months now for various reasons.

One: **Laine Lawless**, pagan lesbian who has been caught by undercover media talking about wanting blatant racists in the anti-immigrant movement ([News](#)⁸⁸), as well as likely sending an email calling on white supremacists to harass and attack undocumented immigrants and their children.

"Make every illegal alien feel the heat of being a person without status. ... I hear the rednecks in the South are beating up illegals as the textile mills have closed. Use your imagination..."
"Discourage Spanish-speaking children from going to school. Be creative." ([splcenter.org](#)⁸⁹).

mexico border) have to do with racism. So even though they mention nothing about skin color or origin, that racism is still there.

You know what? The minutemen wouldn't be too happy if we used the statistics (that really exist) that men are overwhelmingly more likely to rape than women are (not to marginalize the acts of rape committed by women) to keep men from being hired or from renting houses. I wouldn't advocate that kind of thing because it would be highly unfair to men who don't rape and doesn't solve the problem (although imagine a world where that idea had the kind of acceptance as this bullshit discrimination against undocumented immigrants gets).

By the way, i came across [this youtube profile](#)⁸⁵ for a guy based in Kingman. I wonder if he has anything to do with this ordinance. You should check out the nutty attitudes (and poor spelling) that come out in his videos.

OOPS! Racist AZ politician "accidentally" sent out article from National Alliance (Oct 10 2006)

Poor AZ Representative Russell Pearce fell victim to an oversight regarding an article that he pasted to the bottom of an email he sent to a few supporters. This booboo involved an article from National Alliance's website that talks about how the media is controlled by the Jews.

The media presents a "single view of the world - a world in which every voice proclaims the equality of the races, the inerrant nature of the Jewish 'Holocaust' tale, the wickedness of attempting to halt the flood of non-White aliens pouring across our borders, the danger of permitting citizens to keep and bear arms, the moral equivalence of all sexual orientations, and the desirability of a 'pluralistic,' cosmopolitan society rather than a homogeneous, White one," the article says...

He insists that he does not agree with the sentiments in the article, but that the title and the first paragraphs about media bias appealed to him. He said the article had been forwarded to him by someone else and he would not have sent it if he had read it in its entirety. ([Source](#)⁸⁶).

Yeah, I think he really wouldn't have sent out that article if he had read through it. Hatred of Jews is so not PC, and he may even have nothing against Jewish people. (I'm also open to the idea that he did agree with it and that he sent it out thinking it would not get out to the media.) But it's no coincidence that the movement against illegal immigration is associated with blatant racism and hate. It gets me when these people are surprised (or act surprised) that white supremacists and nazis attend their events. It gets me even more when they vehemently deny any association with racists or racism when i constantly find racist remarks on their messageboards and have seen at least one nazi at their Phoenix events. I constantly hear hateful remarks at rallies such as those insinuating that the immigrants are coming here to rape our women and molest our children (!). The senti-

amount of social security revenue in the suspense file. Beyond that endless argument, what is the harm? Why is it treated in such a different way than many other crimes that are committed?

I think that this could very easily be compared to the drug war. Except we're at a different stage with this. So far it's mostly civilians and a small number of politicians who are targeting immigrants. Fortunately, compared to the number of undocumented immigrants in the U.S., a very small portion are being arrested. But I think things are changing for the worse.

Not to ignore the fact that the war against immigration and the drug war are related, but let's focus on some of the parallels.

Three out of four drug users are White (non-Latino), but Blacks are much more likely to be arrested for drug offenses and receive longer sentences. As the Sentencing Project reports, Blacks constitute 13 percent of all past-month drug users, but 35 percent of arrests for drug possession, 55 percent of convictions, and 74 percent of prison sentences. Almost 90 percent of people sentenced to state prison for drug possession in 1992 were Black and Latino.

([Source](#)⁸)

The use of the law to make people criminals, to disempower them and disenfranchise them, is a tool of racism. People are "justified" in having certain attitudes about certain groups of people, or the state is "justified" in imprisoning certain groups of people because they've been made criminals. So now it's not called racism, it's just the rule of law. So non-violent drug offenders can be treated like dirt and no one stands up for them because they're criminals. Let's talk about why people deal or do drugs. You can look into the [conspiracy](#)⁹ about the CIA bringing cocaine into the ghettos, which i tend to believe. You can also consider the poverty people have to deal with, where often one of the few sources of income is in drug-dealing. Also consider that the government has made hardly any efforts into prevention and treatment, but would prefer to imprison the people instead. So there's a problem, most likely created by the government, and the government has no interest in solving the problem at it's root.

Sounds a bit like how our government (economic policy and u.s. corporations) has a role in the poverty down in Mexico but has no interest in accepting any responsibility nor in solving the problem, but would rather make criminals out of people and imprison and deport the ones that they're not exploiting-tons of laborers who are put in a position where they are disempowered from fighting for fair labor practices, fair wages, etc. (What a run-on).

We're talking about many crimes committed out of necessity (i don't think i'll argue that drug-use or dealing is out of necessity, but certainly theft could be considered such), committed by desperate people, who are further disempowered by laws that designate them as criminals.

So people can talk about the people in prison as if they're less than human, just as they can talk about illegal immigrants as if they're less than human, just because there are laws against what they've (allegedly) done. Despite the fact that there are many laws that many people commit that do not designate them as criminals (or "illegals") in the same way.

The Invasion, Racism, English-only and Attrition (Oct 27 2006)

I encountered a wheat-pasted poster calling for the support of "operation wet-back" on my way to work today...

I'm really fascinated by why many u.s. whites feel so threatened by people from another country entering the u.s.. "Eek! It's an invasion! Get them out of my country! Why do I have to dial 1 for english in my own country!?" Do i even have to say that the idea that land can be owned and divided by imaginary boundaries is a totally man-made creation as a means to gain and maintain power and wealth (at the expense of others)? And that white people's sense of entitlement to "our country" is built on white supremacist myths of our benevolent forefathers who actually raped their slaves and killed indigenous people? I would say this in different terms to my mom, but get the f*ck off your f*cking pedestal!

Maybe i should explain why i'm a little emotional right now. I was reading [this article](#)¹⁰ about how the english only proposition on the az ballot is probably not going to do anything and thinking about how it may not do much as far as legislative or executive changes go, but that this collection of anti-immigrant laws is in many ways symbolic, and likely functions to shape our ideas of who doesn't deserve rights, to shape our ideas of the rights of non-citizens, and to shape our ideas of citizenship as it relates to whiteness. So then i was reading about what i learned is called "[language restrictionism](#)"¹¹ and started to get pissed off. Especially when i came to this part:

What is really behind the US English campaign? The founder... John Tanton, has long been interested in restricting immigration to the US... [T]he publication in the Arizona Republic of portions of a confidential internal memo written by Tanton in 1988 provided more than enough evidence that fear of a Hispanic takeover was very much on the mind of the group's founder. Tanton wrote, in part:

Will the present majority peaceably hand over its political power to a group that is simply more fertile?...Can homo contraceptivus compete with homo progeneriva if borders aren't controlled?...Perhaps this is the first instance in which those with their pants up are going to get caught by those with their pants down!...As whites see thier [sic] power and control over their lives declining, will they simply go quietly into the night?

"Eek! We're being outnumbered!" It's no coincidence that a lot of anti-immigrant folks are also against reproductive choice and against gay mar-

I'm interested in more discussion on this. And i'll be reading more and writing my thoughts as i go along...

Watch out Kingman Arizona (Nov 6 2006)

I just recently read that minutemen in Kingman, AZ are planning on instituting the same ordinance that i commented on in depth in my post from last week called "[Immigrants kicked out on their asses in several towns](#)".

The [article](#)⁸³ says:

The Mohave County Minutemen will approach the Council on Monday with a copy of the Hazelton ordinance and ask the city to enact it. "This isn't a matter of racial prejudice or even a matter of illegal immigration. It's a matter of national security," said Gianluca Zanna, a MCMM member.

Huh? It's not a matter of illegal immigration? How is it a matter of national security? The article doesn't really explain...

The ordinance states in Section 2: "That unlawful employment, the harboring of illegal aliens in dwelling units in the City of Hazelton, and crime committed by illegal aliens harm the health, safety and welfare of authorized U.S. workers and legal residents of the City of Hazelton.

"Illegal immigration leads to higher crime rates, subjects our hospitals to fiscal hardship and legal residents to substandard quality of care, contributes to other burdens on public services, increasing their cost and diminishing their availability to legal residents, and diminishes our overall quality of life."

I'm hoping that most will see this "illegal immigration leads to higher crime rates" crap as similar to the racist beliefs of the past (mostly?) that black people are just prone to committing crime by nature.

Well, hey, i just looked into this belief and check out what i found:

The former U.S. education secretary-turned-talk show host [William J. Bennett] said Wednesday [September 2005] that "if you wanted to reduce crime, you could -- if that were your sole purpose -- you could abort every black baby in this country, and your crime rate would go down." Bennett quickly added that such an idea would be "an impossible, ridiculous and morally reprehensible thing to do." But, he said, "your crime rate would go down." (Source⁸⁴).

There's some evidence that those beliefs are still alive today, if you doubted it. Now, there is a difference between believing that someone has a tendency to criminality because of the color of their skin and believing that someone has a tendency to criminality because of the way (without few or no legal options) they decided to cross a man-made boundary to contribute to the livelihood of themselves and their family. Of course, the language of the anti-immigrant culture would be much different from mine, a) because of their selfish privileged perspective and b) because they don't want you to think of immigrants as human beings with real needs and desires. I believe that the attitudes about people who break immigration laws (specifically people from south of the u.s./

There are a few reasons for this. These are some:

1. There are various politicians in the minuteman groups. Randy Graf (ex State Representative, running for congress), Don Goldwater (Legislative Chairman for the Arizona Republican Party) for example
2. The minutemen and others with their attitude have had somewhat favorable coverage in the media and seem to have had an impact on the government's decisions (their attitudes have become more mainstream)
3. There is at least one and probably more anti-immigrant (a user of the [SOS forums](#)⁷⁸) folks known to be in law enforcement (see [this article](#)⁷⁹)



Another issue to discuss is whether minutemen are extremist white supremacists. And if they are, are the politicians associated with them or at least who share their opinion also extremists? If so, what does that say about the media's and government's new relationship with extremists? What is the definition of extremist? If the minutemen as a group are not extremists, to what extent do they have connections with extremists (if you don't know they do, check [this](#)⁸⁰ and [this](#)⁸¹ out).

Are minutemen extremists because they are vigilantes? Are they or are they not vigilantes (some minutemen say they are not, and some say they are- one says they are in this [hilarious video](#)⁸²)? Whether or not they identify as vigilantes, i think they are. What i'm getting at is, do we as activists and organizers view minutemen and their sorts like activists/organizers have viewed nazis/skinheads/hate-groups in the past, or is this a different animal altogether?

And what is the relationship between white supremacist extremists (and the not-quite-so white-supremacist extremists- or this different "animal") and legislation and law enforcement? What is the relationship between white supremacist extremists and institutional racism right now and over the past few years regarding illegal immigration? How are these folks impacting how whiteness is defined via citizenship laws?

I'm interested in reading about how whiteness was constructed gradually through laws such as those that defined citizenship, but it's hard to put in the context of today's legislative changes. there's also the issue of assimilation. People of the same "race" are treated differently based on their citizenship status and also on whether they've assimilated, so what does that mean about race and whiteness? Can we keep the idea of whiteness from being or continuing to be strengthened if we address this issue of assimilation and of citizenship-based legislation?

riage. They think the white race is being threatened! So they don't want white people to be encouraged not to have babies! I don't think this has anything to do with morals for a lot of people. Check out an article chris crass wrote a while back called [Controlling Gendered Immigrants and Racialized Populations: overpopulation, immigration and environmental sustainability](#)¹² for more insight on this topic. This issue is a good example of why immigrants' rights, feminism, and queer rights movements should join forces against these patriarchal homophobic white supremacists...

I have no doubt in my mind that this whole invasion scare has everything to do with race. Anti-immigrant people say they want people to assimilate, but at the same time limit their access to education and other resources. This language restrictionism, english-only stuff, is part of attrition warfare.

The principle idea behind Attrition is that through all kinds of federal, local, government and private efforts, living illegally in the United States becomes less and less satisfactory for foreign nationals. Instead of the taxpayers paying large sums of money to deport them, the illegal aliens buy their own bus and plane tickets back home. (Source¹³).

(And if you don't already know about Laine Lawless's strategy for "private efforts" of attrition, you need to check [this](#)¹⁵ out.)

This is being done not only by pushing for the further enforcement of existing laws, but by making more laws. By making it harder for non-english speakers to get along in the country, resources would be limited and rights infringed upon. It wasn't hard to find this quote:

Back in Farmers Branch, where 37 percent of the town's 26,487 residents are Hispanic, O'Hare sounds less concerned with encouraging Spanish speakers to learn English than with discouraging illegal immigrants from settling in town.

"English-only is one of the ways you can keep illegals from coming into your city and let them know `You're not welcome here,'" O'Hare said. (Source¹⁶).

People who believe they have more of a right to this land than people who speak another language are pushing their will on others. It's really disgusting. Of course, these particular people are at war also with fellow republicans and others who are more interested in benefiting from supporting corporate/capitalist interests in exploiting immigrant workers (and in maintaining racial tensions amongst workers), rather than pushing immigrants out. I believe an unspoken compromise is perhaps that these laws be made so there are token (by token i don't mean to imply that this will not have a great impact on people's lives) efforts at law enforcement (even some against employers), but the ability to exploit labor is maintained a) because immigrants will mostly remain in the country and b) they will be further disempowered from fighting for fair wages and working conditions as well as other rights. Therefore whitey can more easily maintain whiteness and corporations profit as well. How nice.

"Nation of Laws" and the immigrants' rights advocates who embrace the idea (Nov 3 2006)

How can we have a discussion about immigration issues without talking about the injustices that the u.s. government and economy has thrust on so many people? Unfortunately it happens too often.

I went to an immigration forum the other night with panelists talking about the several propositions that, if passed, would diminish even more rights and opportunities to undocumented immigrants. The argument from a young latino (i didn't get his name because i came in late) regarding the proposition that would make it nearly impossible for undocumented arizonan students to go to college was that immigrants should have equal access to education so they can become responsible contributors to the u.s. economy. There were various statements to that effect. "Immigrants are just like you, they're trying to make a living, we respect the law..." I couldn't say what my feelings on this would be if i were not white, if i were not a citizen. But there are plenty of latin@s, chican@s, etc. who don't try to appeal to the mainstream to fight for their rights. I think it's sad that people would have to appeal to the mainstream (or anti-immigrant extremism) to argue for basic human rights for immigrants and their families.

For those of us with white and/or citizen privilege, i think it's all the more important to use that privilege to take the opportunity to call the government out, to call the anti-immigrant folks out, to call capitalists out, because some people feel that they can't and some people perhaps have faith in upward mobility that the u.s. promises (falsely or not).

If many immigrants and their latin@ advocates cannot fight for their rights by saying the u.s. government (whether run by republicans or democrats) is a genocidal greedy war-mongering hypocritical worker-exploiting breaker of international laws (even though this is a "nation of laws") built on slavery and destruction of the earth, then *we will* (well, we will whether they can or not). So they tend to respond to "this is a nation of laws" by waving american flags and saying "we know, we respect the law. We want the opportunity to be legal responsible residents...", we can say, yes, they deserve the opportunity to be legal residents but...

A nation of laws?

F*ck their laws.

Their laws mean people have to die crossing the desert, have no other opportunity but to make shit wages in demeaning jobs, get to be treated like less-than-human because of their immigration status, are subjected to detention/jail/harassment/interrogation/raids/property damage/name-calling/separation from their families..., in the name of the law? Not to mention all the other things the u.s. government has done in the name of the law or in the name of democracy.

to mexico?" to which Joe responded, "Well i don't really have the authority... We should start talking to the federal government and have them enforce the federal law to begin with, they're not doing that either. They're coming across the border by the thousands. They should be locked up as they cross the border, just like i'm doing under the state law."

So what's Sheriff Joe going to do with the authority once he gets it? Would this allow the Pruitt's Furniture owner to call up the cops and say, "arrest all these day laborers hanging out by my property," or would Arpaio and Andrew Thomas team up and try to arrest folks the next time there's an immigrants' rights rally? Considering what Andrew Thomas, nicknamed Candy by "the bird", did when the big marches were happening in Phoenix, i wouldn't be surprised that out County Attorney would allow for the worst. "Deep Beak asserts that, during the march, the MCAO offices at 301 West Jefferson Street were armed to the teeth with Kevlar-wearin', shotgun-bearin' gendarmes lest Hispanic protesters storm the building and tear Candy's pasty, cracker frame limb from limb." The bird continues, "Investigators were taken off regular duties and reassigned inside the building on every floor in case the masses broke through three rings of already established police security,' detailed Deep Beak. 'All investigators were issued an additional 50 rounds of ammo for God knows what, and a final defense team in body armor and shotguns was assigned to protect [Candy] and his people on the eighth floor.'"([Source](#)⁷⁷).

Although the Massachusetts police are no longer going to be enforcing immigration law, there are a number of other places as well that are trying to work this out as Sheriff Joe is. We need to start letting them know what we think of it, and soon.

Anti-Immigrant Extremists and Institutional Racism: Contrasts and Crossover (Oct 18 2006)

I wish i was ready to post a well thought-out theory piece, but this will mostly be just some initial thoughts.

Something i learned pretty soon after i became an anarchist was that white supremacist extremists, nazis, that type of thing, were not **the** problem of racism. Institutional racism must also be combated to end racism. So i was thinking about how a lot of folks focus on minutemen-types but not on the laws that are changing that will have more of an effect on restricting the rights of immigrants (as well as on the attitudes people have about them). I focus on both, but i will say that i feel rather powerless against these changing laws, because the government does not and will never represent me, and freedom will never be on the ballot. But i was thinking about where the minutemen types overlap with the legislative branch, as well as with law enforcement, and i can see that a line cannot really be drawn between the two.

The article stated that "To get what he wants, Arpaio needs approval from the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, which meets Wednesday." This means it would be a good idea to get out there and protest, if possible. The article briefly touched on the problems involved with this including energy/resources being taken away from the law enforcement the police are already doing, and that immigrants would be less likely to report crimes. I remember that at one of the protests against Arpaio's arrests of undocumented immigrants, some people held signs demanding to know why deputies were out hunting for smuggled immigrants when there was a serial rapist out there. I think this is a valid point, except my personal beliefs about law enforcement don't exactly follow the reasoning that various people have regarding this issue. I believe the police selectively investigate, arrest, and imprison people, that they have no real interest in stopping crime (because if they did, they would target the *reasons for crime*, such as poverty, instead of just putting thousands of people of color in prison), and that one of their main roles is maintaining order in the interest of enforcing racial and class lines. So, i'm not going to be one to argue that the police should be able to continue their job as is and not be bombarded with further tasks.

However, i must think as though i were an undocumented woman and a victim of a violent crime, and how i would feel knowing that others had the simple option of calling the cops while i was left with the terrible decision of remaining in an unsafe situation or risk getting deported. Undocumented people already have fears about calling the police. Even if they're not deported, they're often faced with harassment and in some cases, physical assault. I discussed earlier what i learned from "The Color of Violence" (see my post: [Sexual Assault in Mexico, on the Border, and in the U.S.](#)⁷⁵) about the prevalence of sexual assault and harassment by the police against undocumented people, especially women, as well as other women of color and queers of color. Calling the police is not a safer option for many people. This is a reality we have to face. I'm not sure what this means for our struggle against county/state police's jurisdiction expanding to federal immigration law, but we need to view this picture in its totality.

I think state police enforcing immigration law will be a really bad situation because i believe it will be selectively enforced and will instill a lot of fear in people. I think it will also lead to more racial profiling as well.

You might check out this old news show [footage on youtube](#)⁷⁶ to see the likelihood that sheriff joe would arrest people who are protesting for their rights. The host of the show i believe incorrectly stated that sheriff joe thinks the big immigrants' rights rallies were a good opportunity to arrest people, and while sheriff joe clarifies that he's enforcing the smuggling law only, he said if he could, he'd arrest the people at the rallies (and most of us know that not all the people at these rallies were even illegal).

The host of the show said "Now what about lining up some busses and having someone like you usher these people into the busses and... just send them back

You're not to be so blind with patriotism that you can't face reality. Wrong is wrong, no matter who does it or says it.
-Malcolm X

Using that phrase "this is a nation of laws" is an effort to shut people up about the injustices of laws. "Are you advocating for criminals and criminal behavior? How dare you?" But from the perspective of such people who say this, the government is innocent of any wrong doing and the law is right (ha, only in the interest of scapegoating immigrants- they have plenty of criticisms against bush and the government in general when they don't feel the they're privileges are being protected)- especially if it benefits them. This is where perspective comes in. When the government- the system- gives you certain privileges (and has access to the media) you're going to believe the government is (mostly) innocent- or the essence of the u.s. government is just and good. If you get the short end of the stick in this system, or bother to learn about the injustices brought against various peoples, then you're not going to have that perspective, and you're going to question the "nation of laws" and the laws themselves. People who don't question the system get some privileges too- so those who reject those privileges- which inevitably are at the expense of others- have a responsibility to be vocal about the injustices that the u.s. government serves up. (So i asked how can we have a discussion about immigration issues without bringing this up- but i realize it would be pretty hard to be taken seriously if you're up against anti-immigrant politicians. We're not on the same page- at all. Who'd want to be on their page?)

This "nation of laws" bullshit is used to scapegoat, criminalize and disempower people, not to protect anyone (except the rich and powerful). We need to expose it as such, and if people want to buy into it, then hopefully they'll see the err of their ways when we win or the government makes things worse. No one is illegal because "illegal" doesn't mean anything in this country. Undocumented immigrants are not criminals.

Citizenship, Whiteness, and the Dangerous Direction of Anti-Immigrant Legislation (Nov 12 2006)

In this blog post I talk about how anti-immigrant legislation is racially based, how it related to laws that discriminated against blacks and contributed to the creation of whiteness a few centuries ago , and why i think these anti-immigrant laws further sanction discrimination and hate...

One of the problems with proving once and for all that the anti-immigrant efforts are racist is that it's coming from such diverse people. They don't all agree on everything. And some of them i think are just duped by the conspiracy theories about immigrants taking over so you won't be able to speak english anymore (yes, some believe that), for example, while others are looking to gain political office, power, a false sense of security, and/or the ability to disempower more people (although a certain amount of racism is required to

scapegoat undocumented immigrants from Mexico and S. America who really have no control over the situation they're in- no matter what their motivation- not to mention the sense of entitlement to privileges white people have over others).

Well, one thing we know is that most of the Arizonans who voted on the 4 anti-immigrant propositions voted in favor of making English the official state language, denying bail to undocumented immigrants charged with a felony, denying undocumented immigrants the ability to sue for punitive damages, and denying them the ability to get financial aid, in-state tuition (no matter how long they've been residents of AZ), and other educational opportunities. These people are doing anything they can to make it more difficult for undocumented immigrants to live here, ensuring that there will be people who are poor, powerless, and easy to kick while down. A dangerous thing about these propositions passing is that law-makers will be further encouraged to create more and more discriminatory laws because they so easily passed (despite getting vetoed by the governor before getting on the ballot). Another dangerous thing about these laws is it is building upon whiteness. Now whiteness in the U.S. is reshaping in some ways- because you can have two people of the same race treated completely differently based on where they were born, how well they speak English, how much they've assimilated in other ways, whether they're legally in the U.S., and perhaps the nature of the work they perform. So, one could argue that it's not just about race (depending on the definition of race)- but it is about whiteness. Whiteness in the past was extended to the Irish and others who hadn't previously been considered white so as to further distinguish the differences between the races and reinforce the inequalities between them. One of the ways that whiteness was created was through laws. And I see a parallel between the laws against black people and the laws being created to discriminate against undocumented immigrants.

At this time I'm refraining from talking too much about the fact that many Hispanics/Latin@s/Chican@s are considered in legal terms, racially white, while considered ethnically "Hispanic". As a white person I don't feel comfortable addressing what I think people who fit in this group should do regarding assimilation and attempts at gaining white privilege. I think that while I benefit from white privilege, I have no right to judge people who also try to gain this privilege. But perhaps the more we look at the historical context of this issue as well as the current motivations for anti-immigrant legislation, it should become clear that we need to have solidarity with those who are being targeted.

It hasn't even been 150 years since black people were considered citizens in this country and most native Americans were not considered citizens until 1924 (although apparently the latter gift of citizenship was an attempt to assimilate them, not grant them rights necessarily- and perhaps the same could be said for the former). Before they became citizens, would today's minute-man-types say "well, this is a nation of laws, so that's how it should be"? I

charges include capital offenses, sexual assault, sexual conduct with a minor and molesting a child under 15. Bail is also not allowed if someone who is out on bail is charged with another felony or when public safety would be threatened by releasing an accused person.

Illegal immigrants who fit into any of those categories are ineligible for bail right now. Proposition 100 adds a category of non-bailable offenses that apply strictly to people who are in the country illegally. The proposed constitutional amendment lets the Legislature define the new list of unbailable offenses, which lawmakers have said will include class 1, 2, 3 and 4 felonies.

To put things in perspective, a third offense for shoplifting can be a class 4 felony. What's more, the language of the amendment would allow lawmakers to change the list at will.

This comes at a time when police in [Massachusetts](#)⁷² as well as [Cincinnati](#)⁷³ are now able to enforce federal immigration law. Arpaio is of course, looking to do the same thing.

Update: The recently elected governor of Massachusetts decided not to have the police enforce immigration law.

Sheriff Getting Closer to Federal Immigration Law Enforcement (Jan 14 2007)

Sheriff Joe's moving on the efforts to have his officers authorized to enforce federal immigration law.

Specially trained Maricopa County sheriff's deputies soon could begin arresting undocumented immigrants and turning them over to federal authorities for deportation under an agreement being hammered out by the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office and the Department of Homeland Security.

The accord, which could be finalized within days, would give deputies broad powers to combat illegal immigration in Maricopa County, usually the job of the federal government. It comes after Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio began arresting undocumented immigrants last March under a controversial interpretation of the state's anti-human-smuggling law.

Although the details are still being worked out, Arpaio did not rule out the possibility that deputies could use their expanded authority to question people about their immigration status during traffic stops and infractions as minor as "spitting on the sidewalk."

"Any time we come across an enforcement action and we find there are illegals present, then we will put our federal authority hat on and we will arrest them," Arpaio said. "I will do anything I can to fight this illegal-immigration problem, and this is one more step."

A federal official with Immigration and Customs Enforcement, though, said the intent of the program is not to use the deputies for routine traffic stops, as Arpaio plans. ([Source](#)⁷⁴).

people and charging them under this law in the meantime. Additionally, there is a lawsuit against Thomas, Arpaio, and the Board of Supervisors challenging the enforcement of the human smuggling law. I'm not sure about the status of that since the overturned conviction.

Hey Sheriff Joe, Are you just sending a message or just doing your job?

(Dec 14 2006)

10 undocumented immigrants arrested by sheriff's deputies⁶⁹

Maricopa County sheriff's deputies arrested 10 undocumented immigrants early Tuesday on suspicion of conspiring to smuggle themselves into the country. Four smugglers also were arrested near Wickenburg.

The arrests come one week after a Maricopa County Superior Court judge tossed out a jury's guilty verdict and acquitted an immigrant who paid to have a coyote bring him to Arizona.

Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio said Tuesday that he will not change what he is doing. "I'm just sending a message," Arpaio said. "This is the way it's going to be."

Since March, 365 undocumented immigrants have been arrested.

Joe's "I'm just sending a message" statement is further evidence of his hypocrisy regarding his other statements that he's "just enforcing the law" because that's his job.

Immigrants Held Without Bail in Maricopa County (Dec 19 2006)

As you likely know if you've been reading my blog, Sheriff Joe, in cahoots with the County Attorney Andrew Thomas, has been arresting undocumented immigrants who have recently entered Maricopa County. They have been charged with conspiracy to be smuggled under the Arizona human smuggling law. Despite the fact that the authors of the law did not intend for it to be used against others besides the smugglers themselves, and despite some charges being dropped and most recently a [jury conviction being overturned](#)⁷⁰, Sheriff Joe continues to arrest immigrants.

Because the recently passed law that undocumented immigrants are ineligible for bail for class four or greater felony offenses they are charged with, the immigrants being arrested are being held without bail since this conspiracy charge is a class four felony.

Andrew Thomas's self-aggrandizing article about this can be found [here](#)⁷¹. He and Russell Pearce clearly planned to create a situation where undocumented immigrants could be held without bail for simply being here.

Here is some information written before the proposition that made these felonies ineligible for bail passed:

But the Constitution currently makes anyone ineligible for bail "when the proof is evident or the presumption great" that the accused committed crimes the average person would consider "serious." These non-bailable

think so. Because that's what they're saying now.

Citizenship is used to confer privileges to the citizens and keep it from non-citizens, and the ability to become a citizen or be considered a citizen is often racially-based. Some, like [the phoenix insurgent](#)¹⁷ say that citizenship is code-word for white.

Here's a sampling of laws created to further separate blacks from whites...

1660- "customary terms [for labor] were shorter for bond laborers from 'Christian nations'. (No African nations were christian).

1662- "the free or bond status of a child would be figured according to the status of the mother..."

1664- MD "a free woman had to take the status of her bond husband..."

1670- "non-Christian bond laborers brought by sea were to serve their lifetime..."

1670- "a law forbid free blacks from importing bond labor, a severe restriction for a small land holder needing labor to work the land"

1680- "all bond laborers of African descent were to serve as lifetime bond laborers".

1691- "a law was enacted for the 'prevention of that abominable mixture and spurious issue' due to intermarriage of Black, mulatto, or Indian men with 'English or other white women'.

1705- a law "decreed that the livestock of African American bond laborers was to be confiscated and given to poor white freemen..."

1723- "the virginia assembly passed a law denying the right to vote to free African-Americans with property. Earlier laws has already prohibited free African Americans from holding public office or witnessing against a white person. Free African Americans were prohibited from lifting a hand against a 'Christian, not being a negro, mulatto or Indian.'"

"As the numbers of African American lifetime bond laborers increased and the percentage of free European American laborers rose, the white small land holders and tenant farmers were drafted into white militia, organized to prevent African American insurrections. Systems of rewards encouraged whites to turn in any runaways. Although whites remained impoverished in large numbers, most felt no affinity with the African Americans who suffered under the same system-- a system that continued to enrich the ruling elite at the expense of those in the middle and lower classes. By the middle of the eighteenth century, poor European Americans identified as white" ([Source](#)¹⁸.) (Note how white militias play into this. I recommend the book "No One is Illegal" for more parallels between white militias and vigilantes of the past and the minuteman-types of the present- that's important to know about too).

(We could also talk about access to land, jobs, and educational opportunities, but we'll leave that for later).

You can see in these examples and if you throw in some more recent immigration policy like the Chinese Exclusion Act, "the boundaries of whiteness

were constructed by exclusion" and continue to be.

These new laws are an attempt to exclude immigrants, especially mexicans, further from the ability to have any sort of semblance of freedom in this country. The laws of this nature, past and present, act to make discrimination and attitudes about specific groups of people official, sanctioned, justified, reasonable, etc. as far as the people who benefit from it are concerned.

The majority of voters have decided that people who aren't legal- no matter how long they've lived in Arizona do not deserve to be able to pay in-state tuition, and that people who don't speak english don't deserve to understand government documents (despite the fact that they make up such a large portion of our population). And this isn't about excluding people based on their ethnicity/culture/race? These are some things that some folks in Kingman, AZ said to convince their city council that they should pass a similar law to the one passed in PA that keeps undocumented immigrants from renting or getting hired:

"We of the Mohave County Minutemen will fight for the future of our children and our grandchildren.

"This is the greatest country in the world, and we will not allow it to become a third world country," she said.

Italian immigrant Luka Zanna also spoke to Council about the issue of illegal immigration. He warned Council that English would no longer be the spoken language of this country if something wasn't done soon.

([Source](#)¹⁹).

I believe the direction this state and this country is going will continue to make it more and more acceptable to disenfranchise, to discriminate, to harass, to exploit, to imprison, and perhaps even to murder a group of people just because of where they came from and that they are not legal here.

Within the system of racial oppression being established in the U.S. white workers were encouraged to blame enslaved and working class African Americans, not wealthy planters and merchants, for lack of employment or depressed wages, a pattern repeated throughout American history". ([Source](#)²¹).

Some interesting parallels indeed. I'm not saying history will repeat itself, because things are much more complex than that. But i see us going in a dangerous direction. So despite the fact that anarchists aren't supposed to concern themselves much with legislation, this is really important stuff.

On "The Terrorists Who Aren't on the News" (Nov 14 2006)

If my memory serves, before it became more acceptable to shit-talk on immigrants, the border security issue was promoted as more of a keep-out-the-terrorists national security type of thing. And certainly terrorists are still brought up as one of the reasons to secure the border. But what about domestic terrorists?

trained so they can place immigration holds on inmates, while others want broader powers allowing them to detain people they've stopped on the streets for immigration violations. ([Source](#)⁶⁴).

Joe and his buddy Andrew Thomas, with the support of their anti-immigrant fans, have been charging immigrants with conspiracy under the new-ish human smuggling law.

More powers given to the police to enforce immigration laws can lead to all sorts of repression, harassment, racial profiling, detainment, etc., as well as the lack of ability of undocumented immigrants to seek help from police in various situation: medical emergencies, domestic violence, rape, etc. (not that i think the police have a benevolent role to play in that, but in essence folks who would allow this are implying that undocumented immigrants do not deserve help or protection).

Some related youtube videos:

[Sheriff NoBullsh*t](#)⁶⁵

[Copwatch Press Conference with Sheriff Joe Arpaio 6-16 vid 1](#)⁶⁶

Victory for Undocumented Immigrants in Arizona! (Dec 6 2006)

Congratulations to Adolfo Guzman-Garcia, whose conviction was reversed by Judge Thomas O'Toole, after having been found guilty by a jury of conspiracy regarding the recently-passed anti-human smuggling law.

In Tuesday's case, O'Toole acquitted Guzman-Garcia because the prosecution never presented enough independent evidence that he was part of the smuggling business -- prosecutors only proved that he was a paying customer. ([Source](#)⁶⁷).

County Attorney (Maricopa County) Andrew Thomas and Sheriff Joe Arpaio made a crusade of enforcing this law to terrorize all undocumented immigrants who arrive in the county. In fact, Sheriff Joe's going an extra step by getting his deputies trained by ICE.

"When I get my deputies cross-certified, I guarantee you that these illegals, whether they are in a bar drinking or whatever, they are going to be shook," Arpaio said. "They are going to be afraid, because they see that black and gold car coming by thinking they are going to be arrested." ([Source](#)⁶⁸).

Despite his claim that it's simply a matter of it being against the law and it being their job to enforce the law, Thomas and Arpaio purposely misinterpreted the law in their interests. The authors of the smuggling law said they didn't intend for the smugglees to be charged under the law. Three hundred and fifty people have been arrested- most charged with conspiracy. Some have plead guilty to a lesser charge. Adolfo Guzman-Garcia was the first to be convicted by a jury and was facing 4 years in prison, but instead of being sentenced at his hearing on December 5th, the judge announced the conviction was overturned.

Of course Thomas is appealing the case. They are also continuing to arrest

because some weren't talking (smart), and others plead guilty. Now they've got a conviction, which might spark more arrests. I haven't heard of any arrests for a while, which doesn't necessarily mean they haven't been happening. It's very important to know about this. Basically they could arrest any undocumented immigrant (or anyone who looks like an immigrant), and if they can prove the immigrant paid to get into the country, they could convict. Adolfo Guzman-Garcia, the individual who was just convicted by a jury faces up to four years in prison.

Now you might be thinking that the police don't have the resources to arrest a bunch of people- which is true. Unless you're a big bully sheriff with a posse of volunteers- supported by anti-immigrant county attorney Andrew Thomas. That would be Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County who has vocally expressed his interest in deterring immigration and has sent his posse out to arrest immigrants. Over 280 people have been arrested.

And what's extra creepy is that some guy who has posted in the saveourstate.org forums and has (or had?) anti-immigrant hate-speech on his shared blog is in Sheriff Joe's posse.

*"Frankly, I would have shot them and put their bodies through a f*cking meat grinder," reads some August 22, 2005 commentary on the story about Casey Nethercott of a vigilante group called "Ranch Rescue" losing his ranch to immigrants who sued him for assaulting them with a gun. This commentary appears on a blog started by "Tarantulas." ([Check out the story here](#)⁵⁸). It seems he edited out the hate speech on his blog since this story came out).*

[Read more](#)⁵⁹ about the recent conviction.

[Read more](#)⁶⁰ about the previous arrests.

[Read more](#)⁶¹ about the protest Phoenix Copwatch put on against these arrests.

[Watch videos](#)⁶² of Sheriff Joe regarding this issue.

Sheriff Joe Arranging for Police to Enforce Immigration Laws (Nov 24 2006)

Soon after the announcement of a federal lawsuit brought against Maricopa County Attorney Andrew Thomas, Sheriff Joe Arpaio, and the Board of Supervisors, challenging the enforcement of the human smuggling law (more on the lawsuit [here](#)⁶³), Sheriff Joe announced that he's been trying to arrange the ability for his officers to enforce immigration law.

Arpaio said Wednesday he has been negotiating with Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials for months on an agreement letting trained deputies question, detain and arrest people they encounter who are in the country illegally.

Arpaio said he wants about 200 deputies and jail officers to take an eight-week course to learn how to enforce federal laws...

Such training is allowed under the 1996 Immigration and Nationality Act, but a local agency's authority varies. Some only want detention officers

You have to check out "[The Terrorists Who Aren't in the News](#)"²². This is about the incidents of violence and threats by anti-abortion fanatics, specifically an attack that occurred on September 11, 2006, which has not been reported by the mainstream media.

Turns out the guy that bombed a health clinic on 9/11 this year thought that it provided abortions when it in fact did not, but he basically committed an attempted suicide-bombing by crashing his car into the clinic.

Since 1977, casualties from this war include seven murders, 17 attempted murders, three kidnappings, 152 assaults, 305 completed or attempted bombings and arsons, 375 invasions, 482 stalking incidents, 380 death threats, 618 bomb threats, 100 acid attacks, and 1,254 acts of vandalism, according to the National Abortion Federation.

Abortion providers and activists received 77 letters threatening anthrax attacks before 9/11, yet the media never considered anthrax threats as terrorism until after 9/11, when such letters were delivered to journalists and members of Congress.

So why is this not important to the news media? I believe this is for two reasons. One, women's lives and choices are undervalued, so attacks on them are less important than attacks on the general public (or even property damage on private businesses). Two, if it does not involve a person of color, it's not as big a threat- it's not worthy of calling terrorism, because it does not contribute to the picture they're trying to paint of terrorists (scary dark-skinned, dark-haired people from other countries) that the public needs to be okay with locking away forever if "need be".

The author of the article, however, leaves out one point which is that earth and animal liberation activists are also considered terrorists and do not necessarily fit the profile of the scary terrorist (usually Arab) either. So this is not just about race/nationality. But I suppose another reason that this anti-abortion nut's attack is not valued as a news story is because it doesn't threaten big business like the the earth and animal liberation activists do (more on this, see my friend's article, "[The Real Eco-Terrorists](#)"²³).

I think this example highlights the media's purpose as a tool of increasing the public's fear of outsiders and brown people, and of people who dare threaten big business, while ignoring whitey who attacks women and their choices. I'd like to close with a quote from a speech by Joseph Nevins (which can be found [here](#)²⁴) because he said it better than I can...

That migrants are constructed as geographically -- in addition to socio-politically -- outside helps explain why fears about terrorists and criminals from abroad translate into a focus on territorial boundaries to a much greater extent than fears about purveyors of violence from within the United States. Consider, for example, the case of Timothy McVeigh, who, on April 19, 1995, bombed the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, killing 167 people and injuring hundreds more. McVeigh was not from Oklahoma City, nor even from the state of Oklahoma. Indeed,

he crossed state boundaries to commit his crime. Had such movement been restricted, it might have been more difficult for McVeigh to do what he did. Nonetheless, his horrific act did not result in any attempt to restrict movement across state boundaries within the United States. The reason why is clear: he was a U.S. citizen (and a native-born one) with the right to unimpeded travel across national territory. He was not an outsider. He was a white male and a military veteran. He was -- in terms of the dominant perception of what an American looks like -- one of "us." Thus, his crime did not involve a perceived geographical transgression even though movement across space was a key element of his act. Given this perception, territorial security -- at least one conceived in any way similar to that applied along the U.S.-Mexico boundary -- is not the response. In the case of threats -- real or imagined -- emanating from south of the border, however, they are perceived as being primarily territorial in nature and thus necessitate a response involving a build-up of physical boundaries. In other words, the territories from where these dangers come are seen as inherently threatening. It is hardly a coincidence that these menacing areas happen to be places where wealth and income is significantly less than that accumulated in the United States and where the populations are largely non-white. In that regard, the divide and conflict is one between a civilized first world and a barbaric third world.

Sexual Assault in Mexico, on the Border, and in the U.S. (Nov 22 2006)

Receiving and reading my copy of the new [The Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology](#)²⁶ as well as reading the story "[Federal Police Confronted for Sexual Assaults in Oaxaca](#)"²⁷ inspired me to post a blog on sexual assault particularly against women of color and specifically in the context of state repression.



On thursday night, a 48 year old Oaxacan woman called into the APPO university radio and testified that the Federal Preventive Police occupying the zocalo had sexually assaulted and harassed her. Since then, many stories have emerged of sexual assault on part of the Federal Preventive Police. In response, hundreds of women marched around the Zocalo, where police stand guard in riot gear with water tanks around the perimeter. Some of the women theatrically reenacted the sexual harassment in front of the PFP, and others held mirrors with "we are rapists" written on them facing the PFP. Before the act the PFP peppersprayed the crowd, and the PFP also advanced water tanks during the performance.

The experience of women in Oaxaca are not alone in their experience. Earlier

want to leave (via english as official language, making it harder to get housing, harder to get jobs, harder to get education, harder to get healthcare, etc). This is the world we live in- where people are so up in arms about the illusion of their jobs and the integrity of their culture being affected by undocumented immigrants (but they don't want to place the blame on the people who really have some control over the economic situation), that they're willing to render people homeless, jobless, without various resources. Any deaths will be on these people's hands! This is a disgusting situation. We need to do something about this.

Okay, i was going to conclude there, but i have something else to say. Some of them say this is about immigrants bringing crime into the towns. First of all, how much sense does it make to create *new* laws when the present ones aren't being adequately enforced as far as those complainers are concerned (this is happening a lot)?

Second, while i in no way condone the stereotypes of undocumented immigrants being involved with drugs, no doubt some are, just as some of any race or origin are, but the people who don't like drugs in their towns need to realize that the government is not and will not be interested in dealing with drugs in any other way than to imprison and harass a bunch of people.

There's plenty of evidence that drug treatment is more successful than putting people in jail. But that way we'd actually have to treat poor/people of color like they actually deserved better. In addition, the u.s. is very responsible for the poor economic condition Mexico is in. If the u.s. really wanted to address the drugs coming across the border then maybe they/we would create a situation where people wouldn't be so desperate to make money any way they can. Gee, that only makes sense. Too bad it's not compatible with capitalism.

By the way, i hope that the anti-immigrant folks who say mexicans need to improve their own country instead of leaving (as if many haven't been) are paying attention to what's going on in oaxaca.

Update: One of the last articles I read said that pretty much no towns are able to enforce this type of law right now. Some have given up, some are revising it, some are still pushing it. There are arguments that it goes against constitutional rights, and I hope that this type of law is not able to be enforced.

Immigrant faces up to 4 years for conspiracy (Oct 20 2006)

There hasn't been much news for a while about the arrests of immigrants for conspiracy to be smuggled- yes, in maricopa county, az, immigrants were being arrested and charged under the new human smuggling law- not for doing the smuggling, but for conspiracy. So yesterday they got a conviction against an undocumented immigrant who allegedly paid \$700 to be smuggled into the country. Some charges have been dropped due to lack of evidence and

Allen said she also anticipated receiving narratives complaining of agents entering homes without search warrants or the owner's permission...

The results will be part of a report to be released Dec. 10. They also will be presented by about a dozen elected officials, academics and lawyers - with similar documentation compiled by border rights advocates in New Mexico and in El Paso, Texas - at a tentatively scheduled Nov. 30 meeting with White House staffers, Allen said.

The results also will be presented to members of Congress, to Border Patrol Chief David Aguilar and in meetings with local law enforcement and Border Patrol officials, she said.

The interviews will seek to detail whether people were asked for papers, told why and where they were being stopped, whether they felt threatened, how they were treated, what they were asked and how they responded.

Also, groups like the brown berets have started or continued migra watches in their communities. Check out migrawatch.org.

Immigrants kicked out on their asses in several towns (Nov 1 2006)

Apparently, some people feel they are justified in creating a situation that makes it pretty much impossible for undocumented immigrants to have shelter in certain towns.

Hazleton, PA is in the news today regarding a law recently passed...

The law, which had been scheduled to take effect Wednesday, would fine landlords found to be renting space to illegal aliens, close down businesses that hire them, and allow legal employees to sue the businesses for employment lost during such a shutdown. A related law also establishes English as the town's official language...

The law, passed by the city council in July and revised in September, is seen as a template for similar laws passed by 10 other towns around the country...

Thirty-two towns are considering similar measures. (Source⁵⁶).

Now it's okay to kick people and their families out on their asses?!?

Well, some kinda good news:

Judge James Munley of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania issued a temporary restraining order against Hazleton City Council, preventing it from enforcing its Illegal Immigration Relief Act Ordinance.

[Another article](#)⁵⁷ talks about how many people have already fled the area and that businesses are being affected. Other residents are being affected as well...

"Before, it was a nice place," said Soto, 27, who came to the United States from the Dominican Republic a decade ago. "Now, we have a war against us. I am legal but I feel the pressure also."

This is a continuing war of attrition- making it harder for undocumented (and other) immigrants to live in this country with the intention of making them

this year, women in San Salvador Atenco who were arrested by police during the conflict there were similarly treated.

At least 23 complaints of sexual assault including seven rapes - one boy was sodomized with a police baton - have been registered with the National Human Rights Commission (CNDH) and the non-government Miguel Pro Human Rights Center. Most were victimized on an horrific six hour ride between Atenco and a local Mexico state prison during which police "officers" pawed women, ripped off their underclothes, masturbated openly, and in serial rapist fashion, forced their victims not to look at them to prevent identification. (Source²⁸).

Women from outside the community had more ability to get their stories out. See [María Sastres and Cristina Valls's story](#)²⁹ and [Valentina Palma Novoa's story](#)³⁰.

The ongoing horrors in Ciudad Juarez can be shown to be related to these stories. In her article, "The Complexities of 'Femicide' on the Border" (from *The Color of Violence*, Rosa Linda Fregoso wrote,



The newly constituted global economic order impacts the most vulnerable communities--the bodies of the poor and Third World women, who are its disposable targets of labor exploitation. And critical globalization theories have rightly noted the unevenness of development in Ciudad Juarez, the further exploitation of the poor, the lack of

infrastructural development--housing, sewage, electricity, health and other basic services--to accommodate the many poor immigrants recruited from southern Mexico and Central America by the maquiladora industry. However, conflating the exploitation of gendered bodies with their extermination does not offer us the nuanced account of violence that femicide demands... It is important to recognize how violence--not only in Ciudad Juarez, but also in Mexico City--is not simply a problem for the state but is in fact endemic to it, a 'state of exception' produced by an authoritarian government that has cultivated extreme forms of violence, corruption, and yes, even death, in order to cripple people's capacity to resist, to smother effective counterdiscourse and over-power the revitalized democratic opposition... We should consider femicide in Ciudad Juarez as part of the scenario of state-sponsored terrorism..." (If you don't know much about the situation in Juarez, please go to mujeresdejuarez.org.)

I recommend reading the entire article that came from because it goes much more in depth than what i can share in this blog. The situation at the border

seems to put women at a more severe risk for assault as well as exploitation. Women crossing the border and on the U.S. side of the border are more prone to assault because of the political context of the border.

It's worth mentioning here that there are incidents of sexual assault against border crossers that are attributable to border patrol, vigilantes, and human smugglers. The injustice not only lies in the assault itself, but in the way that it is treated. Immigrant women's livelihoods are not seen as worthy of concern by the Mexican government, by the U.S. government, by various people of both nations, which means sexual assault can continue without punishment, and survivors have little means of support and healing.

Sylvanna Falcón in "'National Security' and the Violation of Women: Militarized Border Rape at the US-Mexico Border" (also from *The Color of Violence*) addresses the issue of border further. Some excerpts from her essay:

The level of militarization produced warlike characteristics that make rape and other human rights violations an inevitable consequence of border militarization efforts...

...In every war, in every military conflict, rapes occur because sexual assault is in the arsenal of military strategies; it is a weapon of war, used to dominate women and psychologically debilitate people viewed as the 'enemy'...

Acts of sexual violence which target undocumented (primarily Mexican) women at the US-Mexico border are certainly informed by a legacy of colonialism, which dates back to the forced imposition of a border in 1848.

More than 150 years later, migrant women's bodies continue to denote an 'alien' or 'threatening' presence subject to colonial domination by US officials. Many women who cross the border report that being raped was the 'price' of not being apprehended, deported, or of having their confiscated documents returned. This price is unique to border regions in general; while militarized rapes are part of a continuum of violence against women, I call these violations militarized border rapes because of the 'power' associated with the border itself. In this setting, even legal documentation can provide a false sense of security, because militarization efforts have socially constructed an 'enemy' and Mexican women and other migrants fit that particular profile...

...the absence of legal documents positions undocumented women as 'illegal' and as having committed a crime... the existence of undocumented women causes national insecurity, and they are so criminalized that their bodily integrity does not matter to the state...

In this essay, Falcón tells the stories of a number of women who have been assaulted by border patrol agents. One in particular caused me to write "' next to the passage. Check out how one border patrol agent by the name of Esteves was treated. "In July 1992, Esteves received a twenty-four year prison sentence for the felony rape charge. However, he was released on December 22, 1994." He did under 3 years. How's that for justice?

An interesting and very important point that she makes is that "With a masculinized elite emphasizing the normalcy and role of militarism with regards to 'national security,' broader definitions of security have become marginal-

trade, evidence and all, that the anti-immigrant movement would still scapegoat the undocumented immigrants.

In the past, i've brought up a few examples of border patrol individuals and other officials being involved in the drug trade.

[Oh, Minutemen, how about those drug smugglers in uniforms?](#)⁵³ from the AZ Daily Star and [My opinion Maria Elena Salinas : Corrupt officials at home hinder real immigration reform](#)⁵⁴.

And those are just the ones who have gotten caught. Of course, these are individuals and not necessarily part of a bigger picture- then again, maybe they're just made out not to be part of the bigger corrupt government. It's relevant either way.

To me, the issue is not whether the border patrol agents get pardoned or not. Because if it doesn't happen, maybe that means the next border patrol agent is going to hesitate before he pulls out his gun. If it does happen, then it'll just be another example of how law enforcement can get away with shooting people whether or not they know who that person is or whether or not they committed a crime. The issue to me is what this situation means for how critical people are of the u.s. government and its relationship to the drug trade.

Deputy shoots policeman, immigrant gets deported... What? (Nov 4 2006)

I just read this [article from Northwest Arkansas' News](#)⁵⁵ that a deputy's gun fired and hit another policeman who was "struggling" with Maria Herminia Ayon-Torres, an undocumented immigrant. She wasn't charged with anything, but agreed to be deported. Although the article says the shooting is being investigated, the author doesn't seem to be concerned that an officer fired his weapon. Certainly he didn't intend to shoot his fellow officer, so was he intending to shoot Maria? And if they didn't charge her with anything then how could it possibly be justified that she be shot at? The article doesn't ask that question.

Is this the kind of treatment that is typical of raids on undocumented immigrants' houses? Is this the kind of news coverage that is typical of police shootings (i know the answer to that one)?

A group down in southern Arizona is doing something about human rights abuses against immigrant communities. They're going to go door to door documenting what people have to say about how they've been treated by ICE and police. An article about it was printed in [AZStarnet.com](#).

In the past, immigrants particularly in Nogales and Douglas have told of experiencing what they "feel is verbal harassment, unnecessary targeting based on appearance, abuse of authority _ when there is not enough reasonable cause to be stopping and questioning somebody," Allen said...

about justice and policy as anti-immigrant people do- although definitely for different reasons. I don't think a border patrol agent can go around shooting people in the ass (or anywhere) for whatever reason. But i am suspicious of the government's motivations for prosecuting them. Just as I'm more than suspicious of the government's motivations for being part of NAFTA, FTAA, for building a expensive token fence on the border, etc. There are various accusations about the u.s. government being in cahoots with the mexican government. No matter how much of this is true and no matter how much corruption is going on- this should have no bearing on the individuals who migrate from or reside in mexico. My motivations are in the interest of freedom for all people, whereas the anti-immigrant folks are interested in maintaining a white supremacist order that keeps promising whitey their piece of the pie while denying it to others (that's a simplistic way of saying it- i go more into depth in the 3rd to last paragraph of [Rights and the Anti-Immigrant Movement](#) if you're interested.)

So while groups are planning their rallies to convince bush to pardon the agents, consider their motivations as well as the government's. If you go out there to protest the anti-immigrants' rallies on this case, I want you to go out there with an idea about what your position is on the case. Consider the complexity of the situation- the history of abuse by law enforcement allowed by the government, the fact that the guy was a known drug smuggler, the involvement of government agencies in the drug trade as well as the drug war, and why the anti-immigrant folks would stand up for two agents who a jury found broke the law.

The Drug-Smuggler Stereotype (Dec 27 2006)

As i was thinking and talking about the situation i wrote about in my last post, [The Complexity of the Border Patrol Agents' Sentence](#), i realized i hadn't articulated one important point.

That is that if the u.s. government has involvement in the mexican/u.s. drug trade, then that has an impact on how border-crossers should be viewed. As it is, i already pointed to some examples of the u.s. involvement in drugs, but these examples are largely historically ignored. The cocaine-related examples should be enough for the american people to stand up against the government and say "enough"- because of the hypocrisy, corruption, deaths, etc.

What i'm also concerned with is that border-crossers/"illegals"/"aliens" are given a number of stereotypes. One being the drug smuggler. Of course some are. But is it fair bring or call for repression against a whole group because some people are drug smugglers? Some white women are shoplifters and certainly i'm not treated like a shoplifter and there's certainly no campaign against me.

So not only do the anti-immigrant folks use the drug smuggler stereotype to attack all undocumented immigrants from mexico, they also may be barking up the wrong tree. Just as the corrupt mexican government probably allows the drug trade to continue- gaining power as it does so, but the u.s. government also seems to be complicit in it. And i would be willing to bet that even if it came out that the u.s. government was involved in the mexico/u.s. drug

ized. For example, the provision of basic necessities--such as shelter, health care, and food-- is not seen as a 'security issue' by the US government..." It's not a national security issue that thousands of U.S. citizens are starving. But it is national security issue that too many people aren't speaking English. This attitude allows for the ability of the media, government, and those who benefit from maintaining the social order for the most part to continue their disempowerment, repression, and hate against immigrants to continue. They've clearly decided what their values are. They use the terms "national security," "freedom," "democracy," "liberation," and such to their benefit, despite the true meaning of these terms, effectively shaping the public face of their efforts.

Why is rape not a national security issue? Or like i mentioned in a previous post (see [On "The Terrorists Who Aren't on the News"](#)), why are attacks on women and their reproductive choices not considered a threat to national security?

These efforts at framing immigrants as criminals and a threat to U.S. citizen's livelihood are used to justify poor treatment and even death. How else do you explain the attitude of a MinuteWoman named Christi in [this video](#)³² who says that all the people who died crossing the border (even the children) deserved to die because it was their fault? This is not an isolated phenomenon. People are purposely creating and maintaining a situation where immigrants are desperate, exploited, targets of assault and violence, and the current situation isn't even horrible enough for many anti-immigrant folks. They want to make things far worse to force immigrants out of the U.S. They don't care about the pain they're causing. At least advocates for sexual assault survivors should make more of an effort to see the relationship between anti-immigrant efforts and sexual assault (those that don't already).

In her essay, "INS Raids and How Immigrant Women are Fighting Back" (2000) Renee Saucedo shared one immigrant woman's story.

[Guadalupe Sanchez] was working for a janitorial company in San Francisco, and she was raped twice by her employer, the head of the janitorial company. A lot of people asked, "Renee, do you really believe her? Why didn't she leave the first time she was threatened by this guy?" Well, Ms. Sanchez was the sole breadwinner in her family; her husband had a bullet in his head and was bedridden. She not only had to support her three children, but found it extremely difficult to find another job because of Employer Sanction, a law on the books since 1986. As a result, it is not easy for people without immigration status to get a job, or at least a job that pays over four dollars an hour. Besides, Guadalupe Sanchez's employer told her if she ever complained or left her job, he would report her to the INS. She would be deported. That was enough information for her to decided to endure the abuse.

More from Renee Saucedo:

Redwood City police officers, collaborating with INS agents, stormed about

six apartments where families were sleeping and paraded them in the hallway before they were sequestered in one family's apartment. They would not allow the family members to dress even though many of them were in their underwear since they were shaken out of their beds. Two of the women were forced to raise their blouses, exposing their breasts to the INS agents, the police officers, and fellow family members...

INS raids also happen in collaboration with local law enforcement and with the criminal justice system. I have been doing immigration rights work for over ten years, and I can't tell you how many immigrant women suffer from domestic violence and never report their batterers to the cops because most of the time the police ask the batterer and the women about their immigration status.

One of my main reasons for writing this piece is because of my frustration with many feminists who see law enforcement as a means to ending violence against women- and usually these feminists are white, therefore they don't see as much or none of the incidents where law enforcement are the perpetrators of violence against women. The government is often a perpetrator of violence against women. And as long as these white feminists refuse to make efforts to find new solutions that don't include working with the police/government or simply reforming the police/government.

There are a number of women in the minutemen and similar groups who need to be aware of these issues. I have a feeling they may not care, but if they see that they are contributing to and justifying an environment where women can be sexually assaulted just because of where they come from, their class status, and/or their relationship to the state, maybe they will identify with it even just a little bit. Maybe, maybe not.

Related too, is the common accusation by anti-immigrant folks that undocumented immigrants are coming here to rape "our women," as well as the complaints that male immigrants sexually harass women. While incidents do occur and i wouldn't want to minimize the experience of anyone, immigrant, citizen, brown, white, or whatever, who has been sexually assaulted by a male undocumented immigrant, these incidents should be dealt with on an individual level and not used to bring disempowerment, repression, or hate onto male immigrants or immigrants in general. That is simply not acceptable. I highly doubt that the loud anti-immigrant protester i heard at a rally yelling at immigrants for coming to rape "our women" and molest "our children" had any real concern for women and children's safety more than he had an interest in painting undocumented immigrants as immoral, criminal, and dangerous. I fear that too many feminist working to end violence against women buy into these accusations and avoid making connections between these issues. It must be understood that the state and those allowed by the state have much more power to get away with committing sexual assault than individuals who have few rights in this country. Advocates for sexual assault survivors must shift their focus to government repression if they are to be true allies to these survivors.

Aldrete-Davila, a drug smuggler (i'd usually say "alleged" drug smuggler because of my skepticism about law enforcement, but as far as i know, no one has contested his drug smuggling, including himself).

Why do i find the prosecution of the agents strange? Well, because anyone who has been paying attention to the number of shootings of armed and unarmed individuals by police knows the cops **hardly ever get punished**. The circumstances hardly matter in any case. The "justice" system has proven that cops are virtually immune from punishment. When was the last time you heard of a cop shooting a drug smuggler and facing over 10 years for it? Especially if the drug smuggler was only shot once and didn't die?

In my mind, police and border patrol, both being law enforcement, are given similar responsibilities, privileges, and social worth. Based on how people are reacting to this story, I'm seeing that border patrol seems to be given even more worth by certain people, based not only on the fact that the border patrol agents are called heroes ([youtube video of press conference](#)⁴⁸), but also on the accusations of treason placed on the "justice" system as well as Bush if he doesn't give the agents a pardon.

A Texas jury convicted the pair of assault with serious bodily injury; assault with a deadly weapon; discharge of a firearm in relation to a crime of violence; and a civil-rights violation. Compean and Ramos also were convicted of four counts and two counts, respectively, of obstruction of justice for not reporting that their weapons had been fired.([Source](#)⁴⁹).

The more I read about this story, the crazier it is.

The government brought the charges after Osbaldo Aldrete-Davila, a Mexican national, agreed to testify against the agents in exchange for a grant of immunity in a possible drug case after an investigation by the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General. ([Source](#)⁵⁰).

What was the U.S. government's interest in defending the civil rights of a mexican drug smuggler meanwhile otherwise treating immigrants like shit? Although I have no concrete answers, i think it's worthwhile to consider the corruption of the drug war. You know, the CIA's involvement in bringing cocaine/crack into ghettos ([narconews.com/darkalliance](#), [guerrilla news network video](#)⁵¹), the corruption involving Columbia ([plancolumbia.org](#)) and have you heard about the House of Death ([narconews.com/houseofdeath](#), [the Guardian](#)⁵²)? The main allegation that's coming out of the House of Death controversy is that ICE and higher-ups knew about people being killed- but it didn't matter because they were mexican. Meanwhile their informant was being paid by the u.s. at the same time he was involved in the murders. A mexican involved in the drug trade is allowed to commit crimes while mexicans and mexican americans are disposable- allowed to be murdered (or perhaps given prison sentences?). I can see a pattern...

Why was the drug smuggler worth defending? What are the circumstances surrounding the U.S. government's decision to pursue this case and grant Adrete-Davila immunity? Why does the mexican drug smuggler have more value to the government than two mexican-american border patrol agents? How does race play into this? In what way is the mexican government involved?

It's interesting when, as an anarchist, I find myself having similar skepticism

anti-abortion and anti-gay marriage politics in that a number of them are worried that those brown people are having too many babies (the anti-abortion thing having more to do with white women- these folks have no qualms about advocating a number of other things that restrict people of color's reproductive choice, i.e. forced sterilization, testing unsafe birth control methods, in addition to warlike conditions, lack of healthcare, etc.). You've undoubtedly heard the immigration issue referred to as an invasion. An invasion insinuates that the group doesn't belong- so do they not belong because they don't have papers, or is it something deeper than that? I think you know the answer.

Another major factor is the job situation. But anyone who really looked into the situation would see that the greedy corporations would rather exploit cheaper labor, in addition to bringing many jobs out of the country to exploit even cheaper labor, on top of being a causal factor (in conjunction with capitalism/colonialism/globalization/government corruption) of the poverty in central and south america that causes people to need to come here. And i've mentioned how i feel that pitting workers against each other benefits those in upper classes, so is not above anyone to whom it would be an advantage (like politicians in cahoots with corporations).

I've also mentioned in previous posts about how stereotypes are used, such as the criminal, the drug smuggler, etc., which are intertwined with race. I've written about how certain other criminals and even domestic terrorists are not seen as important as they would if they are non-white, how certain laws are seen as more important to enforce than others based on who would be the target of repression. It's all a bunch of hypocrisy and that's why i call it racism.

Sorry to be abrupt in my conclusion, but much of what I would include here has already been said in other posts. But finally, i'd just like to add that there are blatant racists in the anti-immigrant movement. There are people with ties to those racists in the anti-immigrant movement. There are people who say really horrible things and the people standing next to them who claim to not be racist don't say shit about it. There are tons of racial stereotypes, name-calling, and violent threats against immigrants, and that's not an overstatement.

The Complexity of the Border Patrol Agents' Sentence (Dec 27 2006)

As someone who has followed stories of police brutality and police shootings for around five years, the story of the border patrol agents, Compean and Ramos, who were prosecuted for shooting a drug smuggler struck me as very strange. There are a number of groups with some major resources (i.e. personalities on Fox programs ([fox youtube video](#)⁴⁶), people who have access to president Bush ([youtube video of press conference](#)⁴⁷)), as well as various other groups (mostly anti-immigrant groups) who are campaigning for the pardoning of the two border patrol agents involved in chasing and shooting Osbaldo

I do not want to frame this as just being about immigrant and Mexican women. There are too many stories to mention. I also do not want to frame this as just about women. Other assaults shouldn't be marginalized, such as the boy sodomized in Atenco, and the prison system allowing for sexual assaults to occur in prisons (and men of color/immigrants being disproportionately imprisoned). And I do not forget Amancio Corrales/Dalila, a Mexican immigrant female impersonator who was killed while dressed as a female near Yuma, AZ, most likely murdered because of his gender identity (see [theamancioproject.org](#)). These stories are all related.

Another reason i posted about this is that i also had not seen these issues as so related until i happened to read these essays in *The Color of Violence* and the article on the women in Oaxaca, and i wanted to share this with others. In addition, anti-globalization, anti-border, immigrants' rights, and liberation movements need to be aware of the additional effect of state violence on women. Particularly anarchists who romanticize riots and conflicts with police need to be conscious of the repression handed down to women, queer, trans, and people of color disproportionately more than white straight male anarchists.

"The Color of Violence" touches on many more issues, and I highly recommend it.

Rights and the Anti-Immigrant Movement (Nov 24 2006)

(This was written yesterday but the internet didn't work well.)

I think today's a good day to talk about rights. I've been thinking a lot about what rights are because so many people have different ideas of who has what rights. Civil rights, human rights, constitutional rights, etc. are all things we talk about but the terms tend to be taken for granted while people don't necessarily agree on what they mean. The anti-immigrant folks get so angry when undocumented immigrants fight for their rights. And now they're trying to take even more rights away by, for example, trying to reinterpret the fourteenth amendment that grants citizenship to babies born in the u.s. no matter the status of the mother. I think examining this ambiguity of "rights" is especially relevant on a day such as thansgiving that is a historical symbol of europeans sense of their "rights" to the land of the new world.

I admit i'm rather ignorant about the definitions of the different types of rights are, as i imagine a number of other people are. I don't believe in government, so talking about rights is a little tricky. I don't believe in god, so i don't believe that rights are given by a god. And i think we can all agree that you don't have to believe in god to believe in rights. I could look up what various philosophers and other thinkers have said about rights, but i don't feel like it, because although it is useful because dead white male thinkers have shaped the western/u.s. idea of "rights" i don't want to place a value on their ideas as opposed to others'.

Let's talk about the ambiguity of rights and the desire by certain people to feel they are entitled to something that others are not who therefore try to shape what others' rights are based on their own entitlement which is often based on racism.

One thing that made me think about this was "[You Have No Right.](#)"³⁴ a speech by laine lawless, a controversial pagan lesbian member of tucson-based border guardians who was involved in a public burning of the mexican flag and is also known to have no problem with white supremacist extremists involved in the anti-immigrant movement (hmmm... might that make her a white supremacist extremist?). She says, "You have no right to be here, you have no right to demonstrate and claim the same rights under the Constitution as American citizens."

So it's my understanding that the bill of rights applies to all people in this country and although the constitution does not supply the right to enter the country illegally, it does protect other rights such as to demonstrate and yes, that would mean claiming many of the same rights as American citizens. So does she not agree with the constitution?

This is difficult, because while i agree with many of the rights put forth by the constitution, i do not believe they are rights because they're in the constitution. Meaning, with or without any constitution, i believe in certain rights. Nonetheless, the reality of constitutional rights and such allows me to expose some hypocrisy.

This hypocrisy lies, for example, in the fact that anti-immigrant folks are trying to reinterpret the fourteenth amendment so that it does not give citizenship to anyone born in this country, claiming that it was not written to allow for thousands of babies of undocumented immigrants to have automatic citizenship (more on that [here](#)³⁵). Yet, anti-immigrant folks in arizona are interpreting a law against human smuggling in order to convict your average recently-crossed undocumented immigrant of conspiracy even though the makers of this fairly new law have said they did not intend for it to be used that way. So we have people trying to change the interpretation of an amendment because they say it wasn't intended to give citizenship rights to "anchor babies" and using another law that the authors say was not intended to go after anyone but the smugglers themselves, both in an effort to limit the rights of undocumented immigrants.

Sheriff Joe Arpaio, who is the Maricopa County Sheriff whose department has been arresting the immigrants on the smuggling conspiracy charge maintains that he's just enforcing the law. That's his job. It's as simple as that. Yet we know that meanwhile there are plenty of laws that are not getting enforced as aggressively as this one and that this is a political ploy and a further effort to repress immigrants.

So my argument is that they don't really care about rights or the constitution

The situation is different now, from my understanding, because in the last decade or so, many more indigenous people, having lost their land and livelihood, have been forced to migrate north for work. In addition, the chicanos that Lopez spoke of were not recent immigrants, probably many had family in california from when california was part of sonora. The restrictive border has created an additional layer of difference on people. People used to be able to travel back and forth with more ease, which is not the case now.

This issue cannot be separated from class. The border is clearly designed to separate rich from poor, as explained more in depth in [Boundary Enforcement and National Security in an Age of Global Apartheid](#) ([deletetheborder.org/node/1393](#)). Rich mexicans probably have no problem getting the papers they need to stay in the states- or being illegal for that matter. Poor mexicans are seen as looking to take advantage of our generous healthcare and educational systems. So despite the fact that poor u.s. citizens know damn well that the u.s. healthcare and educational systems are not generous, they often are made to compete with the new-comers, so hate is easily bred among many of them. So the root of the problem obviously has much to do with class differences, but the differences between "races" are perpetuated in their interest.

My main argument is based on the concept that race is socially constructed, which means a) it's not based on any biological reality, and b) social aspects shape what races are or what they mean, which means that we could argue that cues such as language/accents, place of origin, and class can play a bigger role than skin color to determine one's ability to be "white", if that's how it plays out in the social context. So two identical people could be on opposite sides of the immigration debate, but the one on the anti-immigrant side would have to fit certain assimilationist standards. And i don't mean to imply that that person would never be confronted with any discrimination, but it's far less likely. My arguments here show why it is possible for an anti-immigrant group to not consider itself racist, because it allows for the possibility that racism exists among people who aren't prejudiced against or don't hate all people of color. In addition, how a person is treated- i.e. discrimination, police harassment, etc. indicate a difference in race. Therefore: racism.

Let's talk about legal status being a basis for discrimination. Most anti-immigrant folks say that all these efforts against undocumented immigrants are because they are undocumented/illegal. I would argue that the discrimination is why they are illegal, not the other way around. Meaning, there were conscious decisions to make a bigger deal out of the illegal status of undocumented immigrants (specifically from central and south america, but also other brown countries), mainly due to the recent larger influx of immigrants, on top of the hysteria caused by 9/11. Illegal immigration was okay until (white) people started feeling threatened by it. So the question is why they feel threatened. I would argue that a good number of them feel that whiteness is getting outnumbered. They're being reminded that the world doesn't revolve around them. Complaining about having to dial 1 for english on their phones. Boo hoo. The sense of feeling outnumbered is very much interwoven with the

getted, especially here in AZ. Often anti-immigrant folks will say they're against all illegal immigration, but they're emphasis on the border is certainly an indicator of who they are concerned with. It seems also that there has been a rapid increase in people coming across the mexican/us border (not all of which are mexicans, by the way) which contributes to this focus. My experience is that of someone who lives near the mexican border, so forgive me if my analysis does not apply elsewhere.

For the last few years i've struggled with understanding this racism that applies to mostly mexican immigrants. Are mexicans a race? I mean, first of all, race is socially constructed, so there's no actual line drawn between races except those that are socially drawn. It seems that these lines in some ways are ambiguous, and in others have a major impact on people. One main thing that constructs race is how a group of people are treated (by the police, for instance) based on certain cues such as hair/eye/skin color, place of origin, accent/language, and i would argue also class. Many people think of race as skin color, and often despite class background, a person with dark skin might be discriminated against. But one thing that stands out in my mind is a story in an autobiography by either Assata Shakur, Elaine Brown, or Angela Davis (i read them all in a short amount of time, so i don't remember which), about how she and her sister or friend spoke french in a retail store and were treated completely different than if they were speaking the way they usually do. This is an example of how a number of cues are often taken together to shape how one decides to treat another.

Although people from mexico are a very diverse group of indigenous and mestizos with varying degrees of spanish ancestry, and some mexicans have african ancestry, there are many latinos in the states who identify as white (they had lighter skin), and i certainly grew up with some (in the midwest) and didn't think of them as a different race, despite their dark hair and eyes and spanish name.

I read this book *Racism on Trial, The Chicano Fight for Justice* recently, in which Ian Haney Lopez described how people of mexican descent began to identify as brown, as chicano, as indigenous, when they had the option to identify as white. The problem was they were being treated different. Poor education, police harassment and brutality, in addition to past labor and land struggles (Lopez didn't really address the latter, but i wanted to include it) were all things that they experienced. In addition, as they became aware of the civil rights struggles and were inspired by workers struggles, and they began to see parallels between how they were being treated compared to how black people were treated and began rejecting the notion that they were white. That wasn't everyone, just a fair amount who began to identify as brown/chicano. Anyway, what i'm getting at is that how people treat others often determines their race. It wasn't that they just decided to be brown, they realized they were being treated as non-white and that they were determined to unite, encourage pride among their people, and try to raise themselves up to being treated fairly and with dignity.

or the rule of law, or whatever they want to call it, but they will use it and interpret it in their own interest. Why? Because they feel entitled by their white privilege (and if they're not white, perhaps their loyalty to whiteness) and citizenship to certain rights and access to resources. Unfortunately for them (and the rest of us), many of them don't get much of what they're promised by whiteness, because if less people were exploited, well, then businesses wouldn't be as well off as they are, so working class white folks feel screwed. So the blame is placed on the powerless desperate people who have come here for work, instead of the source of the problem: capitalism/business/the elite. And they f*ck themselves over and all the rest of us by trying to keep getting their piece of the pie and trying to keep those less entitled from even getting any crumbs. And you know who's leading them? White guys who get plenty of pie. They're pushing these fears of outsiders and conspiracies about immigrants taking over and they're laughing all the way to the bank because not only can they continue to exploit the immigrant workers because they keep others from allying with them, they can continue to exploit all workers because they are effectively prevented from joining together and demanding justice.

Throughout history the constitution and ideas about our democracy have been interpreted by the elite and white people in their own interest. That's why it said "all men are created equal" and that people had the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but reality did not reflect that for most people. What do rights and democracy mean when this country was built on genocide, slavery, patriarchy, and colonialism? What does having a nation of laws mean when we break international law? What do civil rights mean when our prison system is of the largest in the world with disproportionately black men in the prisons? What does human rights mean when they're broken everyday by businesses, the military, the police, and the prison system? So when anti-immigrant folks talk about rights or laws or democracy, pay really close attention to why they're saying what they're saying and whether they're being consistent. Because I guarantee you they're not being sincere about their respect for rights and democracy.

Related videos on youtube:

[Amnesty for Illegal Aliens Demonstrations: Round 'em Up!](#)³⁶ (with Sheriff Joe Arpaio)

[Anchor Babies](#)³⁷

Anti-Immigrant Folks and the New Slave-Trade (Dec 1 2006)

Please check out this story: [Undocumented Worker Used As Slave In Wisconsin Home For 19 Years](#)³⁸. The story is incredibly sad, but unfortunately if things go the way lots of anti-immigrant folks want, there will be more opportunities for people to be treated like this. The anti-immigrant movement wants to create a situation where undocumented immigrants (particularly mexican) are simply seen as criminals, not as human, and where they are so afraid of being deported or going to jail (especially if they have family here) that they will avoid getting into trouble like the woman in the story.

So by creating and building upon this situation, the anti-immigrant movement is enabling people who would keep slaves, who would refuse to pay their workers because they can get away with it, who would pay their workers shit-wages, etc. And in some cases the anti-immigrant folks might want to exploit slave-labor. In fact, many of us in this country benefit from low-wage labor, yet many do nothing about it, even if they disagree with it.

I recall seeing the terms "slave" and "slave-trader" on the saveourstate.org forums (popular messageboards used by anti-immigrant folks), so i searched and found a few entries. Below are some quotes from the site.

I can't help but notice that many do tend to paint the employers as greedy, but really seem to lack empathy for the workers (even while calling them slaves). And as we well know, even those who have a critique of globalization, the rich, and sometimes even capitalism (who are probably not rich themselves although a number of anti-immigrant folks are), always end up focusing on and blaming the immigrants in the end. Even when they target employers, they're still intentionally keeping workers from getting work, harassing them, and intimidating them, often even trying to get them arrested. So while one might think that if anti-immigrant folks see the reality that workers are being exploited like slaves in this country, one should assume that these folks have any interest in helping fight for the workers' rights to not be treated as slaves.

This is one of the problems as far as convincing anti-immigrant folks that they need to focus their attention on the rich, big business, capitalism, globalization, etc. Those that might agree that all or some of these things are wrong and should be fought are usually of that opinion because they feel like they're not getting what they feel they're entitled to as white people and/or citizens, NOT because they care about whether other people are oppressed or not. If they really wanted to fight those that exploit labor (here and in Mexico) they would first take time to see how they are contributing to it- financially, politically, etc. And then they would take steps to stop- by boycotting, limiting their consumption, creating alternatives for getting needs met. Then they would fight with all the other activists to stop globalization, big business, etc. But they don't. Why? Because they're more comfortable scape-goating immigrants.

It is also important that often despite their criticisms of these things, they still tend to ally themselves with rich anti-immigrant folks (see [Racist Jet-Set: Rusty Childress and the false class consciousness of the Minutemen](#)³⁹). In fact, those who are working class themselves are likely fed most of the anti-immigrant bullshit by politicians and other elite like Sean Hannity and Lou Dobbs who certainly aren't having their jobs threatened, and actually probably profit from anti-immigrant sentiment in the long run. These are some of the hypocrisies i hope to expose, and also something that we should think about as far as our strategy for fighting these ideas.

It was some of their slave employers that came there to hire their slaves for

the day and apparently didn't have enough money so they offered pot instead... [Source](#)⁴⁰).

It's bringing millions of people into this country in hopes of having an underclass of slave labor, and using them for profit. Many businesses are now owned by Hispanics, and they love having these slaves to work for them. These employers say the illegals are such good workers, and will do the work others won't. Slaves don't really have a choice, and the Hispanic business owner knows this. MANY don't even pay minimum wage. They sometimes give them food, but wasn't that what the slave owners in the south did? They want them here just like big business does. [Source](#)⁴¹).

These plantation owners learned that our government will not enforce labor or immigration laws, so they decided to fire the Americans and hire the new illegal slaves!!! Americans all over this nation are being fired and then replaced by illegal slaves!! Americans did not ask to be fired! Americans would love their old jobs back!!! The difference between illegals and legals is RESPECT!! Americans demand a fair wage to support their families, the illegals don't care if they live in tents amongst prostitutes, drugs, and trash! So illegals can afford the cheap wage and apparently don't respect themselves enough to demand better (in their own country)!! [Source](#)⁴²).

Construction projects! We wouldn't need any stinking construction projects, using slave labor if we had the housing illegals have stolen from us and our children and if greedy builders paid fair wages! [Source](#)⁴³).

Many in Congress refuse to listen to the will of the people or follow the rule of law. They have been bought by those who would benefit the most from cheap labor, abundant narcotics and the slave trade. [Source](#)⁴⁴).

I blame it on the corporate barons," Gilchrist thunders. "Not just the huge ones, but the smaller corporations who know they can get desperate workers to work for literal peanuts to do the same work American citizens would want twice the salary for. They laugh all the way to the bank. They're professional slave traders, just like in the Southern states back to the Civil War. . . . I do not like these capitalistic pigs." [Source](#)⁴⁵).

Why I Call it Racism (January 25 2007)

The anti-immigrant movement is often called racist, but I wanted to speak for myself on why i use the term.

There are a few reasons why it's problematic to call the anti-immigrant movement racist. One is that they often deny being racist- that makes it a little more complex. Two is that people of color are among their groups (though in small numbers). Three, many undocumented immigrants are considered white (in the case of Irish for example), and some could be considered white if they looked the same but fit certain standards so as to be "assimilated" (whatever that means), such as speaking English without a foreign accent (many Latino U.S. citizens self-identify as white, are considered racially white for some official reasons- although ethnically Hispanic/Latino).

Immigrants are a diverse group, although often Mexicans are specifically tar-