

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: BODIES ON THE LINE: VIOLENCE,
DISPOSABLE SUBJECTS, AND THE US-
MEXICO BORDER INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Cristina Jo Perez, Doctor of Philosophy, 2016

Dissertation directed by: Associate Professor, Michelle V. Rowley,
Women's Studies

Bodies On the Line: Violence, Disposable Subjects, and the Border Industrial Complex explores the construction of identity and notions of belonging within an increasingly privatized and militarized Border Industrial Complex. Specifically, the project interrogates how discourses of Mexican migrants as racialized, gendered, and hypersexualized “deviants” normalize violence against border crossers. Starting at Juárez/El Paso border, I follow the expanding border, interrogating the ways that Mexican migrants, regardless of sexual orientation, have been constructed and disciplined according to racialized notions of “sexual deviance.” I engage a queer of color critique to argue that sexual deviance becomes a justification for targeting and containing migrant subjects. By focusing on the economic and racially motivated violence that the Border Industrial Complex does to Mexican migrant communities, I expand the critiques that feminists of color have long leveraged against systemic violence done to communities of color through the prison industrial system.

Importantly, this project contributes to transnational feminist scholarship by contextualizing border violence within the global circuits of labor, capital, and ideology that shape perceptions of border insecurity.

The project contributes an interdisciplinary perspective that uses a multi-method approach to understand how border violence is exercised against Mexicans at the Mexico-US border. I use archival methods to ask how historical records housed at the National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library serve as political instruments that reinforce the contemporary use of violence against Mexican migrants. I also use semi-structured interviews with nine frequent border crossers to consider the various ways crossers defined and aligned themselves at the border. Finally, I analyze the master narratives that come to surround specific cases of border violence. To that end, I consider the mainstream media's coverage, legal proceedings, and policy to better understand the racialized, gendered, and sexualized logics of the violence.

BODIES ON THE LINE: VIOLENCE, DISPOSABLE SUBJECTS, AND THE US-
MEXICO BORDER INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

by

Cristina Jo Perez

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2016

Advisory Committee:

Associate Professor Michelle V. Rowley, Chair
Associate Professor Christina B. Hanhardt
Associate Professor Randy J. Ontiveros
Professor Nancy L. Struna
Associate Professor Ashwini Tambe

© Copyright by
Cristina Jo Perez
2016

Dedication

Para mis padres.

Por todo el apoyo.

Con todo el amor.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements are my favorite thing. Acknowledgements remind me of our capacity to make space(s) in the academy, and the world more broadly, for connection, for generosity, and maybe even for love. Even when they detail the painful process of writing, acknowledgements are hopeful and I am thrilled and overwhelmed by the opportunity to write my own.

I am so very grateful to the many wonderful and supportive teachers I have had the privilege of working with over the years. This project is what it is because of the thoughtful insights and feedback of my dream committee, Christina Hanhardt, Randy Ontiveros, Nancy Struna, and Ashwini Tambe. I am hugely indebted to Michelle V. Rowley for making me the feminist scholar that I am today. This project is so much closer to what I wanted it to be because of your careful guidance, your intellectual contributions, and your mentorship. Thank you.

So many wonderful scholars have helped make space for me to do this work in the academy. I am especially grateful to the Department of Women's Studies at the University of Maryland for the opportunity to work and learn alongside such powerful feminist scholars. The faculty has been so supportive at every turn and the graduate students have made this more fun. Thank you to the graduate students who came before me for their guidance and wisdom, especially Renina Jarmon, Julie Enszer, Angel Miles, Lara Torsky, and Katie White. I also appreciate the companionship of my cohort. Melissa Rogers, thank you for your careful eye, your time, and your helpful reading recommendations. Jessica Vooris, I have enjoyed talking about Mexico and the graduate school process with you. Jaime Madden and Sina Lee, I loved learning to teach alongside such phenomenal scholar-teachers. I have enjoyed learning and thinking with Donnesha Blake and Bimbola Akinbola. I do not know what I would have done without Cliffornia Royals Pryor who made sure I did this right and who made this process more fun. Annie Carter, Laura Nichols, JV Sapinoso and Catalina Toala have all saved my life and my paychecks so many times. I am grateful to you all.

My time at the Consortium on Race, Gender, and Ethnicity taught me how to do good scholarship guided by a commitment to visions of social justice. Thank you to Ruth Zambrana for your mentorship and for helping me understand the academy and how to survive it. Wendy Hall and Laura Logie taught me so much. Beth Douthirt Cohen has been a tremendous friend and a model scholar.

In the faculty and graduate students in the Department of American Studies, I found wonderful teachers and critical peers. Nancy Struna, thank you for the opportunity to teach and for a place to push my thinking. Betsy Yuen has been a great colleague and a tremendous friend. Together Paul Saiedi and Douglas Ishii have read so much of my work, inspired me through the difficulties of graduate school, and come be just really good friends.

Thank you to the program in Women's and Gender Studies at MIT for the space and time to sharpen my thinking and finish the manuscript. Helen Elaine Lee has been a fantastic mentor and Emily Neill provided incredible inspiration and advice. My time at MIT has also allowed me to participate in the Boston Area

Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies and to experience a great year of feminist scholarship in Boston. I cannot thank Lisa Lowe and the Workshop for Dissertation Writers in Women's and Gender Studies enough for reading the work and providing intellectual, emotional, and logistical support in this process.

In addition to the many scholars who have taught me how to do research, I want to thank those who taught me how to teach. Martha Gomez, Pat Maguire, Deborah Rosenfelt, and A. Lynn Bolles were all integral to my development as a teacher.

I also want to acknowledge those in the border community who were so very supportive of this work. Thank you to the staff at the Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library and to the many participants who shared their time, their energy, and their stories.

To my many communities that have been there for me across time and space – Claudette, Kallyn, Bonnie, Sarah, Jessica, Julia, and Leslie – I owe you each so much. Thank you.

To Jessica Kenyatta Walker who served as just the best thought partner ever, I am eternally grateful for all the times you pushed me to do better and for encouraging me when I thought I couldn't do it.

In one of the times where I was plagued by self-doubt, my sister, Ali Pérez, went to the grocery store and brought back a tub of red vines. She then took a picture of me holding the tub and crying. She never published it. For that and for all the adjustments and for all your patience, I thank you. And of course, to my parents, who have sacrificed so much so I might sit where I do now. My dad used to ask me what I thought of what was happening in the world. He first sparked my curiosities about the world around me. My mom is the best person I know. She teaches me how to be brave and think big. I love them both.

Table of Contents

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction: Suturing Bodies, Bridging Fields	1
<u>Making Border Violence Visible</u>	1
<u>Approaching the Border</u>	6
<u>The Border Industrial Complex</u>	12
<u>The Construction of Border Crossers</u>	19
<u>Crossing Through This Bridge Called My Back: Creating a Feminist Point of</u>	
<u>Contact</u>	22
<u>Tracing the Border Industrial Complex: A Methodological Challenge</u>	26
Chapter 2: A Theory of the Border Archive: Representing Menacing Crossers and	
Sentimental Heroes	35
<u>Introduction</u>	35
<u>Reading the Border Museum</u>	37
<u>A Theory of the Border Archive</u>	46
<u>Reading the Border Archive</u>	51
<u>A National Language for Understanding the Border Crosser</u>	56
Naming the Migrant	57
Scripting the Migrant	61
<u>A National Language for Understanding the Border Patrol Agent</u>	76
Violent Poetics: the Sensate Nation, the Wounding Migrant, and the Sentimental	
Agent	78
<u>Conclusion</u>	89
Chapter 3: Bodies on the Line: Shifting Borders and Shifty Crossers	91
<u>An Anxious Border Child</u>	91
<u>Method: Collecting Border Stories</u>	95
<u>Methodology: Reading Power and Identity in Border Stories</u>	99
<u>Diverse and Tense Border Crossing Narratives</u>	106
<u>The Shifty Border</u>	111
<u>The Slippery Border Subject</u>	124
Us versus Them versus The Agents	126
<u>Conclusion</u>	136
Chapter 4: Conjured Borders and Waiting Migrants: The Case of Blanca Borrego	139
<u>Introduction</u>	139
<u>The Case of Blanca Borrego</u>	140
<u>A Word on Method and Reading for Migrant Women's Bodies</u>	148
<u>Leveraging a Queer Critique</u>	150
<u>Conjured Borders, Latina Reproduction, and Temporal Orientations</u>	152
<u>The Conjured Border</u>	156
<u>Producing the Anti-Citizen Citizen</u>	164
<u>Temporality, Immigrant Subjectivity and the Orienting of Desire</u>	170
<u>Conclusion</u>	183

Chapter 5: Surplus, Criminality, and Value at the Border, Or How to Live on and with Wounds	185
<u>Maria Romero: A Strategic Starting Point</u>	185
<u>NAFTA, Surplus Life, and the Refashioning of Productivity</u>	190
<u>The Border Industrial Complex and the Investment in Necropolitics</u>	195
<u>Method: Unsettling Criminality, Violence, and Value</u>	198
<u>The Value of Criminalized Bodies</u>	201
<u>The Work of Violence</u>	212
<u>Living on and with Wounds</u>	224
<u>Conclusion</u>	230
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	232
Appendices.....	240
Bibliography	253

Chapter 1: Introduction: Suturing Bodies, Bridging Fields

Making Border Violence Visible

It's night and a mysterious figure is driving west down I-10. The older car drives under the Paso del Norte Bridge, bearing its large green welcome and warning to drivers headed toward Mexico. Shots of what locals call "the spaghetti bowl," a maze of ramps and bridges on and around the interstate, flash on the screen. We catch an aerial view of cars on the bridge itself, lined up waiting to be inspected and waived across.

Back in the mystery car, a gloved hand is removed from the steering wheel so the driver can check their watch. And right on time, streetlights shut off. The car pulls up along the bridge, a pair of boots climbs out of the car. In an office, uniformed men watch surveillance screens go blurry and they panic, quickly typing and picking up the phone. While they sit impotent in their workspace, the pair of boots moves around the car, opens the trunk, gets back in, and drives off.

The lights of the bridge come back on and agents in the office look around to take stock. Amongst the chaos, a dark haired agent watches a screen go live, his eyes narrow and the screen zooms in. Lying on a line marking Mexico from the US, is a woman's body. Her upper half lies on the part of the road marked "Mexico" in white bold letters. Her lower half lies on that marked "United States." Back in his box, our Customs and Border Patrol Officer speaks into his headset: "Holy shit. Shut the border."

In this opening scene from the 2013 FX show, *The Bridge*, we are asked to

consider the possibility that individual bodies might spark international crisis. This dissertation explores how a more dynamic relationship between bodies and borders, one in which bodies cause crisis but international tensions are also written on the bodies of border crossers.

The show also productively showcases narratives wherein the daily concerns of family, love, and even personal vengeance become entwined in global politics. While dramatic exaggeration, the show demonstrates that everyday lives are lived against the backdrop of cartel violence, the hundreds of disappeared women of Juárez, and Mexican migration to the U.S.. In addition to blending the personal and the political, the show unsettles discourses of a national boundary that sharply distinguishes one nation state from the other, illuminating instead the U.S. financial investments in the international drug trade, their malignant disinterest in the disappeared, and their more active role in the thousands of migrant deaths in U.S. deserts.

These two cities, the show seems to argue, are tied together through violence. The show offers no clearer symbol of this bloody union than in the body lying on the bridge. In one of the first scenes, our protagonists - Sonia Cross, El Paso Homicide and Marco Ruiz, Chihuahua State Police- sort out jurisdiction when Cross claims that the body and the car that brought her to the border are American. The case, then, is hers. Ruiz tells her that this arrangement works fine for him, he caught nine bodies at city hall that morning and he has enough to do because they have their own bodies in Mexico.

U.S. control over the case is short lived. When the paramedics go to pick up

the body they discover that what appears to be one body is actually two. The upper half, found in Mexico belongs to U.S. anti-immigrant judge Lorraine Gates. Meanwhile the much browner lower extremities belong to Cristina Fuentes, a nineteen year old who came to the border to work in the maquiladoras. Here, then, we encounter the staging of two embodied representations of border violence – the anti-immigrant judge who refuses to allow Mexican day laborers to work in her city, alongside the bodily evidence of Mexican criminality and national sexism.

Blurring two prominent narratives that circulate globally about Juárez, Ruiz explains to Cross that Fuentes was found in a death house, or one of the empty buildings where sicarios (or Mexican hitmen working for the cartels) dump their victims. He also says that Fuentes is “one of them....the dead girls of Juárez.” While any local and international attention to the disappeared girls of Juárez tapered off in the late 2000s, with the rise of the cartel wars that devastated the border town, the show sutures them together, creating an image of Juárez as a space of incredible violence.

Still, the officers are faced with two dead bodies, each from a different side of the border, each placed on the opposite side of the line from where they were killed, a further gesture of entanglement. And so the a blonde, female American officer with Aspergers and the Mexican philanderer described on the show’s website as “one of the last good men in [his police] department...charming...cunning...he will do whatever it takes to get what he needs” – set off on a binational crime-fighting two seasons.

In 2013, the show was awarded a Peabody. In the announcement of the award,

the Peabody organization mentions the show's willingness to include complex story lines that involve the drug cartels, Cross' Asperger's, and the "Lost Girls of Juárez - a tragedy in which nearly 400 women have been murdered in the Mexican city since the mid-1990s." The organization argues that these border issues "are rarely seen on mainstream U.S. television" and that the show "rais[es] awareness of border issues while creating a compelling murder mystery" (Peabody, 2013).

Indeed, the show uses some of its most nail-biting moments to create this awareness. For example, at the end of the first episode the "Border Butcher" who opened the show in his late night joy ride, leaves a note attached to a fake bomb. He tells the two police officers, the bomb squad, and an El Paso news reporter that: "There are five murders a year in El Paso. In Juárez, thousands. Why? Why is one dead white woman more important than so many dead just across the bridge? How long can El Paso look away? We've got some interesting times ahead. This is only the beginning..." Later in the season, the duo save an undocumented migrant who has been left to die, her body tied down, a camera trained on her as she slowly bakes in the desert. The butcher narrates her capture: "Who cares about one poor Mexican? Not the wealthy. The white. But if they have to see it, feel it, be responsible for letting her slip away, will they care then?" These two moments are profound as they suggest that the U.S.' proximity to Mexican and migrant violence does not necessarily mean that violence is visible. *The Bridge* demands that we look at the violence. In its complicated story lines, those that weave the individual lives of border subjects into broader discussions of transnational flows of money, bodies, and crime, the show offers us few easy answers.

This project dives unapologetically into the heart of this irreconcilability. The project asks us to attend carefully to questions of border violence and the various impacts it has on different bodies. Specifically I consider the various and sometimes violent ways that bodies are read, sorted, and managed while crossers attempt to live their lives at and across the border. This attention to the sorting and management of bodies does two things. First, it allows us to see how identities are (re)constructed at the border. Indeed, bodies are read and assigned categories according to racialized, gendered, classed, and sexualized logics (Chavez, 2016; Luibhéid, 2002; Hernández, 2010) and these logics become apparent when we center the bodies that cross and their related experiences. Moreover, these processes of reading and sorting illuminate the logics that undergird the mundane, epistemic, and spectacular violences at the border. Indeed, what better way to exclude migrants from the nation than through violence, not just the violence that leads to death (though certainly that too) but also the threat of future violence, the rendering of their bodies as criminal, the refusal to allow them access to healthcare, or the process of detention and deportation?

Bodies on the Line aims to center the physical and psychic violences committed against border crossers. One of its methodological contributions is that it begins its analysis of violence through the lives of those most affected by it – border crossers. It deploys a media analysis of cases that feature border assault and or murder and leverages these cases to explore the various and often invisible elements that make up the border and its violent intrusions into the quotidian. To that end, I work to highlight not just the global politics that shape the workings of the border but also the local border community dynamics, politics, and discourse. Additionally, I

take up not just the material border, in this case that of El Paso-Mexico, but also the discursive and affective contours of border politics more generally. Finally, I attend not just to the spatial dynamics of the border but as importantly, I raise questions about the temporality of the border and its policing. Ultimately, this project is about the construction of the border and those crossers, enforcement agents, and policy makers who are constantly remaking and reinforcing it.

Approaching the Border

The bodies that construct the border those who cross it, those who are deployed to protect it, and those who profit from its violence are central to this project. I set out, then, to consider how bodies are read and identities constructed at the increasingly militarized and privatized Border Industrial Complex. I am particularly interested in how discourses of Mexican migrants, as racialized, gendered, and hypersexualized “deviants,” normalize violence against border crossers from the south. Moreover, I aim to consider how discourses that identify Mexican migrants as criminal dangers and queer threats erase their precarious positions in between states and without state protection. In this vulnerable position, migrants become targets of bodily violence that is justified and reinforced by the epistemic violence of the archive, the media, and policy. Indeed, while the archive, the media and policy are often regarded as neutral, their depictions of border crossers and agents often work to create or foreclose sympathy through a range of rhetorical tactics that play up the state’s power to discern between those worthy of protection and those against whom the state needs to protect itself. In analyzing these discourses, I am

careful to consider how even those sympathetic storytellers often reassert the need for such discernment even if they argue that discernment fails in individual cases.

In revealing the vulnerability concealed beneath discourses of danger, threat, and deviance, this project aims to highlight the ways the U.S. state and corporations have invested financially and politically in a violent border machine. Throughout the project, I am guided by the ways in which violence at the border consolidates the Nation and how the imagined threat posed by a “leaky” Mexico shape border policing in the U.S. interior. In the project’s final chapter, I also begin to consider the market that has emerged around border security in the U.S. My intention here is to better understand who profits from the workings of the Border Industrial Complex.

My use of the term Border Industrial Complex aims to illuminate both the political and economic investments in the sometimes violent border policing. While not much scholarly work has centered the Border Industrial Complex, it has been the focus of media attention. For example, National Public Radio’s (NPR) Ted Robbins reported on the growth of a Border Industrial Complex “fed by the government and supplied by the defense contractors and construction companies” (2012). Robbins reports that between 1986 and 2012, the U.S. committed \$219 billion to border security. These hundreds of billions of dollars work to increase the use of technology at the border but also to maintain the 250 detention centers across the U.S.

This last piece of border security, the focus on detention has generated some academic interest. In 2013 political scientists Roxanne Doty and Elizabeth Wheatley identified the immigration industrial system by considering the “legal apparatus, worldviews/ideas, private corporations, and webs of influence” that

shape immigration detention (2013). Of particular concern to Doty and Wheatley was the entanglement between the prison industrial complex and the growing industry that has emerged to warehouse migrant bodies. Not only do they argue that many of the same corporations profit from both systems, they also argue they are both underpinned by an “economy of power” that forecloses the possibility of reform. I consider this turn to immigrant detention just one of the many facets of the Border Industrial Complex.

Building on the work of prison abolitionists who continue to radically theorize the prison industrial complex, I have identified four major characteristics of the Border Industrial Complex: 1. A focus on profit and privatization masked by the discourse of security, 2. The Border Industrial Complex is rooted in the disposability of certain subjects, 3. This process is reliant on human disposability, thereby making the Border Industrial Complex a project of race, one intimately tied to questions of gender and sexuality, and 4. The Border Industrial Complex is related to the twin projects of the military and prison industrial complexes, both in its logic and dependence on these two other complexes.

The notion of the Border Industrial Complex builds on the use of the military and prison industrial complexes. Dwight Eisenhower coined the term, the military industrial complex, at the end of his presidency, on January 17, 1961. In his statement, he warned the nation of the increasing power of the military lobby (Hartung, 2001). Since then the term has been used by activists to point out the excessive U.S. spending on defense that ensures the U.S. outspends other nations on its military many times over, while lining the pockets of private U.S. corporations.

Moreover, the term is at the heart of an analytical and conceptual genealogy that helps us to understand similarly situated machineries, such as the prison industrial complex, and my work here on the border industrial complex.

The idea of a “complex” reminds us of the many moving and entangled parts that undergird the seemingly seamless phenomena such as militarism, the prison, and the border. A primary dimension of this imbrication is the often-erased relationship between government and private profit. Policy analyst, William Hartung argues that failure to continue to invest in private companies can severely undermine U.S. politicians who are then depicted as soft on defense (2001). Indeed, Hartung suggests that in order to disrupt his image as a “draft-evading child of the 1960s” Bill Clinton gave in to the military lobby, outspending the previous secretary of defense, Donald Rumsfeld (2001). This “hardening” of Clinton’s image communicated to the world that he took seriously the nation’s security.

The perception of a nation that is soft or hard in the face of threat and the need for private funds to shore up the state’s capacity to stave off such threats also shape the rhetoric that circulates around the prison industrial complex. Instead of foreign threats, the prison industrial complex is shaped by the fear of the internal threat, one taking the form of the criminal. In *Are Prisons Obsolete?*, Black feminist philosopher Angela Davis argues that the growth of prisons in the U.S. during the “tough on crime,” Reagan era did not actually prevent crime, as promised. Instead, the practice of mass incarceration seems only to have spurred the building of more prisons. With the increase in new prisons came the potential for private corporations to profit off of “construction, provision of goods and services, and use of prison labor” (2003, p. 12).

Davis argues that this accumulation of profit and the ways corporations and state operations became entangled, referenced the prison industrial complex's predecessor, the military industrial complex.

My use of the Border Industrial Complex aims to echo a similar set of processes. Namely, this project marks the ways in which private corporations in the U.S. profit off the discourses of migrants as threats to the nation. I point to the ramped up and consolidated rhetoric around what this threat looks like, its embodiment, and its location at the Mexico-U.S. border. Moreover, like the military and prison industrial complexes, I argue that the Border Industrial Complex is bolstered by racialized, gendered, and sexualized logics and their attendant narratives. The Border Industrial Complex successfully transforms these discourses into the material conditions faced by the border crossers in this dissertation, creating the conditions for violent detention and deferral, increased surveillance, and intensified policing.

Each chapter then asks several questions surrounding the processing and treatment of bodies within the Border Industrial complex. In the first chapter, for example, I read representation of the National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library in El Paso, Texas to examine how border subjects and, conversely, border agents are constructed in border archives. This chapter considers how various subjects treated, interpreted, defined, made absent in the historical understandings of the border. It also explores the narratives that the archives tell about the immigrant body, functioning as a narrative that gives the "Mexican Immigrant" a historical past that is represented as always already there despite its conjuring by the

American State. The second chapter analyzes the narratives of regular border crossers to ask how they define and navigate the border. This chapter focuses on individuals for whom the border is a daily “fixture” of their everyday lives. While other projects focus on the experience of undocumented crosses, this project “studies up” and examines middle class border crossers and discusses their strategies of crossing, their practices of disidentification and the ways that border crossings have shaped their subjectivity.

The third and fourth chapters consider mainstream media representations, policy, and court cases to ask about discourses that circulate widely about border crossers? In reading the narratives of violence at the border, I ask how we might build on and, in some cases, challenge what we know about the racialized, gendered, and sexualized nature of border violence. In the third chapter, I consider different forms of border violence against women. While important work has been done on the gendered nature of sexual violence at the border (Luibhéid, 2002; Falcón, 2007), I seek to extend their work to understand other manifestations of violence against women, especially those that manage their access to reproductive health. I, therefore, read these narratives for evidence of how the border translates Mexican women and men into hypersexual, hyper fertile, and sexually non-normative queer subjects at the border.

In the dissertation’s final chapter, I consider the gendered nature of violence against male border crossers. My goal is to understand how narratives of the Mexican migrant entangle concepts of hypermasculinity, criminality, and labor. I ask how these narratives construct migrants as targets of state violence and help

build a case for an emerging market meant to tighten security at the border.

Therefore, I ask how NAFTA and global trade policies shape an understanding of who is a productive body and whose body is excessive in the neoliberal moment?

Finally, each chapter raises a set of tensions in the often seemingly smooth and neutral operations of the Border Industrial Complex. At the border, tensions arise, for example, between an open and a closed border, between a desire for contact and for divide, between a stationary architecture and an ever expanding set of spaces, between the seemingly natural and the constructed. These tensions require careful attention not just because the bodies of border crossers, citizens, and agents get caught in the crossfire but also because those tensions may tell us about the contradictory nature of the border and the contradictory ways in which we make sense of citizenship, belonging, and subjectivity. Indeed, these tensions play themselves out differently on a crossing-by-crossing, or even a minute-by-minute basis. Sitting in these tensions then illuminates how it is that a border crosser might be permitted to cross one day but not the next and how agents might be held up as heroes and oppressive tools of the state.

The Border Industrial Complex

I consider the Mexico-U.S. border to operate as an assemblage made up of a set of contiguous spaces that entangle historical, political, economic, human, affective, material, discursive, spatial, and temporal elements.

Scholars of international relations, Stephen Collier and Aihwa Ong use assemblages to identify the "product of multiple determinations that are not

reducible to a single logic" (2005, p. 12). Moreover, they pair the idea of the assemblage with their notion of the global and identify the "inherent tensions" in the term "global assemblage" in that "global implies broadly encompassing, seamless, and mobile; assemblage implies heterogeneous, contingent, unstable, partial and situated" (p. 12). I explore the extent to which my pairing of the assemblage with the border runs up against the same kinds of tensions as the border is thought to be natural, transparent, easily understood. The idea of the border at work in this project, is not as a fixed place but as a widely spun industrial complex, I hope to unsettle "seamless" versions of the border, making it harder to pin down. To this end I show the work of "the border" through projectiles, bullets, doctor's offices, as well as the named site of the El Paso/Juarez border.

The Border Industrial Complex allows for a focus on the border as a process, illuminating the work of the border in creating subjects that become targeted. Building on Collier and Ong's conception of the global as an assemblage, this project considers the global and the local as they come together to shape an assemblage.

Drawing on the notion of an assemblage also allows for us to account for the many meanings and uses of the border. For, as transnational feminist scholar Michelle Rowley reminds us, "borders cannot represent any one thing. They may lock people in or provide the means of escape. They may be ephemeral through technological or cultural transfers, fixed through modes of policing, or come to one's door in barrels, visiting relatives, and remittances. They may be adobe walls or the zinc of a tenement yard, country/rural divides or class/ethnic divides" (2011, p. 187). Assemblages, then

allow us to recast the field of border studies, taking in different kinds of borders and their different, often conflicting meanings. Assemblages make room for those who feel the border is, for example, empowering (Anzaldúa, 1987) while others find it to be a site of state power and violence (Rosas, 2012). Additionally, my intention here is not to advocate or disparage disciplinary approaches to the border. Instead, my goal is to cohere this broad field through the use of the assemblage. Indeed, the Border Industrial Complex can be both empowering and violent, historical considerations of the border might exist alongside examinations of the border rendered in the media. In fact, the assemblage requires scholars consider all of these conflicting and distinct accounts together, as each subject's experience of the border is conflicting and distinct.

In this project I work to mine the tensions and contradictions that reside in spaces that hold a plethora of meaning. The project for example, starts in El Paso, TX and is, therefore, “rooted” in and “routed” through a place that is traditionally considered the border. Yet, like the Border Industrial Complex, the very thing it critiques, this dissertation travels and expands. It follows border violence into the archives, through the lives of border subjects, and pays attention to broadly disseminated advertisements and news stories. These movements reflect my understanding of the boundary as a line that is shaped by a range of transnational influences, making it what Andrew Friedman identifies as “contiguous” space, or those ties of “human relationships, labor, and movements” that shape “co-constituted imperial spaces” (2013, p. 301). Taking up the idea of contiguous spaces, I show the influence of the Border Patrol as it moves from beyond the

official border to interior checkpoints within 100 miles of the border, has been used as a security force in the U.S. (Border Patrol Museum), and has even moved into aerospace (Border Patrol Museum).

To parse out how each moment of border subject formation, crossing, or detention is determined by larger global processes, requires "problemat[izing] a purely locational politics of global-local or center- periphery in favor of ... cutting across them" (Grewal & Kaplan, 1994, p. 13). To that end, I consider the act of crossing the border to be defined by local realities and discourses but also influenced by global hierarchies, transnational corporations, and national relations.

In mapping the themes that have arisen in transnational feminist work, Ashwini Tambe identifies a commitment to considering spatial and temporal logics together (2010). I argue here, then, that borders ought to be understood not simply in terms of space but also in terms of temporality. Just as space is carved up to construct nation-states, so too is time segmented to construct notions of linearity, temporality, belonging and progress. The most obvious instance of this segmentation happens on a calendar in terms of days, months, and years as well in relation to notions of the past versus the future. Around each of these chunks of time, borders have been built to make the end of one time period and the beginning of another legible. In this way, things, events, and people are thought to exist within certain temporal borders and not others. An increase in the use of detention and waiting as a means of disciplining migrant bodies illuminates underlying beliefs of who is thought to belong when.

An attention to the ways temporality structures belonging in time also takes us to the archive to consider historical transnational relationships and the ways that they bear on the current moment. Scholars like Nicole Guidotti Hernández, for example, argue that the border requires a transnational lens, as it "signals a theoretical and historical interest in Spanish and U.S. colonialisms and diasporas, a series of displacements caused by extreme forms of physical and psychic violence; overlapping colonial regimes; and the various ways in which Mexican, Indian and Anglo peoples colluded in these colonial projects." (Guidotti-Hernández, p. 28) Indeed, looking at archival records of the border's past allows us to see how past notions of deviance help shape the discourses of the current moment.

Time and space also factor in how we might think about the difference, or "backwardness" (Weston, 2002, p. 7) between the "first world" and the "third world" and the ways that the teleological thinking that structures time also structures which countries are considered "developed" versus those considered "undeveloped" (McClintock, 1995). My work here takes into account the work of anthropologist Kath Weston who argues that, "there can be no absolute division between time and space, because each in some sense *is* the (relation to the) other" (p. 15).

In addition to an attention to time, transnational work also works to address communities that span borders. Kris Manjapra defines transnational studies as that which "comprises an open set of methods and analytic categories that seek to make sense of social interconnection and circulations under conditions of

globalization in the age of nation states." (2010, p. 1) Operating within this expansive field, I hope to explore how these interconnections settle along international boundaries. I focus specifically on historical and migratory interconnections as well as those that form around labor and capital and sexuality.

By way of field interventions the project engages the work of Alicia Schmidt Camacho defines the transnational as "the space in which distinct national localities are linked together by migratory flows, and the diaspora formed by this migration. The transnational may also stand in opposition to the bounded community of the nation-state. As migrants narrate a condition of alterity to, or exclusion from, the nation, they also enunciate a collective desire for a different order of space and belonging across the boundary" (2008, p. 5). Others within the field of border studies consider how borders shape communities that form across them, largely arguing that circuits of migration create communities that remain linked through cultural practices, travel, or communication (Téllez, 2012; Elhaik, 2012; Schmidt Camacho, 2008). These communities and the individuals that make them up are often considered to exist outside the protection of one or both of the nation-states they feel connected to and so their demands for rights and support often appeal to larger concepts of human rights (Fregoso, 2003). These demands, like the communities from which they emerge are rarely unified and are often conflicting, they range from demands for assimilation, rights tied to nation and/or beyond it to international claims for human rights, identity based claims, and those that complicate unitary or fixed identity (Schmidt Camacho, 2008). Still, these communities, born of transnational processes, shaped by multiple cultures and

languages, are still locally situated and thus uniquely shaped (Perales, 2010).

In the project I look to complicate the easy connections drawn between diasporic communities and the countries from which they migrate by paying particular attention to the moment of border crossing. In attending to how Mexican border subjects are made criminal at the border, often by Border Patrol agents of Mexican descent, I wonder if we might be able to rethink diasporic communities. I want to be careful here to move past the dichotomy of the “bad” Border Patrol agent vs. the “weak” Mexican crosser and instead consider the performance of a complex relationship between both border subjects. In the second chapter, for example, I focus on this performance as narrated by border crosses as they shift alliances between agent and different kinds of crossers. Peter Andreas draws our attention to the complicated performance of border policing. He argues that the U.S. Border Patrol and policing has "shaped [the] location, routes, methods, and organization" of both drug and migrant flow by tightening enforcement in some areas and, ultimately funneling it through less visible areas. (2000, p. 8) This, Andreas says, is part of the work of the Border Patrol, not just to actually stop the flow of culture, bodies, or drugs into the U.S. but instead to participate in a kind of "double performance [of] having to assure some of the audience that the border is being opened (to legal flows, specifically of capital) while reassuring the rest of the audience that the border is being sufficiently closed (to illegal flows)." (p. 10) In this performance the Border Patrol is primarily tasked with crafting an image of a border closed to undesirable bodies and cultures rather than effectively closing the border. Considering the border through the lens of an assemblage allows us to hold both the act of border patrolling

with the image it is meant to portray along with the transnational flows and communities that shape the border. The border, then, is certainly an assemblage of transnational flows of people, labor, and capital. Moreover, the border comes to serve as a dynamic space, constantly in flux, and ever shifting.

The Construction of Border Crossers

Defining a border subject is tricky as border studies runs up against the same theoretical obstacles as queer or critical race theory in that the object of study, be it non-normativity, race, or the border, defines everyone. Here, I limit my focus to bodies on the line – those that are proximal to the border, or who trigger the conjuring of the border into the U.S. interior, those who might be considered possible crossers, those who are crossing, or have crossed the border. Specifically, I take up the bodies that are targets of violence – the queer and criminal Mexican, as well as border subjects that do violence – Border Patrol agents, and those who benefit from violence – American business people. Accounting for this range of border subjects allows me to consider middle and upper classed subjects who are often written out of the literature, as well as the writings of agents themselves, who are likewise often erased from our understandings of border crossing.

In this project I unpack the idea of “the border subject,” as one that sits along and/or crosses the Mexico-U.S. border, allowing the term to also fold in the Border Patrol Officer, U.S. business people, and the Mexican migrant. Instead of using the term migrant, throughout the manuscript I favor the term border crosser to get away from the more fixed meanings attached to migrants. While some border

crossers do, of course, cross to become permanent members of the U.S., many do not. Some cross into the U.S. daily for work or to be with family while returning to homes in Mexico. Likewise, some U.S. citizens live in the U.S. while crossing to work in Mexico, either because they are Mexican and are more comfortable culturally and linguistically navigating the Mexican business world or because they are Americans with business in Mexico. Some border crossers cross just once into a new place, others are moved back and forth by forced deportation.

The term border crosser also allows me to consider the implications of those who "carr[y] the border" with them (Luibhéid, 2002). Such an analytical approach will consider how individuals are shaped by moments of crossing. In this vein, I consider understand the processes that happen at the border that redefine the subject, opening and closing possible futures.

Understanding the transnational Border Industrial Complex can illuminate what happens to bodies that become ensnared within the Border Industrial Complex, those who are read and sorted differently based on perceived differences in national citizenship, gender, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. These bodies are (re)configured to become fixed border subjects – the Mexican criminal, the Latino Border Patrol agent, the queer Mexican, the (un)productive Mexican, the American business person. And each border subject different translates the border differently – open or closed, pleasant or deadly.

While I work to address the various categories of border subjects that emerge in discourses about the border, I also work to remain aware that these categories are blurry. Indeed, many people (though certainly not all) along the

border consider the two cities to form one community. Authors like Monica Perales have described communities that have settled along the boundary and where the bridge marks a point of fluidity and/or connection rather than segregation (2010). Others, like Gloria Anzaldúa further unsettle the distinction by noting how single bodies might contain the tensions of the border (2007). Where I look to contribute to the literature is in a project that holds border subjects together to recognize a larger community fractured by violences directed at some while benefiting others.

Finally, the project is grounded in a focus on bodies, serving as a reminder of the high stakes of the work. A focus on bodies reminds us that violence helps us see the many manifestations of state power but that it also has material effects the physical bodies at the border. In her work on representations of rape in francophone postcolonial cultural texts, Régine Michelle Jean-Charles argues for a shift away from conflict zones and toward a consideration of “conflict bodies.” She argues that “foregrounding the context of rape leaves the violated body in the background in a way that reifies cultural silences surrounding sexual violence...I am intentionally shifting the emphasis from the *context* of the conflict in which the rape occurs to the *subjects* of rape in conflict, particularly to consider the physical and material consequences of violence for individualized bodies...” (2014, p. 63).

The notion of conflict bodies is helpful in considering the toll of state violence. I also think that the conflict body might help us trace violence transnationally. Indeed, one of my goal in this dissertation is to suggest that border crossers do not face violence just in one place. Rather, I hope to illuminate the ways that global trade policies like NAFTA have devastated the Mexican economy, that

border policing at the border makes migration a second location where crossers might face violence, and finally, that even should a crosser make it safely into the U.S., their safety is not guaranteed. The border crosser, then, faces an increasingly sprawling Border Industrial Complex that takes many shapes across many locations.

Crossing Through This Bridge Called My Back: Creating a Feminist Point of Contact

In many ways the work of Gloria Anzaldúa serves as an intellectual jumping off point for this project. In part her eloquent theorizing of her experiences as a Chicana lesbian growing up and living along the Mexico-U.S. border inspired new ways of thinking about questions of how borderlands exist beyond the national boundary. In part her work opened the possibility for me of seeing my own experiences as a Chicana who grew up at the border as a place from which to build theory.

Still, as I have worked to engage the field of border studies I have been surprised by the field's reluctance to embrace Anzaldúa's work. I understand that, like all work, hers is not perfect and that pushing at her work leads us to more productive conversations about, for example, the impulse toward whitening in the valorization of hybridity. But I have struggled to accept the critique that her work in *Borderlands* "empties the border of its political significance" (Rosas, 2012, p. 149-150). Instead, I find there to be something incredibly political in the way Anzaldúa theorizes deviance, economic exploitation and violence at the border.

Indeed, in *Borderlands/La Frontera*, Anzaldúa defines deviance as "whatever is condemned by the community" (2007, p. 40). What is interesting about Anzaldúa's

particular conceptualization of deviance is that she seems to suggest that those living in the borderlands find themselves in between often-conflicting notions of deviance. In her example, she tells us that ambition is looked down upon in Mexican culture while it is revered in Anglo culture. In this way border subjects may be pulled in different directions as they attempt not to fall into the trap of deviance on either side of the border. As my work shows, those who live proximal to the border inhabit a contradictory ambivalence about many things, their relationship to both states, their understanding of themselves as both Mexican and American, their simultaneous embrace and disidentification with the politics of Mexicaness. Indeed, my work reflects the complexity that Anzaldúa encourages us to think about.

Not only does Anzaldúa illuminate the specific way deviance operates at the border, her work also details the long story of economic exploitation at the border and of border subjects. She recalls for us the take over of land by the American government and American business but also what it meant that her own family, her own body was exploited so that large agricultural businesses would profit. At the end of "Towards a New Consciousness," Anzaldúa details the uneven relationship across the border so that the profit of some relies on the impoverishment of others. Her analysis here begs us to ask, and I hope to begin to explore this in the following pages, how it is that exploitation is no longer solely a matter of laboring Mexican bodies but is now also reliant on the death of brown bodies in the name of profit for large security corporations. How, for example, do fence-building companies, privately operated detention centers, and military equipment corporations profit from the violence committed against brown border crossers?

Finally, Anzaldúa's work reminds us that while the Border Industrial Complex is a particular and recent violent formation, violence was sewn into the border from its very conception. Unlike the Texas history books I was raised on, Anzaldúa's history tells the stories of the violent removal of first indigenous communities and later Chicanos from their lands. She theorizes the lynchings and shootings of those who resisted removal and the early presence of the U.S. military along the border. As her history unfolds, she highlights the attempts by "mojados" to move back across the border, back to their homes, while Border Patrol agents would set traps, hunt them, track them, arrest them, and again forcibly remove them (2007, p. 33-34). In all of this violence, Anzaldúa tells us, Americans became objective, and Mexicans became objects. The two became distant, creating a "dichotomy" that she calls "the root of all violence." (2007, p. 59)

I follow Anzaldúa's deeply political thinking here as she considers the work of deviance, exploitation, and violence at the border. In the pages that follow, I consider the impacts on border subjects who face epistemic violence in the form of being named and treated as a deviant threat. I turn then to discourses of criminality and queerness that place these bodies outside of normativity and make discourses of protection impossible. I also consider the material harms of economic exploitation and physical violence in the management of life and death at the border.

In theorizing questions of deviance, exploitation, and violence, I have found it productive not only to return to Chicana feminist border scholars, of which Anzaldúa was one of the first. I have also found it helpful to take a step back and engage conversations with feminists of color and critical race scholars, more broadly.

Specifically, I found Rebecca Wanzo's discussion on sentimentality helpful in understanding who is allowed access to victimhood in the border archives. While her work considers how victimhood is foreclosed to African American women in the U.S., I argue the conventions of sentimentality that she outlines are used to craft agents as sacrificing heroes while foreclosing readers' sympathies to Mexican border crossers. Theorists of Afropessimism also illuminate questions of policing. Frank Wilderson's conceptualization of the policing of race was helpful in understanding how the Border Patrol agent is made manifest in everyday civilian citizens. And Saidiya Hartman and Sharon Holland's work on Black subjectivity helped make sense of the legal failures in extending the category of the human to cover racialized subjects and how those failures manifest in violent policing and the foreclosure of justice. Likewise, Asian American critical race and migration theorists like Mae Ngai and Robert Chang have helped make sense of the many ways that the law has brought the logics of the border into the U.S. interior.

My intention in drawing and foregrounding these connections is not to flatten differences across racialized groups. Indeed, these groups experience white supremacy, sexist logics, and sexual norms differently. Still, I hope to suggest that, when we sit in theoretical conversation, connections might be drawn amongst us and lessons learned from each other.

In the preface to *This Bridge Called my Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, Cherrié Moraga points to the ways these conversations are productive but must be approached with care. In illustration of her point, Moraga describes the following scene: after commuting from Watertown through Boston to Roxbury, noting the city's

racial segregation, Moraga arrives at the home of Barbara Smith who welcomes her with a kiss and a firm “we’re sisters.” The term “sisters” unsettles her. She writes,

I earned this with Barbara. It is not a given between us – Chicana and Black – to come to see each other as sisters. This is not a given. I keep wanting to repeat over and over and over again, the pain and shock of difference, the joy of commonness, the exhilaration of meeting through incredible odds against it. But the passage is *through*, not over, not by, not around, but through.

Likewise, my goal in this dissertation is to work *through* some of the connections and tensions that arise in theories about racialized bodies in the US. Like the border, then, I do not mean to dismiss the divides between differently racialized feminists or to suggest that they are not real or important but instead to highlight that connection can still happen through those racial divisions.

Tracing the Border Industrial Complex: A Methodological Challenge

Because the Border Industrial Complex is a complicated web made up of bodies, local and global politics, shaped by constant flows of capital and ideas, and contoured by the temporal and the affective, it requires a set of methods that can account for complexity. To that end, I gather here a range of methods that begin to get at the historical, material and discursive elements of the shifty and ever-changing Border Industrial Complex. Each of the methods I deployed was in some ways complicated by my own position in relation to the border, the communities that make their home along the nation’s edge, and discourse that surrounds border crossers. I attempt to account for my simultaneous proximity and distance from spaces and people I study here but also in the more in-depth methodological accounts of each

chapter.

Keeping historical notions of (un)belonging in mind, the project starts with a chapter on the historical border subject. This first chapter aims to consider bodies that have been written in and out of historical archives and works to unsettle the temporal border between that which has been relegated to the past (versus the present) in order to find traces of histories woven into the present day border. To that end, the first chapter goes to the National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library to understand how border subjects and border violences have (not) been recalled and organized. Here I work not just to read the museum and its archives but also to read against them (Stoler, 2002), highlighting the political investments betrayed in the collection. I analyze the museum's public exhibits carefully considering the agency's discourse and rhetoric of professionalism, migrant as threat, and agent as hero.

Behind this public face of the museum sits a quiet conference room, lined with file cabinets and a computer. The conference room looks into an office kitchen from which museum staff members generously offered to feed me, asked about my degree, and sat with me to tell me about their very personal and deeply moving connections to the museum, all while I sorted through the documents they shared from their private archive. In my time there, I carefully read and transcribed files pulled for me including: agent poetry, articles on the Border Patrol, the Border Patrol oath, the first black inspector, the history of Border Patrol, honor first, tributes to fallen agents, women, the fence, Spanish courses, conduct manuals, blockade/hold the line.

The generosity of the museum's staff, their personal stories pushed me to take

up a more complex reading of the museum and the library, one that worked to account not just the border crosser but also the agents represented in the museum and its archives. Specifically, I trace the way the border archive represents the migrant by ventriloquizing Mexican border crossers in language manuals as they teach them the questions to ask crossers and their potential responses. These manuals demonstrate a shift from understanding crossers as laborers who must be managed to criminals who must be policed. As the agency develops a sophisticated language around Mexican deviancy, it reinforces tropes of crossing as crime, sexual promiscuity, and contagion.

I read these language manuals as a form of mediated archival representation alongside the self-authored border agent poetry found in the archives. These poems grant agents a voice in the archive in a way that is foreclosed to Mexican border crossers. The poems also allow agents to narrate a nation wounded by migrants and, as the nation's heroes, they represent themselves as sentimental figures. Here I draw on the work of Rebecca Wanzo to argue that agents deploy a range of conventions that allow them to be understood as sentimental. Ultimately, these two types of texts, read side by side, illuminate a form of epistemic violence that has been authorized as historical fact.

The second chapter offers interviews of border crossers. In order to understand how border crossers define and experience the border differently, I put their diverse narratives into conversation. Reading these narratives side-by-side allows for a view of a shifting, unstable, and thus unpredictable border. Thus, their narratives and their difficulty in nailing down a definition for this fluid and flexible border, unsettle scholarly attempts to assign fixed meaning to the border, instead they

understood the border as both the community they lived in and the bridge they crossed to get to school, to work, and to connect with family and friends across the national boundary.

Moreover, I work to read against participants' narratives in order to see beyond the "facts" of their crossing to also consider what these narratives suggest about the way they see themselves, the way they see other border crossers, and the way they navigate officers. Reading against the grain of these interviews destabilizes the discourse of us vs. them at the border that pits U.S. citizens against their Mexican counterparts. Instead, in some interviews, participants would, in one minute declare they "understand" CBP's actions, even if those actions inconvenienced or offended them. They would later then align themselves with Mexican crossers, whom they felt were unfairly targeted, criminalized, or disciplined at the border. I read these shifting allegiances as a strategy necessary to ensuring crossers could successfully cross in the cases they narrated as well as future cases. Moreover, these narratives allow us to see shifting subjects who navigate a rather complex web of identity at the border.

In the second chapter, I also consider my own positionality in relation to the border and its subjects, as it was critical to how I read these narratives. To that end, I began the chapter with a bit of autoethnography. My goal was, in part, to answer some of the same questions I asked of my participants. I therefore included a discussion of how I understood the border as a child, how my understanding evolved over time, and a few words about my own experiences crossing borders. I detail, for example, how dual citizenship has served as a privilege, a source of confusion, and part of how I myself perform shifting allegiances at the border. This bit of

autoethnography also frames the chapter's discussion of my feminist approach to working with the interviews of fellow border crossers, as it helps focus a conversation about how I move back and forth as both an insider and an outsider in the interviews I conducted.

The third and fourth chapters weave together the analysis of mainstream media, legal, and political representations of border crossers and cases of border violence. These documents help construct the master narratives of criminality, queerness, and deviance that I argue are read on to border crossers in and after moments of border violence.

Because the language of deviance is rarely made explicit in these documents, I consider what is implicit in these cases. To that end, while no official states explicitly that an undocumented woman was arrested in her gynecologist's office for her insistence on claiming reproductive health care, I read policy in Texas for the anxieties they reveal about migrant women's reproduction. Likewise, while many reporters gloss over the fact that a border crosser's pants were removed while he was beaten to death, I argue that this moment is pivotal in our understanding of how Mexican criminality exists alongside fears of perceived hypermasculinity and related notions of sexuality.

The reading of these case studies attempts to account for the ways that ideas around sexuality shape the construction of the border. Eithne Luibhéid (2002) has argued that the border creates and reifies sexual categories of deviance. Luibhéid argues that the legal processes that shape border crossings both construct and reinforce racialized, gendered, and classed sexual identities and taxonomies. In the act

of examining subjects who are crossing borders, immigration services exert the power to define and assign knowable categories to various bodies. In the dissertation's final chapters, I look to extend her important contributions by considering how sexual deviance is constructed and made knowable in relation to racialized bodies at the border. Specifically, I consider the way Mexican women's reproduction renders them outside and opposite U.S. sexual norms.

My goal in reading these case studies is not just to report on the reporting of these cases, rather to illuminate how discourses operate more broadly. Indeed, while these stories tell us much about the individual targets and instances of violence spotlighted, they tell us more about the complicated web of meanings that become attached to the bodies of Mexican border crossers. While these stories are about the harm done to individual bodies, they are just as much about the narratives of deviance that are repeated over and over to support the work of the Border Industrial Complex.

In the third chapter, I center the coverage of Blanca Borrego, the Mexican-born, undocumented mother of three who was arrested in her gynecologist's office in the Fall of 2015. In reading the discourse surrounding her arrest, I argue that the border haunts the U.S. interior, easily conjured by ICE Agents, local law enforcement, and civilians who have been called to secure U.S. borders. In response, Borrego attempts to deploy a kind of "proximal citizenship" in which she claims that her motherhood, her respectability, and her status as a rights-bearing subject entitle her to health care and freedom from detention. While these claims ultimately fail to ensure her release, they do draw our attention to a performance of "everything but papers" citizenship. Finally, I argue that Borrego's case illuminates the various ways

that waiting has been used to discipline the queer migrant. Queerness then operates to describe not just LGBTQ subjects but also those, like Borrego, who are thought not to belong because they pose a reproductive threat to U.S. white supremacy. While detention and deferred action allow the state to perform a kind of “humane” theatre of policing, waiting comes to serve as a violent form of disciplining the border crosser. In this case, detention and the threat of deportation not only remove Borrego from her family and community, they also restrict her access to medical treatment.

The dissertation’s final chapter analyzes master narratives of border violence, as crafted by the media, to ask how violence against people of color justifies the construction of the Border Industrial Complex. The chapter takes into consideration the deaths of three young men at the border to argue that the U.S. is financially invested in both opening the border and closing it. In other words, U.S. corporations have profited tremendously from global neoliberal policies like NAFTA that open the border up for international trade.

A discussion of the border would be incomplete without attention to the circulation of labor and capital across borders. Taking into consideration past moments in which the border has been open to allow to these flows - policies like the Bracero Program, NAFTA, and CAFTA, I join other scholars in understanding how this transnational labor is highly gendered and sexualized. Many point to the transnational (in that it is made up of Central American, southern and northern Mexican migrants and locals working for largely U.S. companies) and feminized labor force of thousands working at the maquiladoras in Juárez (Wright, 2006; 2007; Salzinger, 2007, Fregoso, 2003, Segura & Zavella, 2007). Others consider the

domestic and affective labor done by migrant women (Enloe, 2000). Still, some of this labor is also uniquely masculinized in that it draws men as cheap day labor into the United States through programs like and legacies of the Bracero program that originally intended to fill a void in male workers in the United States between 1900-1930 (St. John, 2011). The desire to open the Mexico-U.S. border to trade creates tension when read alongside the desire to close the border to Mexican bodies. Here, I argue that both moves result in profit for U.S. corporations. In opening the border to trade, through NAFTA all of this to chapter four, the U.S. economy has benefited first from new markets for U.S. products but also from cheap labor as jobs were exported and migrants crossed into the U.S.. What often goes unconsidered in these conversations, though, is the fact that the U.S. has also built a market around the fiction of a closed border. Indeed, the “need” for a virtual wall, intricate surveillance technology, and detention facilities has also led to profits for U.S. corporations.

The reporting on and court documents related to the deaths of Sergio Hernández Güereca, Anastasio Hernández Rojas, and Antonio Elena Rodríguez all feed into the narrative that Mexican border crossers pose a criminal threat to U.S. citizens. Not only must they be prevented entry into the U.S., but also investments must be made in tightening the border generally. This discourse also underscores the construction of Mexico as a criminal state and the U.S. as its vulnerable neighbor. In order to draw attention to these naturalized notions of space as criminal versus vulnerable, I draw on the work of feminist geographer Katherine McKittrick.

Ultimately, the dissertation asks us to read against various kinds of representations – media, policy, legal, historical – of border crossers in order to

get at the logics of exclusions that underpin the Border Industrial Complex. I argue that none of these representations are neutral but rather take up and reinforce ideologies that construct crossers as deviant, criminally and sexually, and thus disposable. Moreover, it is only by looking carefully at these sometimes-painful discourses that we can begin to move toward a more just version of borders.

Chapter 2: A Theory of the Border Archive: Representing Menacing Crossers and Sentimental Heroes

“The history of the border bridges together the stories of hundreds of crossings with the forces that constrained them.”

-Rachel St. John, p. 9

“The nation-state requires the national language.”

-Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, p. 73

Introduction

Nestled between the Franklin Mountain State Park and the U.S. 54 Patriot Freeway, a little over eight miles north of Fort Bliss, and about fourteen miles from the national border, sits a large beige building, trimmed in terra cotta. Outside the building a tin statue of a waving man in a cowboy hat and boots climbing on top of a horse greets visitors. In the memory of my first trip to the National Border Patrol Museum I vividly see a small sign warning visitors of snakes in the area but if the sign existed, it is gone now (see Appendix 1).

The National Border Patrol Museum opened in 1985 after seven years of planning by, in part, the Fraternal Order of Retired Border Patrol Agents, a national organization for retired employees of the INS and Department of Homeland Security. The museum originally opened in a basement office in the famous Cortez Building in downtown El Paso. It closed in 1992, reopening two years later, after construction on a new building was completed, this time in the midst of the “old Casner Range,” where I found it in the summer of 2014. The museum’s website indicates that it “does not rely on government funds for its operations. The museum does not charge any admission fee because of an agreement with the City of El Paso, but gratefully

receives private donations, monies from CFC contributions, corporate donations and Gift Shop sales for its operational funding” (Border Patrol Museum, 11.19.2015). The museum also offers patrons an opportunity to donate via memberships that cost \$40 a year.

In addition to boasting a range of exhibits meant to honor the agency and its activities, the tax-exempt organization hosts an annual Memorial Service led by the El Paso Sector Honor Guard. These services, attended by hundreds of people each year, are meant to highlight the sacrifices of “the 120 agents killed in the line of duty.” The museum is proud to be the only one in the U.S. that centers the Border Patrol and its work (Border Patrol Museum, 11.19.2015).

Inside the building one encounters large exhibits and a private memorial library that articulate not just the history of the Border Patrol but also the worldview that frames the agency, the nation, and its borders (Miller, 2014). This chapter explores both the museum and its archives not just for their content but also in an attempt to understand the logics upon which they are built. I argue that both the museum’s exhibits and the library frame Border Patrol agents as heroes. In order to do so, the museum re-writes stories of the Civil Rights Movement as depoliticized “situations” in which agents were harmed and responded heroically to uphold the law. These narratives of agent heroes justify the appropriation of bodies of color and indigenous knowledges in the name of defending the nation. The theme of the sacrificing agent echoes in poetry written by agents. This poetry appears in the private library as well as in the museum’s public materials. I read these poems to understand how agents are crafted as sentimental figures who, again, re-write history, deploying

nostalgia and heroic national pasts in which patriots fight to defend the nation.

It would be impossible to frame these agents as heroes if we did not first understand the border crosser as their “enemy.” And so I take up the representations of border crossers in both the museum and the library. I point specifically to the moments where border crossers are described as armed and dangerous. I also consider their description in Spanish language manuals where they are ventriloquized as slippery, dangerously promiscuous, and excessively criminal.

Reading the Border Museum

Inside the beige and terra cotta building, one finds evidence of the agency’s evolving organization, a developing sense of professionalization. Indeed, much like the police force the United States, the agency has undergone a move toward professionalism and militarization¹. In writing about the professionalization of police forces in the U.S., Radley Balko traces the move away from policing done via politics to a “formal profession with its own standards, specialized knowledge, and higher personnel standards and entry requirements” (2014, p. 32). Embodying the move toward professionalization and militarization is an exhibit titled “Uniforms of the Border Patrol.” The exhibit includes early pictures of agents who were not issued uniforms alongside mannequins wearing the ever-improving uniform through its current iteration as “a more useful and paramilitary style uniform” (see Appendix 2).

The museum’s largest display, the “Vehicles of the Border Patrol” also

¹ Evidence of the US police’s militarization lies in the 1033 Program in 1997 that began transferring military equipment to law enforcement entities.

models a constant push to modernization while addressing a “war” on all fronts. For example, an older model car is parked by a sea foam green jeep, which is sitting next to a sea foam green and white 1989 Pontiac Firebird once used as a “pursuit vehicle.” The sports car was purchased as part of the “Roadrunner Project,” and once deemed the “fastest law enforcement pursuit vehicle in the United States” by Motor Trend (National Border Patrol Museum). Hanging from the ceiling is a small plane and a helicopter sits on the ground so that visitors can get in (see Appendix 3). The exhibit is complimented by watercrafts and outside of the building, in an enclosed patio is a large boat once used by agents to secure costal borders. This multi-front approach, one that can capture border crossers on land, sea, or in the air is complemented by an series of exhibits that detail a range of “Operations Exhibits” including those that address sign cutting (a method of tracking border crossers in the desert), train check operations, horse patrol, and flight operations.

Across from the flashy vehicle exhibit sits a decidedly less flashy room erected with cubicle walls wherein framed documents, images, and news trace a history of the Border Patrol across decades. Starting with the pre-patrol years 1904-1924 and moving through the war years, the Bracero Program of the 1950s and the Civil Rights Movement. On the cubicle wall of the 1960s, the museum details the end of the Bracero Program and how Border Patrol Agents were deployed into the U.S. interior to serve as precursors to the Sky Marshals used to respond to airplane hijackings.

Additionally, the wall highlights the agents’ role in Operation Freeway (1962) in which “over 300 Border Patrol Inspectors were deputized to assist the Marshal

Service in assisting James Meredith, a black man, register at the University of Mississippi. The situation led to a riot and 72 Border Patrolmen were injured securing Mr. Meredith's safety and successful enrollment in the University" (National Border Patrol Museum, 2016). The framed description sits alongside the Newsweek cover from October 15, 1962 that features a U.S. Marshal in a gas mask holding a baton alongside the caption: "The Sound and the Fury" in Oxford, Mississippi. A more detailed description of the event on the wall explains that agents did the work of upholding federal law in the face of state segregation. As part of his Civil Rights campaign to desegregate higher education, James Meredith, an Air Force Veteran was safely taken to register in a Border Patrol vehicle, but the museum claims that agents "paid a heavy price for their attention to duty." Below this description sits a print of Norman Rockwell's *The Problem We All Live With* (see Appendix 4).

Together, the images and the text on the wall narrate the U.S. Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s through the lens of the Border Patrolmen. The museum's goal seems to be to spotlight the often-erased role of agents who worked, alongside the U.S. Marshals and the Military Police. Interestingly, though, the narration gestures towards the Border Patrolmen's duty to uphold the federal law and to defend an Air Force Veteran's right to an education rather than a duty to uphold racial equality. Moreover, the use of depoliticized language describing "the situation," and the focus on the patrolmen's sacrifice rather than any harm done to Meredith in the process of his activism, allows the museum to gloss over questions of race and inequality. Indeed, the wall fails to mention that Operation Freeway took place eight years after the contentious 1954 passage of *Brown vs. The Board of Education*, that

Meredith was first accepted to the university before being unaccepted because of his race, or the fact that the U.S. Supreme Court had to overturn state rulings barring him from attending. In this formulation of the story, then, agents are placed on the “right side” of history without acknowledging the racial tensions of Jim Crow segregation that shape that history.

Indeed, James Meredith himself narrates the Border Patrol’s role in the riots surrounding his attempts to enroll differently in his biographic manuscript, *Three Years in Mississippi* (1996). While Meredith acknowledges the ways the patrolmen helped in ensuring his protection, he also considers the violence done to the agency as evidence of the violence of desegregation broadly. He writes:

The border patrol car in which we rode to the administration building was a shattered example of the violence of social change. We had used this car to make our first attempt to enroll on September 20, 1962, and then it had been a spotless, unmarred specimen. Now it was battered and smashed: bullet holes had riddled the sides; the windows were all shot out. McShane sent one of the deputies back into Baxter Hall to get a couple of Army blankets to put over the back seat so we could sit down. The marshals had suffered also. It would have been hard to find one who did not bear some mark of the process of violent change: Bandages, bruises, and limps were the rule.

In his telling of the riots, Meredith refuses to hierarchize suffering bodies. Instead, his description reminds us that all bodies – car bodies, law enforcement bodies, and his unmentioned body, were scathed by the change he, and other activists, demanded.

Finally, the museum’s depoliticized retelling of Civil Rights also erases the role of those of Mexican descent in the movement. Indeed, this telling of Civil Rights reaffirms the Black/White binary not just in terms of racial injustice but also in the fight for racial equality. This telling omits the ways that Chican@s fought alongside

African American activists. It also strategically fails to mention that Chicana@s also crafted an activist response to the specific forms of racialized violence they experienced at the hand of the state (Ontiveros, 2014).

The same kind of shallow attention to race is paid in the museum's archives. Specifically, in the file on the first black Border Patrol agent, Patrol Inspector Harvin, stationed in Miami. The file contains a newspaper clipping from the *Miami Times* titled "Miami gets First Negro Border Patrol Inspector." The article details Inspector Harvin's training at the Border Patrol Academy and his career in the U.S. Marshal's Office in Washington, DC before explaining what his work would be at the agency: "Our country is a mecca for many peoples. Those who meet the requirements of immigration law may enter freely through regular ports of entry. Undesirable aliens, who offer a threat to the security or welfare of our country, are barred, and therefore often attempt to enter surreptitiously. It is the job of the Border Patrol to anticipate their moves to stop them at the borders" (Miami Times, 9.8.67).

In her important history of the Border Patrol, Kelly Lytle Hernández argues that "migration control in the borderlands evolved as the story of race in the United States" (2010, p. 10). For Hernández, policing the border against bodies she terms "*Mexican Brown*" was deeply tied to the black/white racial binary, as the term captures not just ethnic and national difference but a complexion-based, class-specific difference. Hernández, then, argues that "the black/white divide shaped the Border Patrol's Mexicanization of the legal/illegal divide" and that it is impossible to understand border policing without understanding racialization in the U.S. (2010, p. 11). Hernández' claim is convincing; indeed this dissertation argues that racialization

is a critical part of the way bodies are read and made meaningful at the border.

Yet, the museum's exhibit described here and the archive's file on the first black agent put forward a more complex argument about race and the agency. Indeed, while race remains a critical component to border policing, so too does race figure in the idea of what needs defending. In other words, the idea that the agency was critical to the Civil Rights Movement, that the agency itself values diversity within its ranks, and that there is a distinction to be made between good and bad immigrants suggests that there is something desirable about the diversity of the U.S., something under threat by the "undesirable migrants." In this narrative, then, not only is a diverse U.S. desirable, it is made cohesive and then protected by Border Patrol officers who serve as a "first line of defense" against the Mexican migrant who threatens to undermine it.

The idea of the Border Patrol as a "first line of defense" around the nation and the watered down notion of diversity is echoed and extended in the museum's gift shop. Like most museum gift shops, one finds a variety of themed "chacharas." These include memoirs by Border Patrol agents, study guides for taking the Border Patrol entrance exam, baseball caps with the agency's logo on the front, tablet holders, children's toys fashioned in the form of Department of Homeland Security "junior agent" badges, camouflaged blankets, pen sets, pocket watches, mugs, ID holders that mimic badge holders but designate a federate agent's girlfriend or mother, Border Patrol earrings and charms, and stuffed animals in the shape of the Border Patrol's K-9 units or teddy bears wearing United States Border Patrol (USBP) bullet proof vests.

Tucked in a corner, on a wall leading to a stock room, one finds artwork on

display, like that of Wayne Record. In one pencil sketch, a Border Patrol agent (identified by the gun on his hip and the patch on his uniform's shoulder) kneels by a footprint left in the desert sand. The background is made up of desert trees and shrubs, patches of grass, and clouds, but the clouds are made up of the face of a second agent and, next to him, a Native American with long hair and a headband. The Native American reaches from within the clouds to point out to the agent the tracks left on the ground.

The presence of the Indigenous body in the clouds signals the appropriation of another racialized body into the justification of border defense. Just as references to the Civil Rights Movement and Black law enforcement officials attempted to cohere a diverse national body against the image of an undesirable migrant, the use of the Indigenous body here aims to trace that diversity back to the founding of the state, in a gesture meant to authenticate the Border Patrol's mission. Of course, the irony is that the founding of the state was predicated on the genocide of Indigenous bodies and theft of the lands on which they lived.

In addition to the use of Indigenous bodies, the image references Indigenous knowledges, deployed in order to secure the border. Sign cutting – the process in which agents look for disturbances in the environment, including footprints in the ground, and signs of torn clothing left on shrubs – has also been associated with indigenous knowledges. In 2003 the Smithsonian Magazine spotlighted the Shadow Wolves, a Customs unit housed in the Department of Homeland Security made up of twenty-one Native Americans. The magazine details not just the method of cutting for sign but the 108,000 pounds of illegal narcotics seized by the Shadow Wolves

between October 2001 and October 2002 along the seventy-six miles of reservation land along the border (Wheeler, 2003). In the Record's sketch and in the deployment of the Shadow Wolves, we find evidence of defense in name of diversity, but also of the notion that the U.S.' diversity, here the in form of body and knowledge, might be used to defend against the threatening migrant.

The museum also curates exhibits that juxtapose the defense provided by the agency with the threat imposed by the migrant. This is clearest in the gun displays. Again starting with guns early agents brought with them to work before the agency provided them, the display also includes each kind of gun issued to agents, with the exception of the current models. Alongside the display case housing agent weapons, another holds weapons seized from border crossers including ice picks, an AK-47, a Tec-9, an Uzi, and a homemade shotgun (see Appendix 5).

The juxtaposition of the agency-issued weapons against the crafty and scrappy weapons of the border crossers might be read as a David vs. Goliath narrative. We might, for example, sympathize with a border crosser so terrified of the threats found in the desert – the coyote, the bandit, other desperate migrants, and, yes, the agent – that they crafted a weapon from an ice pick or pieced together a shotgun. An exhibit across the museum might be used to reinforce this narrative as it likewise demonstrates the border crosser's desperation. On display there are the material objects carried by border crossers including backpacks, canned food, and tarps. The exhibit includes a homemade dinghy on which border crossers tried to enter the U.S. (see Appendix 6).

Instead of considering the crosser's sacrifice, their desperation, their fear, the

museum's narration of the homemade guns describes the exhibit in terms of the threat they pose, focusing instead of the agents' professionalism in the face of danger. The website reads: "Above the [gun] exhibit, a sign reads, 'awareness is survival' and serves as a reminder that the border can be a dangerous place. These guns are a definite testament to the dangers that the Border Patrol faces each and every day. At the same time, the Seized Weapons section is also a clear proof of the effectiveness and the dedication of the people who are doing this difficult and dangerous job" (U.S. Border Patrol Museum). In this version of the narrative border policing is necessary because arms-bearing border crossers pose a threat to U.S. citizens. The agents' sanitized and agency-issued weapons are then required for their own survival. In this narrative there is no room for a border crosser's sacrifice as sacrifice is reserved for the agent.

Indeed, sacrifice is literally framed in a separate room where fallen agents are memorialized (see Appendix 7). The small room's walls are lined with the framed headshots of agents, mostly men, in uniforms. Though occasionally one finds a picture of a woman in uniform or a man out of uniform, surrounded instead by what we assume might be his family, oftentimes small children. In my first trip to the museum, the room offered a space to contemplate the deaths of these agents, as soft music played in the background, and an empty chair sat in the corner. It is unclear if the memory betrays me because in a more recent visit, the room was silent, the chair gone.

A Theory of the Border Archive

This chapter considers the work of this border archive. Following the many authors who have successfully argued that the colonial archive operated in service of colonial domination (Stoler, 2002; Arondekar, 2009) I argue that the border archive has become a “technology of rule” (Stoler, 2002, p. 83). I read against the archive to argue that the border archive not only justifies the defense of the international boundary but does so by drawing on racialized scripts that cast border crossers as deviant threats, depicting the nation as under threat by their presence, and crafting Border Patrol officials as sentimental figures. To this end, I examine the ways in which the National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library participates in the telling the “official” story of the migrant and the nation and how this archive also helps shape and codify the “national language” used to shape the border subject and agent.

This chapter also builds on the work of Nicole Guidotti-Hernández, who convincingly argues that material violences committed against border subjects are echoed in the epistemic violence done in the narrating of those violences. The rhetorical work of the Border Patrol museum performs these epistemic violences not just in the narration of violent encounters between agents and border crossers, but also in framing these encounters in terms of national defense. For Guidotti-Hernández, news reports and archives represent these encounters as unspeakable, offering us texts in which “we are presented with fragments of the very things selective memory bans from individual and national consciousness, the historical traces that are clearly there but not allowed to be heard, seen, or experienced” (2011,

p. 5). While, this certainly is the case in the border archives, I also argue that elevating these epistemic violences to the level of historical fact, does work for a state that invests politically and economically in a growing border machine.

Not only do archives come to serve borders in their content, they also do so in their form. As technologies of rule, both borders and archives operate similarly. Historian Mike Davis argues that the border is a “permanent construction” site (2002, p. x) but so too is the archive (Mbembe, 2002). Therefore, I read both as constantly evolving, telling us simultaneously about a set of precise historical moments in which they were constructed and how those moments frame contemporary border politics. Indeed, the museum’s references to an increasingly professional and militarized border policing unit speaks to a series of individual moments in which decision making was centralized and procedures formalized. These moments also give way to a contemporary moment in which the agency uses handbooks to detail justified uses of violence against crossers.

While we often think of archives as neutral repositories, what is often overlooked are the ways that archives draw on the same logics of containment to construct the border and our understanding of its location, its “vulnerabilities,” and its necessity. Moreover, as these stories are (re)constructed so too are the bodies that they account for. Both in the archive and at the border, identities are differentiated and sorted, contained within notions of like/same or other/different. More importantly, in both the archive and along the border, like/same and other/different take on particular and often moral meanings. Similarly, the border archive I study here suggests that order follows a defended border while chaos is evidenced by the

presence of undocumented, otherized migrants along the border. In describing the process of archiving, historian Achille Mbembe describes a ritual that includes determining “archivability,” maintaining secrecy and order, exercising judgment, dispossession, and authority. (2002, p. 19-20) Similarly, the border operates through ritual in which authority is deployed so that bodies can be ordered, included or excluded, made to cohere within the nation or meant to exist outside of it.

Finally, both the archive and the border might be understood as theaters, or spaces where acts of governance are publicly performed. The archive, for example, is thought to perform the act of memory and yet Jacques Derrida compellingly argues “the archive is hypomnesic.” He further explains, “the archive, if this word or this figure can be stabilized so as to take on a signification, will never be either memory or anamnesis as spontaneous, alive, and internal experience. On the contrary: the archive takes place at the place of ordinary and structural breakdown of the said memory” (1995, p. 14). In other words, while the archive is constructed to perform remembering, it is also shaped by the act of forgetting. This forgetting happens in what is omitted from the archive but also in the materials that are archived. Derrida describes the archive as an act of mourning, a place where we store memories so that we might forget them, allowing the archive to do the remembering for us (2002, p. 48-49). In building off Derrida’s thinking, Verne Harris argues “all remembering is forgetting.” (2002, p. 81). Indeed, he suggests that archives unsettle the binary between remembering and forgetting (2002, p. 75). Neither archiving nor extracting from the archive, is as simple as remembering and/or forgetting. Instead both archiving and researching in the archive is filtered through a framework for

interpretation. Thus archives are not places of scientific neutrality but rather are “susceptible to the social mores and moral codes” of the time they were built (Reid, 2002, p. 194) and thus “take positions” (Eichorn, 2014 p. 22).

Just as the archive attempts to remember, while under threat of forgetting, so too does the border attempt to claim sovereignty under threat. Scholars including anthropologist Gilberto Rosas (2012) and political theorist Wendy Brown (2014) both argue that contrary to the belief that borders come to represent ultimate sovereignty, they instead mark space where sovereignty is least secured. Mike Davis claims this “massive, militarized display of bounded national identity, everywhere seems to leak sovereignty” (2002, p. x). It is a leakiness that political scientist Peter Andreas reminds us cannot be plugged but only funneled and managed through border policing (2000).

Ultimately, both the border and its archive claim to perform acts thought necessary to governance – defending sovereignty and remembering – all the while performing a more covert set of acts necessary to governing – managing a blurry sovereignty and forgetting. Perhaps the museum’s clearest example of this lies in its appropriation of bodies of color in the name of national defense. Indeed, the museum asks us to remember a version of Civil Rights that simultaneously asks us to acknowledge the sacrifice of law enforcement while directing us to forget the violences done to bodies of color by Border Patrol agents.

If both borders and archives act as technologies of rule, meant to do the work of ordering, and creating the illusion of complete sovereignty over land and knowledge, then we might consider the work of the archival researcher a kind of

border crosser. This border crosser/researcher must gain access. They find that they are denied, turned back, they experience anxiety, disappointment, and ultimately feel both “at home as well as alone” (Steedman, 2002, p. 77). At the National Border Patrol Museum I experienced all of these. There were moments of anxiety in asking for the materials, attempting to frame my requests in broad enough terms to get access. There were moments in which discovery, of language manuals for example, were followed by moments of disappointment when only a handful of manuals were present. I became frustrated as attempts to gather more contemporary manuals at the National Archives in DC and Maryland and at CBP offices in El Paso resulted in failure. And there was a conflicted moment in which I found my name, spelled correctly, in the registry of Mexican names.

This conflicted moment echoes Derrida’s warning that when we study and interpret the archive, we become a part of it (1995). Steedman echoes this claim in arguing that “the object (the event, the happening, the story from the past) has been altered by the very search for it, by its time and duration: what has actually been lost can never be found” (2002, p. 77). Indeed, upon entering the archive, in making demands and asking questions of the stacks of papers we encounter, and in re-telling the archive’s stories, the border crosser shifts its content, injecting themselves into the story.

In building on this theory of the way the border and the archive are similarly constructed by the same logics of governance, the chapter includes a brief word on method and the importance of reading an archive as a political text. Here, I follow the lead of feminist archivists who argue that the archive might be read in order to

understand how power operates in and through the archive. I then turn to the materials found in the archive to ask how they operate in service of the border. How, for example, does the archive make historical fact of the deviant crosser and the sentimental agent? I then consider how migrants are “scripted” in archived Spanish language manuals, how this scripting literally gives Border Patrol agents the evolving language through which to understand the border crosser as a threat to U.S. families and health. In contrast, I consider the poetry written by Border Patrol agents to consider the ways that these poems craft agents as sentimental figures whose heroism is brought into relief by depicting the nation as being wounded by the border crosser.

Reading the Border Archive

Border archives exist wherever texts are assembled to tell an authoritative history of the nation’s edges and the bodies gathered there. For border archives, these “assemblages” represent the migrant, the nation, and those who “defend” nation against the migrant,² my goal in this chapter is to examine one specific border archive found at the border itself - the National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library. The library makes no secret of their investments in preserving their archive’s materials in their online description:

Complementing the museum’s rich Border Patrol collection, the Memorial Library offers a range of materials on Border Patrol history from its inception in 1924 to the present. The library provides support to researchers at all levels interested

² Derrida reminds us that archives are not homogeneous. I agree and so while these figures would be represented in any border archive, I wouldn’t argue that those archives all look the same or represent the nation, the border crosser, and the agency in the same ways.

in furthering their understanding of the nation's first line of defense: the Border Patrol. The library is also open to the general public for reading through our book collection.

Guided by the materials that I analyze below, I argue that this specific border archive performs its mission to inform in contradictory and principally rhetorical ways. This mission to inform directs our attention to the ways that the Border Patrol functions as heroic defenders of the nation. At the same time, this mission to inform belies the archive's strict management and monitoring of access to the materials, constricting who can use what from the archive in order to remember and retell only certain versions of history. Interestingly, this ability to guard the material of the border archive, to keep secret the workings of the border and the agency charged with protecting it is unlike the policies that expose border crossers to increasing surveillance at the border. In fact, at the same time that we are told that the library "provides support to researchers at all levels interested in furthering their understanding of the nation's first line of defense..." we are simultaneously forewarned that:

Research authorization must be granted by the Museum Collections department prior to any research, viewing and/or use of records. Certain sections and or files and materials may be off limits to any and all researchers at the discretion of Museum Staff.

In some ways my identity as a university researcher and a native El Pasoan have allowed me to navigate this contradictory tension. Because of the strict control over materials, I was required to apply in order to access the archives. After conversations with the museum's records keeper, I knew to ask specifically for language and conduct manuals, agent biographies, and any documents that might speak to how

moments of conflict or tension might help me trace the history of the border. After my application was approved, the library's archivist pulled several documents he thought might be of interest. Because I was not able to access a catalogue of holdings, the results illuminated a tension between the border archive's simultaneous withholding and granting of access. Ultimately, then, it was the archive representative who determined what would appropriately meet my needs. And since the ghosts within the archives are eager to tell stories, my archivist as medium presented me with agent poetry, files on the first Black and women agents, tributes to fallen agents, a set of articles about the building of a border fence (later to be identified as a border wall), Spanish course manuals for incoming agents deployed to the Mexican border regardless of language proficiency, conduct manuals, and a file on Operation Blockade/Hold the Line³. Once inside the Border Patrol archives, I was allowed only to take typed notes. Photographs and copies of the archived materials were forbidden.

Here, I use these documents not to tell a history of the Border Patrol. I leave that work in the very capable hands of critical historians Kelly Lytle Hernandez (2010) and Rachel St. John (2011). Instead, what I offer is a way to think about the workings of the Border Patrol archive itself and its gestures of self-narration within and to the national imaginary. As I outline below, a number of archival narratives emerge, carrying with them the legitimization of the Border Patrol Museum's authority, rendering them historical fact. I consider how the stories told in the form of

³ Operation Hold the Line, later to be referred to as Operation Blockade, was the deployment of 400-600 agents to patrol 20 miles of the border as a "show of force" (Figueroa, 9.30.13). Juárez residents rioted, burned the US flag, and protested the way enforcement made getting to work in the US more difficult. It marked a shift in border policing to a focus on deterring unsanctioned entry into the US (Figueroa, 9.30.13).

this authoritative archive might be read as political tools that preserve and perpetuate ideologies of the Mexican laborer whose movement must be managed, philandering Mexicans who might do damage to U.S. families through illicit sexual entanglements, or spread sexually transmitted infections. Likewise, the museum's archive also figures the sacrificing agent who prevents widespread damage done by these migrants. It is these ideologies that have historically justified violence against migrants. And while agents express a vexed relationship with violence against migrants in the poems considered in the last part of this chapter, they never contradict the language of deviance used to define the migrant in the first half of the chapter.

This chapter then follows the lead of Anjali Arondekar who argues that archives, whose content, form and silences ought to be read not as truth but as narrative (2009). As such, these archival narratives must be understood as produced, crafted, and curated (Hamilton, Harris, & Reid, 2002; V. Harris, 2002; Derrida, 1995). And while archives are curated according to a method (Derrida, 1995), they are still “at the mercy of, the conscious beliefs, attitudes, and interests of individual archivists” and dependent on previously authorized histories (van Zyl, 2002, p. 41). In the Border Patrol archives the materials are twice curated. Indeed, archivists shape the library's holdings and then again shape the materials offered to individual researchers. In this way, even the archive's silences and gaps are erased as researchers fail to grasp the “whole” of this border archive.

Still, Steedman reminds us that while the archives can be carefully curated, so too can they be haphazardly organized, made up of materials intentionally selected and preserved alongside those “mad fragmentations that no one intended to preserve

that just ended up there (Steedman, 68). Similarly, the silences and gaps of the archive are sometimes intentional, as the voices of some subjects are deemed unhistorical or unimportant while other silences are overlooked, unnoticed by archivists. These silences, Laura Ann Stoler suggests, come to operate as an archival convention that serves the state, reinforcing state secrets and the fiction of access (2002, p. 98; Arondekar, 2009, p. 3). In this chapter, I hold up the state's language about the migrant against the self-authored language of the agent to compare the two but also to highlight the border-crosser's simultaneous hyper visibility and deafening silence in the archive. In other words, while the crosser is represented in the archive, his representation is always mediated by state documents. Meanwhile, the agent expresses a kind of archival agency wherein he is visible but also heard, allowing him to be understood as a complex subject, one who can describe himself as a sentimental character, who can ask us to feel with and for him as he acts to defend the "vulnerable nation."

The archive, then, cannot be read as a transparent text; instead it requires interpretation (V. Harris, 2002). In laying out a method for finding women in the colonial archive, Betty Joseph puts aside the perceived neutrality of history to consider what the presence of women in the archive tells us about their larger absence. Her argument, that the archive tells "no singular truth" (2004, p. 3) but must, instead, be read for the "grammar of power" that shapes the archive (p. 15). Similarly, Stoler argues that ethnography of archives requires reading both with and against the archival grain (Stoler, 2002, p. 99-100) in order to understand its engrained logics, its loud silences, and its constructed argument.

All the while, Stoler tells us, we must take into account the archive's "emotional registry" (2002, p. 92). This matters in the case of the border archive, which registers a particular affective contour as it aims to reinforce a sentimental form of patriotism while fostering a certain suspicion of the undesirable migrant. This affective register takes shape most clearly in the contrast between the language used to describe the heroic agents and that used to define the deviant migrants. While these two foils weave their way throughout the border archive, I turn to two particularly powerful examples found in the Border Patrol archives - the scripted imagined encounters between agents and border crossers found in recorded Spanish language manuals and the poetry written by Border Patrol agents about the nation they defend, the legacies they draw on, the work they do, their fallen comrades, and their dogs.

A National Language for Understanding the Border Crosser

Presumably, most Border Patrol officers have come to the border intent on securing the nation against ill-meaning crossers. Not all, though, bring the language with which to communicate with these border subjects. Here, I consider the Spanish language manuals used to teach Border Patrol agents the language of Mexican border crossers. I argue that these manuals do not just teach agents necessary Spanish proficiency skills but rather that they give agents the language and framework through which to make meaning of the crossers they encounter.

My goal here is not to suggest interactions between agents and crossers was always modeled after these examples. As Kelly Lytle Hernández has argued, border policing is not simply a top-down process. Hernández' social history of the Border

Patrol sketches a “lesser-known history of Border Patrol officers struggling to translate mandates and abstractions of U.S. immigration law into everyday immigration law-enforcement” (2010, p. 2). For Hernández, dictates and debates in DC became the “context rather than the content of policing” (2010, p. 3). Similarly, the approaches to border crossers laid out in these manuals likely do not represent all exchanges between crossers and agents. This is probably especially true of cases where agents had some command of Spanish or border crossers spoke with English. In these cases, the naming “rules” and the sample conversations described below may have served more as guidelines than scripts. Still, for those agents who did not bring Spanish language skills to the field but who encountered Spanish speaking border crossers, these manuals gave agents a formula in which to record crossers’ foreign names and a language through which to understand and interact with crossers.

Naming the Migrant

In 1963, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), at the time housed within the Department of Justice, provided agents with a “Spanish Name Book” in order to “assist employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in spelling Spanish names correctly.” While parts of the book consist of lists of Spanish names, nicknames, and surnames⁴, the book also details the Spanish practice of naming that “originated in Spain in medieval times when a coat of arms was based upon the two family names in marriage. It has continued down to the present time.”

The book argues that these practices must be attended to because “so many persons of

⁴ For example, the name Perez is found on page 27 amongst a long list of other Spanish surnames, the name Cristina on page 46 along with the possible nicknames Tina and Cris.

Spanish descent have the same first name and surname that positive identification is virtually impossible without the inclusion of the second surname. For example, there are thousands of people with the name Jose Garcia or Jesus Gonzales. To present such a name for identification purposes without the other surname would be futile....”

The book goes on to detail how a woman’s name betrays her marital status by the presence of a lower case “de,” how “religious overtones” are present in children’s names (eg. “Maria derived from the Virgin Mary”), and how “it is also not unusual to find boys with girl’s names, such as Jose Maria Velazquez”.

While the reporting of these rules seems neutral, the insistence on identifying them also signals the “different” and “foreignness” of these names and the bodies to which they become attached. Indeed, we see the way these names are filtered through U.S. normative logics when names are considered longer than standard by the addition of “other surnames.” These logics are also read through U.S. logics of gender in the cases where “girls” names are given to “boys.” Because these Mexican names are so unwieldy, the INS agent is directed to engage in a bit of punctuative ordering, and they are ordered to add a hyphen between the border crossers first (father’s) surname and the second (mother’s surname). This practice, though, does not apply to married women, as their mother’s surname is dropped for her husband’s and joins her father’s surname by the use of “de” (Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1963).

In the only other academic treatment of these kinds of manuals, Victoria Hattam traces their use in the crafting and reinforcing ethnicity in the U.S.. Hattam argues “the category of ethnicity helped to resolve the boundary problems inherent in racial classification in an age of mass migration” (2007, p. 81). In both the census as

well as in documents used at the Mexican border, language, or the “mother tongue” became a means for distinguishing ethnic difference. In her manuscript, *In the Shadow of Race: Jews, Latinos, and Immigrant Politics in the United States*,” Hattam argues more specifically that classifying Mexicans in the U.S. southwest “enabled the state to reconcile the contradictory effects contained in the twin impulses of imperial expansion [into territories previously belonging to Mexico] and whiteness as essential criteria for citizenship” promised to Mexicans living in territories previously belonging to Mexico (p. 98).

Hattam examines a predecessor to the 1963 Spanish Name Book found in the border archives, the 1936 *A Manual of Immigration Spanish* along with the *U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service Supplement to Manual of Immigration, Spanish - Spanish Personal Names*. The second document, the list of six thousand Spanish surnames, was used not just to track migrants at the border but also as part of the Census Bureau’s attempt to record the size of the Spanish-named and Spanish-speaking population in the U.S. southwest. These numbers would matter as, for Mexicans, their mother tongue and surname would come to distinguish Mexicans within the white racial category - “a subset of the white race: white and yet not simply white” (2007, p. 109). In this way, these name books would identify not just individual bodies but would help identify a group of bodies as distinct from white Americans.

These manuals not only distinguish the sea of Jose Garcia’s and Jesus Gonzales from the United States’ Joe Smith’s, this detailed list of Spanish name rules also serves as a reminder to agents that border crossers cannot be trusted to identify

themselves correctly, even if the name they offer is culturally and linguistically correct. Suggesting that border crossers cannot be considered experts or reliable reporters of themselves or their identities, the rulebook removes crossers' power to narrate even their own names. A note is added to these rules that "If any difficulty is encountered in understanding or correctly spelling a Spanish name, the subject should be asked to write the name. Even though the subject writes his name, do not assume that it is necessarily spelled correctly. Many Spanish names are pronounced alike and spelled differently. Care must be taken to assure that every effort is made to spell the names correctly" (Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1963).

While the manual does not clarify why a border crosser might be unable or unwilling to spell her/his name correctly, the book gestures toward the slipperiness of the border crosser. Whether it is the result of a lack of education that leads the border crosser to not know how to spell his or her own name or the cunning attempt by the crosser to evade being tracked through paperwork, the migrant is hard to pin down. In the face of such an elusive subject, the agency responds with rulebooks and lists; a prescriptive desire to re-write the messiness and unintelligibility of the border into the correct order of things. To this end, the agency renames the subject, introducing hyphens where they didn't exist, creating order amidst the chaos of difference⁵. This impulse to order the border crosser not only reinforces the crosser's foreignness, it also speaks the underlying desire to contain that difference.

⁵ In *The Order of Things*, Foucault argues that in making history, the history of the same is considered ordered, the history of the other is written as chaotic.

Scripting the Migrant

In addition to the name book, the file on Spanish Courses also consists of the *Preliminary Course in Spanish for Border Patrol Trainees* by Patrol Inspectors John G. Friar and George W. Kelly. The authors explain the document is meant to support trainees in the field before, those who have yet to attend training school. The manual is broken down into three sections: 1) alphabet and accentuation; 2) parts of speech and an introduction to grammar; 3) conjugation of verbs. After explaining that examples are comprised of “words which are used often by Border Patrolmen...in order to help the beginner build a working vocabulary,” the authors encourage trainees to practice “a great deal.”

The Friar and Kelly manual (1940) emerges in a specific historical moment, as border policing and questions of migration were in transition. Kelly Lytle Hernández argues that the 1940s marked a shift away from a less formally organized agency to one of growing resources and an increased focus on the southern border. This rapidly professionalizing agency, in its early stages of consolidation, performed the double function of policing illicit migration from Mexico while managing U.S. access to migrating labor as sanctioned by the Bracero Program (2010). The Bracero Program, signed in to effect in 1942, was a wartime agreement between the U.S. and Mexico in which contracted Mexican laborers filled vacancies left by enrolled U.S. citizens. Between 1942-1964, Mexico provided over two million Mexican laborers and fulfilled almost five million worker contracts (Hernández, 2010).

This dual focus on policing the unsanctioned and managing Braceros is

reflected in the Friar and Kelly manual (1940) where agents are taught that the letter c in Spanish is soft in words in which it comes before e and i. Examples of this pronunciation are provided in the form of “words used often by Border Patrolmen” including words that might be used in the management of migration, words like centavo (cent), cerca (near). Other examples, those necessary to policing border crossers might include cerveza (beer). In demonstrating how to speak about emotion in Spanish the manual shifts the language of fear not to highlight the danger of the border but of Mexican criminality. Let us take for example:

Temo que el contrabandista se haya escapado.
I am afraid that the smuggler has escaped.

It is difficult to not miss the multiple possibilities that reside in “I am afraid.” On the surface, the clause is simply meant to demonstrate appropriate grammar. Yet, it also serves as a reminder to the patrol officer of to fear “the smuggler.” In the case of an agent who might have been lured into a false sense of security, into thinking that the smuggler poses no threat to him because the agent would never be smuggled, the manual reminds him that smugglers are to be feared. Perhaps it is the “fact” that smuggling is only committed by those of a violent nature, and perhaps it is their sneakiness, their inability to be contained that has led to the smuggler’s “escape.” Regardless, the agent ought to associate the smuggler with a sense of fear.

Before the manual ends with a list of commands that demonstrate an appropriate dynamic between agent and crosser, it sketches a list of questions and statements demonstrating the “subjunctive in conditions contrary to fact.” These questions read as teaching agents how to create pedagogical moments in which agents

use the more respectful “usted” to ask border crossers to re-think their actions. In one case the agent is taught to ask crossers:

If you had known you were going to be arrested, would you have entered the United States illegally?
Si ud. Hubiera sabido que iba asee arrestado, habría entrado ilegalmente en los Estado Unidos?

Similarly, the statements listed here also teach crossers:

I would have remained in Mexico if I had been you.
Yo me había quedado en Mexico si (yo) hubiera sido ud.

The framing of these patronizing pedagogical moments refuse to give language to any of the sympathy or empathy agents might feel toward the crosser. In the first example, the agent is given only the language necessary to talk down to the crosser. The example suggests that a crosser hadn’t weighed his or her options, that the need or desire to cross did not outweigh the risk not only of arrest but violence by agents and other crossers. The erasure of the larger contexts in which decisions to cross are made also echoes in the second example wherein the reasons for crossing, those which might allow the agent to feel something other than contempt for the crosser, are circumvented. What remains is the condemnation for not remaining in Mexico.

In the same file, and behind the Friar and Kelly manual (1940) was a small booklet. The cover image is of two men shaking hands under the American and Mexican flags. The American is in a cowboy hat, the Mexican in a sombrero. Written by Samuel R. Skaggs and Amelia Montes Skaggs, the *Manual Práctico de Inglés*

para los Braceros, was published by Las Cruces Citizen to "help promote better Inter-American relations and that it will aid in reciprocal understanding of English and Spanish." Printed in the middle of the Bracero Program, in 1956, the manual's presence in this folder, whether through agent donation or because it was officially used by in the agency, suggests that this or similar manuals might have also been useful to agents in this moment. In this historical moment the needs of U.S. business become entangled in border policing, and so it makes sense that agents would find the language of labor helpful in understanding border crossers as workers. Interestingly, this manual not only boasts sections on the language of irrigation, cotton picking, and phrases for use in an emergency, it also details the language of flirting. In one section, the manual guides men on how to speak "to the girls," prodding them to salute her ("Hello beautiful!"), guiding them on how to ask her out, and how to propose.

The use of such a manual, then, would suggest the "better[ing] of Inter-American relations" by giving men access to women's bodies. While the manual may have been written in order to allow Mexican workers to flirt with "the [English speaking] girls," the manual's presence among agent belongings might also suggest the document was used backwards, to allow agents the language to cross the border to enjoy "the [Spanish speaking] girls" along the border. Either use of the manual would mark a very different sentiment than that expressed by the agency itself. In the Border Patrol's official manuals, the agency would express a fear of the way Mexican crosses would entangle U.S. citizens in their illicit sexual webs, referencing anxieties about promiscuous Mexicans and those who performed sex work.

Two years after the Bracero program ended, in 1966, a manual, prepared by

the Immigration and Naturalization Service Training Center, would, like the Friar and Kelly manual, (1940) encourage pre-academy trainees to practice the language.

Unlike the former, this later manual would provide a more detailed reason:

This course is designed to help the Border Patrol Inspector Trainee who has...not attended the Border Patrol Academy. Whether it is of a help to you or not, depends upon how you make use of it. If you apply yourself to it, as all GOOD OFFICERS should, it is not difficult. If, on the other hand, you do not make proper use of it and do not study it properly, it is indeed difficult.

First, let us look at the objective - the why - the goal. In learning Spanish, or for that matter, in learning anything, it is always better to have a reason. Why should you learn Spanish? There are many reasons why. The most important is that in order to perform your duties as a Patrol Inspector, you must be able to communicate with people. A vast majority of these people with whom you will have to communicate speak only Spanish. They are not apt to learn English so that you can communicate with them. So---do we need more reason?

Now, let us take an overall look at the task before us. Basically, it is very simple. Just as our every day life, our thoughts, our actions are simple, they consist of three important ingredients - SUBJECT - VERB - OBJECT. We are now into the task at hand. You are learning Spanish. You want to become a Patrol inspector. You talk to people. You listen to people. You talk to aliens. You apprehend illegal aliens. (emphasis in the original)

While previous documents like the name rulebook, the Friar and Kelly manual, and the farmworker's manual suggest that teaching agents Spanish is rooted in a desire to understand and communicate with crossers, the INS Training Center's document makes clear more hostile intentions. Indeed, a patrolman must be able to speak a crosser's language if they are to "apprehend" them.

The hostility of the Border Patrol is made clear in two undated manuals found in the border archives. The first of these was provided by the INS and was titled "The

Recorded Spanish Training Course” (RSTC). The second was titled the “Blackwell Folder.” These two manuals shift both in tone and form from previous manuals. While previous manuals list single words, phrases, and sentences with translations, these manuals offer case studies that detail imagined dialogues between agents and crossers. These conversations make more explicit a perception of crossers as criminals and a preoccupation with their marital status and sexuality more generally. They also reference concerns that the migrant will act as a contagion, disrupting U.S. families, entangling U.S. women in immoral sexual relations, all the while threatening transmission of disease into the U.S..

While these manuals are not dated, the RSTC refers to the Alien Registration Act of 1940 and a case study involves a migrant in the U.S. as a Bracero from 1944-1946, suggesting perhaps that it was published in the late 1940s/1950s. Moreover, the manual also gestures toward a shift from talking to border crossers as laborers toward talking to border crossers as criminals. In other words, the manuals teach agents how to talk to migrants about criminal both related and unrelated to their migration. For example, one case study centers the fictive migrant character, Pablo Torres-Calderon (note hyphenated surname) from Matamoros, Tamaulipas, Mexico. In the case study Torres-Calderon is asked to take an oath of honesty, he is asked about his citizenship, marital status, children, and the last time and manner in which he entered the U.S.. Torres-Calderon admits to spending time in jail having been convicted of “drunkenness, of firing weapons, and of assault against an officer” for hitting a policeman with a rock while drunk. He was charged with a fine but after declaring himself unable to afford it, he served fifteen days and was then turned over to federal

officers.

A decision has been made here by the agency. The agency could have, for example, offered the trainee an example of an economic refugee, a border crosser who migrated in order send money back to a hungry family. Indeed, the agency might have done just that in the case of Torres-Calderon whose drunken abuse of a police officer does not also signal the absence of a hungry family. But that kind of sympathetic crosser might pose a moral dilemma for the agent who might have come from a hungry family. What would it mean for him to deport a subject who is crossing so children might eat? Instead, the agency refuses to name such a border crosser. More importantly, the agency refuses to give the trainee the language to understand the border crosser through this more human lens. Instead, the trainee is given the language of excessive criminality, taught to understand his deviance and his inability to “pay” for his crimes. It is no surprise therefore that such representations correspond to the 1940 INS transfer from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice.

These scripts not only train agents to have conversations that reflect and perpetuate the myth of the excessively criminal border crosser, who cannot, for example, hold his liquor and turns his rage against U.S. law enforcement officials. These scripts also signal the consolidation of illegality as it takes shape around migration. Indeed, they begin to reference how certain crossings, those that fail to follow emerging law, make certain (read: poor brown) bodies criminal. Historian Mai Ngai argues that the category of the “illegal alien” emerged between 1924-1965 in response to policies aimed at migration restriction. Ngai traces the legal and political

category to 1924 Johnson-Reed Immigration Act that aimed to limit the number of Asian and other “undesirable” migrants (eg. criminals and anarchists) into the U.S. through quotas. For Ngai, the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act signals the beginning of migration restrictions based on “*global* racial and national hierarchies that favored some immigrants over others” (2004, p. 3). As the U.S. entered the Second World War, the Border Patrol archives reflect a tension between restricting this “illegal” migration while continuing to manage the entrance of Mexican labor.

Therefore, in the case of Pablo Torres-Calderon his exclusion is based not just on his prior criminal encounter with a policeman but also on his refusal to follow immigration law. For example, in his case study he admits to re-entering the U.S. after his first deportation without filling out a legal application. He also admits to being unaware of and not in compliance with the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Like the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act two decades before, the Alien Registration Act was meant to protect the U.S. from the threat of communism posed by those already in the U.S. borders but also by those immigrants who would support the communist and anarchist cause. The law “required all aliens to be fingerprinted, carry an identification card, and file a sworn statement of the registrant’s associations and political affiliations” (Steele, 1991, p. 72). Therefore, Torres-Calderon is made a criminal not just in his drunken actions toward an officer of the law but also in his unregistered migration.

Torres-Calderon is not the only fictive immigrant accused of evading surveillance and, as a result, breaking migration law in the documents. In a second undated manual an agent yells at his interviewee for falsifying documents. He

screams: “Enough lying! This passport has your picture on it, but the name and description belong to someone else. How did you manage to get a hold of it?” He goes on, “We can, if necessary call witnesses to appear against you. Do you understand?”

While these questions demonstrate a growing preoccupation about the legality of migrants entering the U.S., the agent’s accusation of lying also signals a growing concern about the character of subjects entering the U.S.. In the following examples, then, agents seek to understand not just the legal status of the border crosser sitting across from them but also their marital status and sex lives. In some of these cases, migrants respond to these questions as “good husbands” who care for their wives. Dionisio Fuentes-Quiroz, for example, is working “wet” in the U.S. as a day laborer. His wife is sick and he owes too much money to take her to the doctors or to get the papers necessary to work legally. Similarly, Jesus Vilchis-Ugarte entered the U.S. via a smuggler. Entering the U.S. legally would have cost him \$100 but the smuggler got him in for \$20. Vilchis-Ugarte and his wife make \$15 a week and most of it went for clothes for his wife. Unfortunately, his wife has run off with the foreman. In both of these cases, the border crossers are depicted as hard-working and loyal victims of circumstance and cheating women but are nonetheless law-breakers.

The manuals convey a shocking preoccupation with a presumed and in turn scripted, sense of Mexican infidelity and philandering. Moreover, these cases of Mexicans stepping outside of their relationships almost always lead not just to law-breaking but also an ensuing violence, presumably a kind of lesson or justice for their sexual promiscuity. Indeed, Vilchis-Ugarte’s wife is not the only cheating wife found

in the archived Spanish manuals. Additionally many of the men hold a staunchly oppositional relationship to domesticity. For example, in the second undated manual, the Blackwell Folder, an unnamed interviewee stabbed a man to death because he had been running around with the interviewee's wife. After the homicide, the interviewee migrated to the U.S. and remarried north of the border without first securing a divorce from his cheating Mexican wife. In a third example a man marries in the U.S. after his Mexican wife takes up with a "scoundrelly neighbor." He failed to tell his new wife about his first wife because the new wife "also deceived me, because she didn't tell me that she was no longer a maiden. It is an even break." This man refuses to support his children in Mexico, saying his kids' stepfather (perhaps the same "scoundrelly neighbor") ought to pay for their meals now. This last man ends his imagined interview by asking the agent: "Since when do you have to arrange papers to come to the U.S.? I waded the river, like all the other poor people of my country." (INS, n.d.)

These stories certainly raise questions of (il)legality and crime as these border crossers all enter illegally and some of them prove homicidal. But they also suggest that illegality and criminality speak to a pathological character, one perhaps more likely to indicate the presence of sexual deviance. In these case studies border crossers are understood as entangled in backwards and messy sexual and kinship formations. Crossers are depicted as promiscuous and irresponsible, hot-blooded, and quick tempered. Moreover, they threaten to ensnare U.S. citizens in these webs as they establish families on both sides of the border. This narrative functions especially well in this historical moment, wherein the Second World War causes massive

familial restructuring as men go off to war and (white, middle-class) wives enter the workforce for the first time. These women's vulnerability to sexual deviance becomes a national and moral concern, making the Mexican's inability to remain loyal to their families even more threatening. This disloyalty also resonates in the 1940s as "the loyalty of non-citizens was at the heart of exclusionary practices, but also reflected a more general prejudice of long standing against certain 'foreigners'" (Steele, 1991, p. 67). Therefore, this sexual deviance becomes a concern for agents not simply because it speaks to non-normative sexual subjects but also because it signals an "undesirable" migrant character.

This undesirable migrant character is reflected not just in the border crosser's criminality and sexuality but also in her criminal sexuality, in this case, prostitution. In an exemplary case study found in the RSTC, the border crosser was previously accused of working as a prostitute in New York. She pleaded guilty, served thirty days, but tells the agent that the accusations were false. This case study echoes a preoccupation that first emerged in the Friar and Kelly Manual (1940) when one of the examples teaches agents the subjunctive tense when they model how to ask:

Would you have practiced prostitution in the United States if you had been able to
obtain employment?
Habria practicado ud. prostitución en los Estados Unidos si hubiera podido obtener
empleo?

This question, while acknowledging the structural reasons a border crosser might practice prostitution, again refuses to turn this moment of contact into a moment of connection. Instead, the infantilizing tone underlines that border crossers are

understood as sexual criminals speaking to the limited frame through which to understand sexuality and migration.

The manuals tell a tale of compounded contagion. Border crossers threaten to entangle U.S. citizens in their deviant familial formations, criminalized sexuality, and criminal sex. It is no surprise therefore that the narratives draw on the language of public health; with migrants being represented as vectors of disease in the U.S.. In one of the RSTC case studies, the interrogated border crosser has two names, Rafael Rodriguez and Gabino Urias. From Ciudad Victoria, Tamaulipas, Mexico, Rodriguez/Urias identifies himself as of being "of the white race, the same as you, sir." The agent, participating in what Hattam describes as the process of "creating ethnicity" in the U.S., responds, "We are going to put down that you are dark complected, right?" He responds that he does, indeed, "have a rather dark complexion...with light blue eyes." He is also unflatteringly described as bald, of normal height, weighing 60 kilos, and bearing a pockmarked face.

As his multiple names might suggest, Rodriguez/Urias is never one thing. He has two names; he has two jobs, working as both a leather craftsman and tractor operator. He is transient and mobile, as his few possessions include a car and a few blankets/personal articles. He is economically vulnerable and most importantly his documents reflect that he is not a citizen; found among his few possessions are his birth certificate and 87 pesos. His economic encumbrance is made worse by the fact that he cannot read and is almost blind; rendering his trades useless. In crafting his subjectivity, these manuals suggest that this unteathered and shifty subject gets around sexually too. The trainee is directed to ask about venereal or contagious

disease to which Rodriguez/Urias responds that he has gonorrhea that has “ruptured.” If this was once a medical term related to the STI, it no longer is, but the term does suggest a kind of violent contagion. This disease, in the manuals’ writer’s mind, at least, is perhaps the result of the fact that while he is married and has two children in Mexico with his wife, but he also lives with a mistress out of wedlock. Together, he and his mistress have three children who were born in the U.S.. Rodriguez/Urias came to the U.S. and served as a Bracero from 1944-1946. Still, “when [his] contract expired, they caught [him] and sent [him] back to Mexico.” He was once arrested for being drunk in Juárez, at the time he was also accused of breaking and entering. On his most recent entry, he jumped the line in Nogales.

The manual is not clear on what the agent is expected to do with information, it seems this document is only meant to help illuminate a set of understandings about the border subject. In the case of Rodriguez/Urias, the agent is imagined to come into contact with a migrant who embodies the criminal, the sexually promiscuous and disloyal subject, and a diseased migrant all in one. Rodriguez/Urias is indeed the anxiety around the migrant fictively personified. Not just because he introduces a deviant character but because his character is contagious - he may seduce or ensnare U.S. citizen females, he may drain resources as his blindness may make it hard for him to work, and he has the potential to spread gonorrhea.

This concern about pathogen reflected in the agent’s question about venereal disease is not new to discourses of the border. In fact before the founding of the

Border Patrol in 1924, anxieties about diseased migrants plagued the border.⁶ In 1910, visual health inspections were carried out along the border and examinations were made for “the most obvious physical manifestations of trachoma, the scaly rash of favus, the dry, hacking cough of tuberculosis, the painless but ugly genital chancre (sore) of syphilis, and the telltale scar of smallpox vaccination” (Markel, 2004, p. 124). In an example of the difference between the discourse and the practice of Border Policing, though, these exams were often “hurried” and in El Paso, Texas, were completed by a “per diem physician” rather than a “full time public health officer” (Markel, 2004, p. 125). Moreover, reports from an officer of the U.S. Bureau of Immigration to DC complained that the “doctor hired to perform [the task of evaluating migrants] was retired, in poor health, and legally blind” (Markel, 2004, p. 126).

By 1916, though a local and national panic that typhus would make its way up to the U.S. from Mexico through Mexican migrants had set in. Ignoring the fact that typhus had already appeared in the U.S., U.S. Public Health Service (USPHS) physicians in El Paso were compelled to address the hundreds of Mexicans standing on the other side of the border “without provisions, without money, dirty and lousy, waiting to get over here...” (Tappan as in Markel, 2004, p. 127). These physicians would be instrumental in dictates that required Mexicans and all migrants in El Paso hospitals and jails to be bathed in a mixture of kerosene, gasoline, and vinegar in order to be rid of the typhus carrying lice (Markel, 2004).

⁶ Mexican border crossers are not the only ones associated with notions of disease, see, for example Nyan Shah’s *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco’s Chinatown* (2001) for the ways Chinese migration has been attached to notions of disease and contagion

Migrants were overdetermined as vectors and not human. Despite an incident in which 26 Mexican men, newly bathed in the mixture, in an El Paso jail were killed in an explosion, in January 1917, the same physicians ruled that these delousing baths would be given to every Mexican border crosser. Mexican border crossers who worked in El Paso felt dehumanized by the process and argued it would impact their pay. In response, they launched a protest of the baths. However the spread of disease legitimated further intrusions and more thorough inspections became a part of border crossing (Markel, 2004).

In 2004, medical historian and medical doctor, Howard Markel argues that the threat of typhus was not entirely unfounded as Mexico did experience an outbreak and some migrants did carry the disease north. But he also points to the ways that disease and racialization interacted and contributed to the construction of the Mexico-U.S. border. Markel sites the work of Dr. John W. Tappan, one of the USPHS physicians responsible for initiating the policy of bathing and quarantining migrants, where he argues that at the Mexico-U.S. border, health workers “have to contend with an alien race; one with a different language, different customs, different moral standards, and different diseases” (2004, p. 139). It is significant that Tappan’s words here reference not just different cultural markers but also a different kind of disease. In this way, his discourse crafts disease as a marker of difference, one imagined to reflect more about the body carrying the disease than about the access that body might have to care or the circumstances that surround the contraction of an illness. Instead of the science of disease transmission, the discourse of disease is born of different customs and moral standards.

The result of this kind of discourse serves as a kind of misdirection that focuses on cures for foreignness rather than cures for pathogens. For Markel, in the face of such panics, U.S. citizens and authorities have promoted “the false sense of security afforded by the construction of walls and immigrant checkpoints along a 2,000-mile-long porous border” rather than improving living conditions, especially for migrants who face poor access to sanitation and medical care (2004, p. 139).

Relatedly, Markel also argues that the patrolling and solidifying the border in the late 1910s and 1920s was not just rooted in questions over sovereignty, economics, and race, but also fear of the “Mexican disease” (2004, p. 138). It was this kind of intense and invasive policing that becomes concretized in the language of deviance taught to agents about Mexican border crossers.

A National Language for Understanding the Border Patrol Agent

The Border Patrol archive documents a national language – one that may have influenced the way agents understood and interacted with Spanish-speaking border crossers. But it also documents a different kind of language, one which works to make sense of the Border Patrol agent.

In addition to the state-issued manuals, the Border Patrol archive also stores the poetic and biographic writing of agents. Unlike the manuals, these documents allow readers to identify with agents, threading agents to the state, reifying their position as the nation’s heroes. While my first encounter with agent poetry was with that found in the private files of the memorial library, I also began finding poetry written by agents everywhere. I found poems showcased on the museum and library’s

website. I found them publicly circulated in a published book of *Recuerdos: Stories of the U.S. Border Patrol as Told by Past and Present Border Patrol Agents in Their Own Words*” and in the museum’s annual calendar, which is sold in the gift shop and at the front desk. The calendars are dedicated to the very agents portrayed within and intend to capture them against the backdrop of a moving history:

“As Border Patrol history marches forward, so does this museum strive to grow while collecting that history and telling the stories. As always, we support the Border Patrol in its mission of protecting the security of our great country and its people. We also wish to acknowledge the sacrifices made by our Border Patrol officers who have been permanently injured or lost in “the line of duty”. Best regards from the trustees, board of governors and staff members of the only Border Patrol museum in the United States.” (National Border Patrol Museum, 2016)

These poems are compelling for the ways they depict menacing border crossers and the damage they are imagined to inflict on the nation. The form of these depictions, the poem, also matters here as it provides a forum that communicates not just a story but also a sentiment, an affect. These poems promise us a way to better understand agents, lulling us into a belief that we can know the agents intimately, even as the poems show the intimacy between the agents and the border they are meant to defend.

Poet and folklore scholar, Edward Hirsch writes that poetry communicates not just intimacy but also “interiority, privacy, and participation” (1999). Hirsch goes on to suggest that poetry allows for a kind of intersubjectivity between author and reader, where poems come to “inhabit the reader’s consciousness, the reader’s body” (1999, p. xii). The agent is not just unmediated in the border archives; the manner in which

he becomes accessible occurs at a level that is “deeper than thought itself” (1999, p. xiii). To be clear, I do not claim that these agent poets are always successful at wielding poetry as a deeper way of knowing him or his work. Nor do I suggest they adequately communicate the intimacy, interiority, or affect they set out to express. Rather, I mean to argue that the poems aim to express a kind of sentimentality not afforded to the archived border crosser whose depiction is mediated by the state.

These poems illuminate not just a relationship between author and subject, but one that entangles a connection to geography. To that end, the poems craft a kind of “common ground” through the patrol officer’s intimate connections to the nation and the border. In their poetry, agents make this common ground unstable, its safety made unsure by migrating Mexican bodies. In this configuration, then, the sacrificing and sentimental agent draws on the seductions of conquest and protection to articulate himself as a hero.

Violent Poetics: the Sensate Nation, the Wounding Migrant, and the Sentimental Agent

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the fifteen poems I have collected from the museum’s website, the calendars it sells, and its library all attempt to articulate the sacrifice agents feel, the losses they suffer. Most set their sacrifice in the dangerous desert along the southern border and describe the work they do tracking border crossers, discerning criminals, and catching them. Their sacrifices are made legible in part through their descriptions of the border as a battlefield and border crossers as the enemy. More than that, their sacrifice is made legible in their formulation of the nation as sensate; a feeling body wounded by the crossing and more specifically, the

criminal migrant. It follows then that the nation requires defense against these wounds, defense offered by willing heroes. Within such narratives, the agent comes to figure as a sentimental figure, one constructed by placing the nation's violence in the past, by figuring agents as protectors of children and their K-9 partners, and by erasing the suffering of the migrant.

No other agent depicts vulnerability of the nation as passionately and clearly as Edward G. (Ed.) Woods. Woods was initiated into the patrol as part of the 71st session of the Border Patrol Academy in 1957 and became a Border Patrol Pilot in 1961. Seventeen years later he retired from the patrol, and since then Woods has published several poems and stories about his experience. He has also remained politically active, for example, signing on to a position paper demanding tight immigration control, removal of undocumented migrants, and a limited guest worker program (Parris, 2007).

Twenty-two years after retiring from the Border Patrol Woods published his first poem, suggesting an unrelenting desire for the closed border. In his poem, "The Patriot" (2000), he describes a vulnerable nation, one threatened by migrants and the politicians who refuse to stand up to them (see Appendix 8). In his passionate call to arms, Woods articulates the destruction of the nation, demanding that others join him as he answers "that voice from the past [that] raised up that rousing cry [to] rally 'round the flag boys." Importantly, his nostalgia for a heroic past references not an uncontested form of citizenship or a peaceful nation-state. Rather, he longs for days in which citizens, more specifically, true patriots, could take up arms in response to external threats.

While his nostalgic vision may do a certain kind of emotional work in the poem, it also depicts an ahistorical vision of the past that contends only citizens worked and built the land, now under siege by migrants. He says: “Rally ‘round the flag boys/The aliens, felons, and politicians/Are stealin’ this land we tilth.” His erasure here of the exploited labor of enslaved, indentured, and noncitizen peoples allows him to claim the land for citizens and render those bodies who built the nation, a threat. Indeed, it is these “aliens, felons, and politicians” who are also “tearin’ up the sacred paper/On which the citizens rely.” In this reference to the constitution, Woods seems to suggest that the nation is not just physically losing ground but that U.S. values and ideology is under attack. Arjun Appadurai also argues that deeply entangled in the fears about the migrant’s relationship to the state’s resources is the way the migrant destabilizes hard ethnic taxonomies that serve as the nation’s foundation, those that divide the “we” from the “they” (2006). So while Woods points to the theft of the physical (land and paper), he also references a greater loss - the loss of citizenship, freedom, and truth at the hands of border crossers.

Woods is clear that the nation has been left vulnerable to border crossers who are eager to steal America from Americans, but there is also the suggestion that the U.S. feels these wounds intimately. In *Who Sings for the Nation State? Language, Politics, and Belonging*, Judith Butler articulates a “sensate democracy” in which activists singing the national anthem in Spanish participate in an “aesthetic articulation” that while embodied is also publicly enacted and political. It is an act that, in Bulter’s estimation, allows border crossers to practice a kind of freedom regardless of how the state attempts to foreclose that freedom.

What Butler does not account for is the way that individuals acting on behalf of the state also take up such aesthetic articulations. Woods' poem likewise makes public and political claims of individual and national injury. In this case, the nation has not just been stolen; the nation has been made to pay in blood for the sins of the "aliens, felons, and politicians." Moreover, this frustration with the migrant takes an aesthetic form that, like the anthem sung in Spanish, aims to speak not just to a reader's logic but to less translatable place – their sense of anger at the desecration of the sacred.

Part of this reach for the sacred is an attempt also to speak to a sense of "shared" U.S. history. Woods' references to revolutionary instruments of war, both musical instruments and weaponry, serve various functions here. First, it gives Woods' cause – the defense of the nation – historical legitimacy, suggesting to readers that he is following in the noble footsteps of "George, Ben, and [his] dad." In addition to giving his cause heft, the references to the U.S. revolution again suggest an oppressed U.S., one attempting to throw off the weight of a force attempting to strangle U.S. sovereignty and freedom. While George and Ben's fight was with the British, Woods' oppression is framed in relation to border crossers. In a gendered response to the oppression, Woods gears up. He writes, "I pulled on my clothes and boots/And I started out the door/The wife said hurry back/And don't forget your gun." Here, the "boys" ought to prepare for war while their wives remind them to take their guns, stay home, and fret for the safety of their husbands and the nation.

Finally, the poem creates and stabilizes a fictively homogenous "citizenship" through historical reference. U.S. citizens are those whose fathers fought with George

and Ben, but also those who hold the constitution sacred. This conceptualization of the citizen, though, erases those who George and Ben and [his] dad conquered or enslaved in the process of nation building. Ironically, this conceptualization of the citizen erases the more than five thousand African American fife-players, drummers, flag bearers, and soldiers who “shouldered his musket,” in the Revolutionary War (Southern, 1997, p. 64). In this way, Woods’ erasure is not just a simple refusal to consider but also an erasure through absorption, taking bodies of color into his conceptualization of the citizen while erasing difference and the historical and present violences through which that difference was and is codified. As Appadurai argues, this fiction is made uncertain by the presence of the heterogeneity offered by alternative, racialized histories, and the otherized bodies. For Woods, though, this difference is embodied by the “aliens” and (perhaps racialized) “felons” that are among those spreading “filth.” Those who are represented by the mud contrasted against the more pure snow. His reference here gestures toward the dilution of purity that Appadurai argues is at the heart of anxiety about migration.

These references to history do not simply contribute to the cause; they also help craft the narrative of the agent as a sentimental figure. Just as the nation stands for the wounded party, the migrant represents the subject responsible for the wounding. Meanwhile the agent who stands between the two, ready to protect the former and take on the latter, even at great personal cost, comes to represent the sentimental figure. In *The Suffering Will Not be Televised: African American Women and Sentimental Political Storytelling*, Rebecca Wanzo defines “sentimental politics [as] the practice of telling stories about suffering bodies as a means for inciting

political change. Sentimental political storytelling describes the narrativization of sympathy for purposes of political mobilization” (2009, p. 3) The logics of sentimentality, she argues, help make sense of who is considered a “proper victim” while allowing for the easy dismissal of those who are denied victimhood (2009, p. 3). It is this set of logics that, as Patricia Zavella argues, makes it possible that the erasure of “the human costs of crossing the border and establishing new lives” paid by migrants (2011, p. 27). Indeed, in the poetry below not only are migrants denied victimhood, agents construct the nation and the agent as victims of these threatening migrants.

Wanzo outlines a range of conventions through which these logics of sentimentality are articulated. The first of these conventions is the progress narrative that makes history of injustice while refusing its presence in the present. Woods’ poem plays with this convention, staking its power in threatening a return to an unjust past in which citizens will feel oppression if they fail to act. Conversely, Ronald Moore’s poem, “Wounded Knee” (1973) was sent to the Border Patrol archives by Paul Berg, Senior Patrol Agent in El Centro, CA. Berg felt it would be important to the museum because it “indicates the degree of compassion that Border Patrol Agents have for the people they deal with” does evidence the progress narrative that crafts a sentimental figure (see Appendix 9).

Here Moore revisits the location of the Massacre at Wounded Knee where almost 300 unarmed Lakota Sioux men, women, and children were killed by American troops in December 1890 (Richardson, 2011). As he patrols the area, Moore, nestled in his “suit of camouflage green,” a uniform that gestures toward both

traditions of hunting and militarization, is haunted by “a ghostly troop.” This troop, presumably that made of up of the American troops who massacred the indigenous inhabitants of the valley, march past him wearing their own uniforms, “long greatcoats flapping in the wind.” While these troops offer a terrifying specter with their “numb and blue” faces, they are not readily visible. In fact, Moore describes having to strain to see the troop, hinting that the soldiers and the lessons they carry with them are not always apparent to his peers.

Speaking as an agent of the state, one empowered to act as an instrument of state violence, Moore comes to a realization that humanizes the living border crossers marching through a valley below him. His realization is communicated by the ghosts who “cry,/why stand you on that hill;/Are you here now that we may tell,/how wrong it is to kill.” The troops share with Moore their “immortal shame” and recount the real loss at Wounded Knee, their own souls. This is a complex moment. On the one hand, there is something revolutionary about this humanizing shift, about recognizing that the “there was no foe in the valley.” This humanizing impulse comes to stand in stark relief to the images of the agents separating families in the third chapter and those brutally beating border crossers in the fourth.

Of concern though, is the way the poem still affirms Moore’s power, narrativizing him as a benevolent hero, while placing state violence within the context of the past. This suggestion, that violence against racialized others exists only in the past, indicates that the state has learned its lesson, that the agency has evolved, and that moving forward, violence is only used when necessary, when the individual migrant acts as an enemy of the state. This individual enemy is reinforced in how the

poem transforms the migrant's difference, converting bodily difference to one of "different ideas." This color-blind notion of difference papers over the process of racialization, the way bodily difference becomes attached to the notions of criminality and queerness detailed in this manuscript and suggests that race-inspired violence is no longer of concern.

This is a belief echoed in the poem, "God Wasn't Messing Around When He Made Border Patrol Agents" by an unknown author (n.d., see Appendix 10). This unknown agent poet writes: "There are no bad Border Patrol Agents./There are only those wannabe's that are corrupt who infiltrated and pretended./But the truth is that they were never PA's./The real PA would never betray their brothers and sisters or the call to protect this great nation./It is the rarest combination of character, the courage and compassion that is the essence of a Border Patrol Agent." Much like Moore's benevolent hero, in this poem, the "real" agent would never unnecessarily commit violence against a border crosser. Both poems then, distance themselves from the "fake" agents who abuse their power while they, as good agents refuse to participate in racist violence. Instead real agents recognize that they face "the worst of the worst that this world has to offer,/Yet showing compassion to those that they have to deal with in that environment./It is knowing the difference between a cold blooded killer and a poor farm worker just by the look in their eye,/And treating each accordingly while never showing fear, and always being in control/Even when complete chaos is occurring all around." Again, the unknown agent creates two kinds of border crosser, that which is deserving of pity and the "worst of the worst," against which violence might be justified. In refusing to describe how the two might be

distinguished, the author reinforces the slipperiness of criminality, and the notion that any migrant *might* be understood as a criminal.

In addition to distancing themselves from historical atrocities and present-day “bad apples,” agent poets also align themselves with more sentimental characters. In these poems, agents reference close connections to both children and dogs, specifically, they own a function of their job as protecting children while working side-by-side with K-9 agents.

In the poem, “God Wasn’t Messing Around When He Made Border Patrol Agents,” the agent makes a point of how his duty entails catching border crossing “child molesters.” Specifically, he writes that to be a Border Patrol agent means “working to the point of exhaustion to catch that smuggler, child molester, rapist, murderer or other criminal only to be spat upon and called a racist by the very people they are protecting.” Indeed, for this anonymous author, the sacrifice of one’s own body and reputation is worth it if he can defend the nation’s children, women, and innocent victims. At the same time, he is willing also to protect the innocent child migrant, stating that to be a Border Patrol agent equally means “searching for that lost kid in the desert.” Moreover, his protection of the child figure spills into his everyday, as he saves his neighbor’s choking infant. This unknown agent not only protects the innocent child, regardless of which side of the border they come from, they do so at great personal cost. Indeed, that a Border Patrol agent might be defined by his “hurt marriages and kids who know that Mom or Dad have to miss again because they can’t leave the post abandoned.” In this way, he sacrifices not just his own body but also his relationships with his own children and his children’s security for other people’s

children.

This sacrifice committed in the name of the children, helps craft the agent as a more sentimental figure. Wanzo explains this gesture as the deployment of the “suffering hierarchy” in which “citizens [are] deemed more and less valuable” (2009, p. 13). As Wanzo tells us, notions of masculinity create an expectation of men’s sacrifice in the name of defending the nation; therefore, they are not automatically seen as sentimental figures. Instead, they must be imbued with sentimentality and thus align themselves with figures that sit higher up on the suffering hierarchy. These more sentimental characters are those considered valuable and are expected to not have to suffer in the name of the nation.

Patrol Agent, Lee Cabrera’s poem “Border Patrol Agent’s Desolation,” published in the 2015 BPM calendar, likewise does the work of imbuing sentimentality via proximity to children (see Appendix 11). The poem starts, perhaps with a biblical reference to a solitary walk through a lonely space of misery: “As I walk through this desolation alone/I stay alert and maintain my sense honed/My backup I know is miles away/Yet from this resolute path I will not stray.” While the Biblical passage to which he seems to refer calls subjects to rely on a higher power, Cabrera instead relies on his craft and his senses to navigate the treacherous terrain.

In navigating these dangerous paths, Cabrera encounters a range of environmental and human threats as well as the public’s response to his job performance. Cabrera responds to such “scrutiny” and “chastisement” by arguing that his only goal is to “protect and serve” rather than to “judge.” Instead, Cabrera plays up his neutrality as a law enforcement officer, one who is “aware that it takes just one

[entity on the run] for our boundaries to breach” and for “American’s children” to be made vulnerable. While the unknown agent above details the criminal acts – molestation – that border crossers might commit against children, here the migrant need only cross to violate “America’s children.”

Cabrera also recalls a certain past in which migrants were “beckoned” to the United States, suggesting that at the very least these welcomed migrants were benign and at best important builders of the nation. But Cabrera laments, “times are different now, and [migrants] have become a threat.” This threatening migrant justifies his work defending the nation’s “gracious shores.” Moreover, Cabrera claims that his work is part of what makes America great, for when he presents America with the captured “felon,” the state shows strength in refusing “defeat” at the hands of the migrant. Interestingly, Cabrera’s narrative does the double work of describing the state as simultaneously strong and weak. In some ways the U.S. is described as an undefeatable giant. At the same time, he seems to suggest that this individual “wolf in sheep’s clothing” that sneaks across the border is enough to render her weak. In his last line, this vulnerable nation is embodied by the “oblivious” citizen who sleeps while the agent works, the women in his life, and his “children kneel[ing] in prayer.” Here, then, the agent is constructed as sympathetic not just because of his sacrifice but because of his sacrifice *for* the proper family, the innocent citizen, and the devout child.

In addition to aligning themselves with children, agents also take up the innocent voice and body of the dog in order to create sentimentality. The 2014 NBM calendar publishes only one poem. Written by an unknown author, “A K-9 Prayer”

takes up the voice of the agent's four-legged sidekick to ask for the agent's protection (see Appendix 12). In speaking through the dog, the voice here is understood as pure, untouched by the politics of the border. The dog "neutrally" sees the danger of their handler's duty, and prays for protection against the threat.

In the poem's last line, "I ask nothing for myself," the dog and the handler enter into a metonymic relationship through the concept of sacrifice. Indeed, while the agent clearly sacrifices for the nation's safety and protection, the dog here suggests a willingness to sacrifice herself for the agent, asking not even for her own safety. In this way both agent and K-9 reference each other, suggesting shared qualities. The handler then takes on the characteristics of fidelity, innocence, and loyalty. Moreover, this metonymic relationship also crafts the agent into a sympathetic figure, one concerned only about the keeping of "our streets and homes safe."

Conclusion

If as, Spivak argues in this chapter's epigraph, "the nation-state requires the national language," the border archive is a prime place for crafting, reinforcing, and deploying that language. Furthermore, as the border archive serves as tool of governance, this language serves to author the historical and present day migrant, the nation, and the agent. It matters, then, that the border archive articulates a shifty migrant who must be renamed while agents are armed with the language through which to understand and engage their deviance. It is a language of deviance that attaches borders crossers to notions of criminality, "illegal" migration, promiscuity,

and contagion. Moreover, the space reserved in the Border Patrol archive for the agent to author himself, gives him the power to answer the public's critiques and to narrate the sentiment through which he wants the public to understand and engage him, his work, and even his dog.

Chapter 3: Bodies on the Line: Shifting Borders and Shifty Crossers

An Anxious Border Child

As a child, I understood questions of citizenship to be much more simple and much more complicated than most of my peers. On the one hand I simply understood myself to be Mexican American. On the other hand, as a child in the 1980s and 1990s, Mexican and U.S. law made it impossible for people to hold dual citizenship. So I was told that at the age of 18 I would have to choose, declare myself to be either Mexican or American. Because my parents had invested so much into our family's relocation from Mexico City to Portland, OR to finally settle at the border in El Paso, TX, I imagine they imagined my decision to be easy. Clearly we were now all American, or in the case of my father, a legal resident. The problem was that I was a difficult child and so what they probably saw as obvious, I found anxiety-producing. If I chose to be an American would I still be able to visit my family in Mexico during the summers? And what if I chose to be Mexican? Would I still be able to go to school with my friends? As a child this decision was ultimately about having to choose between the people I love.

While we may have ultimately settled on the U.S. side of the border, in El Paso, TX, as a family we also carved out a transborder existence. My father crossed daily to work in Mexico, where he could more comfortably speak Spanish and build Mexican business connections. He continued to foster a community in Juárez. And so, we crossed regularly for orthodontist appointments with doctors he knew, meals

with family friends, and shopping trips to buy real vanilla extract or a paella pan. On school holidays, childcare took the form of my sister and I crossing the border with my father to his work. We would start each day with breakfast at VIPS, a Mexican chain of diners, where my dad had coffee and business meetings and we would spend long stretches of hot days sorting through big bins of plastic to be processed at the factory. At the close of each day, we would climb into his car (which in my memory has no air-conditioning) and drive back into the U.S..

Border crossing is a process that is now so familiar I have little memory of learning how to do it. We would wait in our car, in line for anywhere from 30 minutes to 3 hours, always trying to guess which line was moving fastest. Along the way we would buy small packets of gum or peanut candies not sold in the U.S., and at the end of our wait we would identify ourselves to a Customs and Border Protection Officer. The officer would ask for our citizenship. We would tell him we were American. He would look at my father's green card. He would ask all of us if we were bringing anything across. Most of the time we would say no. Most of the time we meant it. Sometimes we admitted to bringing back cheap cigarettes for the nice older woman who lived down the street from us.

I don't remember learning to cross the border but I do remember being disciplined as we crossed the border. I remember times my mother turned around from the front passenger seat and told us to behave. I remember times where after hours of horsing around in the backseat, my father yelled at us to put our seat belts back on and to get serious because we were coming up to the Border Patrol kiosk.

I also remember moments where my parents were disciplined. Times when

my father would not be there to pick us up after school, my mother would have received a call that he had tried to re-enter the U.S. without his green card. She would grab us from school, take us all home, go through his pant pockets from the day before to pull out his identification card, pile my sister and I back in the car, and together we would all drive down to the border to spring my dad. I remember the time my dad got worried that his green card was becoming too worn. After pulling his card out of his wallet everyday for years, he was worried it was going to fall apart or become too hard to read and so he got it laminated. The card was confiscated, my mom was called to the border to bring his documents, and he had to apply for a new card.

Despite being an anxious child, I was, for the most part, an obedient child (or, at least I recall myself as an obedient child). As I remember it, I never deviated from the script and so I didn't really have problems crossing the border. At the border, I always identified myself as an American. I let my parents figure out what to say about what we were bringing across, and when asked I would parrot my parents about where we had been. As a teenager, I once even told my mom that she should be nicer to Border Patrol Officers. I recall saying something about putting good energy into the world, even if the agent was asking something that was none of his business. In retrospect my comments were clearly that of a light-skinned, accent-less child who had never fought the state to ensure her family could be together.

It wasn't until I was twenty-one that I had a problem with a CBP officer. It was the summer before my senior year of college. I had just broken in a new passport studying abroad in Europe and had spent the majority of the summer backpacking

with two friends, stopping at so many border crossings to explain that I was an American college student. So, I knew pretty much everything about everything. And yet when the officer stopped a car I shared with my mom, my sister, and a few American aunts and cousins at the Canadian border, I had no idea how to clearly explain to her how it was that I was born in Mexico and carried a U.S. passport. My mother (who had been filling out paperwork about my citizenship longer than I) was also confused. After what I remember to be a lengthy conversation (though in all it probably wasn't more than five minutes) the agent explained to me that I was an American born abroad and she let us go. In retrospect this "problem" with the agent pales in comparison to the problems outlined by friends, family, and those border crossers who agreed to be interviewed below. Still, it caused a minor crisis in my identity, highlighting for me that despite having the "right" paperwork, one might still be excluded simply for not having access to the correct script or presentation.

This chapter is about moments of border crossing. It is about the moment bodies are put on the line both literally and figuratively, to be read through logics of racialized, classed, gendered, sexual (un)belonging. It is ultimately about the value assigned to bodies in the moment of crossing and the resulting decision to include or exclude. Considering these moments from the vantage of those crossing the border allows us to consider how these moments of crossing shapes the identities of border crossers, how they impact their daily lives, as well as how they understand the border itself. While much has been written about borders and migration, little attention has been paid to those who cross regularly; those who daily interact with officers and who daily navigate power at the border. This chapter builds on interviews with nine such

border crossers. I talked with them about what brought them to live along the border, how their understanding of the border has changed over time, and their strategies for crossing. These stories reveal the workings of the ever-changing border and the subjects who craft and adapt their strategies in order to cross it.

Method: Collecting Border Stories

My intention in this chapter is to highlight and analyze the narratives of the border crossers who encounter the machine that is the Customs and Border Patrol on a daily basis. Specifically, my interest was in interviewing people Chávez identifies “border commuters,” those who live in one country but crosses the bridge to work in the other. Chávez argues that border commuters offer “important theoretical insights on how residents who live in the borderlands negotiate this form of binational work-life by crossing borders to take advantage of the resources found in both nation-states” (2016, p. 12). For example, he suggests, border commuters working in the U.S. and living in Mexico, may take advantage of higher minimum wages in the U.S. and lower costs of living in Mexico. While Chávez is interested in the ways border commuters work across and around the border, I interviewed nine regular border crossers with an interest in how their experiences *at the border* help illuminate the meanings assigned to the space and their bodies. Most of my participants had lived in the border for most of their lives and all had reason to cross frequently. Sessions included discussions of their backgrounds, their reasons for crossing, their experiences at the bridge, and their understanding of the bridge as children compared to what it is now. We talked at length about political shifts that have come to

influence their experiences. As such, we talked about the passage of NAFTA, 9/11 and the consolidation of the Department of Homeland Security, and the recent cartel wars in Juárez.

As I set out to collect these interviews, I began with a single participant, Verónica⁷, whose family has been close to my own. She crossed the border on a regular basis and ultimately put me in touch with most of the other participants in the study. Some of these other participants, in turn, suggested other interviewees. While not intentional, this snowball sampling allowed me to tap into a community of border crossers often not considered in the literature, middle and upper class subjects who cross multiple times a week, sometimes many times a day. Of the nine interviews, five were conducted with women, four with men. Five of the participants were U.S. citizens from birth, though all of them were raised at least in part in Juárez. One was a Mexican who had recently become a U.S. citizen as his family moved to El Paso in the wake of the violence in Juárez. Two interviewees were Mexican citizens and one was a Mexican citizen who grew up to petition for Spanish citizenship, in large part to facilitate doing business in the U.S.. Five participants worked in El Paso at the time of interviews, some despite still living in Juárez. Two worked in Mexico, two were students in El Paso, and one was a homemaker in the U.S.. Regardless of where they were born, their citizenship, or their work, all of these participants live on one side of the border and cross regularly in order to visit family, shop, visit doctors, or participate in community across the border.

With the exception of one interview, which took place over the phone, all took

⁷ All names used here are pseudonyms.

place in person. All took place in the winter of 2015/2016 and into the spring of 2016. All but the phone call were recorded and later transcribed for analysis. Despite recording interviews, I also took careful notes of participants' responses. These notes often allowed time for participants to fill silence by expanding their original answers.

Interviews took the form of a kind of oral history/semi-structured interview hybrid. The oral history components of the interview asked participants where they were born, where they had lived, how they came to the border area, and where they imagined their future. As these questions suggest, the oral history components asked participants to narrate their life stories in relationship to geography and, especially, in relationship to the border. Therefore, as we transitioned to questions about the border, I asked participants to reflect on how they understood the border when they were children and to compare their childhood understandings to their contemporary understanding of the border. My first interview followed a different trajectory. My first interviewee, Manuel, came very much wanting to share his own story. After being investigated by the FBI for unknowingly breaking laws regarding bringing money from Mexico into the U.S. for his business, he was barred from crossing. Manuel's case was interesting because it was not the U.S. government who prevented his entry but rather his lawyer whom he hired for \$52,000. Several months after the FBI took his frozen holdings in the U.S. and closed his case, his lawyer continued to tell him he could not cross the border unless he paid tens of thousands more in legal fees. In this case, his telling of the story dominated much of our time and I rarely interjected except to ask him to clarify or to build on points articulated earlier.

In these interviews, I used an interview guide (see Appendix 13) to ask

participants to define and describe the border, to share how often they cross the border and for what reasons they cross. I also asked them to explain the affective landscape of the border and the emotions they feel as they cross the border. Most of the interview was spent talking to participants about their experiences crossing the border. I asked them if there is such a thing as an “average” crossing for them and what that might look like, I asked about the questions officers ask, whether they have ever experienced harassment, detention, or violence or if they know anyone who has. I then asked crossers to reflect on why they think they are treated the way they are when crossing. Of course, when possible and/or necessary, I followed up with questions that asked participants to elaborate or clarify responses.

My goal in these interviews was not to find a participant who could speak to “the average” border crossing. Rather, my intention was to focus on a small sample that would speak to the complexity of individual experiences. As Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber reminds us, in-depth interviews are ideal for allowing participants to consider their lived experiences and to share their subjective understandings of, in this case, the border (2007). In order to get at these understandings of and experiences at the border, I spoke to participants in both Spanish and English. In a few cases I knew the participant was most comfortable speaking Spanish, in these situations I began the interview in Spanish. In most interviews, though, I began in English and if/when the interviewee began speaking in Spanish, I might follow suit. For the purpose of presenting these responses, I have decided to print them as they were spoken in the interview - in English, Spanish, or Spanglish. In cases where the response is in Spanish or Spanglish, I have translated the participants’ responses. For

clarity, I have omitted “false starts” or hesitation. While some scholars suggest these moments of hesitation might be fruitfully analyzed (DeVault as in Hesse-Biber, 2007), in these cases it was unclear what hesitation was caused by reluctance to speak and what was caused by the desire or need to translate a thought.

Methodology: Reading Power and Identity in Border Stories

In her discussion of in-depth interviews, Hesse-Biber also joins the multitude of feminist scholars who argue that feminist scholarship engaged in in-depth interviews must be attentive to questions of power both in the collection and analysis of interviews. Drawing on these feminist researchers, my methodological approach to reading and writing these interviews takes seriously questions of reflexivity, intersubjectivity, and failure.

A feminist methodology, but especially one that engages on and across borders, calls the researcher to reflect on and reveal how her social location impacts her ability to navigate the world she studies as well as how it influences the lens adopted in her work (Nagar and Swarr, 2010). This attention to reflexivity ensures that the researcher is aware of the ways in which she is complicit within networks of uneven power, particularly with regards to the ability to craft and authorize a narrative about her subjects. Reflexivity is important not simply as part of a feminist commitment to understanding the work of power but also in understanding how power shapes the research. Following feminist scholars like Donna Haraway who have argued for work that produces “partial, locatable, critical knowledges [that sustain] the possibility of webs of connections called solidarity in politics and shared

conversations in epistemology” (Haraway as in Bloom, 1998, p. 39), it is important to note that making one’s work locatable means being able to locate one’s self in the field.

In some ways, then, the “field” I engaged for this project was also one of the many places I consider “home.” I was raised in El Paso and spent some of my most formative years living on the border. Trips to the “field” served the dual purpose of seeing family and visiting friends. During these trips I stayed in the house I grew up in and in the interviews, my participants, some of whom were known to me, made reference to my family and me. Manuel, for example, talked about how my mother was “furiosa” at his “maltreatment” at the hands of U.S. lawyers. Verónica laughed when I asked how old she was and then told me she was 25 (she is, in fact 42).

Still, as Kamala Visweswaran argues, just as the field is sometimes our home, so too is the academy and neither is a safe space. My trips to do my homework/fieldwork drew me away from the homework done in universities in the U.S. northeast. In contrast to the border crosser who made her home in El Paso and who charmed her way across the border by smiling and asking agents how they are doing today, the scholar who made her home at the University of Maryland and MIT remained critical, throughout the research, of systems in which some crossers cannot “charm” their way across the national boundary.

Visweswaran speaks to the complexity of our position as feminist researchers in her use of the second-generation, “halfie” (1994, p. 131). Visweswaran’s argument is that all researchers are bilingual hybrids, who might be connected to their subjects through language and/or nationality but who are also distanced as a result of

inhabiting the language and world of academic research. For Visweswaran, the researcher-subject might inhabit a similar hybridity to, for example, the Mexican-American. In both cases, the hyphen connects and separates second-generation immigrants. This argument is powerful because it suggests that, in undertaking feminist research, the researcher and the participant cross borders rooted in more common understandings of identity (race, gender, etc.), but they also cross the porous borders of the academy, creating a shift in the ivory tower.

Indeed, Leslie Bloom argues that both researcher and the research participant become entwined in the work of knowledge production. This process, she argues, renders their subjectivity nonunitary and constantly in flux, shaped and reshaped by the process of building knowledge together (1998, p. 3). Recognizing this entanglement is important because it ensures the researcher pays attention to her location not just as it stands at the beginning of the project but also as it evolves throughout the research, giving new meaning to the relationships between participants but also the work produced.

Thus, as the project progressed, my own location shifted, especially with regard to my status as an “insider” and/or “outsider.” As Hesse-Biber suggests, “one’s insider/outsider status is fluid and can change even in the course of a single interview” (2007, p. 143). In some moments my experiences at and living on the border shaped the way my interviewees and I engaged on common ground. In one moment, Verónica, for example, asked if I remembered the border after the passage of NAFTA. In her words: “well we had the trade, the international trade, entre Canada, Estados Unidos, y Mexico, remember? Well actually it was started open our

doors to the world.” In this moment, Verónica interacts with me as a fellow border resident, one who might remember the mid nineties with her. In the next moment, my position shifts as she tells me about how NAFTA shifted life outside of the border in Southern Mexico, a place I have not been to in a few decades. She goes on:

Verónica: “So and I think a lot of our traditions started to change and we started adopting other festivities. For instance right now if you go to the south, they have, its not a Black Friday but its called Buen Viernes. If you want the correct name, I can call. But you know we didn’t used to have that.”

Cristina: So you are saying the border becomes a way of introducing traditions into southern Mexico?

Verónica: Mhm.

In my interview with Verónica, most of our interview felt like I was an insider. There were several moments where she talked about experiences I hadn’t shared but we also shared a common vocabulary and understanding of the border. We both shared an understanding of landscape of the border and so when she set the scenes of most of her stories, I knew where she was. We also had both crossed the border for similar reasons all our lives. In fact, she and I had recently crossed with my mother, the three of us joking together about the family members we had left in El Paso, about the lines on the bridge, and about having to kick me out of the car because I do not have a SENTRI card.

In a different interview, the one with Manuel, I spent most of our sixty minutes together feeling like an outsider. As a businessman and a European citizen, Manuel had a different vocabulary of the border, one that involved Visas, flying across the border, and conducting business through the border. But my outsidership was consolidated at the end of the interview when Manuel, after concluding a story

about what it means to talk back to CBP officers who target foreign citizens, turned to me and said:

Manuel: Ahora tu no lo ves por que tu no viajas con gente con otro passaporte, pero nosotros vemos todo eso. Todos los dias. Todos los dias. Todos los dias. (*Now, you don't see it because you don't travel with people with other passports, but us, we see all that. Everyday. Everyday. Everyday.*)

Admittedly, I was caught off guard. Here Manuel assumed not only that I was a U.S. Citizen but also that my network of friends and family were also U.S. Citizens who had never experienced the kinds of exclusion he had faced. It was an important reminder of how my bodily presentation allows subjects to fill in my silences, writing on me different relationships to the border that shaped how my participants interacted with me.

Manuel's interview was my first interview but it was the first of many wherein I "researched up." In this project, researching up meant most of my interviews were with subjects who crossed the border as managers, business owners, and high-level employees. As importantly, most participate in the Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) program. Instead my own border crossings involve waiting in the regular lines or, when I cross with family, all of whom have the card, I am unable to cross with them. As we approach the border, I have to leave the car to walk across the border. As a result of our different experiences at the border, we have different relationships to the border.

Still, accessing my participants was fairly easy; many wanted to talk to me about their experiences. When I told Laura about my project she was anxious to participate and seemed excited to have a space in which to discuss her frustrations

with unjust border practices. Similarly, Manuel ended his interview by saying that he wanted to be interviewed, that when I contacted him about the interview he said “yo quiero ir. It’s real lo que vas a oír de mí. Es real. (*I want to go. It’s real what you will hear from me. It’s real.*)”

Conversely, I was surprised to find my access to Customs and Border Protection officers was limited. As I set out to do the project, I assumed that officers I knew through acquaintances and family friends would be willing to be interviewed. While one was willing to sit down and talk informally, they could not sign consent forms. I was generously put in touch with the public relations department for CBP officers and I had several productive conversations with their office about what kinds of projects they could sign off on and what kinds of questions I could ask. After much discussion I significantly reduced my list of questions to three and my request was sent up the chain of command and disseminated to different specialists. Still, my request is still pending and was not resolved in time for the completion of this manuscript. This is an area in which I hope to expand future research.

In retrospect, my inability to access CBP officers disrupted my rather naïve assumption that public agencies are or ought to be accessible to the communities they are meant to serve. Moreover, it unsettled my assumption that *I* ought to have access to them. While my interactions with CBP officials were always cordial and respectful, they were able to deploy a level of opaqueness not afforded to the border crossers I interviewed. Indeed, each participant I interviewed talked about the way one responds to the officers’ invasive questions. Patricia, for example talked about transparency:

Cristina: Are there certain questions that you normally get asked?

Patricia: Many times I'm asked, why did you go to Juarez? I don't think it's any of their business. They can ask me did you buy something illegal or did you buy this or that, but why did I went to Juarez. I don't think it's appropriate but that's one of their main questions. And you answer as nicely and truthfully as you can. What else do I get asked? Where do you live? Constantly. I live in El Paso, my port pass says I live in El Paso. My passport says I was born in El Paso and my driver's license says I live in El Paso but still I'm asked where do you live? You know? What else? What else do they ask? Do you have anything to declare, which is very normal. That is fine for them to ask. That's a very good question. But the first one is not.

Cristina: Do you always just tell them or do you ever?

Patricia: No I tell them. I have nothing to hide. You know, sometimes I went for a baby shower and I'll say I went to a baby shower. A funeral. I went to a funeral, whatever I went for I tell them. But really honestly that's not their business.

Patricia was not the only one, several respondents talked about the importance of being honest and open with agents, even when, as Manuel put it, the questions felt like “they wanna have control over everything...[like they] wanna get into your life.” In studying airport security, Rebecca Hall has argued that transparency has become a kind of performance, one that not everybody is able to perform (2015). In the case of the border, then, it matters that crossers are required to perform transparency while the agency itself does not have to. For the Border Patrol the refusal to perform such transparency might be done in the same breath as they suggest that revealing themselves threatens U.S. security. Meanwhile, for crossers, refusing to be made transparent only reads as an admission of guilt.

The CBP officers were not the only ones to refuse to participate in the project. Indeed, a tenth participant reluctantly sat down to talk with me. Yet, in what Visweswaran identifies as a “failure,” when I later reviewed this participants' consent

form, I discovered that each page was initialed but the last page remained unsigned (1994, p. 98). Just as Visweswaran's silent subject resisted being made knowable, so too did my participant refuse to share their experiences, radically different from the others represented here. These experiences haunt the chapter but they also demonstrate the way this work cannot represent complete truths. With this epistemological failure in mind, knowing that the feminist researcher will never fully capture her research subjects or their experiences, she sets out to offer, instead Haraway's partial knowledges, those that only begin to tackle questions of power and subjectivity (1991).

Still, the narratives of the subjects here do a certain kind of work to unsettle the "grand narratives" about the border (Mufti & Shohat, 1997). Together, these narratives reflected a thorny multiplicity that sometimes come together and sometimes conflict drastically. These multiple and often unheard stories elucidate the slipperiness of the border. They also illuminate the ways notions of "us" and "them" are constructed but constantly shifting at the border. These narratives also reveal the ways that in a space where any border crosser might be read as (an)other, crossers marshal a range of resources at their disposal to ensure safe passage across the border. These resources are sometimes available to them through their class status, other resources are related to their ability to perform obedience and disidentification.

Diverse and Tense Border Crossing Narratives

The first chapter considered how archives remember and forget along with how borders assert vanishing sovereignty. This chapter picks up on the theme of

tension at the border. Specifically, I argue that the narratives of border crossers, in this case those who regularly engage with CBP officers, can illuminate the tense and sometimes conflicting workings of the border and the way crossers respond accordingly. Indeed, these narratives, vacillating between being at times pragmatic and in other moments sentimental, offer not just a description of events at the border but also the meanings of the border and the different ways of constructing and navigating subjectivity at the border.

Narratives of border crossers undo the fixedness of the border. These narratives affirm what geographer and border scholar, Melissa Wright, drawing on Walter Benjamin, describes as a “dialectical image,” or a fixed image where the “apparent stillness obscures the tensions that actually hold it in suspension” (2007, p. 72). Following Wright and Benjamin, I read these narratives to argue that tensions hold together the border and that the stillness of the border as a coherent and fixed object erases the conflicting elements of the border. Border crossing narratives reveal the many ways that the border is constructed, contingent, and constantly in process. They are also instructive reminders that borders are always being shaped and reshaped by a range of oppositional politics, histories, and bodies. Moreover, as participants explain their relationships to the border, what comes into relief are the ways that border crossers understand themselves are unstable and constantly in flux. Thus, these narratives highlight how intimacies between bodies and national bodies, space and power on the border might then also be rethought outside of normative frames.

Normative frames, by their very structure, work to hold up the power of a

single story. In this context that single story is that of a Mexican subject crossing illegally. The stories that undergird this chapter describe traumatic, life changing, and permanent border crossings. Without discounting that border crossing can be traumatic and that undocumented subjects do cross sometimes with the intention of settling for good, my interviews suggest that there is no one kind of border crossing. Instead, diverse subjects experience the border differently, for different reasons. For some crossers, the border serves as an obstacle or an impediment to their daily lives. For others, the border can be crossed multiple times a day with few impediments. Other contradictions arose as I asked participants to define the border. In these moments some participants defined the border in terms of business and economics. Relatedly, others used the language of time, temporality, and waiting to describe the bridge. Many participants described the border in terms of a border community, conflating that the national boundary and the borderlands that surround it. In defining the border, some participants considered it to be a place of beauty and life while others explained it in terms of fear and anxiety.

Border sociologist Sergio Chávez argues that interviews with border crossers mark more than the diversity of their experiences. He claims that their narratives, among other things, highlight the way the border poses both a set of challenges and a set of opportunities for crossers. The focus on lived experiences at the border, then, forefronts the tension between agency and structure. The question of structure, for Chávez is particularly important, as structure is not a nebulous disciplining force, it is power that is physically manifested (2016). Here, power has architecture, taking the physical form of walls, fences, kiosks, and human barriers. In the face of these

material obstacles, some subjects felt empowered to talk back to agents, to resist, file complaints, or ask to speak to supervisors. Yet, most of my participants felt powerless in the face of intimidating CBP officers, fearing the loss of documents, without which future border crossings would be made impossible. Expectedly, an inability to cross carries different implications for different participants. From strained family relationships to lost wages, and from an inability to drink in bars with friends to an inability to access their desired education, crossers narrated this threat differently.

When asked about the power exerted by both the U.S. and Mexican governments at the border, some participants feel that the tightening of security at the border is justified even if that tight security results in their inconvenience, discomfort, or feeling targeted. Other participants, on the other hand feel the behavior of agents is threatening, disrespectful, and unnecessary. These narratives not only hinted at participants' political views, they also helped map where subjects locate themselves in the landscape of the border. Some interviewees, for example, expressed an "understanding" of agent action at the border, even when it might be understood as excessive or abusive. This "understanding" was deployed as part of a rhetorical strategy that allowed them to distance themselves from the criminals and terrorists that figure prominently in U.S. border discourse. Other participants were critical of those discourses, suggesting they made victims of all Mexicans. Rather than creating an "us" versus "them" that fell along the lines of "criminals/terrorists" versus "respectable Mexicans," those critical of border policing figured an "officer" versus "everyone else." Some participants moved back and forth from these two binaries, suggesting a more complicated understanding of subjectivity at the border and

speaking to the ways that the intimacy of the border reorganizes subjectivities and bodies.

One of the many examples of the ways that bodies are reoriented at the border involves the use of the fast lane. Indeed, most of my participants participate in the Secure Electronic Network for Travelers Rapid Inspection (SENTRI) program. These participants have been issued SENTRI cards “that allow expedited clearance for pre-approved, low-risk travelers upon arrival in the United States. Participants may enter the United States by using dedicated primary lanes into the United States at Southern land border ports. Travelers must be pre-approved for the SENTRI program. All applicants undergo a rigorous background check and in-person interview before enrollment.” The SENTRI card, one that designates a “trusted traveler” costs \$125.25 in fees and additional fees are charged for extra vehicles (\$42) or lost cards (\$25). These calculations do not include the time card holders spent applying, the cost of having to sit in offices while officers “drank coffee,” waiting their turn to be interviewed, or gathering the documents necessary to prove they qualified for the privilege. Moreover, the process requires a valid passport, which comes with its own costs (Customs and Border Patrol Website).

While the fast lane allows some subjects to navigate the border more easily, it also speaks to and attempts to resolve one of the border’s deepest tensions, that of the desire to hold an open border for business while closing the border to certain bodies. Therefore, the SENTRI card and my card-carrying participants constantly move back and forth between the privilege of being associated with desirable border activity - enterprise, trade, and education - and the fear that they will be understood as

criminals, deviants, or disrespectable subjects. In this way, their varied performances at the border, of respectability and/or defiant subject, speak to the anxieties associated with the ways in which “the bridge crossing” might come serve “as a place where the self temporarily occupies the space of the other” (Chapin, 2003, p. 8). To that end, Chapin considers those subjects who manipulate the confusion of the border as well as those who feel unsettled by the loss of privilege at the border. Indeed, the border is a place where anyone might be read as anyone (else), because of the ways the border makes suspects out of everyone, the line flattens out difference. The intuitive, if not experiential understanding of this flattening out, this being made to toe the line is a critical component that was present in the narratives of those who regularly cross and serves as an important contribution in our understanding of subject formation.

The Shifty Border

Scholars have long debated the names and meanings of space at the border. For example, scholars have demonstrated an investment in distinguishing the border from borderlands, border zones from boundaries (Anzaldúa, 2007; Nevins, 2002). In some ways these distinctions matter for the sake of precision. At the same time, my respondents suggest that such precision may not be possible at the border. Or more to the point, borders elide such precision. On the whole, participants struggled most with the question that asked them to define the border. Some even suggested that despite having lived along the border for multiple decades or all their lives, that they were unable to fully or correctly define it. Furthermore, questions about how they understood the border as children compared to how they understand it today also

provides glimpses in to the way the meaning of the border changes over time.

Considering the narratives of border crossers illuminates various tensions in the ways we understand the border, the borderlands, and the national boundary. These narratives illuminate the complexity of the border and the sometimes struggle that it is to define an institution constantly in flux, always being (re)worked in response to time and bodies. These narratives also tell us about the way that the border can operate at once as a place of contact and interaction as well as a place of division and difference. Finally, these narratives gesture towards the temporal and economic dimensions of the border.

Asking participants to define the border sparked a lot of confusion. Several respondents asked me to clarify what I meant or what specific aspect of the border I wanted them to define. Patricia, for example, was born in El Paso but has moved back and forth between El Paso and Juárez as both a child and adult and now lives in El Paso and works at the local university. Patricia calls herself a “border brat,” an “original El Paso and Juárezian.” In a play on the term “military brat,” Patricia’s loving use of “border brat” here is interesting. Despite having spent most of her life at the border, the use of the term suggests a kind of movement, instability. Instead of being rooted in one place, the term indicates always having to engage new spaces, new people, and different languages from an early age. Still, Patricia does root herself in the area. She traces her family back six generations in Juárez and she has family living on both sides of the border as they have moved back and forth, displaced throughout generations by historical events like the Mexican revolution. Despite this long familial and personal history in the area, Patricia asked for further clarification

when I asked her to define the border, “In which area? Economic area? Social area? Educational area? Which area are you talking about?”

Patricia referred me to speak to Daniel, a 22-year-old student at the local university. Daniel lives in Juárez and commutes to El Paso for school, work, and to spend time with his friends. In response to the same question, Daniel echoed Patricia’s sentiment that the border has many different meanings. He says, “in terms of? What do you mean like? Cause I would define it in different ways, like I don’t know. Like can you be a little bit, just like more specific? Cause I can direct my answer to many directions.” Similarly, Laura, a 31-year-old young professional who commutes daily from Juárez to work in El Paso, asked about the terms in which I wanted her to define the border.

Despite the confusion caused by the question, I chose not to change or refine it’s language over time. Indeed, I found the confusion productive. Clearly the confusion spoke to the border’s complexity, not just at a scholarly level, but also in the lived experiences of border crossers. Indeed, the border does act, as Patricia’s questions suggest, as an economic, social, and educational force in people’s lives. Just as these moments of confusion reference the complexity of the border, they also suggest a failure of language to capture the border’s constantly shifting meaning. For border crossers, the border may mean different things over time and even within the same trip across the border. One trip across a border may be economic - crossing for work, for access to schooling, or to bring across goods or capital. Another trip may be social, allowing participants to visit family, friends, or to take part in one city’s nightlife instead of another’s.

The shifting meaning of the border was rooted not just in the terms through which we define it or the things that draw us over and across it, but also in the slipperiness of terms through which we described the border in our conversations. Indeed, my participants and I often used the terms “border” and “bridge,” and in Spanish, “la frontera” and “el puente” interchangeably. When I asked some participants to define the border, they would tell me about the larger community, what some scholars might consider the “borderlands” (Anzaldúa, 2007). In these cases, the next question I asked was for them to tell me about the “bridge.” For example, in our phone conversation I asked 75 year-old José, who has lived along the border for 47 years, to define the border. In response he told me about the place he lives, explaining that it is “el mejor lugar para vivir [porque aquí tienes] lo mejor de México y los Estados Unidos” (the best place to live [because here you have] the best of Mexico and the United States). When I asked José to explain “el puente” he described the lack of cooperation between the two countries that results in the congestion and traffic at the bridge. Later in our conversation, José would say that in his childhood “no hubo frontera.” Here, José explains the way that the boundary did not exist, detailing a trolley that would take him across the border for Price’s ice cream. More specifically, José shared how his family would give him money for the trolley but he would walk to El Paso, pocket the trolley money, and use it to buy himself ice cream instead. In addition to being just the most charming story, José also fluctuates here in his use of the term “frontera.” In the first story, la frontera is the community he lives in; the ice cream story la frontera is the nonexistent line whose uneventful crossing provides him access to sweet treats.

Just as José's terminology moves between *la frontera* and *el puente*, so too his narrative tell of a border that is a point of contact and a sharp divide. In describing the open border, José joins several other participants in loosely echoing Joseph Nevins' definition of a border "as an area of interaction and gradual division between two separate border entities" (2002, p. 8). For Nevins this space of entanglement and "gradual division" is distinct from a "boundary as a strict line of separation between two (at least theoretically) distinct territories" and a "frontier" or "a forward zone of contact with the uncontrolled or sparsely-settled" (2002, p. 8).

Speaking to a sense of "gradual division," José describes *la frontera* as a space where the best of both worlds is combined to shape an ideal place to live. In telling me about his understanding of the border, José offers us a Mexican version of the U.S.'s melting pot. Rather than telling me that the border is a space where different cultures mix to create something new (the melting pot), he instead describes a kind of *molcajete* in which U.S. and Mexican ingredients are carefully procured by the resourceful border subject who carves out an existence from the raw materials (best) procured on *both* sides of the border. He illustrates his point through food. He tells me, for example, that in the U.S. you get great milk, eggs, and cheese, which may be less accessible or more expensive in Juárez. At the same time, he says, in Juárez you can get limones (lemons), carne (meat), tortillas, piña (pineapple), papaya, and avocados. Though he is careful to remind me that one must buy avocados without seeds, as you cannot cross the seeds. This, list, he tells me yields cheaper and tastier guacamole. He also goes to great length to explain that clothes are cheaper in the U.S., as is gas. I admit to loving José's description. I love that this story plays on my

taste buds to make me miss home, I appreciate that theoretically it offers us a new way to understand cultural contact zones. Indeed, for José, each side of the border maintains its own cultural identity but one that is inflected by the other. Returning to our symbolic guacamole, José offers us food that does not dissolve into each other but rather is mashed together by an active agent.

Phylicia and Verónica further explain this point of contact. Phylcia is a 44-year-old woman who grew up in Juárez but spent a year of high school in Indiana to perfect her English. Phylcia narrates her life around a freeing change in career; from a business major to a student at the Health Sciences College. While the switch was healthy for her it is one she has had to justify to family. When I asked Phylcia to define the border, she explained:

Phylcia: How would I define the border? The border is known as twin cities region. Exchange of culture, beliefs, and traditions, of course, commerce. Support for one another. Protective of their own. And the way I see it as people most of the time is humble. And it's a land of great opportunity. You have areas like the Tiguas in Ysleta del Sur. And then you have these great areas in Hueco Tanks so there's places for hiking, for looking at nature, very peaceful. And it's just, I see it as an opportunity to awaken into what a new culture is becoming in many areas of the U.S. as well.

Cristina: You mean the Latinos that are growing...the growing Latino population across the U.S.?

Phylcia: Well I see you know how our culture is mixed here right and then people from maybe up North come here and they like it. And they take some of the traditions and culture back to their place and how some people that grow up here go and study somewhere else like you. So you go and take that culture over there as well, so it's not just necessarily just with Latinos but it's just that the melting pot that we've created.

What Phylcia suggests here is that the border creates a unique culture, similar to that

described by José. It is a culture that mashes together a range of cultures that comes to influence “up north,” presumably the U.S. interior. Phylcia’s description of the border above mirrors that of Verónica’s below:

Verónica: And I think that when all the, when everything was open, all the frontiers, with [Mexican President Carlos] Salinas de Gortari. It was even better because everything was, we could cross more things, businesses were more used to buy, import supplies, so we were more open. Not only well we had the trade, the international trade, entre Canada, Estados Unidos, y Mexico, remember? Well actually it was started open our doors to the world. So and I think a lot of our traditions started to change and we started adopting other festivities. For instance right now if you go to the south, they have, its not a Black Friday but its called Buen Viernes...but you know we didn’t used to have that.

While Phylcia tells the story of a border culture that moves north, Verónica narrates the border as a place, that when open, allows for the flow of culture south. To be clear, in neither woman’s story is there a clear cut U.S.-Mexico binary. Indeed, Phylcia takes into account local indigenous tribes in her reference to border culture, explaining that their traditions become woven into the traditions that travel north. Meanwhile Verónica considers not just free trade between Mexico and the U.S. but also Canada. Her reference here interestingly holds up Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994) for his opening of the borders through his instrumental work in developing NAFTA, a matter to which I will return in chapter four. Verónica does not clarify whether the importation of a certain kind of consumer culture is a good or a bad thing, but she does note the way contact through the border has changed the culture in Mexico.

Laura, like José is more explicitly positive in her assessment of the border. She tells me she loves it, that she is “enamored by like the two cultures and the fact

that I can speak English and Spanish in either city and I'll get understood." Patricia also sings the area's praises,

I would say El Paso is a very international city. It's a small city but it's a large city also in the fact that there are so many people here from both countries. They bring experiences together from both countries. They have the cultures interlaced, the Mexican culture and the American culture. It's very rich area because of the languages, because of the food and the people here in this area are very open to outsiders, very welcoming. It's a very welcoming city. So, as you can tell, I enjoy living here.

In both cases this point of contact is made richer because of the two countries' proximity.

Still, some of these participants argue that the contact is uneven. They suggest that while some in the border community cross frequently, others refuse to cross. For Patricia this isolation, largely among El Paso residents is rooted in self-hate or bias. After describing El Paso as "a very welcoming city," I asked Patricia about El Paso's relationship to Juárez. Her response speaks to the border community's complexity:

Patricia: It has different facets. There's the old family from Juarez have family in El Paso, so to them that is one El Paso-Juarez area. They are like me, border brats. Then you have some families that have lived in El Paso and have never actually gone to Juarez. And it's not that they don't have the means, it's just that they've never had reason to, which was really surprising to me when I found out. But there are people like that. There's bias in El Paso. Some Anglos are biased against the Mexicans, the Hispanics. They don't see the fruitful, what can I say, the positive of being here. They see only their side of it. And I think those are people who have not travelled, who are not very open to different cultures. It has nothing specifically to do with Juarez, it's just they're ignorant. And then there's the people that have come from Juarez very low-income people, that have come because they were farm workers or things like that. And usually unfortunately, those are divided into two groups. The group that really supports the

Hispanic side of them and the group that hates the Hispanic side of them and wants to be Anglo and is against all other Hispanics that have to do with Mexico. So it's a funny situation.

When I asked Patricia about the Hispanics in El Paso who have bias or hate other Hispanics she talked about the misconceptions that migrating Mexicans were poor or undereducated but she also talked about the complex process of assimilation, saying,

The Mexican people that came over here, a lot of them as I said, people who were of very low means and so what happened was that when they came over here, there were many biases against them. And the sooner they would learn to speak English and not speak Spanish and try and integrate into the society as Anglos, which obviously they couldn't but that's what their goals were, the better. So they didn't want their children to speak Spanish. They wanted their children to speak only English. They didn't want to be related or identified as outsiders. They wanted to belong. And so all that prejudice made those people that way.

Here Patricia captures the trap of assimilation, suggesting that even at the border, national and ethnic divides make it impossible for working class Mexicans to integrate. Still, the desire to belong was so strong that they distanced themselves and their families from other Hispanics who might be looked down upon. This distancing was linguistic but also geographic as, in her earlier statement she suggests that it is this desire that prevents border subjects from crossing into Juárez.

For Laura, border subjects in the U.S. are also less likely to cross into Mexico, not because of self-hate but rather because of the reputation that Juárez developed during "la violencia." La violencia refers to the drug cartel wars in Juárez that made the city infamous. La violencia started in the mid-2000s and while it tapered off dramatically after the 2012 Mexican presidential elections, it is not quite over. The violence was a recurring theme in these interviews. Here Laura explains how the

violence shapes border crossing:

Laura: Okay. The border now is, I think it's really divided now. I think before it used to be a little bit more of a nice partnership and now it's become this huge divide. Family members refuse to cross to Juárez because of you know, the violence a few years back. People squint when you say you live in Juárez versus oh wow, you live in Juarez. So it's become quite taboo and so they're not fascinated by it anymore. They're horrified for it and they almost probably feel sorry for you.

In Laura's understanding of the border, people just do not cross any more because of a fear of what lies on the other side. For her this fear is rooted not just in the death toll and the real lives lost in Juárez but also the perception crafted by the news media. She suggests the media "fed on this violence and made it such a story, everyday. That people here, in El Paso watching just became completely—and frightened is like a really, not a strong enough word...I mean they just kind of, I think they changed people's perception. I think they went that far." Laura also points out the U.S. hypocrisy in distancing itself from "la violencia," as she suggests that drug trafficking is a part of border life, not just at the El Paso, Juárez border but "every border across the country." Laura is insulted by the hypocrisy of Mexicans in the border who "pretend to not even understand to speak Spanish" as a result of wanting to distance themselves from Juárez.

Regardless of the cause, both Patricia and Laura's definition of the border shows cracks in the notion of the border as a zone of contact. Interestingly, neither narrates white subjects as responsible for the fault lines. Instead, both participants describe the border as a place where the Mexican diaspora starts to fracture, where the pressures of assimilation and Western perceptions about Mexico make it so that

some subjects begin to distance themselves from their origins in Mexico. While both participants find the distance sad or disgusting, both also recognize the structural and discursive pressures placed on migrating bodies.

Division between the two nations was not just ideological or geographic. Indeed, crossing is about waiting, waiting for kiosks to open, for agents to inspect one's car, for the approval of visas, and for thorough interrogations. Another theme that emerged as I asked border crossers to define the border was the temporal distance constructed between the two nation-states. When I asked Verónica to describe "el puente" her response was "Lines (we laugh). Lines. A lot of imports and exports. [Frustrated] people. And [a] pollution problem. If you are a green person, right?" Daniel also described the time most border crossers spend on the bridge as a "problem," one that requires border crossers to spend "from one to three hours" in their car just to buy cheaper goods in El Paso. For Daniel, money saved on cheaper goods is mitigated by time spent on the bridge.

Similarly, Phylcia explains that one semester in about 1995, she would spend several hours in the lines on the bridge trying to get to and back from school. Patricia marks 9/11 as the time when the lines became outrageous. She says, "after 9/11 I would get up at 4 o'clock in the morning and go to the bridge because the lines were so extremely long. There was no fast lane that we had to be there for hours and hours to get across. And I understand that you need to make sure that there's no problems, but it was just ridiculously slow. And what's more upsetting is you get to the bridge and there's three open lanes and four closed lanes and there's two hours of lines of people there. So why do they have the lanes closed if they have the way of speeding

that up. But they don't."

For my participants, then, being made to wait just to wait is a sign of disrespect. Many acknowledge that there may be justifiable reasons for being made to wait. For Patricia it could be thoroughness, for Manuel it might be a strategy used by agents, perhaps to make ill-intentioned crossers nervous. Still, just as Patricia is annoyed that kiosks stand empty, making lines longer, Manuel is frustrated watching agents mill around, drink coffee, and work on their computers every time he goes to apply for a visa. In response he suggests CBP needs to recognize the border crossers' time is valuable. Daniel echoes, this sentiment when he suggests that "time is gold." In these cases, crossers indicate feeling devalued by agents who aren't respectful of their time.

Sama, a 44-year-old father of two, married to Verónica, left Juárez during "la violencia" and settled his family in El Paso. When I asked him to define the border he described the temporal distance caused by obstacles at the border in the form of CBP officers obsessively checking bags. These obstacles and the temporal distance they cause could be corrected by politics and the coming together of both nation states. He explains:

Sama: Well, what I wish that the governments, both governments, Mexican and U.S. governments, would do is to make it faster and easier to go back and forth, because 20 years ago, 30 years ago, I remember coming every weekend to McDonald's with my parents to visit my uncle in El Paso and it was very fast, very easy to come over. And we...the people from Juarez liked that. Coming to El Paso, just for a burger or an ice cream or whatever, just to get out of the routine. And before you could see a lot of U.S. people crossing over for whatever reason, tourism, or sometimes dental, or medicines whatever you...a lot of people have their relatives over there still. So it was a lot

easier to go to Juarez and right now, when you cross over downtown, you can see the border patrol, checking everybody that is walking over to Juarez, checking all the bags. I don't think it is the drugs and the bullets and all that, the guns...I don't think they cross through those, through that path, you know. The people...you can see the people are just working people. They come and they buy because it's cheaper, because they work here and they live in Juarez, many people do that. Many people work in Juarez and live in El Paso and vice versa. Well just make it easier. I know...and the real drugs and the real guns, the big guns are not crossing...I don't think they're crossing that way. And they're somewhere else. And it's just for the normal people, it's I think that they make it hard to move around. The real crooks are somewhere else.

Cristina: [Laughter]. Right. It's not me.

Sama: [Laughter]. I think so. Like the...you can see the ladies coming...I mean downtown El Paso buying things, then they cross over, walking. I don't think if they had money, I don't think they would be walking.

Cristina: Right. Right. With their groceries.

Sama: With their groceries. I mean the Border Patrol is just, "Oh let me see what you have?" That doesn't sound like it's, like...I don't think it's a well spent dollar, those kind of...oh well.

For Sama then, the distance between the U.S. and Mexico is absolutely temporal but so too is political as everyone, including the ladies who walk across the bridge to shop is figured as a "crook" who must be checked to ensure they pose no threat. In this way, time ought to be taken from criminals, but those "innocent" border crossers ought not be punished in the same way.

Only one participant suggested the time waiting on the bridge was not so bad, perhaps indicative of her confidence in being allowed entry. In describing her years of commuting across the border to attend high school, Phylcia described waits of up to about an hour. Still, she told me, "if everything went smoothly, which was most of the time, you could just read something" and while wait times might be getting worse,

improved technology now make waits “better because you can watch a video or something.” In the interview, Phylcia moved back and forth in how she described her time on the bridge. She worked to make it an “opportunity,” using the time to “watch YouTube, some documentary, or something.” She seemed to resist wanting to call it stressful for her but also acknowledged that if the line is more than an hour, she worked to avoid it “because it takes a lot from the body also. It can be very draining, energy-wise.”

Phylcia’s statement here is worth noting. In some ways it is clear that there is a certain privilege to being able to avoid lines at the bridge, whether it is through the use of SENTRI card or through the avoidance of a border crossing. Some border subjects are, for work or class reasons, unable to simply avoid the border or pay for the fast lane. And yet, because of the way that the border reorders bodies, even the privileged experience the border as “draining, energy-wise.” Indeed for most at the border, the bridge is unavoidable and the often conflicting and tense operation of power is inescapable. As such, participants suggest that their responses to CBP must be carefully crafted.

The Slippery Border Subject

Evidencing uneven privilege at the border, border anthropologist Jessica Chapin asked two Juárez-El Paso border residents about their experiences crossing the bridge. In response to the question, Juana, a worker in the Juárez maquilas and a neighbor of Chapin’s put on Chapin’s sunglasses and a big sun hat and pranced around the room joking “I’m gonna bleach my skin and put on sneakers and Bermuda

shorts and cross the border just like a tourist” (2003, p. 8). Meanwhile, on the opposite side of the border, Elaine the wife of a maquiladora manager and a border transplant from Michigan has had to build a support network amongst other midwestern migrants because she finds the border community divided along racial/ethnic lines. This division makes Elaine feel like she is “treated like a minority in her own country” (2003, p. 8). Elaine tells Chapin that while she once crossed the border as a tourist, over time she grew “afraid to cross the border...because her husband has warned her that they put drugs in your car while it is parked over there” (2003, p. 8). Chapin reads these two stories against each other to argue that border crossing is a process in which anyone can be made into anyone (else).

Chapin argues that crossing the bridge for Juana becomes a matter of playing with meanings assigned to bodies, while Elaine fears the loss of the privileged meanings assigned to hers. She goes on, “these two stories, however, must be understood not as paradigms of experience or subjectivity emerging from separate cultural or national identities but in relation to each other, as two aspects of a struggle for meaning at the border, produced, at least to some extent by the narrator’s differential position in hierarchies of power and identity” (2003, p. 9). Chapin’s description of “a struggle for meaning” in which some bodies, aware of the struggle, play with meaning while others operating under an essential notion of identity are undone by its instability, appeared in the interviews I did with border crossers. Unlike Chapin’s interviewees, my participants often expressed both the anxieties of Elaine and the awareness of Juana. Many expressed anxiety about being misread at the border, being confused or lumped in with “criminals,” “terrorists,” or the

impoverished migrants who might “drain on the U.S. economy.” It was this anxiety of being undone that led many to certain kinds of performances as they crossed. Like Juana, then, they understood the need to manipulate or play with the meaning of bodies at the border.

In the interview transcripts, I found evidence of different kinds of strategic performances described by border crossers as they manipulated the way their bodies were read at the border. The most prominent was to complicate an understanding of border subjectivity. In these stories interviewees would (re)work allegiances between bodies found at the border. In some cases, participants would align themselves with CBP officers, supporting their mission to protect the border against those crossers who might cause harm. Conversely, some participants would align themselves with border crossers who were unfairly treated by agents. In other cases, they would carve a space between “bad crossers” and agents creating other categories in which they would fit. As a whole, these narratives unsettle the notion of binaries at the border, constructing a kind of us versus them versus agents that allowed participants to strategically (re)locate themselves.

Us versus Them versus The Agents

Just as the meaning of the border shifts across time and space and in response to different bodies at different moments, so too does the border shift how border crossers see and present themselves. These shifts in subjectivity become clear in the way participants narrate their crossings. Anthropologist Pablo Vila has argued that “the categories we use to describe the reality that surrounds us, as well as the interpellations we accept as valid to address ourselves and ‘others,’ are in some way

overdetermined by the different stories we tell about ourselves and ‘others’” (2003, p. 108). Vila claims that at the border, where identity categories are blurry and constantly in flux we can turn to the narrative of border subjects to understand the lines along which they constitute identity and difference. For Vila, some border subjects create allegiance through ethnicity while others use notions of nationality to locate themselves and the “other.” Vila’s work is useful in understanding a space where different systems of meaning making are simultaneously deployed to construct and fracture community.

I add here to Vila’s thinking in suggesting that these narratives do not just suggest a static notion of how participants see themselves versus the “other,” but rather that my interviewees leveraged different systems of meaning making at the moment of crossing and after in order to (re)align themselves. This shifting subjectivity matters not because it tells us the “truth” of how participants see themselves but because it unsettles the “us” versus “them” binaries that become entangled in discourses of borders and migration. Rather than seeing the world in terms of U.S./Mexico, “good migrants”/“bad migrants,” respectable border crossers/deviant threats to the nation, or crosser/agent these crossers shift their allegiances strategically in order to ensure successful entry and future opportunities to cross.

For some border crossers, crossing is made simple by their ability to claim U.S. citizenship, although as my own case at the Canadian border highlights, the anxiety about anchor babies complicates even “simple” interactions at the border.. Both Daniel and Laura talked about how their citizenship impacts their border

crossing. Daniel, for example, is the only U.S. citizen in his immediate family. When I asked if this was weird, he said it wasn't, that instead it was a "complete advantage." Later he considered the way his citizenship ensures his entry into the U.S.. For Daniel, his citizenship opens the border to him as all he has to do is pronounce himself as a citizen. In Daniel's estimation, the CBP officers take stronger measures against "international people or...people from other nationalities than U.S. citizens." In an example, Daniel tells me about a time that he got pulled over for a random inspection. After returning from a study abroad trip in Spain, he forgot to put a new insurance card in his car and so he failed the inspection. He received a strike against his SENTRI card and was required to come back to show proof of insurance. Providing proof required Daniel to cross back and forth multiple times in a single day. Each time an officer stopped to ask why he was crossing he told them he just had to provide his insurance card. As a U.S. citizen, he moved through the lines quickly. But the experience also required him to stand in line with other border crossers. He recalls:

"So I just stand in line and after the...you were able to see how people in front of you, I mean especially Mexican citizens, they were treated really, really different. Like, what do you have...there was this guy, he had like his headphones, but he didn't have any cell phone or MP3, you know. And he had a backpack. His mom passed first and then he was going to go second. So the custom said what do you have headphones on, you don't have a cell phone or MP3. He took...it took him like at least five minutes asking that question. I'm not being...I mean I'm being serious. And the guy was so...I mean you were able to see the guy was nervous. People get nervous whenever they're gonna cross the bridge."

Here Daniel is sympathetic to the Mexican crosser, recognizing the unfairness of

being held up under false pretenses meant to justify excessive questioning of Mexicans. But nonetheless engages in profound disidentification in the very next moment, shifting his support to the officer doing the unfair questioning:

I mean I remember back then or even now sometimes, it's not that you're crossing the bridge or you're using this line because you want to go to a bar or because you want to go to a friends party. But sometimes you just don't say it because the customs' try to treat you like, oh so you're coming here to party. You're coming here to consume alcohol, oh okay. No, no, you can't cross. You know. I mean you can cross but people tend to lie a lot of their reason for crossing just so they can cross easily. For me at that time, in this specific situation, it was like this is a stupid question. Why ask this guy a billion times, why does he have, I mean why is the reason being he has headphones and not a cell phone. But after that I was like, okay, wait maybe he has his backpack. He's maybe visiting...I think he was visiting a relative in Dallas or something like that. Or I don't know, he was doing something or in El Paso. I don't remember. But who knows if he was planning to stay longer. People tend to stay longer. I mean they have their visas. They cross. Their visas get expired and they don't come back to Mexico. They prefer to have a part-time job or at a McDonald's or a job wherever in here, as long as they are in the United States.

In telling this story, Daniel carefully crafts a narrative that reinforces his U.S. citizenship. While he does suggest some sympathy toward the Mexican crosser, he uses his own position as a border crosser who may find cause to lie to agents to pivot to support CBP officers. Indeed he tells us that while he may be tempted to lie, it is only to suggest that agents have to sort through lines of potentially lying crossers. These crossers, he thinks, may take advantage of the U.S. and what he considers to improved standard of living and opportunity. His narrative then moves fluidly between a critique of “aggressive” customs officers to a justification of the behavior

because it's their "job, [they] have to protect the country. I mean it's not only that there is people good for good opportunities. They are gonna do good things for the United States. But there are also a lot of people that are just bringing in drugs, trafficking stuff, even terrorists. You never know when these people are gonna cross you know. So it's good that they're like this because people get spotted really easily with this type of behavior against them." Ultimately, though, Daniel is "glad that I'm a U.S. citizen. I was raised in Mexico but I was really glad that I'm a U.S. citizen because otherwise I think that I might be in those shoes rather than in these shoes, you know." This final thought matters because while he clearly asserts his privilege as a U.S. citizen, he also recognized the fine line that distinguishes him from the Mexican border crosser he watched get unfairly interrogated.

Laura's narrative also frames her as a U.S. citizenship but, for the most part, she does it in order to spotlight the treatment of Mexicans at the border. In describing her interactions with agents, Laura states, "We've even got American license plates on our cars. American vehicles. And it'd be different if when they would stop and ask us questions, they'd be respectful or they'd be good people. But they're awful. They lack so much empathy. They lack so much tact. I mean I don't understand how these people can have these jobs. When they deal with so many people who unfortunately...we are...even me who I am an American citizen." She tells me that even as a U.S. citizen she feels fear crossing the border, when I ask her to explain why she tells me that her fear is not because she is doing anything wrong, but she says she tends to worry because "you just never know what you're gonna get [in terms of the person who's gonna be checking]. You might get somebody bad,

especially if I'm crossing with my dad who's not an American citizen. I fear that the guy's gonna give him a hard time."

Cristina: So you say that they, like you're worried about getting a bad one. What would a bad one do?

Laura: He would be rude. He would be...you know cause it depends, because if I cross the regular bridge it's different then if I cross the express lane. So when I used to do the regular bridge, even if you're a U.S. citizen, they'll give you a hard time. They'll be rude. They'll ask you, which in my opinion are insignificant questions. One of them actually taunted me with passport. I gave them my passport, he was extremely slow that day. I think he was taking at least 10 minutes per car, which is a lot. And I remember he grabbed my passport and I reached to grab it and he took it back and said, "what you want this?" And I'm an American citizen. And I said, "Don't do that to me, you have to give my passport back." And once I like glared at the where you go and park for the, what do they call them? Like the searches...

Cristina: The secondary inspection?

Laura: Right, the secondary inspection, like I turned over, like really kind of thinking, I was going to just go there, park and make a fuss out about it. He just kind of threw it at me. And like I said, I'm an American citizen and so he knows I can find out how to properly defend myself or file a complaint. So and I can't say I'm assuming because I know it happens. They're a hundred times worse with people that they know won't do anything or are too afraid to speak up.

Here Laura leverages her citizenship to challenge officers that she describes as being "on these huge power trips and I like saying that they're thinking, they have this mindset about saving the world, one Mexican at a time. Because I really do think these guys, I don't know if they're trained...I'm sure they're trained to think like this. That we are the enemy. And for some reason, we are here to bring some sort of wrath into you know, the country. We're just trying to get to work. We're just trying to get to school. That's all we're trying to do and they make it so hard everyday." Here

Laura not only uses her privilege as a citizen to stand up for the “other,” she herself identifies as a Mexican, someone living in Mexico, whose family lives there, and who has to justify her daily crossing.

Still, Laura’s narrative is not without contradiction. While Laura did grow very angry about the way border crossers are treated at the border, there was a moment at the beginning of the discussion in which she described border crossing as ordinary, “inconvenient.” This was not unusual. Most participants described the border as an unremarkable and it was only after asking more specific questions about their experiences that they talked about moments they considered problematic. What is worth noting is that Laura goes on to say that “inconvenient” border crossings are a “small price to pay for the American experience...being able to have a decent education here in El Paso, work, earn dollars versus pesos. Know two languages. I guess experiencing...I hate to say more working...a better working government but it’s a safer feeling, I think.” Laura’s comment raises a particular tension because even in the same interview she suggests that the border puts crosser in direct contact with abusive agents and that this is a small price to pay for access to the U.S., suggesting that it might be hard to distinguish inconveniences from everyday violences.

Indeed, amongst the larger group of interviewees, there was little consensus with regard to whether the border was a violent place for crossers, whether officers mistreated them or not. In fact, most of my participants suggested that the only thing you can rely on at the border is uncertainty. Patricia described the ways that this uncertainty shaped the affective contours of her crossings:

Cristina: You talked a little bit earlier about the emotions you associate with crossing the border, but I want to talk

specifically about that. What do you feel as you cross the border both ways?

Patricia: Well when I cross to Juarez, I have no problem because I know exactly what to expect. I get a red light, they stop, they search me, and I go, you know. But when I cross to El Paso, there's a strain, there's a stress. Stress I think is the word that you don't know what the customs or what the person at the border is going to be like. Is he gonna be nice? Is he gonna be friendly? Is he gonna have an attitude problem or is he gonna be or an ethical problem or biased problem or what kind of problem. So the stress until you're cross the border, you know it's not nice. It's not nice. It's sad.

Cristina: And so it's just the uncertainty. The border crossing, it's just the uncertainty?

Patricia: Well the uncertainty of the person. That's why...it boils down to people. It boils down to people. What have these people been trained for? Who trained them and if when they trained them was it a person that was a positive or a negative person towards the Hispanic or Mexican? That training is what they bring with them, along with their own problems. [Chuckle].

Cristina: Right.

Interviewee: And so it's the people. It's not the laws. It's the people that make the difference.

Manuel echoed this anxiety, when he told me that the kind of agent one might encounter at the border is a topic of conversation amongst Mexicans crossing the bridge. He says that a car of Mexicans traveling from Chihuahua to El Paso might spend the whole four and a half hour car ride talking over the upcoming experience. Specifically these conversations include a discussion of the kind of officer they will encounter. He says Mexicans might worry, “nos va a tocar un hard officer o un soft, osea uno bueno? That's a theme of conversation. (*will we get a hard officer or a soft, by that I mean good, one?*)” For Manuel, every interaction at the border is defined by the officer's “discretion.” The “easy” officers will identify the crosser as a good person and will let them pass, asking them to fulfill minimum requirements. A “hard”

officer, on the other hand, will ask additional questions or will tell you the documents you provide are not sufficient. Whereas the good officers are willing to “trust you and you’re good to go,” the “bad guys” will ask “mas preguntas, mas preguntas. They tend to scratch and scratch and scratch.”

Like Manuel, anthropologist, Josiah Heyman has argued that an agent’s discretion matters at the border as his discretion determines who is held up and who moves across the border freely. For Heyman, this discretion calls on officers to ask about a border crosser’s trustworthiness versus the risk posed by the crosser. Heyman’s study suggests that trust and risk is determined through a complex web that entangles a crosser’s nationality, class, legal status, and race (2009).

Certainly these factors matter but, according to my subjects, so too does the officer’s own identity. Laura claims that officers wear “Mexican blinders” that impair the officer’s visual field. “They see...for some reason, I feel like they see all of us as threats. And for some...and it’s the Hispanic ones that are the worst ones. They’re the rudest...I don’t even know where they’re from, but if they have like an accent maybe like from Puerto Rico or somewhere else, they’re even worse. African Americans are usually really nice.” Phylisia also argues that the agent’s gender identity is also a factor. “[I]t’s sad to say it but most of the time, you know, harassment wise, that I’ve heard about maybe it’s just because they blow it out of proportion. [But] it’s from women custom agents...and I can understand that they have to prove that they can do their job. But as in any other job, I think sometimes trying to be aggressive is not the same as being assertive. And they’re...I know they’re suffering because they also...they’re the minority there.”

Ultimately, then, participants indicate that discretion, whether it is shaped by an officer's identity, the crosser's presentation of trustworthiness or riskiness, or even just the officer's mood, determines the ability to cross. One of the most concrete examples of this took the form of a story Verónica told about her new puppy.

Verónica and her husband bought her two children a new puppy at the beginning of 2016. They bought the puppy in Juárez because dogs there cost less but when they purchased the puppy they approached border officials to clarify the rules about crossing him. Could they, they wanted to know, cross the puppy in the fast lane. They were told they could cross the dog in the fast lane but that they would need to bring the dog's vaccination records. The family crossed the dog, along with his vaccination records, three times in the fast lane with no incident. On their fourth trip across the border, the family was detained. This time the officers told the Verónica's husband that the dog could not pass without a rabies vaccine. Her husband completed a packet of paperwork in which he was asked about the dog's residence. He was warned that the dog would have to be left at home and could not leave the house without his rabies vaccine. Because the dog was too young for the vaccine the dog could not be taken to a local park, much less back across the border. A week or two later a police officer was dispatched to Verónica's residence to ensure that the dog was still there.

What strikes me about Verónica's story here is that nothing changed between when she went to the border officials to ask about correct procedures for crossing the dog and the family's fourth trip with him. The story demonstrates the degree to which discretion is at play so that two different officer facing the same crossers might make radically different calls. While one might not think twice about a man crossing his

two small children and the family pet, a second would respond strongly enough to send a police officer to check on the dog's whereabouts. This second officer's response speaks volumes not just about the role of discretion at the border but also the power of the border to reach into one's life beyond the bridge. Verónica's story seems like one of the more intrusive manifestations of the border's reach as it brought law enforcement to her door. And yet, her story serves as just the most literal ways that the border has interfered in the lives of border crossers. My own history with the border suggests that every difficult encounter at the border follows that crosser home. Indeed, here I sit ten years and hundreds of miles away from my difficult interaction at the Canadian border, and I can still recall its unsettling effects. Border crossers carry these stories, along with the legal and political ramifications of these encounters with them into conversations with family and friends and curious researchers. So too do these encounters shape crossers' everyday lives as torn visas result in more time spent applying for a new one, inspected cars require cleaning and reorganization, legal fees require paying, and dogs require speedy vaccines.

Conclusion

The border, as described by my participants, is a place of stark contradictions and deep tensions. As a result, their responses require them to operate flexibly, shifting allegiances and identifications, supporting agents in one moment and crossers in the next. Therefore, in one moment they may identify with respectable crossers and in the next with all stigmatized crossers. In some cases, crossers may describe the world of the border as an unpredictable and thus dangerous place. But they are just as

likely to describe the border as a place “full of life.” Indeed, Phylicia, in her unending optimism told me about the vitality she encounters on the bridge and how, for her the bridge serves as a microcosm of the complexity of the larger world:

Phylicia: Well you see people selling candies, selling sodas, Mexican candies, fruit with chili, you know, all over it. You have the people selling the magazines. People wanting to clean the windows and you’re like oh no, no, no. And they clean it anyway and they’re proud of their work and they’re trying...everybody’s trying to make a living. And even the oldest lady or man there have light in them and remind us of what life is really all about. I think that’s sometimes why it makes it stressful because sometimes we are afraid of facing the real situation that a lot of people are having to struggle and maybe that’s why we block that and become angry and start to honk and get frustrated and that’s the negative aspect of it. But then on the other side, you see the cars full of families, crossing to come here and have lunch or maybe dinner or shopping. Right? And you see them in the car during summer and they’re like all sweating and stuff but they’re still happy because they’re coming over. And then you see other...depending on the day of time, you see other youngsters maybe coming back in the middle of the night, all happy because they went to party to Juarez. You know and now it’s getting safer to do that again. [Laughter]. So, and then you see sometimes executives in their cars coming back from work and then in the mornings, you see people coming to school, right. So it’s just, it’s full of life. You see all the spectrum of life, you know, and you even...I mean, we even know of course it’s no secret that a lot of people come here and give birth, you know. So sometimes you’ll see the pregnant lady almost about to give birth, you know. So you see the whole spectrum, from birth to what have you and sometimes even the ambulance going from one place to the other exchanging patients, whatever happened. And then you see people protecting the border of course, trying to do their job and then you see other people just trying to make it hard on you. [Laughter]. And it’s just and then you see the buses, right, full of people, you know, coming back from visiting Mexico. And then you see the semi’s you know, the trailers, and just carrying and you see commerce there. So it’s just a little bit of everything.

Cristina: Yeah. Yeah. I love that.

Chapter 4: Conjured Borders and Waiting Migrants: The Case of Blanca Borrego

What happens to a dream deferred?

Does it dry up
like a raisin in the sun?
Or fester like a sore –
And then run?
Does it stink like rotten meat?
Or crust and sugar over –
like a syrupy sweet?

Maybe it just sags
like a heavy load.

Or does it explode?

Harlem
Langston Hughes

Introduction

This dissertation has analyzed historical and interview data to consider the various ways Mexican migrants have been constructed as deviant, disposable, and excludable within the context of the Border Industrial Complex. Paying specific attention to how racialized and gendered sexual norms operate in the construction of migrant deviance, I now turn to media coverage of cases of violence against Mexican migrants within the U.S.-Mexico Border Industrial Complex in order to explore how migrants have become targets of state violence. Here I analyze the discourse that surrounds the case of Blanca Borrego, an undocumented migrant from Mexico arrested in her gynecologist's office. In light of the case, I argue that the policing of the border has moved into the U.S. interior. As Mexican migrants navigate this

widening network of surveillance and policing, they are rendered queer, or sexually non-normative, and thus vulnerable to everyday logics of containment and exclusion. Cases like Borrego's, then, might be read through the lens of a queer of color critique that highlights the critique her body and reproduction pose to the state.

Moreover, the story of Blanca Borrego highlights the way Mexican migrants are asked to wait, for doctors, for arresting officers, for legal proceedings in the hopes that waiting will play on their desire for the nation. To that end, I seek to consider the ways that temporality is one of the many strategies of managing and containing migrant bodies, albeit an often overlooked method of management. Considering the temporality as discipline illuminates the various ways that violence hides in deferment and detention.

The case of Blanca Borrego is a complex one. It takes place in the context of transnational circuits of labor that start in Mexico, winding its unpredictable way through the hallways of legislators in Washington, D.C., to the chambers of Austin policy makers and back again, with many stops in homes, schools, and doctor's offices. It is therefore to moments of everyday surveillance that I now turn in order to fully examine the gendered, racialized, and sexualized ways in which women are affected by immigration policy and state surveillance.

The Case of Blanca Borrego

In 2003 Blanca Borrego, along with her husband and her two children acquired U.S. visas and left Mexico for Houston, Texas.⁸ That same year the family

⁸ In addition to the sources mentioned, in telling this story I draw on the following sources: Barajas, 11.11.15; Barajas, 11.16.15; Cote, 11.14.15; DeFrates, 11.14.15;

overstayed their visas, settling into the Houston area. Borrego's husband got a job with benefits, while Borrego stayed home to raise the daughter and son she brought from Mexico. A few years later, their family grew to include a second daughter, a U.S.-born citizen. Over time, the two oldest children were admitted to colleges and, during Barack Obama's second term, were granted temporary legal status through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). A mere twelve years after their arrival to the U.S., Borrego's oldest daughter (22 years old) had graduated from Sam Houston State University with a degree in kinesiology. All of her promise notwithstanding, shortly after graduating, her work permit, granted in association with her DACA status, expired and she was unable to find employment. Meanwhile, her 19-year-old brother had found work and was attending Lone Star College.

Ultimately Borrego and her family had settled into a life of liminality, one lived on the borders of citizenship, until early 2014 when Blanca Borrego began to feel pain in her abdomen. She began seeing Dr. David Bonilla who diagnosed her pain as the result of a cyst. Sixteen months later, on September 3, 2015, Borrego reported to the Memorial Hermann's Northeast Women's Healthcare Clinic in Atascocita, Texas for a follow-up visit with Dr. Bonilla. While Borrego has not articulated her own motivations in selecting Dr. Bonilla, it is easy to understand why she might have chosen him. A fellow Latino migrant, Dr. Bonilla's Memorial Hermann Clinic profile page claims the Puerto Rican doctor was inspired to become

Ekberg, 11.11.15; Fox News Latino, 11.14.15; Garcia-Ditta, 11.14.15; Hennessy-Fiske, 11.15.15; Lazare, 11.16.15; Marcotte, 11.14.15; McLaughlin, 11.15.15; National Hispanic Leadership Agenda, 11.18.15; National Latina Institute for Reproductive Justice, 11.12.15; Not One More, n.d.; Pérez, 11.22.15; Pieklo, 11.14.15; Schiller, 11.17.15.

an obstetrician and gynecologist by his parents. In a video on his site Dr. Bonilla states:

We provide compassion and care to the patient. I think that's the most important part of the practice, is to provide dedicated, compassionate care. And I think the patients realize that in this practice we take our time to...to consider the problems you know, in a very thorough fashion. We not only take care of the patients as a medical problem but also as a whole, we...we take care of the patient's emotional issues if we have to, especially during pregnancy which can be a very hard process to go through."

In a separate video, Dr. Bonilla says, in fluent Spanish, that at his practice they are "proud to represent the Latino community in Houston and to serve pregnant and non-pregnant woman with very common problems that affect her daily life" (Memorial Hermann Medical Group, translation mine).

While Borrego had seen Dr. Bonilla before, this visit was different. This time she was a new patient at his Memorial Hermann office and was asked to fill out a new set of paperwork and to produce her ID. On these forms Borrego filled in her private insurance information, paid for by her husband's job. Still, she was unable to provide a state-issued identification card because the state of Texas requires proof of lawful residence in order to qualify for a driver's license. In order to survive encounters such as these, Borrego had procured a false driver's license and social security card. We do not know how her fake IDs were secured, but we can imagine that the documents had, by this point, become critical to the way Borrego navigated the world. Indeed, Texas' refusal to issue driver's licenses to undocumented migrants means that migrants break the law every time they check in for a flight, buy a beer, or go to the dentist's office. Recently, the denial of state identification has also impeded migrants' ability to

procure birth certificates for their children born on U.S. soil (Peralta, 10.17.15). This refusal further pushes migrants into a state of symbolic and material liminality. So Borrego handed over a false identification.

And then she was asked to wait.

Blanca Borrego and her two daughters sat patiently in the clinic's waiting room for approximately two hours. Her oldest daughter would later tell the press that she knew something was wrong because the clinic's receptionists kept stealing glances at the waiting family. At around four p.m., Borrego was called back to the exam room where she found two sheriff's deputies waiting for her. It is unclear whether she was arrested and then searched or searched and then arrested but ultimately she was taken into custody and her purse was opened. There the arresting officers found a false social security card. The falsified social security card would come to serve as justification for charging Borrego with third degree felony: tampering with government documents. Borrego was handcuffed and walked back through the doctor's offices. At the time of her arrest, the officers warned her two daughters that she was being taken into custody, that her bond would be about \$20,000, and that she would ultimately be deported.

As one might imagine, the consequences for Borrego and her family were serious. Borrego was detained for two weeks in jail. During those two weeks, she and her family were expected to raise a \$35,000 bond. Additionally, because of Borrego's status as an undocumented migrant, Borrego's lawyer worked to ensure that Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) did not put a hold on her case. Such a hold would mean that, despite paying her bond, she would be released not to her

family but to ICE.

The arrest also set off a domino effect with far-reaching impacts for the precarious mixed-status family in which most members are either undocumented or hold deferred status. While all members of the family have long resided in the U.S., their presence, their community, and the family itself has always been at risk. Upon her arrest, Borrego's husband stopped reporting to work for fear of likewise being picked up for being undocumented. Beyond the immediate threat of detention or deportation, the arrest also poses a threat to the future possibility of gaining citizenship, as a felony conviction would reverse Borrego's eligibility for Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA).⁹ The fear of deportation also impacted Borrego's oldest daughter, who recently lost her temporary legalized status under DACA. Borrego's daughter consequently refused to share her name with the press, but did articulate the arrest's affective dimensions as she recounted stories of her eight-year-old sister crying while watching her mother be arrested.

Immediately after the arrest, Memorial Hermann assumed a position of non-

⁹ DAPA, of Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents offers temporary relief for parents of citizens or lawful permanent residents. Like DACA, DAPA comes with a set of expectations and limitations. Under President Barak Obama's November 20, 2014 executive action, applicants are only eligible if they have been in the US continuously since Jan. 1 2010, were present on Nov 20, 2014 and at the time of application, did not hold lawful status on Nov. 20, 2014, have not been convicted of a felony, a significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, do not pose a threat to national security, and are not an enforcement priority for removal (US Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2015). While Borrego may have been eligible at the time her youngest daughter's birth, recent action in Texas has made it more and more difficult for parents to receive birth certificates for children born on US soil. The state of Texas is now turning families away by claiming that their IDs from Mexico cannot be verified.

disclosure. Their spokesperson, Alex Rodriguez Loessin, invoked “patient privacy” as the grounds for the hospital’s inability to respond to inquiries from the press (Barajas, 9.11.15). This rhetoric of “non-disclosure” and “privacy” soon shifted as they deployed the putatively neutral language of law and order and “public safety.” After sustained pressure from the media, Loessin told the *Los Angeles Times* that the practice does “not report any undocumented patients to law enforcement. In this case, law enforcement was called because of a potentially false identification presented at the clinic. Memorial Hermann was never aware of the patient’s resident status, and first heard of her resident status when it was reported by media. Memorial Hermann does not exclude, deny benefits to, or otherwise discriminate against any person who presents at any of our facilities. It was clear to the individual who received the ID that it was false,” she said (Hennessy-Fiske, 9.15.15). Thus in their second statement, Memorial Hermann pivoted away from the (ironic) language that depicted Borrego as a patient deserving of privacy to a language that highlighted her criminality. It was a language that would also paper over any racial profiling involved in their call to officials.

The Harris County District Attorney’s office echoed Loessin’s statement by emphasizing Borrego’s criminal act. Their statement detailed how the driver’s license aroused suspicion because, although Borrego’s picture and address were on the card, it was the wrong color, did not contain a hologram, and used a number that had been assigned to a man. Thus the sheriff’s office responded to the call “*as it would [to] any other merchant* reporting suspicious documents, and that medical privacy was not an issue” (Hennessy-Fiske, 9.15.15, emphasis mine). Again, the language here evokes a

kind of color-blind law and order that erases how state power is differently triggered by different kinds of bodies. Additionally, the language obfuscates any distinction between a medical provider and “any other merchant.” The comment suggests that the medical provider does not have a specific ethical responsibility to their client’s privacy and well-being. Moreover, the statement implies that the state does not have a stake in allowing or foreclosing access to the “good” of healthcare. It is a claim that is deployed repeatedly in the legislative and law-enforcement cases concerned with migrant access to reproductive care. More to the point, the state contradicts its own claim of noninvolvement when it uses access to healthcare as a means of managing the migrant body in the U.S., as it did in this specific case.

While the clinic and the sheriff’s office were issuing statements, so too were Borrego’s family and lawyer. The medical and state institutions vacillated between privacy and public safety, while Borrego’s narrative gesture was one that held up a kind of “proximal citizenship.” This rhetorical maneuver operated in opposition to the many ways that the U.S. attempts to defer and distance migrants from the category of the citizen. Here I use the idea of proximal citizenship as a way of capturing the family’s response, which emphasized that while Borrego was not a citizen at the time of her arrest, she occupied a place that was *akin to citizenship*. This proxy-like performance of citizenship was, according to the family and lawyer, defined according to her morality, her motherhood, and her claim to rights. In other words, the depiction of Borrego as a model citizen attempted to make her, in all but documentation, an ideal member of the nation. We know that rhetorical moves such as these seldom work because they deny subjects complex personhood, requiring

them to meet unrealistic standards of perfection. They also betray the fiction that racialized subjects could ever be “good enough” citizens.

Still, with so few options available to them, the family deployed a discourse of proximal citizenship in their statements to the press. In one of the clearest examples of this claim, Borrego’s daughter told *The Los Angeles Times* that, “We’re not bad people. We don’t hurt anybody. My siblings and I have done everything right, and we just want to help my mom so she can be with us and not worry about getting detained anymore” (Hennessy-Fiske, 9.15.15). Here Borrego’s daughter deploys the family’s moral character, countering the clinic and the state’s claim of Borrego’s criminality while also issuing an indictment to both for detaining Borrego, making it impossible for her to continue being a good mother. Ultimately, Borrego’s daughter suggests that the arrest, the subsequent detention, and constant fear of the law place an unnecessary stress on the family.

Borrego’s lawyer also told the press that while she understood that a crime had been committed, it was a victimless crime because Borrego had private insurance. Moreover, she explained, Borrego’s rights were violated because “it’s a basic human right to be able to get medical care. It wasn’t like she was getting public assistance even, she had an established doctor-patient relationship with that gynecologist. This shouldn’t have happened like this” (Barajas, 9.11.15). Here the lawyer cleverly and problematically raises the racialized rhetoric of welfare in order to reinforce the binary between good, self-sufficient citizens and those who are a drain on the state. In this binary, Borrego’s lawyer would like us to imagine her to be the former. Sitting on the “right” side of the binary, Borrego should not have been penalized for her attempt

to claim her right to healthcare.

Because so much of the discourse circulates around questions of healthcare, I want to pause for a while in a gynecologists' waiting room where we will consider the ways we can use Borrego's doctor's waiting room for what it tells us about the intersections of national security, neoliberalism, immigration, and racialized women's bodies. What can we glean from the fact that Borrego was arrested in her gynecologist's office? In what ways is the arrest based on the anxieties that surround the Mexican migrant woman's reproductive body? I also follow Hughes' critical engagement with the notion of deferral in the chapter's epitaph to consider what it means that the American Dream is not just foreclosed but rather dangled for those who might consider themselves proximal citizens. I therefore interrogate the categories of "waiting" and "deferment" for what they might tell us about desire for the nation-state and control of migrant bodies. What does it mean that Borrego waited - first in the waiting room and then in jail? How has waiting become a part of disciplining the immigrant body in this particular moment? How might this index of waiting and deferment illuminate a kind of migrant temporality that aims to intensify the migrant's desire for the nation?

A Word on Method and Reading for Migrant Women's Bodies

While this chapter takes Borrego's case as its primary object, it is to the mainstream and online newspaper stories that covered Borrego's arrest that I turn for data. Prior to her arrest, Borrego's survival relied on her invisibility, but her arrest prompted a media spectacle that presents a rich opportunity for a discursive critique

of state impositions on migrant women's bodies. Articles appearing in news outlets like the *Houston Press*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *Huffington Post* are therefore used not just to understand the events that occurred in the Houston suburb, but also the discursive field through which the law, the state, and the media makes sense of migrant women's bodies. There are obvious concerns about this approach. Primarily that the information produced by the media is also filtered to fit narratives that make legible the subjects and events they cover. In this way, the coverage of Borrego is at once unique to her case and also a rehearsed narrative that deploys a shorthand for understanding the case. These narratives, complete with images, rely heavily on a general public's understanding of racialized migrant subjects and those meant to police them.

In constructing a legible narrative, these media outlets simultaneously craft and depend on what film scholar Kara Keeling (2007) has identified as "clichés," or "common memory-images" that fall into a framework shaped by the retellings of shared stories. While Keeling's work is situated in the cinematic, the press too is involved in using certain images and narrative structures that are understandable because they are part of patterns that convey broader meanings and feelings that we have come to recognize over time. The stories that news outlets tell are instructive precisely because of their dependence on familiar narrative clichés, conveying not just the "facts" of the case but also the affective and ideological dimensions that shape our shared understandings of migration, citizenship, and Latina reproduction. Moreover, the notion of clichés also demonstrates how Blanca Borrego, her family, and her allies similarly solicit violent recognition through the construction of a certain

narrative form because the familiar narrative includes characters with particular roles and scripts (White, 1990). Borrego, for example, was cast as a Mexican immigrant and a criminal who committed the serious offense of identity theft (Fox News Latino, 9.14.15). In response, Borrego's family and lawyer deployed a similarly limiting response; that Borrego was instead a victim of an overly harsh, rights infringing security state who was "tricked" by medical professionals (McLaughlin, 9.16.15).

This chapter reads with and against the media's coverage of Borrego's case. I consider both the events as they are presented and *how* they are presented for evidence of state surveillance and its constant policing of women's bodies. The state's intrusion into the waiting room of Dr. Bonilla's gynecological practice makes visible its consistent presence. I argue that the news reports demonstrate the ordinariness and everydayness of border policing in the U.S.. At the same time, I also want to suggest that the news reports do not just tell the story of the policing of migrant women's bodies; they also become a part of the broader Border Industrial Complex by disseminating logics of violent exclusion and the accompanying migrant's fear through the limited narratives that make up the telling.

Leveraging a Queer Critique

In reading Blanca Borrego's case, I use the theoretical frames of queer-of-color critique and queer diaspora to attend to the ways she is understood as a queer threat to the nation, her queerness rooted in discourses of sexual and racial deviance (Ferguson, 2003; Rodríguez, 2003). Additionally, this lens allows us to make sense of the failed attempt to "rescue" Borrego from this deviance. My hope is to contribute

here to Gayatri Gopinath's "concept of a queer diaspora [that] enables a simultaneous critique of heterosexuality and the nation form while exploding the binary oppositions between nation and diaspora, heterosexuality and homosexuality, original and copy" (2005, p. 11). Indeed, I believe that Borrego's body and the discursive renderings of it offer the opportunity to stage this layered critique of the intersection of national logics and normative sexual regimes. Her brown body's presence in the gynecologist's office references the ways Mexican migrant sexualities and reproduction are deemed excessive and threatening, occurring outside the bonds of the white and heteropatriarchal family but dangerously within U.S. national borders. The way her body is understood as sexually queer and racially non-normative also has a very real material impact. Despite the clinic's official statement to the contrary, I argue that Borrego was reported to the police not just because her ID was read as fake but also because her body was read as illegal and thus, justifiably and violently denied access to medical care. Moreover, her disciplining, accomplished in part through forced waiting, moves Borrego out of normative notions of time, structured by logics of production and reproduction. Building on a recent emphasis in queer theory on time and temporality, I argue that moving migrants out of time can serve as a violent form of managing migrant bodies (Halberstam, 2005; Muñoz, 2009; Freeman, 2010).

While I believe that this understanding of queerness, rooted in racial and sexual deviance and non-normative temporality, is important to illuminating the events around Blanca Borrego's arrest and the state's response, my commitment to this line of thinking is also politically motivated. We know that heteronormativity

“works to support and reinforce institutional racism, patriarchy, and class exploitation” and therefore a radical queer politic must work toward a broader understanding of sexual “deviance” (Cohen, 1997, p. 455). I position this research within the framework and logics that enable us to imagine the liberatory possibilities of a queer politic, one that considers sexuality as a primary (but certainly not the solitary) axis through which to understand one’s relationship to power.

Indeed, Cathy Cohen argues that one of the figures that should be of concern to the queer activist is that of the welfare queen, who, while imagined to be heterosexual, is cast out of heteronormativity “as a system of regulation and normalization,” because of her racial and class identity (p. 447). For Cohen, the welfare queen is a figure whose behavior and identity must be managed by the state because she is “perceived as threatening [to] systems of white supremacy, male domination, and capitalist advancement” (p. 455). Cohen’s larger point is that sexual norms have been used to punish those imagined to fall short, not just because they identify as gay or as lesbian (though certainly them too) but also those subjects who, because of their race and class, would never be allowed to benefit from heteronormative privilege. In deploying Cohen here, I hope to suggest that a more complete queer theory will take up, along with the welfare queen, another figure who, because of racial tropes, is imagined to undeservingly take from state resources, that is the figure of the Mexican migrant woman.

Conjured Borders, Latina Reproduction, and Temporal Orientations

A raced and classed heteronormativity that excludes the Mexican migrant

woman must be policed. This chapter considers how such policing occurs through what I call the conjured border. This understanding of the border is of one that haunts the U.S. interior but is summoned or activated by a range of formal and informal actors who serve to “protect” the nation against undocumented migrants. This conjured border is patrolled in the everyday by federal ICE agents as well as local law enforcement agents who have become formal partners with ICE through the Delegation of Immigration Authority Section 287(g) which “permits state and local law enforcement agencies, on the basis of a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with ICE, to function as immigration agents.” In the case at hand, the Harris County Sheriff’s Office, who currently holds such an MOA with ICE (U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, n.d.; 7.22.10), worked with deputized citizens who were, in the spirit of “see something, say something,” enlisted to report the racialized immigrants imagined to be a threat to the state.

Like policing at the geopolitical border, the patrolling of the conjured border relies on racialized, gendered, and sexual logics of exclusion. Therefore, Borrego’s arrest at the gynecologist’s office was about excluding her individual body but was also motivated by the anxiety around her reproduction. Much has been written about the various ways that Mexican and Latina women’s reproduction is imagined to be excessive and thus, outside the bounds of the normative (read: white) family (Gutiérrez, 2008). Compounding the “problem” of excessive reproduction is the question of the child born to the Mexican migrant. On the one hand this child is imagined not to belong. S/he threatens the fiction of a white hegemonic U.S. and is likewise constructed within the narrative of criminal and hypersexual discourses

(Romero, 2001; Berg, 2002; Vargas, 2010; Chavez, 2007). At the same time, being born on U.S. soil means that Borrego's offspring becomes a documented citizen. The child then is understood as a wolf in sheep's clothing, the "anti-citizen" disguised as a citizen. Specifically, the birthright citizen is not imagined as belonging socially or racially in the nation but has a legal claim to the state. The birthright citizen, commonly and pejoratively known as the anchor baby, complete with legal claims to the state and its accompanying rights cannot be deported, making her/him less exploitable and therefore, a less desirable migrant figure. Borrego's potential to reproduce "anti-citizen" citizens makes her more vulnerable to policing at the conjured border, specifically as it was made manifest in a gynecologist's office. In other words, surveilling and policing her body becomes a critical function of patrolling the conjured border, one that manages individual migrant's bodies in the hopes of also controlling the national body, or population (Luibhéid, 2002; Campbell and Sitze, 2013).

In addition to the various violent tactics we tend to think of as being associated with border policing, those tactics explored in other chapters that include shooting, beating, verbally abusing border crossers, I look to include waiting and deferment to our list of methods used to manage migrant's bodies. Specifically, I offer waiting and deferment as key analytics for understanding questions of temporality, immigrant subjectivity, and the migrant's (imagined) desire for the nation. I argue that Borrego's time in the doctor's waiting room, specifically her waiting to the point of intuiting impending danger, points to how waiting generally has become an important part of the migrant's experience in the U.S.. I use this

category to illuminate the processes of detention and deferred action as they have formalized the expectation that migrants *should* wait. Specifically, they should wait in a state of deportability, constantly on the verge of being excluded. As they sit in anticipation of the relief offered by political and physical inclusion in the state, migrants demonstrate their desire for the nation and thus are more easily exploitable. Moreover, as they wait to take their turn after more deserving citizens, they are “put in their place” on the political agenda, and reminded that the migrant’s time simply is not as valuable as the citizen’s.

Waiting is deployed to many ends. Among these, I suggest, is the need to produce a sense of the “humane” in the state’s management of migrant bodies. As the Border Patrol faces a public relations nightmare as a result of demonstrating too much force against migrants, waiting allows the Border Patrol to stage a seemingly more humane form of migrant control. Waiting then is deployed as a tool of biopolitics (Campbell and Sitze, 2013), or an apparatus through which to manage the migrant’s access to life or death. Waiting, as in the case of Borrego, erases the violence of the refusal of health care and the warehousing of migrant bodies. Her story is simply one example in a larger landscape in which waiting and deferral makes invisible the abuse of power that occurs during practices of detention and deferral that place the migrant closer to death.

Suffering these abuses of power allows the state to test a migrant’s desire for the nation, giving migrants the opportunity to demonstrate a determination and commitment to the state. Conversely, when the waiting ends in either forced or self-deportation, the waiting reaffirms the government’s ability to exclude the migrant.

Ultimately, while waiting is meant to play on the migrant's individual desire for the state, I believe it does more to betray the nation's desire for the excludable migrant.

The Conjured Border

Policing the excludable migrant happens at the geopolitical boundary but so too does it happen inside the official border. I use the term conjuring to foreground the deployment of the conditions and logics of the border in the everyday interior of the U.S.. Border scholars have convincingly argued that the Mexico-U.S. border has migrated, or "thickened" so that it now operates separate from the geopolitical boundary and in the U.S. interior (Chang, 1996; Rosas, 2006, Inda and Dowling, 2013). Conjured borders represent a practice wherein the border and all of its related machineries of surveillance and force might be *summoned* to do the work of determining belonging in the U.S.. The border, then, does not simply become unmoored from the geopolitical boundary, but is called on by ICE agents, local law enforcement agents, and especially the deputized citizen, who has, with the state's permission, become emboldened to act to secure the nation. I use the term conjured to deliberately attend to the magical and performative nature of this border, the sense that it might appear out of nowhere, with a subtle sleight of hand, in the taking of one's ID to be photocopied, momentarily masked by the distraction of being made to wait on a doctor who then appears in the form of ICE's local henchmen.

As the border appears, it captures those around it in a dense net of surveillance meant to determine who does and does not belong. The conjured border entangles an act of discernment we are all asked to perform when we are told first to "see

something.” We are then not just allowed but rather commanded to act, to even just “say something.” It is a logic that hides behind a set of law and order protocols that appear neutral but ultimately serve to sanction the targeting of migrants because of their race, gender, and sexuality.

To say that borders can be conjured is to suggest that borders haunt all spaces (Gordon, 1997). More to the point, the border can be made to appear anywhere because the border is always already everywhere. As Robert S. Chang explains, the functions of the border have expanded from the geopolitical boundary because “the border is imperfect. It does not operate perfectly in excluding that which does not belong. Some slip through, managing to escape detection. Mistakes are made. As a result, the geopolitical border is supplemented by internal policing mechanisms, formal and informal” (1996, p. 249). These errors lead to increased surveillance and/or expulsion of the threatening foreign body “for the good of society.” (p. 249) As a legal scholar, Chang is particularly concerned with the ways that anti-immigration laws – originating in border states but mimicked throughout the country – have become a way to disseminate border logics into “the heartland of America, even in such places as Kansas. For example, if a Korean national flies from Seoul and lands in Kansas, the border will be there to greet her. The border is everywhere” (p. 246). This image of the border that rises up to meet the migrant helps us see the material manifestation of the border and its logics across the U.S..

Images of the conjured border figure prominently in news stories like those that covered the arrest of Blanca Borrego as well as popular media that documents efforts to secure the homeland. For example, *National Geographic’s* 2010 series,

Border Wars considers not just incidents of Border Patrolling in South Texas but also, for example, at Super Bowl XLIV in Miami, FL. Citing section 187(a)(3) of the Immigration Act of 1952, journalist Todd Miller explains that one need not be on the “international border zone” to be policed. Rather, proximity to the border is sufficient as the “Border Patrol can do a warrantless search on anyone who is within one hundred miles of the U.S. Coastlines and land borders.” Within this zone “Homeland Security officers have federal, extra-constitutional powers that are well above and beyond those of local law enforcement” (p. 15). As Miller suggests, proximity to the border only creates an intensification of anxiety about the porous border and the threat of the racialized migrant, but the publicizing of the policing also serves to amplify the threat issued to migrants, that the border might be called to appear anywhere.

Just like at the geopolitical boundary, this conjured border operates in part by asking formal and informal border guards to read bodies to discern belonging. Within this logic, a false identification card alone might not prove sufficient to set off alarm bells, but when it is presented by a brown woman, the medical assistant is called to identify the transaction and the body as illegal. In this process, the racialized migrant is read through the intersection of nativism and racism, what Chang terms nativistic racism. In this reading, the racialized migrant is marked as foreign and unassailable, a threat to the nation. In his meditation, Chang’s concern is the Asian American body and the specific ways that Asian Americans’ economic successes are imagined to pose a threat to the economic security of “real” Americans. While Mexican migrants are not figured in the same kinds of model minority myths that circulate around Asian

American bodies and are therefore not always imagined to pose the same economic threat, they do experience the ways “foreign-ness is inscribed upon [their] bodies in such a way that [they] carry a figurative border with [them]. This figurative border, in addition to confirming the belonging-ness of the ‘real’ Americans, marks [them] as targets of nativistic racism. It renders them suspect, subject to the violence of heightened scrutiny at the border, in the workplace, *in hospitals*, and elsewhere” (p. 249, emphasis mine). In response to these suspicious bodies the border then is conjured in order to protect the “real” American from the threat posed by racialized migrants like Blanca Borrego.

In addition to forcing us to recognize that the border haunts all spaces in order to police the racialized migrant, the concept of conjuring also points to the multiple actors that might summon the border into various spaces. In considering the various manifestations of what they call “governing immigration through crime,” Jonathan Xavier Inda and Julie A. Dowling describe the use of local and state law enforcement, prosecution, and detention to discipline migrants within the U.S. (2013, p. 2). In these cases the use of local law enforcement is conceptualized as a way of augmenting federal forces as “force multipliers” (U.S. ICE as in Inda & Dowling, 2013, p. 13). According to ICE Agreements of Cooperation in Communities to Enhance Safety and Security (ICE ACCESS) Programs, it is possible for “state and local law enforcement agencies, on the basis of a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with ICE to function as immigration agents.”¹⁰ Acting as immigration agents involves “arresting people for immigration violations and screening local jails for ‘criminal aliens [and] working

¹⁰ CAP and Secure Communities were the other two

with ICE on immigrant investigations” (2013, p. 13). Additionally, the extension of these powers to local law enforcement also involves charging undocumented migrants for crimes that are caused by but might not be directly related to migration, for example identity fraud.

In July 2010, ICE announced that in the first three and a half years of the program, over 172,000 undocumented migrants had been “removed after being identified by 287(g) officers.” These 1,200 plus officers represented signed MOAs with 71 local enforcement agencies across the country, including the Harris County Sheriff’s Office in Texas, the very agency called to respond to Borrego’s gynecologist’s office (U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, n.d.; 7.22.10). While it is unclear whether or not Borrego’s arresting officers were 287(g) officers, the “partnership” between immigration officials and county officers suggests a desire and commitment by the Harris Sheriff’s offices to identify and contain undocumented migrants. In this regard, the use of local law enforcement agents intensifies border policing within the geopolitical borders of the U.S..

In addition to the use of potentially deputized local officers, Borrego’s case exemplifies Inda and Dowling’s notion of criminalizing migrants in the charges filed against her. Indeed, the Office of Harris County District Clerk, Chris Daniel, lists the complaint brought against Borrego to be a third degree felony: tampering with government records. This charge allows authorities to justify Borrego’s arrest as a neutral action, one dictated by the rule of law and not affected by the reading of her brown body in the clinic waiting room by the medical administrator. *The Los Angeles Times*, for example, reported that Deputy Thomas Gilliland, a spokesman for the

sheriff's office argued the agents were "obligated to respond to the clinic, just as it would any other merchant reporting suspicious documents..." (Hennessy-Fiske, 9.15.15). Likewise, Bob Dane, executive director of the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) was able to leverage the charge to claim the arrest resulted in securing American safety. He was quoted in *Fox News Latino* as saying: "whoever the rightful owner was of the social security card that Ms. Borrego reportedly presented has been spared the nightmare of identity theft within the labyrinth of the health care system" (9.14.15). Here again a leader in the anti-immigrant movement is, like local enforcement agents, able to retreat behind race-blind language that, while pointing to a "nightmare," pretends to attach the term to a crime rather than the body committing the crime.

The focus on the crime rather than the "criminal" is a move also deployed by the informal arm of the law entangled in the case – the deputized citizen who placed the call to officials. Recall Memorial Hermann's spokesperson, Alex Rodriguez Loessin's statement above that law enforcement was alerted only because of the identification and not because of Borrego's undocumented status. Recall the office's insistence that they do "not exclude, deny benefits to, or otherwise discriminate against any person who presents" seeking their services (Hennessy-Fiske, 9.15.15). While Borrego's attorney has countered that the crime was a victim-less one, criminalization allows all law enforcement and citizen agents of the border involved to construct themselves as innocent of profiling and suggest they were instead accountable to the race blind system of law and order.

The commitment to upholding the "neutral" standards of law and order is just

one of the attributes of the citizen who reported Borrego to the authorities. In addition, the citizen has been authorized to act in the name of securing the nation through government mandates like “see something, say something.” The policing of non-citizens through the language of criminalization by deputized citizens echoes the ways Frank Wilderson III writes about the policing of Black bodies in the U.S.. He argues that this policing “(re)produces, repetitively, the inside/outside” of society. In his understanding, “civil society” and the “Black world” exist as oppositional categories with the power to destroy each other. “In such a paradigm,” he goes on, “white people are, ipso facto, deputized in the face of Black people, whether they know it (consciously) or not...In short, white people are not simply ‘protected’ by the police, they *are* – *in their very corporeality* – the police” (2003, p. 20, emphasis in original). Wilderson would likely not concede that policing of the Mexican migrant’s body operates along similar logics. For Wilderson, histories of immigration and their accompanying “narratives of arrival based on collective volition and premeditated desire” cohere the idea of the nation, whereas the Black subject unsettles the nation (p. 24). While some migrants, those with a claim “over the legitimacy of arrival” (p. 24), may, through their desire for the nation, consolidate the idea of America, I am not entirely convinced by Wilderson’s claim that all migrants cohere the nation. Indeed, when a migrant’s body is deemed illegal, they might, in some cases, trigger similar anxieties about the inside and outside of civil society, and thus similarly transform the citizen into Border Patrol agents.

Like the Border Patrol agent, the citizen-turned-agent is also able to access violence as a form of policing the conjured border. In a process he identifies as the

“thickening” of the border, anthropologist Gilberto Rosas argues that in the U.S. Southwest and beyond, “increasingly extra-official actors, specifically vigilantes claim to be acting in the state’s name and to be enforcing its boundaries as they draw on anti-‘immigrant’ and border discourses” (2006, p. 342). Rosas details the cases of physical abuses and discursive violence perpetrated against immigrants and those racialized citizens who are collapsed into the same category, alongside the tacit endorsements state actors have given these forms of anti-migrant violence.

For Rosas, these acts of violence operate within a system of biopower, where both official and unofficial law enforcement agents enact the power to “let die” (2006, p. 336). While Borrego walked away from her encounter with law enforcement alive, it did prevent her from accessing medical care. As feminist scholars have argued convincingly elsewhere, limiting a woman’s access to health care is itself a form of structural violence (Petchesky, 2003). Moreover, like the forms of vigilante violence that Rosas outlines above, the impacts of the phone call placed by the deputized citizen to law enforcement ripples through migrant communities. In this specific case the far-reaching effects put other migrants closer to death. Indeed as Ana Rodriguez DeFrates has stated,

The sad fact is that many immigrant women in Texas, and across the country, already forgo needed health care, living with lumps in their breasts and daily pain, because clinics are inaccessible or put them at risk of deportation. This is an ongoing human rights crisis, and Blanca Borrego’s arrest shines a light on the struggles of immigrant women, who are routinely denied driver’s licenses, affordable healthcare, and other basic human and civil rights...No one should be afraid to seek medical care for fear of arrest or deportation. (National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, 9.12.15)

Still, migrants face risk as they attempt to access reproductive health because their reproduction makes them a threat.

Producing the Anti-Citizen Citizen

Blanca Borrego was not, to my knowledge, pregnant at the time of her September doctor's appointment. Yet, the violence that she faced in being denied access to health care is likely the result of anxiety about the reproductive potential of her body, the tension around the Mexican migrant's reproduction. Much has been written about the various ways that Latina and Mexican women's reproduction is imagined to be excessive and uncontrollable. Compounding the "problem" of excessive reproduction is the tension that surrounds the child born to the Mexican migrant on U.S. soil. On the one hand this child is imagined to not belong. At the same time, being born on U.S. soil means that Borrego's offspring is granted birthright citizenship. The child then becomes a threat in disguise, the "anti-citizen" with the papers of a citizen. Therefore, surveilling and policing her sexuality and reproduction become a critical function of patrolling the conjured border.

The surveillance and policing of women's bodies has always been a part of patrolling the geopolitical border. As Eithne Luibhéid has argued, "in seeking to ascribe [sexual] identities the immigration service centrally contributed to constructing the very sexual categories and identities through which women's immigration possibilities were regulated" (2002, p. xi). Among the many "peripheral sexual figures" that Luibhéid claims the Border Patrol has constructed and regulated are the lesbian, the prostitute, the pimp, the woman who would marry the American

for his wealth, and of particular interest here, the “fecund woman whose reproduction was uncontrolled” (p. xv). The last of these poses a particular threat not just because she represents a type of sexual deviance that evades state control, but also because of the type of population she has the power to reproduce.

Just as Chang and Rosas argue that racialized policing at the border is related to racialized policing in the U.S., for Luibhéid, the project of patrolling the border against certain sexual subjects operates in tandem with the policing of sexuality in the U.S. interior. Specifically, Luibhéid considers how welfare and immigration laws work together as a means of exercising power over poor and racialized women’s heterosexualities. The case of Blanca Borrego exemplifies Luibhéid’s point that “sexual regulation at the border articulates sexual regulation within” (2002, p. xxi) in that the conjured border likewise does the work of policing the nation through what advocate Ana Rodriguez DeFrates has diagnosed as reproductive oppression with severe consequences for migrant women.

Set in the great state of Texas, Borrego’s case represents one of already limited reproductive options. Indeed, in the two years prior to her arrest, Texas’ conservative lawmakers had successfully passed two key pieces of legislation meant to restrict women’s access to reproductive health. For example, 2013 saw the passage of House Bill 2 despite Wendy Davis legendary eleven-hour filibuster. HB2 has been credited with severely limiting Texas women’s access to abortion. Among other provisions, the bill bans abortions past twenty weeks, raises the standards for abortion-providing clinics to those set for ambulatory surgical centers, and requires

doctors to include a patient's country of residence in their reports.¹¹ The bill's repercussions were far-reaching and, according to the *Austin Chronicle*, is expected to result in the closure of all but eight abortion clinics in Texas (Tuma, 6.26.15). Additionally, during the summer of Borrego's arrest, HB 3994 was passed in Texas. The bill, which was meant to make access to abortion more difficult for patients under the age of 18, has also made access more difficult for undocumented women as the bill requires women to present valid government identification in order to access the medical procedure.¹²

This hostile environment has had a particularly hard impact on Latina immigrants, creating what DeFrantes calls health-care deserts. Migrants, especially, she adds, "cisgender women, trans men, and nonbinary people who can be pregnant" are left to navigate these deserts under constant fear, "the most noxious byproduct of

¹¹ HB 2 relates to admitting privileges, prevents abortions past 20 weeks, regulates abortion-inducing drugs, and raises the standards for abortion providing clinics to those set for ambulatory surgical centers. Moreover, the bill changes the ways doctors report abortions so that these reports now include the patient's country of residence. Per the bill, a doctor can lose their license for providing or procuring a criminal abortion or for performing a third trimester abortion (except in the case of the life or health of the mother or the brain damage or paralysis of the unborn child) or for providing an abortion to a patient under the age of 18 without parental, guardian, or court consent. Finally, the bill formally adopts the language used to speak about pregnancies. Prior to the bill the official language counted a period of gestation, after the bill the language shifts to "probably post-fertilization age of the unborn child."

¹² The bill reads: "A physician shall presume that a pregnant woman is a minor unless the woman presents a valid government record of identification showing that she has reached the age of majority. It is a defense to prosecution under this section that the minor falsely represented her age or identity to the physician to be at least 18 years of age by displaying an apparently valid governmental record of identification such that a reasonable person under similar circumstances would have relied on the representation. The defense does not apply if the physician is shown to have had independent knowledge of the minor's actual age or identity or failed to use due diligence in determining the minor's age or identity."

anti-immigrant policies and practices” (9.18.15). Borrego’s story, she predicts, will only contribute to this fear.

Indeed, the arrest of Borrego in the gynecologist’s office and the widespread publicity it garnered affirms anthropologist Leo R. Chavez’ claim that “Latina reproduction” has become “an object of a discourse” with “a limited range of meanings, with an emphasis on ‘over’-reproduction and on a fertility and sexuality depicted as ‘out of control’ in relation to the supposed social norm” (2007, p. 69). What is most useful about Chavez’ use of Latina reproduction is how he understands reproduction as “an ideological concept that defines normative fertility levels (that of Anglos or non-Latino whites) and their opposite: the nonnormative, stigmatized, ‘high fertility’ level of Latinas and the sexual behavior that produced it” (69). Chavez’ thinking here echoes not only the subject Luibhéid claims the border constructs and patrols, it also highlights the unspoken anxiety that surrounded Borrego’s arrest: that her presence at that gynecologist’s office may have triggered state officials’ concern about her Mexican hyper-fertility.

The anxiety around the “highly fertile” Mexican migrant is not *just* rooted in the actual numbers. Indeed, white couples who birth nineteen kids (and counting) are featured on television shows, websites, and the covers of magazines. They gather devoted followings, and religious communities crowd around them in support when it is revealed that their children transgress sexual norms.¹³

¹³ I refer of course, to the Duggar family depicted in TLC’s reality hit *Nineteen Kids and Counting* and the upcoming special *Jill and Jess: Counting On*, as well as the family’s struggle with the allegations that the youngest son inappropriately fondled several young women before he was 18. The family’s blog can be found here: <https://www.duggarfamily.com>

Instead the anxiety about Borrego's reproduction is also based on the notion that her children would be the documented "anti-citizen." My understanding of the "anti-citizen" comes from Inda and Dowling's argument that in a neoliberal state, one marked by an expectation that citizens ought to care for their own personal security, the proper citizen is governed and secured through the market. The "deviant anti-citizen – the criminal, the poor person, the homeless person, the welfare recipient – who is deemed incapable of managing his or her own risks" must be managed and disciplined by the state through the mechanisms of criminal justice (2013, p. 4). In other words, the "anti-citizen" is understood to become a charge of the state, one who is imagined to drain resources from their more deserving and responsible counterpart – the proper citizen.

In this proper citizen/anti-citizen binary, Borrego is clearly imagined as the anti-citizen, one who breaks the law in order to take American resources. Indeed, upon her arrest executive director of the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), Bob Dane, claimed that she not only perpetrated identity theft but that she was also costing an American citizen somewhere his money and time as a result (Fox News Latino, 9.14.15). What goes unmentioned in this interaction around Borrego's criminality is that her arrest took place within the context of her (criminal) reproduction. In other words, what is not explicitly articulated but what need not be uttered is the fear not just that Borrego is an anti-citizen who is unable to manage herself in the neoliberal state, but that her body is the mechanism through which anti-citizens are reproduced and then granted legal documentation.

The threat posed by Borrego's racialized sexual deviance echoes a broader set

of literature often identified as queer of color critique. As part of this literature, Juana María Rodríguez, in *Queer Latinidad*, has argued that queerness “is a challenge to constructions of heteronormativity.” (p. 24) While Borrego does not (publicly at least) identify as anything other heterosexual, her racialized heterosexuality and presumed excessive sexuality and fertility places her not just outside of, but in opposition to normative heterosexuality wherein healthy sexuality is practiced within the bounds of a family capable of (re)producing the nation. As the producer of anti-citizen citizens, Borrego is not capable of reproducing the nation. Indeed, as Roderick Ferguson argues, “as a technology of race, U.S. citizenship has historically ascribed heteronormativity (universality) to certain subjects and nonheteronormativity (particularity) to others. The state worked to regulate the gender and sexual nonnormativity of these racialized groups in a variety of ways. In doing so, it produced discourses that pathologized nonheteronormative U.S. racial formations.” (2004, p. 14). In light of Rodríguez and Ferguson’s understanding of racialized sexuality as queer, it follows that in an attempt to regulate her racialized reproduction, the state and its unofficial agents must render Borrego as a queer threat, one covertly operating to undo the nation from within.

It is precisely this threat, that of the imagined hyper-reproductive anti-citizen, capable of producing the anchor baby en masse, that Texas spent the summer of 2015 trying to ward against. In June 2015, the state arguably defied the U.S. constitution and stopped issuing birth certificates to babies born in the U.S. to undocumented parents. The pretext for refusing to issue these birth certificates was the claim that undocumented parents were unable to provide legitimate forms of identification.

While the state of Texas had previously accepted the matricular consular (a form of ID provided by Mexican consulates to migrants living in the U.S.), the beginning of the summer marked a change the policy (del Bosque, 7.20.15). In response, a group of undocumented parents filed a lawsuit the following month, but a judge ruled that while they waited for final word in the case Texas was justified in refusing to issue birth certificates to birthright citizens (Peralta, 10.17.15).

In response to the judge's ruling, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton hailed the verdict as an "important first step in ensuring the integrity of birth certificates and personal identity information" (Peralta, 10.17.15). Yet the broader landscape of Texas reproductive health and the way it has proven hostile to Mexican migrants generally and Blanca Borrego more specifically, suggests a deeper fear, one marked by concerns about the integrity not just of documents – IDs and birth certificates – but of American citizenship and belonging more generally. It is an integrity that must be defended and protected by the conjured border where racialized and sexualized subjects are disciplined by waiting.

Temporality, Immigrant Subjectivity and the Orienting of Desire

Pausing in the waiting room with Blanca Borrego and her two daughters allows us to sit with questions of temporality, migration, and desire. Of particular concern is how waiting has become a part of the migrant's condition in the United States. Indeed, the nation demands that migrants wait at every turn, ensuring they sit in anticipation and yet constantly on the edge of excludability. Migrants wait in line at the border to physically enter the U.S., they wait in offices to be interviewed or

fingerprinted, or they wait to make enough money to make their journey. Once in the U.S. they wait for work, to be reunited with their families, or to encounter the wrong state official who may begin the process that ends in deportation. In the U.S., migrants wait.

Sitting with migrants like Blanca Borrego highlights the multiple ways that migrant waiting accomplishes various goals for the U.S.. Ultimately, I argue that waiting stages a theater of humane policing wherein exclusion from the nation state *appears* less violent than the more visible and easily recognized measures described elsewhere in this manuscript. In this theater, detention and deferral are used to hide violence while also violently placing the migrant out of time. At the same time, waiting is imagined to affect the migrant's desire for the nation. In cases where the migrant waits, their desire to be in the U.S. is imagined to build, to intensify, making them ideal migrant laborers and proximal citizens but no less excludable. In cases where the migrant gives up, choosing to "self-deport," the U.S. has effectively excluded the migrant through humane means, lightening the load migrants are imagined to place on the nation's strained resources. In either case, the state narrativizes the migrant's wait as a win for the state, telling us more about the U.S.' desire for the excludable migrant, than it does the migrant's own desire.

Blanca Borrego has, in fact, waited a long time. The seemingly first and certainly most referenced of the articles about Borrego's arrest opens with Borrego's waiting: "Blanca Borrego and her two daughters had been sitting in the waiting room of the Northeast Women's Healthcare clinic in Atascocita for nearly two hours" (Barajas, 9.11.15). Borrego's daughter would later tell reporter Molly Hennessy-

Fiske, writing for *The Los Angeles Times*, that after waiting two hours she approached the front desk staff to ask what was taking so long because the family was ready to leave. After being arrested, Borrego's waiting was compounded by her detainment in jail where she waited an additional two weeks. Here her waiting indexes the many ways that migrants wait in the condition of deportability, highlighting how waiting has become integral to the migrant's experience in the U.S.. Her tense body sitting in the doctor's waiting room and then in a jail cell points us to the many waiting migrant bodies.

Queer theorist José Esteban Muñoz writes that being othered is, in part, about being made to wait. According to Muñoz waiting might be understood "as a desire for the good life that we have been denied in straight time's choke hold. We are left waiting but vigilant in our desire for another time that is not yet here" (2009, p. 182).

He goes on:

"there is something black about waiting. And there is something queer, Latino, and transgender about waiting. Furthermore, there is something disabled, Indigenous, Asian, poor, and so forth about waiting. Those who wait are those of us who are out of time in at least two ways. We have been cast out of straight time's rhythm, and we have made worlds in our temporal and spatial configurations. Certainly this would be the time of postcoloniality, but it is also crip time or, like the old joke, we still use CPT (colored people time). It seems like the other's time is always off. Often we are the first ones there and the last to leave. The essential point here is that our temporalities are different and outside. (p. 182-3)

We might imagine that the immigrant also belongs on Muñoz' list of waiting subjects.

Not only are immigrants like Borrego racialized, so too are they cast outside of normative temporal configurations through official government mechanisms meant to

make them wait.

In putting a migrant out of time, in refusing them mobility, contact with family, and general autonomy, the state performs an act of violence on migrant bodies. This violence is further exacerbated by the abuses that migrants face behind detention center walls. Yet, waiting allows the government to paper over the violence of waiting to perform a kind of border control that, from the outside at least, appears more humane than the violence of exclusion at the border. Rather than using guns, abusive language, or military equipment, the method of disciplining the migrant who has stepped out of bounds involves requiring them “to wait their turn.”

One of the primary ways that waiting has become formalized in this theater of humane border policing is in the practice of detention. Detention, or “the physical custody of an alien in order to hold him/her, pending a determination on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States or awaiting transportation to his/her country of citizenship after a final order of removal has been entered” (Department of Homeland Security, 2014), has long been used in the U.S. to place a hold on Mexican migrant mobility. This desire to halt the migrant’s slipperiness has become even stronger as it has been acknowledged that migrants are no longer just settling in the U.S. Southwest. Rather numbers of Mexican migrants are growing in cities like Chicago, New York, Atlanta, and Miami as well as in non-metropolitan hubs in the U.S. South and along the east coast (Zong & Batalova, 2016).

Mexican migrants specifically have faced detention at the hands of the U.S. government since before World War II but detention programs have increased significantly since 9/11 as the overall number of detainees in the U.S. grew by almost

100,000 in the first five years of the War on Terror (Hernández, 2013). In 2013, the Office of Immigration Statistics' annual report on Immigration Enforcement Actions stated that ICE had detained a total of 440,557 migrants. Of those, 244,585 claimed Mexican nationality (Department of Homeland Security, 2014). Perhaps it was the media attention, the resulting protests in the Houston community, or something particular about her case, but despite threatening to detain her, ICE ultimately allowed her to post bond and go home to her family.

In the other cases, those where a migrant is detained, the U.S. government claims that detention is meant to be an administrative process rather than a punitive one, designed simply to hold migrants for a hearing or for deportation but scholars disagree. On the most basic level, detention has been used as a method of law enforcement wherein authorities detain migrants in order to “discover after-the-fact charges that justify long-term detention and facilitate deportation” (Hernández, 2013). This, it seems, is the logical result of the close relationship between the prison industrial complex and the tremendous growth of immigrant warehousing (Douglas and Sáenz, 2013). Likewise, the abuse of power in these warehouses have resulted in reports of violence including the refusal of health care, sexual assault, and unexplained deaths (Douglas and Sáenz, 2013; Hernández, 2013).¹⁴

The punishment occurring behind the thick walls and fences of ICE detention centers is physical and violent but it is also temporal. Indeed, inside detention centers both the nation-state and the private corporations with which it partners to warehouse

¹⁴ On Nov. 30, 2015 Not One More reported that over 110 migrants in ICE detention were taking part in an organized hunger strike across several detention centers in the US in protest practices of solitary containment, medical abuse, and detention that had, in some cases, reached two years.

immigrant bodies (Douglas and Sáenz, 2013; Hernández, 2013), fixes “the pace of living in the places and people they take on: to quicken up and/or synchronize some elements of everyday existence, while offering up other spaces and activities as leisurely, slow, sacred, cyclical, and so on and thereby repressing or effacing alternative strategies of organizing time” (Freeman, 2010, p. xii). In the case of detained bodies, the state and the corporation structure time so that it slows, drags, becomes torture. This is evident in an art project sponsored by End Family Detention, “a network of families, volunteers, pro bono lawyers, social justice organizers, and digital activists dedicated to raising awareness and promoting action to end family detention.” In the spring of 2015 the group collected letters written by women detainees in the Karnes Residential Center and gave them to artists to visually represent. In one such letter, a woman whose name was redacted penned the following:

“My name is [redacted] and I have a one year old son here where I am being detained for the past seven months. I was detained on July 30, 2014 and I was in the “Ice box” for 7 days and came here to Karnes on August 7, 2014 and since that date I am still here. I can’t stand to be here anymore. I am desperate, I don’t like the food anymore, and I don’t want to be here. My son’s first birthday was here. I would like to get out of here. I’ve been here for a long time. I would like you to help us get out. I pray to God. Only God has given me the strength to bear all of this time here. With this I say goodbye.”

In almost all of the letters, women detail the months they have spent in detention waiting, they fear, only to be deported. For them, time spent in the detention center is time exposed to terrible food, bleach in their drinking water, and violence covered over by racist guards (End Family Detention, Letters From Inside). But time

is also, just as in the letter above, desperation, something to be endured. Indeed, in detention the spatial – the “box” – also takes on temporal dimensions as detainees are put on “ice.” In their activist song, “Ice El Hielo,” *La Santa Cecilia* describes ice in the following ways: 1. “ICE, water frozen solid;” 2. “ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement;” and 3. “ICE, el hielo.” The song’s lyrics reference how the hyper-mobile ICE agents roam the city, immobilizing undocumented migrants through raids on their workplaces. In both the letter above and the song’s reference to freezing ICE agents, we come to see the unique spatial and temporal contours of immigration policing.

We might imagine that during Borrego’s two weeks in county jail, time functioned similarly. In jail, time dragged as distance between herself and her family, medical attention, and autonomy grew. While Borrego’s jailing lasted two weeks, the Washington post reported in 2013 that migrants average a wait of 550 days in detention (Khim, 2.22.2013). Borrego’s case also reminds us that time is also gendered as women age out of their child-bearing years, they are vulnerable to sexual assault, and to the refusal of reproductive care.

Part of what allows waiting to be seen as a more humane form of border control is the way that the violence moves behind walls, hidden from the public’s view. Additionally, making migrants wait, rather than deploying weapons to deter entry, appears more humane because it seems to give migrants a choice. Either they wait and demonstrate an intense desire to be folded into the nation through formal citizenship or they can opt to self-deport, leaving the nation to return to their sending country. In either case, the migrant is imagined to have exerted her/his own agency.

What is erased from this formulation are the ways waiting puts pressure on that agency.

For Borrego and her family, that pressure through waiting took the form of DACA, or Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. Through the policy, Borrego's two oldest children met the necessary standards so that the threat of their deportation was deferred. Not foreclosed but deferred. Deferral offers perhaps more mobility and spatial freedom than detention and yet continues to ensure that migrants wait in a liminal state, foregrounding their deportability and emphasizing their exploitability as laborers. In essence, a deferred status communicates to migrants and citizens alike that migrants must wait to enjoy the full set of rights associated with citizenship. The danger of deferment is in its elusiveness, unlike "waiting," deferment suggests an elusive hopefulness, which may or may not be realized. Deferment therefore presents a peculiar psychological precarity for the waiting migrant.

For Mexican migrant subjects like Borrego's children, the temporal displacement through waiting recalls what Dipesh Chakrabarty refers to as the "imaginary waiting room of history" (2000, p. 8). Chakrabarty explains that colonial rule operates, in part, by relegating colonized subjects to the "*not yet*" of civilization. Similarly, deferral communicates to Mexican migrants that they are thought to be "*not yet*" citizens (Ahmed, 2010, p. 133), those who must wait for the privilege of democracy, progress, and modernity promised by citizenship in the U.S.. In the state's imagination, the migrant's imagined backwardness would necessarily result in the fumbling of privileges of citizenship while deferral allows the migrant the "opportunity" to demonstrate they can be made worthy of citizenship.

Borrego's oldest children qualified for such an opportunity because they were brought to the U.S. before they were sixteen years old, had continuously lived in the U.S. since June 15, 2007, had not yet turned thirty-one as of June 15, 2012, and had not been in the U.S. legally since 2012, were in school, had graduated from high school, had not been convicted of a felony, a significant misdemeanor, or three or more misdemeanors, and were physically present in the U.S. on June 15, 2012. Having met these standards, Borrego's children filed a complicated portfolio including proof of having met the guidelines, a complete packet of official forms and worksheets, evidence of a biometric authentication test, and \$465 in fees (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2015). And then they waited while their status was updated online. While both children were granted deferred status, the status itself formulates a different kind of waiting, as "deferred action does not provide lawful status" (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2015). Rather, deferred action makes it possible for youth to be considered for work authorization, makes possible leaving and re-entering the U.S. with government permission, and allows for "prosecutorial discretion to defer removal action against an individual" for two years. At the end of those two years, that individual may reapply for renewed status by submitting a renewal packet and an additional \$465 four months prior to the DACA's expiration (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2015).

The state's expectations laid out above help us think through what an ideal migrant citizen looks like while also allowing the state to imagine its future. Ideal migrant citizens are young, meaning they themselves were not responsible for illegally entering the U.S.; but their youth also suggests they are or have the potential

to be productive bodies. They are educated and/or have served the U.S. army and their (known) actions suggest they do not pose a threat to the security of native-born citizens. Moreover, they are willing to jump through the hoops of bureaucracy and pay substantial amounts for partial inclusion, suggesting they desire to be a part of the nation. In wading through these documents and in waiting the many years for non-deferred, permanent action, migrants prove their desire to become a part of the nation.

Additionally, their waiting is imagined as intensifying their desire for the nation. In narrating migration as only about the American Dream, the migrant is understood as the sole desiring party in the story of immigration. In this simple version of the story of migration, the migrant is imagined to possess a singular and easy desire for the U.S.. The longer the migrant waits, the more they must desire the U.S.. Moreover, this time spent in close proximity to the American Dream offers the migrant time to develop a deeper appreciation for the promises of (relative) safety, security, and wealth. What is often not considered is how, as the migrant waits, she also fulfills the desire of the nation. Indeed, the national imagination feeds on the idea of a migrant that so intensely desires the U.S. that they will sit in detention centers or spend years working without the guarantee of citizenship.

Still, not all migrants wait. Some opt to return to Mexico, removing themselves from the violence of the detention center (Solomon, 2005) or the everyday violences of the empty promises of the American Dream. Indeed, a few short months after Borrego was arrested in her gynecologist's office, the Pew Hispanic Research Center reported that from 2009 to 2014 the U.S. experienced a net loss of 140,000 Mexican migrants as more Mexicans left the U.S. than migrated to live in its borders.

The report suggests three major reasons for the slowed flow into the U.S. and the trend of self-deportation including the slow economic recovery in the U.S., stricter immigration laws and enforcement, and family reunification (Gonzalez-Barrera, 11.19.2015). In these cases, waiting for a job, for citizenship, for family becomes untenable and migrants feel waiting as a form of discipline that is both temporal and spatial.

As Kath Weston, drawing on Chandra Talpade Mohanty, reminds us the temporal and the spatial are deeply related, evidenced in the spatiotemporal distance erected between the “First World” and “Third World.” (2002) In cases of self-deportation the disciplining of the migrant’s time is then also about disorientation by putting spatiotemporal distance between the migrant and the nation, relocating them to somewhere else. Ultimately, the impatient migrant, the one who will not wait, still fulfills the desire of the nation for a migrant that leaves, one imagined to continue to desire the nation from the other side of the border, one that cannot, from such a distance, come to serve as a drain on U.S. resources.

In the end, the nation-state wins regardless. If the migrant waits and suffers through the abuse of detention and/or deferral, the migrant becomes the ideal desiring migrant who can be put to work. The migrant that stays produces both cheap labor as well as the idea that the benevolent nation makes space for moral subjects who contribute. If the migrant leaves, the nation can still figure the deported migrant as one that desires the nation but who could not be made useful either in terms of labor or in the narrative of the nation.

The narrative, then, of the nation relies on stories about migration that are, in

effect, stories about desire. In the generous versions of these stories, it is a yearning for a dream. In a less generous version, it is a desire to take from the more deserving U.S. citizen. In both versions, much is made of the migrant's desire for "a better life" for themselves and their families. In this particular story about the desire for the American Dream, the child figures prominently. I know this story well because it is the same one my parents told me as a child. We had to leave Mexico for my education, for my safety, for my health. In some versions of this story the parent leaves their home country in order to send money back for the child(ren) left behind.

Migrant desires are likewise narrativized through the asylum system. For example, in his work with asylum seekers who sought reprieve from persecution related to sexual orientation in Mexico, Lionel Cantú Jr. argued that asylum is organized to solicit a certain script from asylum seekers. This script not only fixed their sexual identities as "immutably" gay but also established "one's [sending] country in racist, colonialist terms, while at the same time disavowing the United States' role in contributing to the oppressive conditions that one fled" (Cantú with Luibhéid and Stern, 2003, p. 61-62). In the story of asylum the desire of the migrant for safety (at the very least the promise of safety, no matter how elusive) is foregrounded, while the U.S.' desire to imagine itself a progressive and benevolent haven is erased.

This erasure makes it appear as though the only interested and benefiting party in migration is the migrant. This narrative of the desiring migrant and the generous state further sets up the discursive field in which the migrant is able to take advantage of the state's generosity to the point of harming its citizenry. Yet, in my analysis of

Borrego's case, her desires remain unknowable. Indeed, Borrego does not speak at all in any of the news outlets I found. Even those speaking on her behalf – her daughter, her lawyer – did not articulate any desire for the nation. They spoke to a desire for her family and for her right to being free of fear of state surveillance and detention or deportation. No one articulated her desire for citizenship; still, in my reading of the case it is clear that Borrego's arrest and detention betray the nation's desire for detainable and deportable migrant bodies.

Figuring prominently in the nation's desire is the idea that Borrego must want to be made into an ideal citizen. Following Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's argument in "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1998), there is no way to know Borrego's desire because it has necessarily been filtered through narrativizing processes like the asylum courts and media reports. This narrativizing filter is deeply entangled in the process of migration generally. As Brad Epps, Keja Valens, and Bill Johnson González argue, in crossing the border, migrants tell stories of the nation and of themselves that ease their entry into the U.S. (2005). Likewise, in an attempt to narrate Borrego as a sympathetic migrant, the press has suggested that while not yet a citizen, Borrego likely would have qualified for citizenship under President Obama's 2014 executive action. Still, no report has suggested that she or her husband have applied for citizenship. This could be the result of not having access to the resources or knowledge necessary to do so. This inaction with regard to her citizenship could also be rooted in a lack of desire to be formally folded into the nation.

Neither the sympathetic nor the more hostile accounts of Borrego that I read suggest that she might lack a desire for citizenship and belonging in the nation. This

possibility is not legible because it would undermine the U.S.' desire to be understood as exclusive. Indeed, the image of an exclusive and desirable state only functions if Borrego wants to belong but is denied membership. And so in the speech act made by her arresting officers to her daughters sitting in the waiting room, wherein the officers predicted a bail of about \$20,000 and deportation, Borrego was set aside as detainable and deportable, perhaps the most ideal of migrant subjects.

Conclusion

In some ways Borrego's story is unbelievable. That a woman would present herself for medical care but would instead be arrested because of her status as a migrant is outrageous. Yet under our shock is a nagging understanding that her arrest is entirely believable; it was even, perhaps, to have been expected. That nagging is founded upon our understanding that the border might be conjured anywhere by the deputized citizen, but that, in the logic of the state, must be especially conjured to police Mexican women's reproduction.

So Borrego's story flooded Facebook news feeds for about a week in September as both local and national news outlets covered the case. And then Blanca Borrego disappeared. Her arrest, once a spectacle slipped from our notice, performing the Mexican migrant's hyper visibility and simultaneous invisibility. Likewise, the border that sprung up around her has since moved on, deployed elsewhere to capture another brown body to feed the Border Industrial Complex. Meanwhile, Borrego continues to wait for the all-too-deceptive relief found in the "American Dream": a

not guilty verdict, the permanence of home and family, and being able to manage the pain of a cyst.

Chapter 5: Surplus, Criminality, and Value at the Border, Or How to Live on and with Wounds

“Borders are set up to define the places that are safe and unsafe, to distinguish us from them.

A border is a dividing line, a narrow strip along a steep edge.”
(Anzaldúa, 2007, p. 26)

Maria Romero: A Strategic Starting Point

This chapter could open with a bullet. Alternatively, it could start with the brown bodies toward which the guns or Tazers were directed, split second decision to pull a trigger and the lives cut short in the name of securing the U.S. homeland. Likewise, this chapter could begin by considering those holding the weapons, agents of the state, tasked with serving as a human wall where chain link has yet to be erected. Or we could begin with a (set of) criminal act(s): a car stolen, drugs bought, sold, and consumed, bodies disappeared, a rock thrown, an illegal entry. But none of these cases is that transparent.

In 2006 the Mexican Drug War took serious hold along the Mexico-U.S. border. In the following years, intense poverty, proximity to U.S. drug markets made more profitable and forced underground by the U.S. War on Drugs, and the pressure on Columbian drug suppliers by the U.S., had shaped the Mexican border town of Ciudad Juárez into the most murderous city in the world (Cook, 2007; Valencia, 4.21.15). By 2010 the city saw an average of 8.5 deaths per day as the Sinoloa and Juárez cartels battled for control of the city’s access to American drug markets (Valencia, 4.21.15) and so Maria Romero picked up her family and moved them

across the border into the U.S. (Albuquerque Journal News Staff, 2.23.12). If her reasoning was similar to that of the border crossers I interview in chapter two, her hope was to distance herself and her loved ones from the bribes paid to cartel members in exchange for tenuous safety while still remaining close enough to family, friends, and community in Juárez.

Romero did not become a citizen of the U.S. in her first few years here but she did become a legal resident and settled into a life. Five years after coming to the States, on February 21, 2012, Romero spent a Tuesday morning on Overland Avenue in downtown El Paso shopping with her one-year-old grandson. As she pushed his stroller down the street, she was hit in the calf by a stray bullet. The media reported that the “full metal jacket hard-nosed bullet” came from a gunfight half a mile away in Juárez between Mexican officials and a group of car-jackers. In the fight, they said, fifty shots were fired and one traveled across the border. Romero was treated and released from the hospital (Albuquerque Journal News Staff, 2.23.12; Associated Press, 2.22.12; NBC News, 2.21.12).

According to the U.S. media, Romero was the first human victim of a stray bullet from across the border but most sources also reported that several El Paso buildings had been hit and damaged by bullets from Mexico (Associated Press, 2.22.12). Evidence, they suggested, that El Paso, named the “safest city in the country” by CQ Press from 2010-2014, was at risk of experiencing “spillover” violence from Juárez (Aguilar, 12.17.14). In fact, Juárez, at the height of the drug war and in about the same few years (2009-2011), was named the most violent city in the world by the Citizen Council for Public Security and Justice (Associated Press,

2.22.12). To be clear, the violence was real. The threat Romero felt, that my informants felt, was not fictive. Still, my concern here is how that violence was used to feed a narrative of a criminalized city and its criminal inhabitants.

The fiction here, as I have argued throughout, is the national narrative of and compulsion for the impermeable border. The stories of grandmothers and buildings hit by stray bullets remind us that these “borders” do not prevent individuals standing on one side of the border from being wounded or even killed by someone on the other side. As importantly, the discourse of a safe city in need of protection from its far more violent sister city maps the border region in terms not just of safe and unsafe but also in terms of morality and criminality. This discourse, for example, signals a benevolent and law-abiding U.S. that absorbs innocent refugees to protect them against an unlawful and unruly Mexico overrun by cartels and corrupt politicians. Conversely, Juárez is understood as teeming with crime and violence, so much so that this criminal element threatens to leak out across the border, as contagion, to make El Paso a similarly unruly state.

The idea that the border is not static but rather constantly being remapped pushes against the idea that space “just is” and instead highlights the stratagems that are needed to produce space and its meaning (McKittrick, 2006, p. xi). Indeed, this space-making labor is evidenced in a statement issued by Juárez mayor Hector Murguía after Romero’s shooting. While, Mayor Murguía’s statement, that “it is unlikely that the bullet was from Ciudad Juárez,” that investigators “would be better served looking at ‘Fast and Furious’ operations” (Albuquerque Journal News Staff, 2.23.12) performs a kind of discursive *fort/da* where violence is displaced from

Mexico to the U.S., simultaneously facilitating the displacement, if only temporarily, of the trauma of violence. In this moment of deferment, Murguía suggests that the U.S. Operation Fast and Furious – an investigation in which U.S. ATF agents sold 2,000 weapons to Mexican weapons traffickers in the hopes they could use the weapons to build cases against cartel leaders - contributed to making the space violent. It is worth noting that while the operation failed to result in high-level arrests, weapons sold to Mexican weapon dealers “were later recovered by law enforcement officials at crime scenes in Mexico and the United States,” including at the scene that left U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agent Brian Terry dead (Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, Nov. 2012).

Murguía’s mayoral counterpart in El Paso, on the other hand, reinforced the presumption of space as “always already”; that these spaces naturally “just are.” In calling the incident unavoidable, saying there was “no way to prevent incidents like this from happening,” Mayor John Cook naturalized the notion that the border divides a space of death and crime from a space of vibrant life, law, and order (Albuquerque Journal News Staff, 2.23.12). It is important to consider Mayor Cook’s claims because those that attempt to erase the labor of space making are indeed a part of the process. In this particular case, Mayor Cook participates in what Katherine McKittrick, in putting forth a black feminist approach to geography, considers an act of geographic domination, or “social processes that *make* geography a racial-sexual terrain” (p. xiv). For McKittrick, geographic domination “naturalize[s] both identity and place, repetitively spatializing where non dominant groups belong” (p. xv). Here Mayor Cook, perhaps unintentionally, articulates the notion that Mexico “just is” a

place where criminals belong and the U.S. “just is” at risk of being impacted by Mexican violence. The “just is” serves not only to fix notions of space; it also creates an ideological distance between the two nations where spatial distance may not be possible.

The U.S. is not the only guilty party in dictating belonging, naturalizing identity, and making space. Scholars like Gilberto Rosas have convincingly argued that Mexico, in its attempt to modernize and to encourage remittances from Mexicans in the U.S., has likewise been guilty of practices that prescribe deviance, make life unlivable for those considered deviant, and create spaces of death around those who are imagined not to belong (2012). Indeed both nations have been complicit in what McKittrick calls “rational spatial colonization and domination: the profitable erasure and objectification of subaltern subjectivities, stories, and lands” (2006, p. x).

McKittrick’s connections between the creation of space, practices of domination, and the logics of value drive this chapter’s exploration of how spatial domination at the border refashions Mexican productivity for U.S. profit. I argue that the border vacillates between the open border required of NAFTA and similar liberal trade policies and the closed border triggered by U.S. anxieties about Mexican migration. While the open border has allowed for the exploitability of Mexican labor (Mize and Swords, 2011), the closed and militarized border has made the mere presence of migrant bodies at the border productive, calling for billions to be spent on walls, technology, and more agents. In other words, open or closed, NAFTA or the militarization of the border, both moves are predicated on U.S. profits generated by Mexican bodies.

This growing investment in the closed border involves the doubling of the Border Patrol agents since 2005, the 651 miles of physical fencing, and the political resolve to build a “virtual fence” made up of radar, sensors, and human monitors to “protect” the border (Lipton, 6.6.13; Associated Press, 3.25.14). According to political scientist Robert Koulish, this growth in the militarization of the border poses a threat as it calls for “privatization – enforcement, detention, inspections and services – that would place the fate of potential immigrants in the hands of private mercenaries and military contractors” (8.21.06). In fact, he claims, increased agents result in contracts with Blackwater, Inc. to train those agents, while the capture and arrest of more migrants leads to bids by private companies like Corrections Corporation of America to detain them. This twin process of militarizing and privatizing the border raises questions of surplus, value, and criminality at the border and become evident in the cases where agents use lethal force on border crossers. In these cases, I argue, discourses of deviance are used to devalue Mexican subjects, while their presence at the border is also meant to signal the productive need for increased investment in border security measures.

NAFTA, Surplus Life, and the Refashioning of Productivity

Tightening of border policing is often attributed to post-9/11 U.S. politics, the resulting move of the Border Patrol from the Department of Justice to the Department of Homeland Security, and the rhetoric that the border makes the U.S. vulnerable to migrants as well as terrorists. There is no doubt truth in this claim. Yet, it would be shortsighted to not interrogate how the opening of the Mexican border to trade

through NAFTA is connected to increased migration and the militarization of the border.

The North American Free Trade Act (NAFTA), signed by Mexico, the U.S., and Canada, and effective January 1, 1994, ostensibly aimed to eliminate tariffs and other trade barriers in order to facilitate trade and secure comparative advantage amongst the three nations (Hing, 2010). Economists and politicians promised that NAFTA would create jobs in all three countries (Lee, 1993), and that the jobs created in Mexico would help curb migration to the U.S.. It is now well established that migration from Mexico to the U.S. undoubtedly increased in response to NAFTA's implementation (Hufbauer and Scott, 2005). Gary Clyde Hufbauer and Jeffrey J. Scott, economists at the Institute for International Economics demonstrate that this increase was, in part, the result of Mexico's peso crisis and a consolidation of rural land, factors not immediately attributable to NAFTA. However, as is always the case with major economic restructuring, guided by a neo-liberal imperative, they also note the role that NAFTA played in making Mexico's local and fragile economy vulnerable to an influx of cheap imports, and subject to the loss of advanced infrastructure and technology which migrated to the U.S.. Both moves invariably undermined rather than strengthened the local manufacturing sector. Both moves produced a surplus of labor within the Mexican economy (Hufbauer and Scott, 2005).

It is now accepted doctrine among scholars of political economy that for multilateral economic partnerships to work, weaker economies are dependent on a wide range of supports from their stronger counterparts. In this regard, legal scholar Bill Ong Hing notes the need for "serious support for infrastructure, development,

and labor-migration avenues” for weaker economies (2010, p. 5). Without these supports, countries with stronger economies edge out weaker ones, removing their comparative advantage. Hing points to agriculture, suggesting that while Mexico *should have* the advantage over the U.S. and Canada, NAFTA has resulted in Mexican dependence on the U.S. for grain, oilseeds, and meat. These inequities, of course, result from the removal of tariffs and other trade barriers that would have once protected Mexico’s fledgling or labor-intensive sectors¹⁵. As local Mexican farmers struggled to compete with large U.S. corporations, Mexican laborers found themselves jobless (Hufbauer and Schott, 2005) at the same time the United States’ growing agriculture sector and U.S. subsidies (subsidies that the Mexican government cannot afford to offer) created a demand for cheap, immigrant labor. While agriculture provides one of the clearest snapshots of the damage NAFTA has done to the Mexican economy, job loss became a reality in most economic sectors and as jobs migrated to the U.S., so too did people (Hing, 2010).

As Mexicans were pushed out of work, experienced lower wages and poorer job quality they were pulled to and across the border (Hing, 2010; Hufbauer and Schott, 2005). Indeed, in a post-NAFTA Mexico, much of the formal-sector job growth was in the maquiladoras, “foreign-owned plants (largely in border areas) that import components duty-free, assemble them into goods, and then export the goods” (Hufbauer and Schott, 2005, p. 453). Maquiladoras reordered the border landscape; drawing displaced Mexican labor north from central and southern Mexico with the promise of work. Yet while this work was originally designed for former braceros

¹⁵ In one example, NAFTA allowed for Mexican corn markets, once highly protected, to be flooded by US imports grown more efficiently by large US corporations, to be sold in Mexico free of tariffs and other trade barriers.

being exported from the U.S., a significant percentage of these jobs went instead to “young women from the interior, many in their first jobs, [believed] more likely to be satisfied with assembly-line work” (Hufbauer and Schott, 2005, p. 454). So while women have historically been absorbed by the maquiladoras in a rather violent process that constitutes them as disposable workers that can be (over) worked, harassed, and then easily replaced (Salzinger, 2007; Wright, 2007), the maquiladoras did little to create jobs for out-of-work Mexican men. Moreover, as China overtook an economically gutted Mexico as the United States’ second largest trading partner, even these jobs began to disappear (Hing, 2010).

Just as the contemporary rhetoric of migration and protection would have us not see the damages done by NAFTA and the modes of precarity that exist within Mexico, so too have they made invisible the ways the production of surplus labor in Mexico occurs alongside a heightened investment in militarization at the border. These discourses erase that in the first part of the 1990s, as the U.S., Canada, and Mexico were in talks to develop NAFTA, the U.S. Border Patrol shifted tactics along the southern border in response to a wave of anti-immigrant sentiment (Fox, 1999). For example, Operation Blockade (also known as Operation Hold the Line) in El Paso in 1993 marked the beginning of a new approach of “prevention through deterrence” that made an increased number of armed agents more visible at the border. The strategy, replicated in San Diego (Operation Gatekeeper, 1994), Arizona (Operation Safeguard, 1994, 1999), and South Texas (Operation Rio Grande, 1997) was only effective in pushing migration away from highly visible border cities and funneling it

into less safe crossing points like the Arizona deserts where thousands of migrants have died in the last few decades (Andreas, 2000; Dunn, 2009).

My goal in this chapter is to make clear that the exploitation of open economic borders and the militarized physical border do not just happen along parallel tracks but rather as entangled processes wherein some surplus Mexican bodies can be put to work literally while others are made productive in discourses that rely on their criminal presence to build a market around border defense. In the book *The Value of Homelessness: Managing Surplus Life in the United States*, Craig Willse draws on Marxian notions of surplus labor as the foundation of capitalism, and Foucault's thinking around biopower and the management of life to deploy the term "surplus life." Surplus life, he argues, describes, "the ways those made to embody and live the category of 'homeless' become socially and economically productive" (2015, p. 12). Willse claims that the management of homeless bodies has created an industry financially and politically invested in making these surplus bodies "into economically useful matter, matter to be managed, as surplus life reinvested not as labor but as 'the homeless'" (p. 12-13).

Similarly, my goal is to understand how the Border Industrial Complex transforms not the life of migrants, but their death into productive matter. I work to unsettle the discourses of criminality that suggest that the bodies to which they become attached are of little to no value. Rather, in becoming targets of violent policing, these subjects do the work of consolidating state power and sovereignty and justifying political and economic investments in the growing machine of border security. Ultimately, the cases of state violence considered in this chapter, illuminate

how the state has placed a value on criminality. Moreover, these cases indicate the ways that justice, in the very few cases where it is offered aims more to protect the system of border policing through violence than to protect the border community from violent policing.

The Border Industrial Complex and the Investment in Necropolitics

While chapter three was concerned with the management of life and life-giving technologies (eg. healthcare and reproduction) in the case of Blanca Borrego and Mexican migrant women, this chapter leverages Achille Mbembe's notion of necropolitics to understand how death is deployed at the border in order to help grow the defense industry and to ensure U.S. national sovereignty. As Mbembe argues, "the ultimate expression of sovereignty resides, to a large degree, in the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die" (2013, p. 161). Sovereignty then is understood as a "right to kill" that relies heavily on references and "appeals to exception, emergency, and a fictionalized notion of the enemy" (p. 165). At the Mexico-U.S. border the fictionalized enemy is the Mexican national, steps away from being the Mexican migrant, and always imagined to be illegal. This body's presence on the border triggers, along with the sensors buried underground as part of the virtual fence, a range of anxieties that imagine the Mexican migrant as a criminal element, one here to "steal" American jobs and to manipulate U.S. generosity by draining American welfare reserves. Within this frame, the Border Patrol agent protects the U.S. by eliminating the threat.

This chapter considers cases wherein the state used this language of

criminality and threat to justify the killing of this “enemy.” This rhetoric aims to offer an indisputable reason for murder. How might one argue against the call for a safer homeland? Yet, this reason also covers over a drive to sovereignty, profit, and productivity that might spark a debate about who really must die at the border.

Mbembe gestures toward this economic motivation when he uses the work of French philosopher Georges Bataille to link death and sovereignty by arguing that they are both rooted in excess. For Bataille death is “the very principle of excess - an *anti-economy*. Hence the metaphor of luxury and of *the luxurious character of death*” (Mbembe, 2013, p.164). In this anti-economy of the border, it becomes necessary to ask: for whom is the death of the Mexican migrant a luxury? Who profits from his death? How does death at the hands of the Border Patrol agent transform the figure of the Mexican migrant from a thief of U.S. resources, a threat to those living in the U.S. into a productive subject?

This process of making the Mexican migrant productive in death operates on two levels. First, the Mexican migrant affirms the life of the not-dead U.S. citizen. In other words, if we take seriously Lisa Marie Cacho’s contention that subjects are valuable when they are understood in opposite relation to a valueless subject, the U.S. citizen is then understood as valuable in relation to the less valuable migrant. The migrant’s worth lies in his worthlessness. More concretely, the Mexican border subject’s death provides evidence of an enemy at our doorstep, a threat so immediate that war must be waged. And as with all wars, there is a profit to be made by those ready to supply bullets, to build walls, and erect surveillance. In this way, the Border Industrial Complex, a web of deeply entangled private transnational corporations that

partner with the state to secure the border, feeds on dead Mexican bodies.

Specifically, the Border Industrial Complex tends to feed on the bodies of young male Mexican border subjects, those who, through tropes of machismo, the Mexican bandido, and the gang member, are most often associated with notions of criminality (Romero, 2001). Certainly, women do also become the target of Border Patrol violence. Sylvanna Falcón (2007) and Eithne Luibhéid (2002) both convincingly claim that sexual assault has become an element of securing the border against Mexican and Latina women migrants. My interest here is in adding to their analysis of how the intersection of race, gender, and sexuality make some subjects vulnerable to violence, in this case the masculine Mexican border subject. Moreover, as in the case of women migrants like Blanca Borrego, while the politics of respectability are used in an attempt to rescue each of these men, they often fail to ensure “justice.” They certainly always fail to return the dead to life.

In addition to being a certain kind of gendered subject, the subject of state violence is also a certain kind of sexualized subject. Mbembe, along with French philosopher Georges Bataille, argue that death, sovereignty, and sexuality are all related in that the three exceed and defy borders. Mbembe writes, “the truth of sex and its deadly attributes reside in the experience of loss of the boundaries separating reality, events, and fantasized objects” (2013, p. 165). For the two philosophers, the privileged, sovereign subject is able to risk transgressing the borders posed by sexuality and death, for the subordinated subject, the goal is to avoid such risk. Yet despite the attempt to avoid transgressing norms, the Mexican border subject is always constructed as risky, particularly he is understood as sexually risky. While the

Mexican border subject's sexuality is often omitted from the news reports I consider here, I assert that this element of his imagined identity matters to the story of Mexican border crossing. As in the third chapter, I ask how his presence at the border signals a kind of criminal sexuality, one that threatens national (read: white) sexual norms.

The Mexican border subject's presence at the border threatens national sexual and gender norms. He also triggers anxieties about criminalities that can only be made productive through his exploitation or his death. In response to this state violence, calls have been issued by activists, non-profits, and the family members of murdered Mexican border subjects for the brand of justice offered in court cases and legal proceedings. These calls clearly indicate a community wounded by the murders of Mexican border subjects, but I admit I worry that legal forms of "justice" would work to paper over the wounds left by the deployment of necropolitics at the border. Instead, I suggest we uncover and excavate the wounds experienced by those located along what Gloria Anzaldúa once famously described as "una herrida abierta" (2007, p. 25).

Method: Unsettling Criminality, Violence, and Value

The third chapter read along and against news reports of Blanca Borrego's arrest to unpack the shorthand with which we tell the story of Mexican migrant's reproduction, the way the border is conjured in the U.S. interior to police their bodies and reproductive potential, and the way time is used to discipline and contain their excessive, queer bodies. I now turn to consider the master narratives of Mexican migrant criminalization at the geopolitical border, primarily as they are told in the

media. Of particular interest here is not only what is articulated about the bodies rendered criminal but also what need not be said. Specifically, I consider how these narratives underscore how criminality not only justifies the individual border crosser's death but also justifies billions spent to secure defense against others like him. How do law enforcement agents, media reports, and legal documents indicate criminality through language and in what they omit? How for example does the assumption of criminality result in the decision to pull the trigger without evidence of criminal behavior? How does a postmortem pronouncement of past criminal behavior paper over that racially motivated decision? And how do notions of racialized gender and criminalized sexuality underlie these stories with few express references?

As the Border Patrol has argued in response to the publicity of cases where they have been accused of excessive force, agents have to make split-second decisions in the field. In the sped-up temporality of border policing, agents are not allowed the time to perform background checks, they cannot interrogate suspects or collect evidence. In these cases, then, criminality is not rooted in prior criminal acts, and yet in response to agent shootings, the agency is quick to reference criminal records and to suggest illegal acts at the time shots are fired (even as evidence proves otherwise). Criminality, then, is not a fact. Rather criminality is embodied.

To be clear, I do not mean to suggest that a criminal record or an illegal entry justifies these deaths. Rather, I argue that the category "criminal" is not fixed. In the cases I consider in this chapter, it becomes clear that criminality shifts. As Cacho has argued, "the meanings and definitions of criminal, immoral, deviant, and illegal appear to be commonsensical and incontestable only because they are continually

being devised, redefined, reinvented, and repackaged” (2012, p. 126). Here I consider how these categories are, in part, (re)constituted based on notions of racialized masculinities and criminalized sexualities. Moreover, criminality is assessed in terms of the value attached to the futures of Mexican border subjects. In these cases criminality was not just read on to the bodies of these border subjects, it is also read in the context of the border. In other words, these young men’s presence along the border comes to shape the agents’ and the U.S. public’s understanding of their bodies as threats.

In order to get at this shifting notion of criminality I take seriously the narratives outlined in the news media along with legal documents like lawsuits filed on behalf of family members who survive men killed at the border, reports compiled by outside research agencies like the Police Executive Research Forum and the ACLU as well as responses by the Customs and Border Patrol (CBP), and political rhetoric by both border and national politicians in order to create an archive made up of “texts that produce official narratives” about racialized criminality (Cacho, 2012, p. 27). These narratives work on several registers in order to “ascribe value and deservingness” to some, while they also “depend on and therefore support the permanent criminalization of unsympathetic racialized statuses” of others (p. 27). Within this frame, even those texts that might be read as sympathetic to the racialized targets of state violence at the border are rooted in a kind of “calculus of human worth” (Cohen, 1999, p. 325) that suggests some attributes of these young men’s lives are of value even while others are not. This limited calculus is the very device that justifies violence against some and not others. In this chapter, my interest lies in the

alternative ways this calculus is figured so that the border subject's body refreshes the threat of Mexican border subjects and reinstates the state of exception that allows for investments in militarized Border Patrol.

The Value of Criminalized Bodies

On June 7, 2010 in El Paso, Texas, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) agent Jesus Mesa fired his weapon. Across a river and national boundary, in Juárez, Chihuahua, a bullet hit 15-year-old Sergio Adrian Hernández Güereca in the face, killing him immediately. Following Hernández Güereca's death, the FBI announced that a group of young men had been trying to cross the border into the U.S. illegally. When agents captured two of them, the rest allegedly ran back across the border, where they threw rocks at the agents. According to reports, one of the agents, detaining one of the young men yelled at those across the border to stop throwing rocks and to move back. Even though no rocks hit the agent with the gun, when the rock throwing didn't stop, the agent fired (Frey, 5.1.2013; Borunda and Ybarra, 6.8.2010).

While not widely covered in the U.S. press, the Latin American Herald Tribune reported that an FBI spokeswoman, Andrea Simmons, announced that the Mexican military responded to the border shortly after the shooting and "pointed their guns at the Border Patrol agents across the riverbank while bystanders screamed insults and hurled rocks and firecrackers." As a result, the U.S. agents were forced to leave the scene. Meanwhile a relative of Hernández Güereca who was present said the responders were not military but were federal police who only aimed at the CBP

when they tried to enter Mexico to collect evidence. The eyewitness further claimed that the scene escalated to a standoff between agents on both sides of the border before the U.S. agents left the scene (Latin American Herald Tribune, n.d.). Over the course of the week, Mexican President Felipe Calderon issued a call, “demand[ing] the United States government conduct a thorough, impartial ... investigation, concluding with an establishment of the facts and punishment of the culprits” (Sydney Morning Herald, 6.11.2010).

In the rhetoric of both nations lies clear evidence of an attempt to identify criminals. In the rhetoric of President Calderon, the guilty party was the agent who fired and who, despite representing the U.S., should, nonetheless, be punished. In the announcements made by the Border Patrol, the teenage boy who wrongly exercised force against a U.S. law enforcement agent by throwing rocks is the criminal. The emphasis on Hernández Güereca’s rock-throwing is later supplemented by the suggestion of a past criminal record. Three days after Hernández Güereca’s death, CNN reported that a spokesman for Customs and Border Protection, Mark Qualia, had told the news outlet that the young man “had a history of involvement with human smuggling and was on a list of repeat juvenile offenders...[that] had been apprehended by U.S. officials on more than one occasion but was never criminally charged.” It was, according to Qualia, a “common tactic for smugglers” to use youth to cross people into the U.S. (6.10.2010).

The statement’s work was twofold. First it suggested the behavior of assaulting an officer was not out of Hernández Güereca’s character, as his was a criminal character. Useful here is the way Michel Foucault describes the intersection

of the institutions of psychiatry and the judicial. In *Discipline and Punish*, the philosopher attends to the “‘soul’ of the criminal” and the focus and trial not just of the crime committed but the criminal, “not only on what they do, but also on what they are, will be, may be” (1977, p. 18). In this statement to the press, Qualia makes gestures toward Hernández Güereca’s soul, toward not just his past acts but his propensity for escalated future crimes. As importantly, Qualia’s reference to Hernández Güereca’s youth attempts to reframe the conversation, making it so that his youth is not the reason we question his criminality but instead the very reason we believe it. Finally, Qualia’s statement signals that this is a larger set of practices, implemented by a larger group of people – “smugglers” – who likewise have a kind of criminal soul against which the border must be fortified.

Still, as Mesa was standing at the border, Hernández Güereca’s prior charges of human smuggling were unknown to him. Rather, his decision to dispel his firearm might be understood in light of how communication scholar, Brian Massumi theorizes the preemptive as it operates in the War on Terror. In Massumi’s estimation, preemption takes up an uncertain future threat as its object. The uncertainty of the threat is critical as the threat becomes malleable and the state, unsure of the form of the threat or the shape of the enemy but sure of the fear triggered by the enemy, produces and responds to the threat. In other words, the state deploys a “*conditional* logic” in identifying threats, one that “cannot be wrong. First because it only asserts a potential, and second because, especially as in the case of something so slippery as a potential, you can’t prove the negative. Even if it wasn’t *actually* there, it will always still have been there potentially” (2015, p. 13). Massumi’s concern is the perceived

terrorist, but I argue there that criminality works in similar ways.

Within the operative logic of preemption, then, Hernández Güereca is made into a potential threat of a criminal, one that was produced not just as he was identified and shot but also in the aftermath of his shooting. Mussami argues “truth, in this new world order, is by nature retroactive” (2015, p. 14). In this retroactive version of the truth, the same article that accuses the fifteen year old of smuggling migrants can also link to a cell phone video taken of the shooting that first aired on *Primer Impacto* in Mexico. According to CNN, the video “casts doubt on the Border Patrol agent’s claim that he was surrounded by rock-throwing suspected illegal immigrants” when he fired (6.10.2010). While these pieces of data may seem to contradict each other, within the framework of preemption, the rock throwing is almost beside the point. On the one hand, it does support the idea that Hernández Güereca posed a material threat, on the other hand, he need not have been acting to be understood as such and the state only has to suggest he “could have, would have” posed a threat to be a justified target (Mussami, 2015, p. 13). Within this frame, the misrecognition of a threat is not a concern.

Cacho argues that misrecognition and criminalization are often treated as the same thing. In her estimation, criminalization is not simply confusing a body of color who has committed criminal acts for one that has not. Indeed, that logic reinforces a division between respectable and deviant subjects of color, a division that fractures communities of color. Instead, Cacho is concerned with considering criminalization as that which occurs when one is “prevented from being law-abiding” (2012, p. 4). Criminalized subjects, for example, face constrained options and a unique

relationship with the law wherein they are subject to the law without enjoying any of its protection. Hernández Güereca was therefore criminalized in the moment of his shooting. So too was he criminalized when he was prevented from being law-abiding, when his alleged employment (that which is born of increased migration as a result of U.S. economic policies in Mexico, like NAFTA) came into conflict with the law. More than that, he was criminalized when he was understood as someone not protected by the border or by either Mexican or American law. He was criminalized at the moment his body's presence on the border triggered a defensive response by U.S. agents and when his means of protesting¹⁶ or defending himself against an agent with a gun was understood as a crime. Just as Mussami argues that truth is retroactive (2015, p. 14), Hernández Güereca's criminalization and, relatedly, his purported value(lessness) has also been retroactive, conferred and confirmed through the U.S. government's investigation into the matter and as his family filed a series of lawsuits that forced both parties had to (re)narrativize the events at the border and the life of the young man.

Calls by the family, the Mexican government, and the ACLU for accountability through legal systems of justice in the U.S. fell on deaf ears. After an investigation that took almost two years, on April 27, 2012, the Department of Justice and the U.S. Attorney's Office declared the case closed and that no charges would be filed against Mesa. The related press release emphasized Hernández Güereca's criminality, the ways his criminality would cost U.S. citizens in both security and tax

¹⁶ Weber and Pickering argue that fatal violence against rock throwers, "amount[s] to sanctioning and systematizing the use of disproportionate force" (p. 134) because they understand throwing rocks "as a protest against segregation and disempowerment" (Weber and Pickering, 2014, p. 133)

dollars, and reasserted the threat he posed. In the document the incident was described as having “occurred while smugglers attempting an illegal border crossing hurled rocks from close range at a CBP agent who was attempting to detain a suspect.” During the review of the case, two possible charges had been considered. As to the first, “a possible violation of federal homicide statutes.” it was determined there was “insufficient evidence to pursue prosecution” as the “review took into account evidence indicating that the agent’s actions constituted a reasonable use of force or would constitute an act of self defense in response to the threat created by a group of smugglers hurling rocks at the agent and his detainee. The investigation also revealed that, on these particular facts, the agent did not act inconsistently with CBP policy or training regarding use of force” (Department of Justice, 4.27.12).

Ultimately, the government’s argument here points to an asymmetrical valuing of life so that one, that of the U.S. agent, was worth preserving even at the cost of the Mexican subject’s life. An argument codified by CBP policy.

As to the second count, that of a possible violation of civil rights, the government’s response reinforced not only the physical border between the U.S. and Mexico, but it also suggested that the category of the human only extended as far as the national boundary. Indeed the DOJ pronounced that “a prosecution under the federal criminal civil rights statutes would be barred because the investigation determined that Hernández Güereca was neither within the borders of the United States nor present on U.S. property, as required for jurisdiction to exist under the applicable federal civil rights statute” (Department of Justice, 4.27.12). The Department of Justice press release ends with a statement that the “U.S. government

regrets the loss of life in this matter” but that there was to be no action taken after a thorough review of this case, fueled by commitments to the Mexican government and to “investigating allegations of excessive force by law enforcement officers” (Department of Justice, 4.27.12).

On August 18, 2011, CNN reported that the lawsuit against the government had been dismissed as “precedent prohibits the family from suing the United States because the injury happened on the Mexican side of the border, even though the action originated on the U.S. side.” At the same time, the U.S. district judge ruled that the suit against the U.S. government and the CBP agent, Jesus Mesa, Jr., were in fact different suits, meaning that while the family would have to appeal their claim against the government, they were free to continue their case against Mesa separately (CNN Wire Staff, 8.18.11).¹⁷ Six months later, the case against Mesa was dropped by the same judge, who ruled that Mesa did not violate Hernández Güereca’s “constitutional protections against deadly and excessive force...because Güereca isn’t covered by these protections because he was a Mexican citizen and was in Mexico when the shooting took place” (Chávez, El Paso Times, 2.18.12).

In response to the argument that humanity ends at the border, repeated by both

¹⁷ While both cases would go on to be argued in front of higher courts, I am interested in the separation of the cases and the suggestion by the courts that Mesa was acting separate from the state. The problem with this approach, one taken by the Mexican government, echoed by the US government, is that, just like the logics of criminalization that rendered Hernández Güereca criminal without accounting for the ways he could never not be criminal, both governments consider Mesa’s actions without recognizing the larger structures of power in which his choices were limited. To be clear, as he was acting on state authority, Mesa’s violent actions were valued above and considered more legitimate than the teenager’s smuggling, but they were nonetheless prescribed by the state, even as the US suggested that the case of his individual violence ought to be considered separate from the state’s violence. Moreover, the separation of the actor from the system that the actor represents, allows the state to benefit from the violence without facing the consequences.

the Department of Justice and U.S. courts, the Mexican government issued a warrant for Mesa's arrest (Frey, 5.1.13). As in the case of Maria Romero's shooting, the existence of the warrant in this case is a clear attempt by the Mexican government to reverse the U.S.'s claim that Mexican criminality justifies U.S. force and to instead suggest that criminality originates on the northern side of the border. It is an easy and logical argument to make, to assign guilt to man holding the gun. Indeed, it is ultimately an argument that the U.S. government echoes as they face a lawsuit from Hernández Güereca's family. Seven months after Hernández Güereca's death, on January 17, 2011, his family filed a \$25 million lawsuit against the U.S. government and Agent Mesa. In the suit, the family claims their son's civil rights were violated and that this was a case of wrongful death as their son was not a criminal. Leaning on an argument that their son was misrecognized, and that his life was of more value than that of a criminal's, the family argued that the teen had not been trying to enter the United States illegally but that he was playing a game with friends that involved running to and from the border fence when the CBP approached, and that he was a bystander when he was shot. The family further accused the agents present of failing to contact emergency services for Hernández Güereca, instead leaving the scene as the young man died on the border (Associated Press, 1.17.11).

Evidenced in both the U.S. and Mexico's investigations of the shooting, is the way the case can be leveraged to create distance between the nation and the criminal threat posed by the other. For example, in this case, the U.S. benefits from reasserting that the border separates U.S. citizens from criminal and threatening Mexican subjects. At the same time, the state's violence toward and subsequent discourse

about Mexican subjects reinforces the notion that these criminal subjects ought to be tied to geographies of death and militarization, geographies that operate in opposition to the U.S. as a space of life. Following Cacho, then, the racialized border subject is not devalued because race itself is devalued, rather because race becomes attached “to other categories of devaluation” – like the criminal (2012, p. 3). In Cacho’s estimation, the criminal is “affixed with an amoral nature and ascribed shameful meanings that justify why certain people need to be targets of violence and state abandonment” (p. 3). It is this process, the affixing of the criminalized border subject to spaces of violence that makes this subject, often dismissed as disposable and valueless, of value to the state. In this moment, the state not only defines itself in opposition to the border subject, but it also justifies continued investment in technologies of surveillance, policing, and preemption.

Questions of value become complicated when they entangle large corporations and questions of profit. In Cacho’s work, these corporations are those that stepped in to post-Katrina New Orleans in order to exploit the “devalued land” and “forsaken residents” (p. 14). Of interest in the case of Hernández Güereca, and other criminalized border subjects, is the role of the Border Industrial Complex, made up of private corporations that profit off the sale of goods and services to the state in order to assist in the process of militarization. These corporations exploit for profit the belief that Mexican migrant bodies are criminal and hide behind the lie that criminal bodies are of no value.

Michael Dear has rightly drawn the connection between the arrest of migrants and the build up of “an archipelago of detention, prosecution, and deportation

centers” (10/06/2015). In addition, Dear describes the way border zones along the U.S.’ southern border might be described as a “police state,” one that entails:

fences and walls, surveillance towers, official ports-of-entry, and border patrol stations. Beyond these, however, the plentiful detritus of occupation is also manifest indirectly as dams, stadium lighting, diverted drainage channels, landfills, airborne surveillance, custom-built access roads, staging areas, parking facilities, internal checkpoints, endless vehicular patrols, armed foot patrols, large-scale earth removals, warehousing, acres of trash, drones, and the ubiquitous signage of prohibition.

Still, scholars like Dear have missed the opportunity to consider the ways that dead migrant bodies, those who have been attached to the category of criminal and targeted by law enforcement agents, encourage political and financial investment in the industry of border defense.

According to a *60 Minutes* episode that aired exactly six months before Hernández Güereca was killed, the Department of Homeland Security was three years into a billion dollar contract with Boeing called the Secure Borders Initiative Network, or *SBI*net, meant to technologize border surveillance against “migrants, drug smugglers, and even international terrorists trying to enter the country illegally” (1.07.10). *60 Minutes*’ Steve Kroft added, “In principal it’s not that much different from the security systems you might find in someone’s home, office building, or the convenience store down the block – only on a much larger and more sophisticated scale.” Statements like Kroft’s only reinforce the notion of defending the *home* in homeland.

While *SBI*net would go on to fail in 2011 after experiencing glitches and hurdles in securing just 53 miles of the 2,100 mile border, it would not deter the growth of privatized corporations working to secure the border. In April of 2015,

Tom Dart of the Guardian reported from the Border Security Expo in Phoenix, Arizona. Here he found agencies looking for more reliable technology on a smaller scale than that promised by *SBI*net and vendors looking to capitalize on the discourse of insecurity and criminality that looms large in the story of Hernández Güereca. In the article, Dart quotes David Aguilar, former Border Patrol chief: “The border today is transformed. Border communities are safer than the interior locations of each of the border states.” In stark contrast stands the rhetoric of a technology vendor at the expo who states “Obama says he’s tough on the border, but everyone knows he’s not” (4.26.15). It is clear that the rhetoric of the vendor is that which wins out in cases where the Senate proposes an immigration reform bill that calls for a \$46 billion budget that buys more agents, fencing, and technology.

This rhetoric also feeds on the discourse surrounding cases wherein Mexicans in Mexico are killed by agents in the U.S.. In these cases, as evidenced in the case of Hernández Güereca, discourses of criminality, smuggling, the stealing of goods and jobs underscores the notion that these migrants posed a threat so great it had to be eliminated. The discourses work to paper over the reality of economic abandonment and exploitation at the border and the conversion of Mexican bodies first into surplus labor and then into a body that justifies the creation of a defense market. Meanwhile, resulting lawsuits have proven ineffective because of the victims’ citizenship and geographical location have affirmed their lack of social value while the Border Industrial Complex has claimed their futurelessness in the name of its own financial growth. And so the closing of the border to “smugglers” like Hernández Güereca and those he is accused of smuggling, preventing those driven from Mexico by intense

poverty and crime, opens a market for corporations looking to make a profit off of the promise of a more secure border.

The Work of Violence

Ten days before Sergio Hernández Güereca was shot and 848 miles away from where he died, 42-year-old Anastasio Hernández Rojas was taken into custody at the San Ysidro Port of Entry in San Diego, California. In a report, “Crossing the Line at the Border,” published on April 20, 2012 by Brian Epstein, PBS’ program *Need to Know* covered the death of Hernández Rojas. In a second part, not considered here, reporters zoomed out to consider abuse by Border Patrol agents more generally including overcrowding in detention centers, sexual violence by agents, and physical abuse. The first part of the program begins with a police report, an autopsy report, and a two cell phone videos – the first of Hernández Rojas unconscious in the hospital and the second of a violent altercation between the border crosser and Border Patrol agents. As he outlines these pieces of evidence, a PBS reporter asks us to consider whether the methamphetamines found in Hernández Rojas’ system led to his death, whether he became combative with agents, or whether this was a case of excessive force.

In the twenty or so minutes that follow, the *Need to Know* reporter, along with actor and activist John Carlos Frey detail the death of the Mexican national who had lived his life at the mercy of volatile labor markets in Mexico and notions of illegality in the U.S.. Drawn to the U.S. by economic opportunity, Hernández Rojas had spent twenty-seven years in the U.S. as a builder with his wife and five children. In May

2010, as his work as an undocumented contractor had dried up, Hernández Rojas was caught shoplifting tequila and a steak, likely a gift for his wife. Upon his arrest, officials completed a background check and, probably as a result of the intensified information sharing amongst law enforcement agencies that was brought about by Secure Communities: A Comprehensive Plan to Identify and Remove Criminal Aliens, he was identified as an undocumented migrant. The now-renamed Secure Communities' mission had been to "improve public safety by implementing a comprehensive, integrated approach to identify and remove criminal aliens from the United States (U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, 2009) and was actuated through a surveillance net that included national biometric identification, integrated record checks on all arrested individuals, and a commitment to responding to record checks promptly. Upon identifying a "criminal alien," Secure Communities prioritized "enforcement actions to ensure apprehension and removal of dangerous criminal aliens." And so in the case of Hernández Rojas, he was deported back to Mexico (Epstein, 2012).

In Mexico, Hernández Rojas called his wife and promised to return to her and their five children quickly. In the interview with PBS, she recalls telling him not to come back because security at the border was so tight. A few days later Hernández Rojas unknowingly tripped a ground sensor paid for, placed in the desert, and monitored by the U.S. Border Patrol as he re-entered the U.S.. He was apprehended by Border Patrol agents, and taken to a detention center in San Diego. A lawsuit filed by Hernández Rojas' family later would allege that in that detention center Hernández Rojas was questioned and, in the process, an agent kicked out a previously broken

ankle. In excruciating pain, Hernández Rojas asked for medical attention and to file a complaint against the agent who had kicked him, Agent V325. Rather than receiving care, Agent V325 and one other agent refused protocol that dictated they take him to a deportation center and instead drove him to the border. Police reports would suggest that his handcuffs were removed and he became combative, the officers on the scene had to no choice but to respond with force (Epstein, 2012).

PBS' investigation suggests that that story is, at best, more complicated, at worst meant to cover up agent brutality. Doctors contacted by the news agency would indicate that the amount of meth in Hernández Rojas' system was not enough to spark violent behavior. In fact, cell phone videos captured by American citizens crossing into San Diego from Tijuana suggested that Hernández Rojas couldn't have become violent because his hands were cuffed, and later his feet were hogtied. Moreover, the videos offered by Umberto Navarrete and Ashley Young recorded Hernández Rojas crying for help, begging the dozen or so agents surrounding him to stop. The video, once lightened, captured one agent removing Hernández Rojas' pants, another putting his leg on Hernández Rojas' throat to choke him, and the five different times he was Tazered including the final "drive stun" applied directly to the skin. On May 31, 2010, two days after being taken into custody, Hernández Rojas died in a San Diego hospital (Epstein, 2012).

Just as in the case of the death of Sergio Hernández Güereca, the killing of Hernández Rojas, along with the 25 other people killed in encounters with CBP officials since 2010 (ACLU, 2.24.14), demonstrates that border violence is not transparent. Lethal violence is not, as suggested by the San Diego Police report,

simply a matter of defending the nation against undocumented immigration. Rather, Hernández Rojas' murder and its lack of media coverage illuminates the way state violence becomes a naturalized backdrop to the more visible violence perpetrated by criminalized individuals, one that shores up national sovereignty and continued investment. This backdrop covers over not just the ways that violence creates difference amongst citizens and non-citizens, but also sexualized and gendered non-citizens.

Over five years after Hernández Rojas died, on November 6, 2015, the Department of Justice issued a statement that closed the investigation into his death. Similar to the statement released after Hernández Güereca's death, the agency declared that no federal charges would be pursued against the agents involved. The narrative crafted by the DOJ surrounding Hernández Güereca's death is as follows:

The evidence developed during the investigation indicated that when Hernandez-Rojas' handcuffs were removed at the San Ysidro Port of Entry, Hernandez-Rojas began grappling with the two U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) agents and then resisted their efforts to restrain him. Two Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents, as well as another USBP agent, joined the struggle and struck Hernandez-Rojas several times with their asp batons. The agents again secured Hernandez-Rojas in handcuffs, but he continued to struggle and kick at the agents. The agents called for backup and a transport vehicle to take Hernandez-Rojas for processing since he was no longer eligible for voluntary return due to the struggle. As agents attempted to place Hernandez-Rojas in the transport van to take him back to the station, he again physically resisted and attempted to kick the agents. A number of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officers responded to the scene, one of whom shocked Hernandez-Rojas with a taser. Hernandez-Rojas stopped resisting and the agents restrained his legs. Shortly thereafter, Hernandez-Rojas' breathing slowed and he became unresponsive. The CBP officers administered CPR until medical personnel arrived

at the scene. Hernandez-Rojas was pronounced dead two days later after being removed from life support.

Putting aside the difference between this narrative and the events as they were depicted in the cell phone videos shown on *Crossing the Line*, in this narrative, the “criminal act” of refusing arrest is emphasized over the “reactionary” violence of Border Patrol agents and CBP officers. Moreover, in explaining the cause of death, the DOJ identifies “acute methamphetamine intoxication, pre-existing heart disease, the level of physical exertion during the struggle, the electroshocks from the Taser and the positional restraint” as all having contributed to Hernández Rojas’ myocardial infarction (heart attack). But only the methamphetamine intoxication is isolated as “the medical examiner stated further that Hernandez-Rojas would not have died had there not been methamphetamine intoxication” (11.6.15). Therefore the criminal act of drug use becomes not just as important, but more important than the use of batons, Tasers, and restraints.

The focus on Hernández Rojas’ criminality evidences philosopher Slavoj Žižek’s assertion that not all violence is the same. Indeed, while we often consider violence to take the form of actions by an identifiable (group) of criminal actor(s), like that of Hernández Rojas’ illegal entry, his alleged resistance of agent commands, and his use of illegal drugs, Žižek encourages us to consider the less visible forms of violence. Systemic violence, for Žižek, refers to “the violence inherent in a system: not only direct physical violence, but also more subtle forms of coercion that sustain relations of domination and exploitation including the threat of violence” (p. 9). Likening systemic violence to the “‘dark matter’ of physics,” Žižek claims that systemic violence must be accounted for in order to understand the more visible

violences perpetrated by criminal and terrorist actors. Within this frame, Hernández Rojas' criminal acts cannot be understood as separate from the acts of violence perpetrated by the state. For example, Hernández Rojas' illegal re-entry is textured differently by the violence of family separation. His resisting arrest cannot be understood apart from the violence of those agents: the kicking of his ankle, the introduction of a baton, the shock of a Tazer on bare skin. The state's violence reframes his resistance as perhaps not an attempt to break the law but rather a will to survive.

Yet, there is no space in our understandings of violence to recognize moments wherein resistance takes violent forms. Ethnic studies scholar Randall Williams argues, not unlike Mbembe, that states claim power by "securing a monopoly on the concentrated means of violence" (2010, p. 17). In Williams' estimation, then, this monopoly takes hold through the mechanism of (il)legality. In other words, the state "converts" its own violence into legality while it "resistant violence" is made illegal (p. 18). The Department of Justice enacts this exact protocol as it dismisses potential charges of criminality against agents and officers, issuing the claim that the DOJ is unable to "disprove the agents' claim that they used reasonable force in an attempt to subdue and restrain a combative detainee." They cannot be charged with violating Hernández Rojas' civil rights because there is no evidence they intended to violate his rights. They cannot be charged with homicide because it cannot be proven they used their tasters with "malice," manslaughter charges cannot be brought because their behavior was "not unlawful and, based on the evidence gathered relating to the federal agents' use of force training, the federal agents' actions were not done without

due caution and circumspection.” (11.6.15)

Hernández Rojas’ case lays out a clear example of how this violence unfolds but the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), along with the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) and activist journalists provide a larger snapshot of violence perpetrated by the Border Patrol. According to the ACLU, between January 2010 and February 2014, twenty-seven people died as a result of engagements with CBP officials. Seven of these people were under the age of 21, eight of the twenty-seven were accused of rock-throwing, six were standing in Mexico, nine were U.S. citizens (2.24.14). In the report that follows, the ACLU points toward recommendations that would make investigating such deaths more thorough, consistent, and transparent to the public, as the ACLU argues, there is no way for them or others to access the official details of CBP investigations.

In a move toward investigating the use of force by Border Patrol officials, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection commissioned the “Use of Force Review: Cases and Policies” report by the Police Executive Research Forum.¹⁸ In compiling the report, PERF analyzed sixty-seven case files dated between January 2010 and October 2012. The research organization commended CBP for the use of several best practices, including firearms qualifications, new mapping software that allows CBP to map and track use of force, and the creating of a reference guide regarding how to

¹⁸ From the organization’s website: “The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) is an independent research organization that focuses on critical issues in policing. Since its founding in 1976, PERF has identified best practices on fundamental issues such as reducing police use of force; developing community policing and problem-oriented policing; using technologies to deliver police services to the community; and evaluating crime reduction strategies. PERF strives to advance professionalism in policing and to improve the delivery of police services through the exercise of strong national leadership; public debate of police and criminal justice issues; and research and policy development.”

document the use of force. While recommendations for improvement targeted the agency's reporting, investigating, reviewing cases along with the weapons, protective equipment, and training provided to officers, they also foregrounded its two largest concerns: the use of violence against rock-throwers and shots fired at moving vehicles. In both cases, PERF found that agents would put/keep themselves in the path of rocks or vehicles in order justify the use of deadly force. PERF calls for the de-escalation of these cases, training officials to remove themselves from the path of rocks when possible and forbidding the shooting at moving cars (as a moving car with a shot driver becomes more dangerous).

Yet, just as Williams suggests, CBP has converted these cases of violence into the law and when made visible articulates the need for increased security against the criminal element of the border crosser. First the agency refused to release the entire PERF report. Handed over to CBP on February 2013, the agency kept the document away from Congress and the public. It was not until a copy was leaked to the LA Times' Brian Bennet (2.27.14) and the ACLU (2.28.14) joined The Center for Investigative Reporting (5.23.14) called for full transparency that the CBP released the report (5.30.14) along with a revised set of guidelines for use of force. As the report became public though the agency also went back to review the sixty-seven cases reviewed by PERF, only to absolve agents involved in all but three of the cases (Bennett, 6.15.15).

Indeed, this absolving of agents was necessary, for as Williams argues, the state's monopoly on violence "must be perpetually renewed against challenges to its monopoly from within and from without" (2010, p. 18). Border anthropologist

Gilberto Rosas similarly argues that sovereignty must always be reasserted through force at the Mexico-U.S. border. Specifically, he claims that border policing has escalated into low-intensity conflict that “dramatizes the necessarily incomplete nature of sovereignty in the age of late neoliberal globalization” (2012, p. 7). For Rosas, neoliberal sovereignty is enacted in the policing of difference on the nation’s borders through “legitimate displays of violence” (p. 11). For Rosas these acts of violence may legitimize the state but also display “the criminal depths of state power in the age of neoliberal globalization” (p. 11). Rosas’ clear investment in blurring the lines of criminality extend to his consideration of the subject targeted by state violence. For Rosas the state can be criminal but so too can the criminal be just as guilty of targeting other migrants.

Importantly, the policing through “managed violences” (Rosas, 2012, p. 13) not only continuously shores up sovereignty, it also constructs and reinforces notions of difference. For Nicole Guidotti-Hernández, “violence is an ongoing social process of differentiation for racialized, sexualized, gendered subjects in the U.S. borderlands” (2011, p. 3). Guidotti-Hernández considers cases of lynching against Mexicanas and mass violence against Native Americans at the border to argue that violence serves to limit or sever the control racialized, gendered, and sexualized subjects had over their own bodies and resources. It is a violence that is repeated in media and archival accounts of violence against racialized border subjects that simultaneously makes mention of the violence and then erases that violence. Hernández Rojas’s case evidences not only the ways that his criminality was defined in the moment of violence, but reinforced by DOJ’s statement that the meth in his

system prompted his death.

Mbembe also locates difference in the subject's relation to violence. For him, this becomes evident in the way that violence - state, poverty, environmental racism - follows the otherized subject, while the privileged subject might chase violence through risk, secure enough in their ability to walk away from the violence. Rosas describes a similar process of violent identity making and marking. Exiting a sewer tunnel between Nogales, Sonora and Nogales, Arizona, Rosas and his informants, a group of criminalized youth that "ooze" back and forth across countries, violently encounter Mexican transito (transit) police. While Rosas' U.S. passport saves them from a more severe beating, he explains that even the "stories of beatings and extortion press on the youth, incite them, provoke them, and define them in perverse relationship to that oppression and related ones" (2012, p. 5). The process Rosas describes here also echoes Cacho's notion of the criminalized subject who has no choice to be law abiding. Both Rosas' delinquent subject and Cacho's criminalized are made subjects *to* (though certainly not *of*) the state. Leveraging the important contribution of Timothy Dunn to border studies, and his claim that tactics at the Mexico-U.S. border evidence what is known as Low Intensity Conflict (LIC), Rosas argues that the border forms a "peculiar and particular conjunction of the military's power to kill and the police's power to regulate is doubled in the case of undocumented migrants..." (2012, p. 11). As such, Hernández Rojas and border subjects like him are defined and made subject to the state through the entwined process of criminalization and state violence.

Importantly, in this moment, Rosas also offers a critique of those scholars who

argue that border violence is rooted in law. Instead, he argues, “racialized and gendered nationalisms license the abandonment, or punishment, incarceration, and subjugation of others” (2012, p. 17). Hernández Rojas was targeted as a racialized and criminalized subject, but so too was he targeted as a gendered and sexualized subject, as becomes clear in the moment in the cell phone video where an agent leans in, through the tangle of bodies and removes Hernández Rojas’ pants. Clearly, on a very basic level, the agent’s removal of his pants might be read as an attempt to emasculate the “hypersexual,” “macho” Hernández Rojas. As Bonnie Mann has argued, racist notions about foreign hyper-masculinity have long sat at the center of U.S. military tactics. In reading testimony by Dhia al-Shweiri, who was held at Abu Ghraib by the U.S. military, Mann argues “manhood is the kind of thing that can be shattered, and our military and our government have been staging events, committing acts with the intention of shattering it” (2014, p. x). Yet there is also something insufficient about considering the act of disrobing a handcuffed, prone man surrounded by a dozen agents as just rooted in emasculation.

In her own consideration of the ways in which the U.S. military enacted physical and sexual violence on a racialized and sexualized enemy, Jasbir Puar argues that Abu Ghraib is the manifestation of both Giorgio Agamben’s state of exception and U.S. exceptionalism that “works to turn the negative valence of torture into the positive register of the valorization of (American) life, that is torture in the name of maximization and optimization of life.” (2007, p. 3) For Puar, in order to “consolidate national sentiment and consensus” around the state of exception, the state works to fold in a figure previously considered deviant - the homosexual. Still, she argues not

all queer subjects can be incorporated, indeed there are some deviances that cannot be made to belong. Hernández Rojas is one such (sexual) deviant.

Where the Abu Ghraib scandal and the beating and violation of Hernández Rojas differ is in the military captors' use of image as part of the torture. Instead, the Border Patrol agents attempted to disrupt the capturing of Hernández Rojas' dehumanization. Ashley Young, the witness who captured the video that shows his beating and the removal of his pants tells reporters that the couple standing next to her on the bridge had their phone confiscated for taping the incident (Epstein, 2012). Perhaps the attempt at secrecy is the result of scandals such as Abu Ghraib and the impulse to avoid making visible the violence of the state. Or perhaps the attempt to eliminate the image of an agent removing a border crosser's pants was meant to erase evidence of the transfer of deviance, to wipe away the moment of policing in which the police became the criminal, of when they took pleasure in the violation of another man's body.

While cases of agent violence against border crossers, like the one of Hernández Rojas, are often offered as transparent cases of national self-defense, in which the state had to protect itself against the unending threat of Mexican migrants, I read Hernández Rojas' case as much blurrier. It is the case of a criminal act (the theft of a bottle of tequila, the consumption of meth) and a set of criminal agents who beat a man and removed his clothing. It is the case of a criminal state converting a man into a criminal, whose death will shore up investment in the state and its protection. A criminal state that will hide behind justice foreclosed with the conclusion that: "While the loss of life is regrettable, the facts of this matter do not support a federal

prosecution.” (11.6.15)

Living on and with Wounds

Cases of border violence in which justice is denied, like those of Hernández Güereca’s and Hernández Rojas’ force us to reckon with the question of what justice might look like when the state is the perpetrator of violence. While some turn to a brand of justice offered by the state, it might be worthwhile to ask how the justice system protects not just individual state agents but also the larger system that profits from the death of criminalized border crossers.

On October 10, 2012, in an incident that echoed the facts of the case of Sergio Hernández Güereca, sixteen-year-old José Antonio Elena Rodríguez was shot and killed by Border Patrol Agent Lonnie Ray Swartz. According to Rodríguez’ lawyer, the young man was walking down Calle Internacional as he returned home from a game of basketball with friends (Rodríguez v. Swartz). At the same time, across the border, Border Patrol agents and police officers responded to a 911 call about a group climbing over the 18-foot border fence separating Nogales, Sonora from Nogales, Arizona. As the officers approached, the border crossers climbed back into Mexico and, according to the police report, began throwing rocks (Yuhás, 5.31.15).

As in the case of Hernández Güereca, the media has cast doubt on whether rock throwing really put agents in danger. NPR’s reporting took them to the location where Rodríguez was shot. They claim that rock-throwers “would have to throw their projectiles 40 to 50 feet up in the air to clear the top of the fence, and the rocks would have to drop straight down to harm an agent standing on the other side. Or they would

have to aim their rocks to fly through the 3.5-inch gaps between the iron bars” (Burnett, 10.9.15). Moreover, Rodríguez’ family’s lawyers contend that he was not one of the border crossers and that he was not throwing rocks.

Still, Swartz fired into Mexico twelve times, ten of his bullets hit Rodríguez. Eight hit him in the back (Yuhas, 5.31.15). Some reports suggest Swartz stopped shooting and reloaded his weapon (Burnett, 10.9.15). Ultimately, Rodríguez died thirty feet into Mexican territory (Yuhas, 5.31.15).

Two years after Rodríguez’ death, the government had still not rendered a decision in a federal investigation and so Araceli Rodríguez, José Antonio’s mother, filed a lawsuit in federal court. A few months later, Agent Swartz was indicted for second-degree murder in federal court. In response, the Border Patrol Union issued the following statement: "Sadly, our agents and all law enforcement officers operate in a world of political agendas and armchair quarterbacking. But our jobs are dangerous, and the decisions we make every day determine if we will return home safely to our families. We ask the public to withhold judgment about agent Swartz while the legal process unfolds” (Associated Press, 9.25.15).

All reports of Swartz’s indictment point to the rarity of his case. His is the first case of a cross-border shooting to see a courtroom (Gardner, 9.28.15). Only two cases have been brought against agents who killed an immigrant (1992, 2007) and in both cases agents were cleared (Associated Press, 9.25.15). In one 2006 case, two agents were found guilty of killing a Mexican drug dealer and hiding evidence but President George W. Bush commuted their sentences after public pressure to do so (Burnett, 10.9.15). In 2013, Arizona Republic conducted an investigation that found that

between 2005-2013, Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Patrol officers had killed at least 42 people. The report found that in “none of the 42 deaths is any agent or officer publicly known to have faced consequences — not from the Border Patrol, not from Customs and Border Protection or Homeland Security, not from the Department of Justice, and not, ultimately, from criminal or civil courts.” (Ortega & O’Dell, 12.16.13). Calling internal discipline a “black hole,” the investigators were highly critical of the silence around agents involved, use of force, or repercussions faced.

In the midst of state silence over her son’s shooting, Araceli Rodríguez called for justice and in 2015 she told *The Guardian*, “I don’t see the case to have a trial, or why there are so many questions when it’s clear that he was murdered. I’m not just saying that - it’s a reality. They threw away his life. The whole world knows what justice would be. To have my son’s killers pay for what they did, that would be justice.” In reference to the U.S. government, she challenges, “What is your law, then? What does justice mean to you? What could be more important than justice?” The article concludes with Araceli Rodríguez’ words: “I don’t want my son to be forgotten. I want people to keep talking” (Yuhás, 5.31.15). What strikes me in her call is her complex understanding of justice. In some ways, her call sounds very familiar, as she demands that the guilty party must “pay.” This payment might take the form of a financial solution to a lawsuit, but it also echoes the rhetoric of a justice system that demands payment in the form of time behind bars or a life surrendered to the state. Still, there is something more to her call for justice, a plea to remember her son, for people to continue to talk about him.

In some ways, Araceli Rodríguez' call is contradictory. She demands legal closure at the same time that she refuses closure, demanding that he survive, if not in fleshy presence, in other ways. It is a refusal she practices when she states: "He's still a part of me. Even though he's not here he's still my son in spirit, in soul, in thoughts, in words. My son, my son, my son" (Yuhás, 5.31.15). It is this form of justice, a justice that would allow José Antonio to linger that legal justice cannot provide, that in some ways the legal form of justice forecloses.

At the heart of Rodríguez' case, as in the case of Hernández Güereca and Hernández Rojas, is a question of rights. Does a Mexican have the rights of an American? Can a Mexican standing in Mexico claim protection against "excessive and unjustified force" from an American officer standing in the U.S.? Rodríguez' lawyer, senior attorney with the ACLU argues yes. Not only is the constitution applicable because the agent was in the U.S., but also because the U.S. has extended the constitution "extraterritorially unless it would be 'impracticable or anomalous' to do so in a particular case"¹⁹ (Rodríguez v. Swartz).

In considering another case where rights had to be extended to those not thought to bear them, Saidiya Hartman argues that neither the category of human nor the granting of rights simply expanded to cover the former slave. Rather, new categories of the human were created, and "slave humanity — that is, the sated subordinate and/or willful criminal, the calculation of humanity the fabulation of the will, and the relation between injury and personhood" took form (1997, p. 6). I want

¹⁹ The lawsuit goes on to read: "Here, there is nothing impracticable or anomalous about requiring Defendant to comply with the constitutional limits on the use of deadly force when he fires through the fence at an unarmed civilian. What *would* be anomalous is a legal rule that allows border agents to fatally shoot someone on the other side of the border—even intentionally—with constitutional impunity."

to be clear, the Mexican citizen/U.S. non-citizen is not configured in the same way; their subjectivity is not born of the violence of slavery. What is relevant here, though, is that in extending the category of the human and its accompanying rights, the state rearticulates racialized violence under the pretense of equality. It is a legal move that shifts blame for brutal policing on to criminalized subjects while silencing a critique of the state. This maneuvering is evident first in Swartz' attempt to dismiss Rodríguez' suit based on the sixteen-year-old son's non-citizenship and his subsequent appeal to self-defense. This legal gesture is also clear in the Border Patrol Union's defense of Swartz and the claim that even if this one young man is innocent, agents in field encounter an entire nation of criminalized subjects and they must be able to kill them if needed.

Still, should Swartz be found guilty of ending a human life, I remain convinced that the U.S. legal system can not grant Araceli Rodríguez the brand of justice she calls for, one that puts pressure on a larger system of law. Indeed the U.S. system of justice individualizes not just the death of one man but also the guilt of an individual actor, foreclosing a critique on the larger system, that which put the gun in the hand of the agent and placed him at the border. In this case, a verdict finding him guilty of using "excessive violence" gets held up as abnormal, normalizing what Žižek calls "objective violence...the violence inherent to this 'normal' state of things" (2008, p. 2). In other words, the excessive violence normalizes the other cases, where violence was deemed reasonable.

Finally, I read in Swartz' trial, an attempt to paper over the wounds created in the border community, to erase the wounds on the bodies of Mexican border subjects.

I read in this trial an attempt to silence the dead. In *Raising the Dead: Readings of Death and (Black) Subjectivity*, Sharon Patricia Holland takes up the work of listening to the dead as they “uncover silences but also transform inarticulate places into conversational territories” (2000, p. 3-4). Taking up the work of Michael Taussig, she mines a range of literary borders, including representations of the U.S.’ own border which she determines “is a constant space of death and terror” (p. 4) in the belief that “embracing the subjectivity of death allows marginalized peoples to speak about the unspoken – to name the places *within* and *without* their cultural milieu, where...they have slipped between the cracks of language” (p. 5). While Holland’s work is invested in listening to the literary dead, I wonder what it might mean to do as his mother suggests, and to listen to José Antonio.

The very first time I opened Gloria Anzaldúa’s *Borderlands/La Frontera*, I was crossing the border from Juárez to El Paso. Her description of the border as an open wound, one caused by the grating of two countries made geographical sense as I stood above the concrete bed that fixed the one-time flow of the Rio Grande. The bed looked like a slit cut through land, sometimes empty, sometimes dry. Today, I think the Border Industrial Complex, the increasingly militarized forms of border control, the investment in violent policing give her words (re)new(ed) meaning. Today, I think the border community feels these wounds where community members used to stand, where Sergio used to play and Anastacio used to work, where José Antonio used to live. When their deaths are allowed to revive the fiction of a Mexican enemy at our doorstep ready to steal, rape, and violently take over they come to reinforce a normalized notion of violent border patrolling. It is worth considering, I think, how

excavating the wounds they leave behind, in allowing them to haunt the border, in listening to them speak might muck up the otherwise seamless work of the Border Industrial Complex.

Conclusion

The discursive work of the Border Industrial Complex attempts to smooth over the messy, blurry, and violent material realities faced by Mexicans at the border. The Border Industrial Complex' discourse affirms the idea that Mexico is a space of death and criminality while erasing the hand that the U.S. has had in creating that space. For example, the United States' War on Drugs is evacuated from the story of Maria Romero, shot on a mid-morning shopping trip with her grandson, and the exploitative economic relationship between the U.S. and Mexico fails to appear in suspicious accusations of sixteen-year-old smugglers who might make a living escorting economic migrants out of a devastated economy. The Border Industrial Complex erases the way U.S. gender, racial and sexual hierarchies determine who must live and who must die while also driving investment in technologies and personnel meant to spread this violence further along the national boundary. It conceals its criminal workings with an individualized and elusive justice system.

Still, perhaps the greatest illusion perpetrated by the Border Industrial Complex is the idea that there "just is" a border to defend. Indeed, as bullets fly across the border they do not just cause bodily harm they also interrupt the fantasy that a marked line, a bridge, a chain-link fence, or even a wall is capable of keeping apart deeply entangled nations, communities, bodies.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Borders are often thought of as neutral and fixed. They are thought to mark the edge of the state, reflect its sovereignty, and exist under its total control. The discourse of fixed borders also fixes the migrant, attaching to border crossers a set of meanings in which they are understood as desiring to be made permanent part of the nation, motivated by greed to steal from more deserving U.S. citizens, and law breakers, if only by nature of their entry into the U.S.. Moreover, the master narratives of the border and its crossers would tell us that migrants pose a threat to nation's children and women, who are understood as vulnerable to the migrant's sexual deviance.

Indeed, in the now-famous speech that launched his 2016 presidential campaign, Donald Trump announced: "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending they're best. They're not sending you (points to audience). They're not sending you (points to a different place in the audience). They're sending people with lots of problems and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists" (Time Staff, 6.16.15). Trump's comments matter not just because they reflect the opinion of a powerful U.S. businessman but also because they are shared widely. Political commentator Anne Coulter took credit for inspiring the comments in her 2015 book, *Adios, America: The Left's Plan to Turn Our Country into a Third World Hellhole*. She echoed the sentiment in a blog titled "Donald Trump: *Still Right About Mexican Rapists*." The blog opens: "There's a cultural acceptance of child rape in Latino culture that doesn't exist in even the most

dysfunctional American ghettos. When it comes to child rape the whole family gets involved. (They *are* family-oriented!)” In both Trump and Coulter’s comments, it becomes clear that the Mexican migrant’s deviance is rooted in a criminalized sexuality, one that is so deviant it cannot be incorporated into even the nation’s “most dysfunctional ghettos,” another space of state abandonment and violent neglect. Therefore, migrant’s mere presence in the U.S. is a matter of home/land security.

In an age in which a reality star can leverage such discourses to become the presumptive nominee of the U.S.’ “Grand Old Party,” it behooves us to look closer. I do not mean that we need to spend an entire news cycle watching an orange man offensively eat a taco bowl while claiming that he loves those Hispanics who may (or may not) have made that taco bowl. Instead, I mean to suggest that we ought to consider carefully the fact that a significant (enough) portion of the population believes, like he does, that the presence of Mexican bodies at our borders signals the end of a (great) nation.

Moreover, in the U.S., anti-immigrant sentiment does not play itself out along party lines. At the same time that President Obama and a mass of Democratic leaders took to the microphone to denounce Donald Trump’s divisive language, they lent support to the ICE raids that brought arms-bearing law enforcement officers to the homes, places of worship, and schools of undocumented Latin American border crossers living in the U.S..²⁰

²⁰ According to a statement by Secretary Jeh C. Johnson, after the first weekend of raids, ICE took 121 Central American refugees, adults and children, into custody in Georgia, Texas, and North Carolina (Department of Homeland Security, 1.4.2016).

This dissertation asks us to read against such discourses, to unearth the ways that the rhetoric of the threatening Mexican migrant papers over their vulnerability at the hands of the state and its many official and civilian agents. Indeed, the ideological frame through which this rhetoric operates also often makes it impossible for those who have experienced violence at the hands of the state to make the claim that they were not deserving of the violence. As we have seen throughout the dissertation, these discourses can muzzle migrants, leaving them incapable of talking back to power. Consider the interviewed border crossers of the second chapter who were afraid of losing the ability to cross to work or to see family for pointing out that an agent was cruel. Or take the family of Blanca Borrego whose reach for proximal citizenship failed to get her timely and appropriate medical care. The cases examined throughout the dissertation register not just the violence of law enforcement agents but they also document a broader inability to recognize that violence as such.

And so I work here to see that violence for what it is and to explore the racialized, gendered, and sexualized dynamics that underpin it. My goal was to trace this violence and its accompanying discourse across time and space, allowing for the possibility that time and space themselves have become part of the disciplining of the border.

In considering the way these discourses have evolved over time, it is important to trace what has been captured by the archive and preserved as historical fact. Capturing the ways that Mexican deviance is made historical fact includes attending to the narratives crafted about these border crossers, paying attention to the words that are put in their mouths. So too does it include tracing those against whom

they are defined. To that end, an important part of the master narratives about Mexican migrants is that narrative spun about Border Patrol agents, their patriotism, and sacrifice. In casting Border Patrol agents as sentimental figures, border archives position them opposite the crossers who are denied access to victimhood.

This refusal to allow crossers to access victimhood operates not just in the archive but also in the present. These narratives require crossers to navigate not just discourses of deviance as they come up against the architecture of the border. The material manifestations of power at the nation-state's edge lends legitimacy to the idea that the border is fixed, that it draws the state's boundaries. But reports from crossers who experience the border on a regular basis, speak to the border's shiftiness and the ways that criminalizing discourses, ever-evolving policy, and even individual agents' moods constantly remake the border. In response, border crossers make themselves flexible, moving in and out of allegiances, aligning themselves differently on even a minute-by-minute basis.

Perhaps it is this flexibility, this shifting subjectivity that the U.S. government attempts to disrupt in its attempts to detain border crossers. It is an attempt, I argue, rooted in both physical and temporal containment. In this way, it is clear the waiting becomes a form of disciplining the migrant, a tool that is used increasingly across space and whose broad use also indicates an expanding border. This border moves beyond the state's boundaries to haunt the U.S. interior. It is a border whose logics and operations might be conjured anywhere because it haunts everywhere. This increasingly flexible border specifically targets the flexible crosser who has made herself impossibly small to squeeze through the holes left at the porous border. This

same crosser who has made herself impossibly strong to build a home for her children in a hostile environment only to fall sick after a decade of swallowing the racist and sexist discourses about her and her family that air on the nightly news. She is the target of this flexible border.

This flexible border crosser, who could be anyone at anytime is easily targeted not just by a conjured border but also by agents who articulate the need to make a “split second decision” about the identities of the border crossers they encounter. Time then becomes not just a means for disciplining the migrant but also the justification for that disciplining. After the instance of violence, the agency is given a new opportunity to reinforce the crosser’s criminality, the agent’s sentimentality, and the need to invest politically and financially in the military regime at the border. The discourse that surrounds agent shootings and beatings is not always put to work to decrease the agency’s power, but rather to make a case for increasing support for the task of border policing. These discourses, even when sympathetic, work to affirm myths of Mexican criminality.

My focus on the many ways criminality is imposed on subjects does not mean that I cannot make space for border crossers’ complex subjectivity and the possibility that Mexican border crossers can and do break the law. Rather, I mean to hold up the many ways that criminality, an act of breaking the law, might speak more to the structural circumstances in which racialized border crossers find themselves than about the border crossers themselves. In the case of Anastasio Hernández Rojas, then, my reading would suggest that we might make room for the fact that he did steal a bottle of tequila and a steak for his wife as a mother’s day present. But his theft, I

believe, tells us more about the lack of economic opportunities for undocumented workers in the U.S. than it does his character. His death also tells us more about the treatment of brown men in our criminal justice system than it does about his morals.

And it is precisely about this system that I am concerned. My goal here, then, is to move away from narratives of “bad policing” by singular “bad apple” agents. Instead, I want to consider how border violence is expanding, branching out, calling on civilians to take up task of reporting and detaining “illegal” bodies. Just as in the case of criminalized border crossers, my intention is not to suggest that these agents and these civilian Border Patrol officers are bad people. Rather, I hope to gesture to larger structures of power that shape their behavior and that set up these violent square offs between border subjects.

This complex understanding of border violence intentionally puts pressure on our understanding of justice at the border. I cannot pretend to have answers for what justice should look like in cases where agents do harm to border crossers. But I suspect that if we allowed the ghosts of the border to take their rightful place in our discussions about border violence, if we listen when they speak through their mothers and community members, we may find ourselves closer.

Unsettling these narratives requires listening to the ghosts of the border through a critical frame. Here, I suggest that this frame include a queer of color critique as articulated by José Esteban Muñoz, Juana Maria Rodríguez, and Roderick Ferguson, to argue that sexual deviance becomes a justification for targeting and containing migrant subjects. By focusing on the financially and racially motivated violence that the Border Industrial Complex does to Mexican migrant communities, I

expand the critiques that feminists of color like Angela Davis have long leveraged against systemic violence done to communities of color through the prison industrial system. Finally, this project contributes to transnational feminist scholarship by contextualizing border violence within the global circuits of labor, capital, and ideology that shape perceptions of border insecurity.

There is a lot of work yet to do in undermining the harmful narratives of border crossers. As the project evolves, I hope to push at the discourse further.

While this project began as one primarily about the space of the border, as I looked more closely, important questions about time and temporality emerged. As the project moves forward, I hope to explore these more carefully. I hope to consider questions of temporal borders in and throughout the archives and the museum. I also look forward to understanding how different bodies experience time differently at the border, thinking especially about rapid entry in crosser interviews, agent's long days in the inspection kiosk's that dot the border, detention and deferral, and the split second decision to pull the trigger.

I look forward to adding to the very rich set of data I have gathered through interviews with regular border crossers. I would be excited to add a consideration of class to the dimensions of crossing and how differently classed border crossers experience the border, with and without SENTRI cards. Further, I hope to explore the tension between the need for crossers to perform transparency, perhaps to paper over their shifting alliances, and the agency's ability to make their operations opaque. Finally, I want to consider more carefully the ways that crossers deploy a neoliberal

language of value as they attempt to make a case for why they ought to be respected by Border Patrol officers.

While interviews with border crossers provided much rich data, I remain committed to interviewing Border Patrol officers. I think that in order to move away from the narrative that violence is committed by “a few bad apples,” it is imperative to understand how officers experience their job, how they understand the system for which they work, and how they too occupy space on the line. Also, because crossers staged a set of critiques about how officers’ identities shape their encounters with crossers, alleging that Mexican and women officers were most likely to abuse their power, I think it is important to talk to officers about the ways they see their identity interacting with their work as law enforcement officials.

Finally, I plan to follow the cases of Blanca Borrego, Anastasio Hernández Rojas, Sergio Hernández Güereca, and Jose Antonio Elena Rodríguez as they wind their way through the U.S. justice system. I expect that as these cases unfold discourses will shift, and I look forward to tracing these shifts across time and through different political moments.

Appendices

Appendix 1

The National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library



Appendix 2

The Uniform Exhibit



Appendix 3

Vehicle Exhibit



Appendix 4

The 1960s Wall



Appendix 5

The Gun Displays



Appendix 6

Border Crossing Crafts



Border Crossing Gear



Appendix 7

Memorial to Fallen Agents



Appendix 8

The Patriot
by Ed Woods
Dec. 2000

I came awake the other night
Was late November and dark
Faint sound I heard was strange
To these old ringing ears
Tramping of many ruffled feet
In the snow and the mud

A voice was sayin' to the beat
Rally 'round the flag boys
They are stealin' the Constitution
And bring yer muskets, too

The drum roll was long
Kept tapping to the shout
In time with the notes
Played upon that little fife
Was music to my ears
Seemed to rouse my ragged fears

Again that voice from the past
Raised up that rousing cry
Rally 'round the flag boys
The aliens, felons, and politicians
Are stealin' this land we tilth
A spreading' lies, untruths, and filth
They are tearin' up the sacred paper
On which the citizens rely
Lived honestly, coveted for so long
Served our purpose, they tear it down

So up all you citizens and brothers
Remember the blood that it cost
Forget not our brothers in arms
Your citizenship they are stealing
In the cold of the night
Rally 'round the flag boys
Resist with all your might
And bring yer muskets, too

There before my eyes a little fellow
With cloth bound cold feet
Playin' that tune on a little fife
The drummer marched next to him
There next old Glory held high
The fourth shouldered his musket

The vision fades from my view
And I set up in my bed
Recognized old George, Ben, and dad
So I pulled on my clothes and boots
And I started out the door
The wife said hurry back
And don't forget your gun

They are stealin' our greatest land
Trampling upon the truth
Bring your vigilance and gun at hand
Rally 'round those long forgotten men
As they pass to guard freedom's land
My cry joins theirs as we march
Arise you citizens, protect your land

Rally 'round this battered banner
Protect your freedom and this land

Guard citizenship with all your might
It's the last in this world, you see
Rid us of felons, aliens, and bad politicians
Walk with pride and dignity
And don't forget your muskets, boys

Appendix 9

Wounded Knee, South Dakota
Ronald Moore
1973²¹

I stood above on a windswept hill,
overlooking the valley below;
Dark rainclouds sweeping low overhead
I strained to see my foe.

Lightening flashed past the hill that day,
the thunder as a cannon's roar,
Rain pelting down to sting my eyes,
I wondered why and what for.

I snuggled deeper within my clothes,
a suit of camouflage green;
The cold wind biting deep to my bones,
was this valley ever clean?

Eyes straining with my need to see,
a ghostly troop appeared in review;
The long greatcoats flapping in the wind,
the faces looking numb and blue.

I heard the sounds of leather creak,
the stomping of many hooves;
Feeling faraway stares from piercing eyes,
Each questioning me for proof.

I heard their voices in unison cry,
why stand you on that hill;
Are you here now that we may tell,
how wrong it is to kill.

A century ago to this valley we marched,

²¹ In the archive this document has two dates on it, 1973 at the top and 1977 at the bottom.

but our souls disclaim any fame;
For we're the silent troop of death,
and Wounded Knee - our immortal shame.

Sill straining, I saw them pass from view,
onward their never ending march;
I then vowed to myself not to become,
ever-separated from my heart.

A truth that day I came to know,
as the rain washed away my tears;
There was no foe in the valley below
only other people with different ideas.

Appendix 10

GOD WASN'T MESSING AROUND WHEN HE MADE BORDER PATROL AGENTS

Author Unknown

It isn't every day that a real BPA is born.
And it isn't every day that they are lost in the Line of Duty.
It is a rare person that can uphold the standard required to be considered a Border Patrol Agent.
There are no bad Border Patrol Agents.
There are only those wannabe's that are corrupt who infiltrated and pretended.
But the truth is that they were never PA's.
The real PA would never betray their brothers and sisters or the call to protect this great nation.
It is the rarest combination of character, the courage and compassion that is the essence of a Border Patrol Agent.
It is coming up against insurmountable odds day after day, night after night, facing the worst of the worst of the worst that this world has to offer,
Yet still showing compassion to those that they have to deal with in that environment.
It is knowing the difference between a cold blooded killer and a poor farm worker just by the look in their eye,
And treating each accordingly while never showing fear, and always being in control
Even when complete chaos is occurring all around.
It is never letting each other down, and never backing down...from anything.
Because if they back down,
There is no one else to stand up and fight.

It is knowing that no matter how overwhelming the odds are,
That they can never be defeated,
Because they will always get back up and come back at the adversary.
It is knowing that the adversary isn't quite sure what makes that agent tick,
And that constant sense of fear and uncertainty that the BPA instills.
It is rushing into the most fearsome of situations imaginable
While all others are running for their lives,
Because somebody has to go in there,
And the PA wants to be that somebody.
It is sacrificing personal agendas for the common good,
And hurt marriages and kids who know that Mom or Dad have to miss again because
they can't leave the post abandoned.
It is working to the point of exhaustion to catch that smuggler, child molester, rapist,
murderer or other criminal only to be spat upon and called a racist by the very people
they are protecting.
It is stopping to help the stranded motorist by the side of the highway,
Searching for that lost kid in the desert,
Responding to that domestic because the local Sheriff can't get there for an hour,
And counseling the suicidal man who just caught his wife cheating on him.
It is saving the life of a neighbor's choking infant, and going on to work as if nothing
unusual had happened.
It is jumping into a moving vehicle full of people left to crash by a smuggler and
bringing it to a safe stop, risking life and limb as if routine.
It is jumping into dangerous waters to rescue the ones who despise them, risking their
lives.
It is carrying a sick and injured man for miles through the desert,
Saving his life,
And going home at the end of shift.
Just another day.
It is being mocked at a checkpoint, disrespected by neighbors, maligned by the media,
and manipulated by politicians endlessly,
And still showing up and giving the job everything they have.
It is always taking the high road, when the low road is so much easier.
It is living character and honor in all they do.
And sometimes it is about being betrayed by those pretenders who never deserved to
wear the green.
It is always being the underdog,
And always overcoming the odds...eventually.
It is about making the impossible possible.

It is about never quitting, never giving in, and always being there for each other.
It is knowing that the PA beside you has faced down the giants alone
And that together, you are invincible.
It is telling those unbelievable stories, the ones that make trainees shake their heads
and doubt,
When the reality is that you don't have to embellish
Because you have been there and done that.
It is about all of these things but always, always it is with humility.
Border Patrol Agents are the "Rudy" of law enforcement,
But they know they will never be carried off the field...and they are good with that.
Just give them the keys to the Four By and let them get to work.

Appendix 11

Border Patrol Agent's Desolation
Lee Cabrera
2015

As I walk through this desolation alone
I stay alert and maintain my sense honed
My backup I know is miles away
Yet from this resolute path I will not stray

Searing heat, freezing rain, or numbing cold
Do not impede my progress as I trek the forsaken road
My oath is to protect and serve
And I'll be damned if I break my word

I reflect on the public's scrutiny and their chastisement
As I toil in the midst of threat, and darkness of night
Unbeknown to them is that I do not judge
I am unbiased, and from this credence I will not budge

For I do not decree a sentence upon anyone
I am only an Agent in pursuit of an entity on the run
I am aware that it takes just one for our boundaries to breach
In order to violate America's children and her keep

It was not long ago that America beckoned foreigners with her luminous torch
Welcoming distant nations and their people to our gracious shores

Times are different now, and have become a threat
So I preserve my allegiance and labor with no regret

For when I lay that felon and his disgrace upon America's feet
And bear witness to her defiance as she maintains her poise of no defeat
I can attest to the anguish because I am there
To arrest the wolf in sheep's clothing
While the oblivious sleep, and my beloved mother, wife, and children kneel in prayer

Appendix 12

A K-9 Prayer
Author Unknown

Oh, Almighty God,
Whose great power and eternal
Wisdom embraces the universe,
Watch over my handler while I sleep.

Protect my handler from harm
While I am unable to do so.

I pray, help keep our streets and homes
Safe while my handler and I rest.

I ask for your loving care because
My handler's duty is dangerous.

Grant my handler your unending strength
And courage in our daily assignments.

Dear God,
Protect my brave handler,
Grant your almighty protection,
Unite my handler safely with the family
After the tour of duty has ended.

I ask nothing for myself.

Amen.

Appendix 13

Sample Questions

General Demographic Questions:

- For publication purposes, please select a pseudonym.
- Tell me a little about your life here. (ex. I would love to hear about your work, your family, your community, etc.)
- Age
- Family
- Education
- Where were you born?
- Where do you live now?
- What brought you/your family to the US-Mexico borderlands?
- Tell me a little about your life here. I would love to hear about your work, your community, etc.
- Where else have you lived?
- Do you have plans to move in the near future? Where?

Border Crossers:

- How would you define the border?
- How would you describe the border?
- Did you think about the border as a child? How did you imagine it? How do you think about the border now? If there is a difference, what accounts for this change in opinion over time?
- Do you cross the border? How often?
- Why do you cross the border? Why did you (if unable to move back and forth now)?

- What emotions do you associate with crossing the border? Why?
- Is there such a thing as an “average” border crossing for you? What does that look like?
- What kinds of questions do you get asked when crossing the border?
- What have your experiences been crossing the border?
- Have you experienced harassment? (eg. Unnecessarily holding you up, use of inappropriate language, unfounded searches, etc.)
- Have you ever been detained?
- Have you ever witnessed or experienced violence? Can you tell me about it?
- If you’ve ever experienced any of the above did it occur more than once? How often?
- Why do you think you were treated the way you in those interactions?

Bibliography

- Aguilar, J. (2014, Dec. 17). Murders up, but El Paso still safe, lawmakers say. *Texas Tribune*. Retrieved from <https://www.texastribune.org/2014/12/17/el-paso-still-safe-despite-murders-lawmakers-say/>
- Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Albuquerque Journal News Staff. (2012, Feb. 23). Victim of stray bullet moved from Juarez to be safe. *Albuquerque Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.abqjournal.com/89796/abqnewsseeker/updated-victim-of-stray-bullet-moved-from-juarez-to-be-safe.html>
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2014). ACLU recommendations regarding force by US Customs and Border Protection Officers. Washington, D.C.: Washington Legislative Office.
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2014, Feb. 28). ACLU statement on reported audit of Border Patrol's use-of-force policies. San Diego: ACLU San Diego.
- Andreas, P. (2000). *Border games: Policing the US-Mexico divide*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Andreas, P. & Snyder, T. (2000). *The wall around the West: State borders and immigration control in North America and Europe*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2007). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

- Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear of small numbers: An essay on the geography of anger*.
Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Arondekar, A. (2009). *For the record: On sexuality and the colonial archive in India*.
Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Associated Press. (2011, Jan 17). Family of Mexican teen killed by border agent sues
US: Wrongful death, civil rights violation alleged in June 2010 shooting.
NBCNews.com. Retrieved from
http://www.nbcnews.com/id/41125520/ns/world_news-americas/t/family-mexican-teen-killed-border-agent-sues-us/
- Associated Press. (2012, Feb. 22). El Paso woman hit by stray bullet from Mexico.
CBS News. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/el-paso-woman-hit-by-stray-bullet-from-mexico/>
- Associated Press. (2014, Mar 25). Senate committee approves virtual border fence.
Arizona Republic. Retrieved from
<http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/2014/03/25/senate-committee-approves-virtual-border-fence/6892043/>
- Associated Press. (2015, Sept 25). Border Patrol agent charged with second-degree
murder in 2012 fatal shooting of Mexican teen. *New York Daily News*.
Retrieved from <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/border-patrol-agent-indicted-2012-fatal-shooting-article-1.2373905>
- Author Unknown. (n.d.) God wasn't messing around when he made Border Patrol
agents. El Paso TX: United States Border Patrol Museum and Memorial
Library.

- Author Unknown. (2014). A K-9 Prayer. In United States Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library (Ed.), *National Border Patrol museum calendar*. El Paso, TX.
- Balko, R. (2014). *Rise of the warrior cop: The militarization of America's police forces*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs Books.
- Bennet, B. (2015, June 15). Border Patrol absolves itself in dozens of cases of lethal force. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-border-patrol-shootings-20150615-story.html>
- Bloom, L. R. (1998). *Under the sign of hope: Feminist methodology and narrative interpretation*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Borunda, D. & M. Ybarra. (2010, June 8). Mexico blasts fatal shooting by Border Patrol agent. *El Paso Times*. Retrieved from http://www.elpasotimes.com/ci_15256386
- Barajas, M. (2015, Sept 11). Woman arrested at gynecologist appointment could face deportation. *Houston Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.houstonpress.com/news/woman-arrested-at-gynecologist-appointment-could-face-deportation-7754827>
- Barajas, M. (2015, Sept 16). Protest planned at Memorial Hermann over woman arrested at Ob-Gyn's Office. *Houston Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.houstonpress.com/news/protest-planned-at-memorial-hermann-over-woman-arrested-at-ob-gyns-office-7767016>
- Berg, C. R. (2002). *Latino images in film: Stereotypes, subversion, and resistance*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Bonilla, D. (n.d.). *Memorial Hermann Medical Group Doctors*. Retrieved from <http://www.memorialhermann.org/doctors/ob-gyns/dr-david-bonilla-md-356003/>
- Brown, W. (2014). *Walled states, waning sovereignty*. New York, NY: Zone Books.
- Burnett, J. (2015, Oct 9). In a first, border agent indicted for killing Mexican teen across fence. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/2015/10/09/446866267/in-a-first-border-agent-indicted-for-killing-mexican-teen-across-fence>
- Cabrera, L. (2015). Border Patrol agent's desolation. El Paso, TX: United States Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library. Retrieved from: <https://borderpatrolmuseum.com/1465-2/1468-2/1470-2/>
- Cacho, L. M. (2012). *Social death: Racialized rightlessness and the criminalization*
- Campbell, T., & Sitze, A. (2013). Introduction. In T. Campbell & A. Sitze (Eds.), *Biopolitics: A reader* (pp. 1-40). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Cantú, L. with Luibhéid, E. & Stern A. M. (2005). Well-founded fear: Political asylum and the boundaries of sexual identity in the US-Mexico borderlands. In E. Luibhéid & L. Cantú (Eds.), *Queer migrations: Sexuality, US citizenship, and border crossings*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Casares, Cindy. (2013). "Border patrol takes 'no' for an answer at internal checkpoints." Texas Observer. <http://www.texasobserver.org/border-patrol-takes-no-for-an-answer-at-internal-checkpoints/>

- CBS News. (2010, Jan 7). Watching the border: The virtual fence. *60 Minutes*.
Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/watching-the-border-the-virtual-fence/>
- Center for Investigative Reporting. (2014, Mar 23). Border agency blocks release of independent report on use of force. *Reveal News*. Retrieved from <https://www.revealnews.org/article/border-agency-blocks-release-of-independent-report-on-use-of-force/>
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chang, R. S. (1997). A meditation on borders. In J. F. Perea (Ed.), *Immigrants out!: The new nativism and the anti-immigrant impulse in the United States*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Chapin, J. (2003). Reflections from the bridge. In Pablo Vila (ed.), *Ethnography at the border* (1-22). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Chávez, A. (2012, Feb. 18). Shooting suit against border agent dismissed. *El Paso Times*. Retrieved from http://www.elpasotimes.com/ci_19992315
- Chavez, L. R. (2007). A glass half empty: Latina reproduction and public discourse. In D. A. Segura & P. Zevella (eds.) *Women and migration in the US-Mexico borderlands: A reader* (67-91). Durham, Duke University Press.
- Chávez, S. (2016). *Border lives: Fronterizos, transnational migrants, and commuters in Tijuana*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- CNN Wire Staff. (2010, June 10). Youth fatally shot by border agent had smuggling ties, official says. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2010/US/06/10/texas.border.patrol.shooting/>
- CNN Wire Staff. (2011, Aug 18). Judge dismisses part of suit over Mexican teen shot by US agent. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2011/US/08/18/texas.border.patrol.shooting/>
- Cohen, C. (1999). *The boundaries of blackness: AIDS and the breakdown of Black politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Collier, S. J. & Ong, A. (2005). Global assemblages, anthropological problems. In S. J. Collier & A. Ong (Eds.) *Global assemblages: Technology, politics, and ethics as anthropological problems*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cook, C. W. (2007). *CRS report for Congress: Mexico's drug cartels*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service.
- Cote, R. V. (2015, Sept 14). Woman arrested, threatened with deportation while at health clinic. *Jezebel*. Retrieved from <http://jezebel.com/woman-arrested-threatened-with-deportation-while-at-he-1730697494>
- Coulter, A. (2015, Aug 5). Donald Trump: *Still* right about Mexican rapists. *The Daily Caller*. Retrieved from <http://dailycaller.com/2015/08/05/donald-trump-still-right-about-mexican-rapists/>
- Dart, T. (2015, Apr 26). Inside the US 'border industrial complex': Spy tech meets immigration crackdown. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/apr/26/surveillance-border-security-expo>

- Davis, A. (2013). *Are prisons obsolete?* New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- Davis, M. (2002). Foreward. In J. Nevins (Ed.), *Operation Gatekeeper: The rise of the “illegal alien” and the making of the U.S.-Mexico boundary* (pp. viii-vxi). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dear, M. (2015, Oct. 6). Beware of the growing US-Mexico Border Industrial Complex. *Huffpost Politics*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-dear/beware-of-the-growing-usm_b_8252586.html
- DeFrates, A. R. (2015, Sept 18). Blanca Borrego and the reproductive oppression of immigrant women. *Reality Check: Reproductive & Sexual Health and Justice News, Analysis & Commentary*. Retrieved from <http://rhrealitycheck.org/article/2015/09/18/blanca-borrego-oppressive-immigration-policies-strip-women-reproductive-rights-human-dignity/>
- Del Bosque, M. (2015, Jul 20). Legislators ‘alarmed’ by state’s refusing birth certificates for children of undocumented parents. *Texas Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.texasobserver.org/legislators-alarmed-texas-refusing-birth-certificates-children-undocumented-immigrants/>
- Department of Homeland Security. (2016, Jan 4). Statement by Secretary Jen C. Johnson on Southwest border security. *Department of Homeland Security*. Retrieved from <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2016/01/04/statement-secretary-jeh-c-johnson-southwest-border-security>

- Department of Justice. (2012, Apr 27). *Federal officials close investigation into the death of Sergio Hernandez-Guereca*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Public Affairs.
- Department of Justice. (2012, Nov). *A review of ATF's Operation Fast and Furious and related matters*. Washington D.C.: Office of the Inspector General, Oversight and Review Division.
- Department of Justice. (2015, Nov 6). Federal officials close the investigation into the death of Anastacio Hernandez-Rojas. Washington, D.C.: Office of Public Affairs.
- Derrida, J. (1995). Archive fever: A Freudian impression. *Diacritics*, 25(2), 9-63.
- Derrida, J. (2002). Archive fever in South Africa. In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (38-39). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Doty, R. L. & Wheatley, E. S. (2013). Private detention and the immigration industrial complex. *International Political Sociology*, 7, 426-443.
- Douglas, K. M. & Sáenz, R. (2013). The criminalization of immigrants and the immigration-industrial complex. *Daedalus, the Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 10, 199-227.
- Dunn, T. J. (1996). *The militarization of the US-Mexico Border, 1978-1992*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Dunn, T. J. (2009). *Blockading the border and human rights: The El Paso operation that remade immigration enforcement*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Eichhorn, K. (2014). *The archival turn in feminism: Outrage in order*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Ekberg, O. (2015, Sept 11). Illegal immigrant arrested at gynecologist's office after using fake ID. *The American Mirror*. Retrieved from <http://www.theamericanmirror.com/illegal-immigrant-arrested-at-gynecologists-office/>
- Elhaik, T. (2012). Borderline ghosts: From *Touch of Evil* to *Maquilapolis: City of Factories*. In J. Kun & F Montezemolo (Eds.) *Tijuana dreaming: Life and art at the global border*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- End Family Detention. (n.d.) *Letters from inside*. Retrieved from <http://endfamilydetention.com/category/blog/letters-from-inside/>
- Enloe, C. (2000). *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. (2000). *Maneuvers: The international politics of militarizing women's lives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Epps, B., Valens, K., & González, B. J. (2005). *Passing lines: Sexuality and immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Epstein, B. (2012, Apr 20). Crossing the line at the border: Part one. *PBS Need to Know*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/security/video-first-look-crossing-the-line/13597/>
- Epstein, B. (2012, Jul 20). Crossing the line, Part two. *PBS Need to Know* Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/video/video-crossing-the-line/14291/>

- Falcón, S. M. (2007). Rape as a weapon of war: Militarized rape at the U.S.-Mexico border. In Denise A. Segura & Patricia Zevella (eds.) *Women and migration in the US-Mexico borderlands: A reader* (203-223). Durham, Duke University Press.
- Ferguson, R. A. (2003). *Aberrations in Black: Toward a queer of color critique*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Figueroa, L. (2013). [Experts: Hold the Line did more harm than good]. Blockade/Hold the Line. National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.
- Foucault, M. (1994). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Random House.
- Foucault, M. (2013). Right of death and power over life. In T. Campbell & A. Sitze (Eds.), *Biopolitics: A reader* (pp. 41-60). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fox, C. F. (1999). *The fence and the river: Culture and politics at the US-Mexico border*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fox News Latino. (2015, Sept 14). Woman faces deportation after she's arrested during routine visit to her gynecologist. *Fox News Latino*. Retrieved from <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2015/09/14/woman-faces-deportation-after-arrested-during-routine-visit-to-her-gynecologist/>

- Fregoso, R. L. (2003). *meXicana encounters: The making of social identities on the borderlands*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Frey, J. C. (2013, May/June). Over the line: Why are US Border Patrol agents shooting into Mexico and killing innocent civilians? *The Washington Monthly*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/may_june_2013/features/over_the_line044512.php?page=all
- Freeman, E. (2010). *Time binds : queer temporalities, queer histories*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Friar, J. G. & Kelly, G. W. (1940). [Preliminary course in Spanish for Border Patrol trainees]. Spanish manuals. National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.
- Friedman, A. (2013). *Covert capital: Landscapes of denial and the making of US empire in the suburbs of Northern Virginia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- FX Network. (2013). *The bridge*. Retrieved from <http://www.fxnetworks.com/shows>
- Garcia-Ditta, A. (2015, Sep 14). Houston mom arrested at gynecologist's appointment may face deportation. *Texas Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.texasobserver.org/woman-arrested-at-gynecology-office-may-face-deportation/>
- Gardner, J. (2015, Sep 28). US Border Patrol agent indicted for murder after using a Mexican child for target practice. *Alternet*. Retrieved from

<http://www.alternet.org/civil-liberties/us-border-patrol-agent-indicted-murder-after-using-mexican-child-target-practice>

- Gaspar de Alba, A. (2005). *Desert blood: The Juárez murders*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press.
- Gonzalez-Barrera, A. (2015, Nov 19). More Mexicans leaving than coming to the US. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2015/11/19/more-mexicans-leaving-than-coming-to-the-u-s/>
- Gopinath, G. (2005). *Impossible desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian public cultures*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Gordon, A. F. (2008). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Grewal, I. & Kaplan, C. (1994). *Scattered hegemonies*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gutiérrez, E. R. (2008). *Fertile matters: The politics of Mexican-origin women's reproduction*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Guidotti-Hernández, N. M. (2011). *Unspeakable violence: Remapping U.S. and Mexican national imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Halberstam, J. (2005). *In a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Hall, R. (2015). *The transparent traveler: The performance and culture of airport security*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Hamilton, C., Harris, V., & Reid, G. (2002). Introduction. In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (7-18). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Harris, V. (2002). A shaft of darkness: Derrida in the archive. In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (61-83). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hartman, S. V. (1997). *Scenes of subjection: Terror, slavery, and self-making in nineteenth-century America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hartung, W. D. (2001). "Eisenhower's warning: The Military-Industrial Complex forty years later. *World Policy Journal*, 18:1, (39-44).
- Hattam, V. (2007). *In the shadows of race: Jews, Latinos, and immigrant politics in the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hennessy-Fiske, M. (2015, Sept 15). Advocates protest Latina immigrant's arrest at Texas doctor's office. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/nation/nationnow/la-na-houston-immigrant-clinic-arrest-20150914-story.html>
- Hernández, D. M. (2013). Pursuant to deportation: Latinos and immigrant detention. In J. X. Inda & J. A. Dowling (Eds.), *Governing immigration through crime: A reader* (pp. 199-216). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hernández, K. L. (2010). *Migra!: A history of the U.S. Border Patrol*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

- Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2007). The practice of feminist in-depth interviewing. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber & Patricia Lina Leavy (eds.) *Feminist research practice: A primer* (111-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Heyman, J. M. (2009). Trust, privilege, and discretion in the governance of the US borderlands with Mexico. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 24(3), 367-390.
- Hing, B. O. (2010). *Ethical borders: NAFTA, globalization, and Mexican migration*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Hirsch, E. (1999). *How to read a poem: And fall in love with poetry*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Holland, S. P. (2000). *Raising the dead: Readings of death and (Black) subjectivity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hufbauer, G. C. & J. J. Schott. (2005). *NAFTA revisited: Achievements and challenges*. Washington D.C.: Institute for International Economics.
- Immigration and Naturalization Service. (1963). [Spanish Name Book]. Spanish Manuals, National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.
- Immigration and Naturalization Service. (1966). [Pre-academy Spanish training course for probationary Border Patrol officers]. Spanish manuals. National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.
- Immigration and Naturalization Service. (n.d.). [The recorded Spanish training course]. Spanish manuals. National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.

- Immigration and Naturalization Service. (n.d.). [Blackwell folder]. Spanish manuals. National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.
- Inda, J. X. & Dowling, J. A. (2013). Introduction: Governing migrant illegality. In J. X. Inda & J. A. Dowling (Eds.), *Governing immigration through crime: A reader* (pp. 1-36). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Jean-Charles, R. M. (2014). *Conflict bodies: The politics of rape representation in the Francophone imaginary*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Joseph, B. (2004). *Reading the East India Company 1720-1840: Colonial currencies of Gender*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Keeling, K. (2007). *The witch's flight: The cinematic, the Black femme, and the image of common sense*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Khimm, S. (2013, Feb 22). Many immigrants facing deportation must wait 550 days for their day in court. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2013/02/22/many-immigrants-facing-deportation-must-wait-550-days-for-their-day-in-court/>
- Koulish, R. (2006, Aug 21). A corporate takeover of American borders. *Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved from http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2006-08-21/news/0608210032_1_private-companies-border-military-contractors
- Latin American Herald Tribune. (n.d.) Video emerges: US Border Patrol killed boy in Mexico for throwing rocks – Mexico soldiers draw rifles on US Border Patrol. *Latin American Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.laht.com/article.asp?CategoryId=12394&ArticleId=358434>

- Lazare, S. (2015, Sept 16). Arrest of undocumented woman at gynecologist visit sparks outrage, protest. *Common Dreams*. Retrieved from <http://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/09/16/arrest-undocumented-woman-gynecologist-visit-sparks-outrage-protest>
- Lee, T. (1993). Happily never NAFTA: There's no such thing as a free trade. In R. Nader (ed.) *The case against free trade: GATT, NAFTA, and the globalization of corporate power*. San Francisco: Earth Island Press and North Atlantic Books.
- Lipton, E. (2013, June 6). As wars end, a rush to grab dollars spent on the border. *New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/07/us/us-military-firms-eye-border-security-contracts.html?pagewanted=all&_r=1
- Luibhéid, E. (2002). *Entry denied: Controlling sexuality at the border*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Manjapra, K. (2010). "Introduction to the editors' forum: The practices of transnational studies." *New Global Studies*, 4:1, (1-5).
- Mann, B. (2014). *Sovereign masculinities: Gender lessons from the war on terror*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marcotte, A. (2015, Sept 14). Woman arrested at OB-GYN's office for being an undocumented immigrant. *Slate*. Retrieved from http://www.slate.com/blogs/xx_factor/2015/09/14/woman_arrested_at_ob_gyn_office_her_crime_being_an_undocumented_immigrant.html
- Markel, H. (2004). *When germs travel: Six major epidemics that have invaded America and the fears they have unleashed*. New York, NY: Vintage Press.

- Massumi, B. (2015). *Ontopower: War, powers, and the state of perception*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2002). The power of the archive and its limits. . In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (19-20). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mbembe, A. (2013) Necropolitics. In Timothy Campbell and Adam Sitze (eds.) *Biopolitics: A reader* (161-192). Durham: Duke University Press.
- McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial leather: Race, gender and sexuality in the colonial contest*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McKittrick, K. (2006). *Demonic grounds: Black women and the cartographies of struggle*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McLaughlin, M. (2015, Sept 15). Doctor's staff tricked undocumented immigrant into arrest: Deputies nabbed the patient in the doctor's examining room. *HuffPost Latino Voices*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/undocumented-immigrant-arrest-doctor_55f89853e4b0b48f67011c06
- Meredith, J. (1996). *Three years in Mississippi*. Jackson, MS: Meredith Publishing.
- Miller, T. (2014). *Border patrol nation: Dispatches from the front lines of homeland security*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Publishers.
- Miami Times. (1967, Sept 8). [Miami gets first negro Border Patrol inspector]. First Black CPI, National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.

- Mize, R. L. & A. C. S. Swords. (2011). *Consuming Mexican labor: From the Bracero Program to NAFTA*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Moore, R. (1973). [Wounded Knee]. Agent poetry. , National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.
- Moraga, C. (1983). Preface. In Cherrie Moraga & Gloria Anzaldúa (eds.) *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color* (xiii-xxi). Latham, NY: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.
- Mufti, A & Shohat, E. (1997). Introduction. In Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti & Ella Shohat (eds.) *Dangerous liaisons: Gender, nation, & postcolonial perspectives* (1-14). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Muñoz, J. E. (2009). *Cruising utopia: The then and there of queer futurity*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Nagar, R. & Swarr, A. L. (2010). Introduction: Theorizing transnational feminist praxis. In Richa Nagar & Amanda Lock Swarr (eds) *Critical transnational feminist praxis* (1-22). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- National Border Patrol Museum. (nd). *Agency history*. El Paso, TX.
- National Border Patrol Museum. (nd). *Library overview*. El Paso, TX.
- National Border Patrol Museum. (nd). *National Border Patrol Museum Homepage*. Retrieved from <https://borderpatrolmuseum.com>.
- National Border Patrol Museum. (nd). *Operations exhibits*. El Paso, TX.
- National Border Patrol Museum. (nd). *Vehicles of the Border Patrol*. El Paso, TX.
- National Border Patrol Museum. (nd). *Weapons gallery*. Retrieved from: <https://borderpatrolmuseum.com/exhibits/weapons-gallery/>

- National Border Patrol Museum. (2015, Nov. 19). *The 30 years of National Border Patrol Museum*. Retrieved from <https://borderpatrolmuseum.com/the-30-years-of-national-border-patrol-museum/>
- National Border Patrol Museum. (2016). *National Border Patrol museum calendar*. El Paso, TX: United States Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library.
- National Geographic (n.d.) *Super Sunday*. Retrieved from <http://channel.nationalgeographic.com/border-wars/episodes/super-sunday/>
- National Hispanic Leadership Agenda. (2015, Sept 18). NHLA responds to arrest of Texas Latina Blanca Borrego. *National Hispanic Leadership Agenda*. Retrieved from <http://nationalhispanicleadership.org/17-press/321-september-18-2015-nhla-responds-to-arrest-of-texas-latina-blanca-borrego>
- National Latina Institute for Reproductive Justice. (2015, Sept 12). Texas Latina is arrested at gynecologist's office. Retrieved from <http://www.latinainstitute.org/en/texas-latina-arrested-gynecologists-office>
- NBC News. (2012, Feb. 21). Rogue bullet shot across Mexico border hits El Paso woman. *NBC News*. Retrieved from http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2012/02/21/10471871-rogue-bullet-shot-across-mexico-border-hits-el-paso-woman?lite
- Nevins, J. (2002). *Operation Gatekeeper: The rise of the 'illegal alien' and the making of the U.S.-Mexico boundary*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ngai, M. (2004). *Impossible subjects: Illegal aliens and the making of modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Not One More. (n.d.). Stop deportation of Blanca Borrego, Texas woman turned in by gynecologist. #NotIMore. Retrieved from <http://www.notonemoredeportation.com/portfolio/blancaborrego/>
- Not One More. (2015, Nov 30). Breaking: #FreedomGiving hunger strikes spread to new facilities. #NotIMore. Retrieved from <http://www.notonemoredeportation.com/2015/11/30/strikes-spreading/>
- Ontiveros, R. J. (2014). *In a spirit of a new people: The cultural politics of the Chicano movement*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Ortega, B. & R. O'Dell. (2013, Dec 16). Deadly border agent incidents cloaked in silence. *Arizona Republic*. Retrieved from <http://www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20131212arizona-border-patrol-deadly-force-investigation.html>
- Peabody Awards. (2013). *The bridge (FX)*. Retrieved from <http://www.peabodyawards.com/award-profile/the-bridge-fx>
- Perales, M. (2010). *Smeltertown: Making and remembering a Southwest border community*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Peralta, E. (2015, Oct 17). Judge says Texas can continue denying birth certificates to immigrants' kids. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/10/17/449432963/judge-says-texas-can-continue-denying-birth-certificates-to-immigrants-kids>
- Pérez, M. Z. (2015, Sept 22). Arrest of undocumented Latina at gynecologist's office could scare others from healthcare. *Colorlines*. Retrieved from

<https://www.colorlines.com/articles/arrest-undocumented-latina-gynecologists-office-could-scare-others-away-healthcare>

Petchesky, R. P. (2003). *Global prescriptions: Gendering health and human rights*.

New York, NY: Zed Books.

Pieklo, J. M. (2015, Sept 14). Latina woman arrested trying to access reproductive health care in Texas. Retrieved from *Reality Check: Reproductive & Sexual Health and Justice News, Analysis & Commentary*.

Police Executive Research Forum. (2013). *US Customs and Border Protection use of force review: Cases and policies*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Record, W. (n.d.). *No title*. Pencil sketch. National Border Patrol Museum: El Paso, TX.

Reid, G. (2002). 'The history of the past is the trust of the present': Preservation and excavation in the gay and lesbian archives of South Africa. In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (193-208). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Richardson, H. C. (2010). *Wounded Knee: Party politics and the road to an American massacre*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Robbins, T. (2012). US grows an industrial complex along the border. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from: <http://www.npr.org/2012/09/12/160758471/u-s-grows-an-industrial-complex-along-the-border>

- Rodríguez, J. M. (2003). *Queer Latinidad: Identity, practices, discursive spaces*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Rodriguez v. Swartz. Plaintiff's opposition to motion to dismiss. Case No. 4:14-CV-02251-RCC (US District Court for the District of Arizona).
- Romero, M. (2006). State violence, and the social and legal construction of Latino criminality: From el bandido to gang member. *Denver University Law Review*, 78(4), 1081-1118.
- Rosas, G. (2006). The thickening borderlands: Diffused exceptionality and 'immigrant' social struggles during the 'War on Terror'. *Cultural Dynamics*, 18(3) 335-349.
- Rosas, G. (2012). *Barrio libre: Criminalizing states and delinquent refusals of the new frontier*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rowley, M. V. (2011). *Feminist advocacy and gender equity in the Anglophone Caribbean: Envisioning a politics of coalition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Salzinger, L. (2007). Manufacturing sexual subjects: 'Harassment,' desire, and discipline on a maquiladora shop floor. In Denise A. Segura & Patricia Zevella (eds.) *Women and migration in the US-Mexico borderlands: A reader* (161-183). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schiller, D. (2015, Sept 17). Immigrant mother arrested at gynecologist's office draws national attention. *Houston Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.houstonchronicle.com/news/houston-texas/houston/article/Immigrant-mother-arrested-at-gynecologist-s-6512587.php>

- Schmidt Camacho, A. (2008). *Migrant imaginaries: Latino cultural politics in the US- Mexico borderlands*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Segura, D. A. & Zavella, P. (2007). Introduction. In Denise A. Segura & Patricia Zevella (eds.) *Women and migration in the US-Mexico borderlands: A reader* (1-32). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Shah, N. (2001). *Contagious divides: Epidemics and race in San Francisco's Chinatown*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Skaggs, S. R. & Skaggs, A. M. (1956). [Manual práctico de Inglés para los Braceros]. Spanish manuals. National Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library, El Paso, TX.
- Solomon, A. (2005). Trans/migrant: Christina Madrazo's all-American story. In E. Luibhéid & L. Cantú (Eds.), *Queer migrations: Sexuality, US citizenship, and border crossings*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Solomon, D. (2015, Sept 16). An undocumented Harris County woman faced deportation after being arrested at her OB-GYN. *Texas Monthly*. Retrieved from <http://www.texasmonthly.com/the-daily-post/an-undocumented-harris-county-woman-faced-deportation-after-being-arrested-at-her-ob-gyn/>
- Southern, E. (1997). *The music of Black Americans: A history*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Spivak, G. C. & Butler, J. (2011). *Who sings the nation-state? Language, politics, belonging*. Chicago, IL: Seagull Books.

- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Steele, R. W. (1991). 'No racials': Discrimination against ethnics in American defense industry, 1940-1942. *Labor History*. 32(1), 66-90.
- Steedman, C. K. (2002). *Dust: The archive and cultural history*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- St. John, R. (2012). *Line in the sand: A history of the western US-Mexico border*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stiehm, M. & Reid, E., Bernstein, C. G., & Blomgren, L. (Producers) (2013). *The bridge*. [Television series]. Los Angeles, CA: FX Productions.
- Stoler, A. L. (2002). Colonial archives and the arts of governance: On the content in the form. In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (83-102). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sydney Morning Herald. (2010, June 11). Mexico urges US probe of border death. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.smh.com.au/breaking-news-world/mexico-urges-us-probe-of-border-deaths-20100611-y0yc.html>
- Tambe, A. (2010). Transnational feminist studies: A brief sketch. *New Global Studies*, 4:1 (1-5).

Téllez, M. (2012). Community of struggle: Gender, violence, and resistance on the US- Mexico border. In J. Kun & F Montezemolo (Eds.) *Tijuana dreaming: Life and art at the global border*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Texas House Bill No. 2. (2013). Retrieved from

<http://www.legis.state.tx.us/tlodocs/832/billtext/html/HB00002I.htm>

Texas House Bill No. 3994. (2015). Retrieved from

<http://www.legis.state.tx.us/tlodocs/84R/billtext/pdf/HB03994I.pdf>

Time Staff. (2015, June 16). Here's Donald Trump's presidential announcement speech. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>

U.S. Border Patrol. (2005). *Recuerdos: Stories of the U.S. Border Patrol as told by past and present Border Patrol agents in their own words*. El Paso, TX: United States Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (n.d.) *Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)*. Retrieved from <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca>

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (2015, Jan 30). *You may be able to request DAPA. Want to learn more?* Retrieved from https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/ExecutiveActions/EAFlier_DAPA.pdf

- U.S. Customs and Border Protection. (2016). Non-refundable application fee. Retrieved from <https://www.cbp.gov/travel/trusted-traveler-programs/sentri/how-apply-sentri/non-refundable-application-fee>
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection. (2016). Secure electronic network for travelers rapid inspection. Retrieved from <https://www.cbp.gov/travel/trusted-traveler-programs/sentri>
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection. (2014). CBP releases use of force policy handbook and Police Executive Forum Report. Washington D.C.: Department of Homeland Security.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (Sept 2014). Immigration Enforcement Actions: 2013. *Office of Immigration Statistics*. Retrieved from https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/ois_enforcement_ar_2013.pdf
- US Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2009). Secure communities: A comprehensive plan to identify and remove criminal aliens. Washington D.C.: Department of Homeland Security.
- US Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2010, Jul 22). 26 law enforcement officers trained by ICE to enforce immigration law. *ICE Newsroom*. Retrieved from <https://www.ice.gov/news/releases/26-law-enforcement-officers-trained-ice-enforce-immigration-law>
- US Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (n.d.) *Delegation of Immigration Authority Section 287(g) Immigration and Nationality Act*. Retrieved from <https://www.ice.gov/287g>

- Valencia, N. (2015, Apr 21). After years of violence and death, 'life is back' in Juarez. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2015/04/21/americas/mexico-ciudad-juarez-tourism/>
- van Zyl, S. (2002). Psychoanalysis and the archives: Derrida's *Archive Fever*. In C. Hamilton, V. Harris, J. Taylor, M. Pickover, G. Reid, & R. Saleh (Eds.), *Refiguring the archive* (39-60). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Vargas, D. R. (2010). Representations of Latina/o sexuality in popular culture. In M. Asencio (Ed.), *Latina/o sexualities: Probing powers, passions, practices, and policies* (pp. 117-136). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Vila, P. (2003). Introduction: Border ethnographies. In Pablo Vila (ed.), *Ethnography at the border* (ix-xxxv). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Visweswaran, K. (1994). *Fictions of feminist ethnography*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wanzo, R. (2009). *The suffering will not be televised: African American women and sentimental political storytelling*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Weber, L. & S. Pickering. (2011). *Globalization and borders: Death at the global frontier*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weston, K. (2002). *Gender in real time : power and transience in a visual age*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Wheeler, M. (2003, Jan). Shadow wolves. *Smithsonian Magazine*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.smithsonianmag.com/people-places/shadow-wolves-74485304/?no-ist=>
- White, L.E. (1990). Subordination, rhetorical survival skills, and Sunday shoes: notes on the hearing of Mrs. G. *Buffalo Law Review*. 38(1), 1-58.
- Wilderson, F. B. (2003). The prison slave as hegemony's (silent) scandal. *Social Justice* 30(2), 18-27.
- Williams, R. (2010). *The divided world: Human rights and its violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Willse, C. (2015). *The value of homelessness: Managing surplus life in the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Woods, E. (2000). The Patriot. In US Border Patrol (Ed.), *Recuerdos: Stories of the U.S. Border Patrol as told by past and present Border Patrol agents in their own words*. El Paso, TX: United States Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library.
- Woods, E. (2003). I am a citizen! In US Border Patrol (Ed.), *Recuerdos: Stories of the U.S. Border Patrol as told by past and present Border Patrol agents in their own words*. El Paso, TX: United States Border Patrol Museum and Memorial Library.
- Wright, M. (2006). *Disposable women and other myths of global capitalism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wright, M. (2007). The dialectics of still life: Murder, women, and maquiladoras. In Denise A. Segura & Patricia Zevella (eds.) *Women and migration in the*

US-Mexico borderlands: A reader (184-202). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Yuhas, A. (2015, May 31). Justice for José? Border shooting of Mexican teen raises constitutional issue. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/may/31/jose-antonio-us-mexico-border-shooting-constitutional-rights>

Zavella, P. (2011). *I'm neither here nor there: Mexicans' quotidian struggles with migration and poverty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Žižek, S. (2008). *Violence: Six sideways reflections*. New York: Picador.

Zong, J. & Batalova, J. (2016, Mar 17). Mexican immigrants in the United States. *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/mexican-immigrants-united-states>