
U.S. Immigration Officers of Mexican Ancestry as Mexican Americans, Citizens, and Immigration Police¹

by Josiah McC. Heyman

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officers of Mexican ancestry do not identify with Mexican and other Latin American immigrants. Instead, they understand themselves as U.S. citizens who reject both domestic racism and ethnic loyalties that cross national borders. Their self-understandings emerge from processes that include U.S. citizenship ideology and social mobility into primary-labor-market jobs with stability, benefits, and progressive careers. These processes insulate them from the experience of immigrants in casual and insecure labor markets devoid of social benefits. Thus they differ from immigrants not only in being on opposite sides of the bureaucratic encounter but also in being at opposite poles of bureaucratized social citizenship. This suggests that a cause of opposition to immigration in advanced capitalist societies is that citizenship-based job and benefit systems restrict the scope of empathy.

JOSIAH MCC. HEYMAN is Professor of Anthropology at Michigan Technological University (1400 Townsend Dr., Houghton, Mich. 49931-1295, U.S.A. [jimheyman@mtu.edu]). Born in 1958, he was educated at The Johns Hopkins University (B.A., 1980) and The City University of New York (Ph.D., 1988). His publications include *Life and Labor on the Border* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1991), *Finding a Moral Heart for U.S. Immigration Policy: An Anthropological Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1998), and the edited volume *States and Illegal Practices* (Oxford: Berg, 1999). The present paper was submitted 11 X 99 and accepted 11 X 01.

1. This paper was originally presented at the 1994 meetings of the American Anthropological Association, in a session under the auspices of the Association of Latina and Latino Anthropologists chaired by Norma González. Over the years, the paper has received various helpful commentaries and reviews. I appreciate all this generous scholarly help. Above all, I thank my informants inside and outside the INS, who cannot be named. Research on the INS was supported by grants from the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation and the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. All responsibility for errors of fact or interpretation remains my own.

About one-third of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officers working at the Mexico-United States border are of Mexican ancestry. Although there is no universally accepted ethnic term for them, I will call them "Mexican Americans."² Their job requires them to question and sometimes arrest or turn away people from Mexico and Central America. How do they understand and justify their work? They might envision themselves as sharing an origin with fellow Latinos and possibly a common fate that spans borders. All but one of the 33 officers interviewed had grown up close to the border or in a heavy migration area of a border state. Most of them were generationally not far removed from immigration to the United States, and most had parents who held working-class jobs, in this region largely filled by Mexican immigrants. Mexican Americans historically have been treated as a separate "race" in this region, blurring the line between them and people in Mexico. Thus, cross-national ethnic solidarity is a meaningful option. Alternatively, they might envision themselves as U.S. citizens whose fate diverges from that of recent migrants. They might assert their ethnic identity as Mexican Americans or deny the relevance of that ethnicity, but in either case they would not have to assume commonality with noncitizens. In fact, these officers vary on the question of ethnicity, but with striking consistency they emphasize their standing as U.S. citizens, with specific rights to jobs and public distributions. They are sharply critical of illegal (undocumented) migrants and generally skeptical about recent legal immigrants as well. While they sometimes discuss migrants with sympathy from above, stressing the poverty in Mexico and the need for people to find work in the United States, they criticize them for welfare dependence and poor work skills, again involving value judgments from above. In neither sympathy nor criticism do they view migrants as equals—as sharing a path through life.

This article addresses limitations on expressed empathy in situations of differential citizenship. In stratified (and perhaps all) situations, people envision themselves and others as members of recognized (though not exclusive) sets. The reigning anthropological wisdom, especially well-developed for ethnicity, is that group categorization is fluid and situational (Barth 1969, Vincent 1974) and groups largely a question of identity. I have no problem with the notions of situationality and fluidity; as we shall see, the position of Mexican Americans in

2. When doing interviews and observations, I used the term "Hispanic" so as not to put anyone on the spot, and my informants replied with this label and often volunteered it themselves. "Hispanic" is too vague, however, to convey the important fact that they are all of Mexican ancestry and are arresting or otherwise controlling current Mexican immigrants. "Mexican American," along with its alternative "Chicano," has particular political and generational connotations in the U.S.-Mexican community with which some officers might not agree. "Latino," a more current term, has the same encompassing meaning as "Hispanic" (it does not distinguish people of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, etc., backgrounds), and I use it in cases where common Latin American origin is salient. "Anglo" (short for Anglo-American) is used for all U.S. citizen whites, following usage in the borderlands.

the U.S. West has changed, though quite incompletely. However, a focus on "identity" begs important questions. First, seeing identity as artificial and constructed, it concentrates on the words and ideas involved in group labels. While relevant, this treats identity as if it were a kind of magical hat that people put on and then become that kind of hat. It does not examine how social and economic processes penetrate lives and motivate group identification. Second, it assumes a rather simple development of opposition to nonmembers. Perhaps the very fact of discourse—the choice of one word to recognize an identity—forces contrast and conflict with other identities, but I suggest that the substantive powers, privileges, and institutions involved with identity also matter. Citizens' rights and benefits shape their experiences and contemporary life-worlds. Lived contexts and formal ideologies affect interior motivations,³ involving understandings of others and emotional states toward them. Citizenship privileges render the imagination less able to envision other, unprivileged ways of life and hence less likely to empathize with them. Such motivations support the daily work of enforcing distinctions and sustain the broader "citizenship politics" justifying and promoting this work. By making explicit con-

3. There are serious problems with attempting to describe mental processes but strong reasons not to be deterred. Claudia Strauss (1992) recognizes that people's statements are often inconsistent with their mental states or behavior, but she argues that to understand culturally meaningful action we need to explore how shared cultural models are linked with motivation. To get at such motivation she combines cognition (as I do in discussing officers' imagination about immigrants) and affect (as I do in discussing empathy), suggesting that motivation emerges when emotionally charged life experience intersects with stock cultural patterns. My arguments about citizenship invoke just such issues, so I need to make inferences about mental states from outward expressions and actions. My field observations on the INS indicated consistency between expression and action involving the two stances I diagnose in the interviews: paternalistic sympathy with poor migrants and coldness toward perceived illegitimate claimants to citizenship privileges. When laws could be effectively enforced, they were enforced strictly either with tact and kindness directed at perceived poor and peaceable outsiders or with cold aggressiveness directed at individuals perceived as bearers of danger and immorality. Any bending of the rules was justified in terms of a heavy caseload and weak evidence (that is, unenforceability) rather than a desire to help people with familiar problems (Heyman 2001a:131–33). Furthermore, I have tried to make clear that I am talking about *expressed* empathy and moral imagination. To do this, I have paid most attention to subtle statements that perhaps best express mental states, such as the use of pronouns, passing statements of knowledge of or concern with the daily life of immigrants or their absence, recollections of concrete events and circumstances (especially ones that informants considered meaningful), and so forth. I have not ignored more formal rhetoric, but I have tried not to rely on it, for its relation to consciousness is problematic (I view it more as evidence of the way in which people fuse affective states with publicly supplied ideologies). Interviews were relatively frank, and people spoke openly about other disparities between their formal roles as INS officers and their expressed thoughts about the border region and immigration (Heyman 1995a:275–77). Interviewees were mostly motivated to present themselves as being sympathetic to immigrants—in order to show me that INS officers were not brutes, which they feared was their public image—and therefore, if anything, the expressions should be more empathetic or sympathetic than the total pattern of thinking.

nections between levels usually obscured in the term "identity," I seek to link the global distribution of unequal life chances (which are substantially affected by citizenship rights and redistributions), the explicit politics and ideologies of citizenship identity, and the inward experience of being a "citizen." The instance of Mexican American INS officers has all these elements: successful historical struggles, both collective and personal, for U.S. citizenship rights and benefits, expressed statements of imaginative sympathy and rejection based on the substance of citizenship, and a key role in the day-to-day tasks of governing a world-systemic flow of migration. Citizenship is powerful. What, then, accounts for its persuasive force?

The citizen-immigrant distinction has been the subject of two recent anthropological essays. Verena Stolcke (1995) examines the political rhetoric of immigration exclusion in Western Europe, finding a shift from racism to claims of cultural purity that she terms "cultural fundamentalism." Aihwa Ong (1996) sees the U.S. white-black racial dichotomy as shaping the citizen-immigrant distinction and distinctions among new immigrants. There is much to be learned from both articles (both cultural fundamentalism and racialized lifestyle concepts sometimes surface in INS officer thinking), but by displacing the topic to culture or race they skirt citizenship *per se*. Yet citizenship more than suffices as a distinction for most Mexican American INS officers, who as a result of their historical situation as a discriminated-against minority in the United States are less likely than other officers to indulge in racist or cultural-fundamentalist rhetorics of immigration exclusion.

Citizenship is membership in a political collectivity, involving duties (such as military service), rights (such as not being subject to deportation), and claims to redistributed resources (such as old-age benefits). The collectivity varies, from cities and local districts through nation-states to transnational organizations. My immediate focus is nation-state citizenship, but eventually I shall bring lessons from the present study to bear on other scales of collectivity. One approach to the study of citizenship emphasizes official definitions and statutes (Soysal 1994, McNeely 1998). Such "formalist" studies, though necessary, pay little attention to how people identify with and act on their citizenship. This article takes a more "substantive" approach (Holston and Appadurai 1996:190) in two ways: it concerns itself with the content of citizenship rights, and it asks whether and how such content matters in people's ideas and actions toward noncitizens.

As for the content of the lived experience of citizenship, I tend to be inclusive. I consider the U.S. federal civil service jobs which INS officers hold and which are restricted to citizens as the way in which they experience primary labor markets and job-allocated benefits such as health care. These labor markets and benefits are not formally part of nation-state citizenship, but in practice they have developed together historically and are important ways in which citizens distinguish themselves from noncitizens. Distinctive national political arrange-

ments—citizenship in the formal sense—bind a web of rights and redistributive claims across many legal and institutional terrains, and the individual experiences this web as a whole life-world. Robert Alvarez (1987) found that the naturalization (conversion to U.S. citizenship) of Mexican immigrants was the holistic outcome of many experiences, such as established jobs and a relatively high standard of living, played out across personal history. This enveloping, life-long accretion of ideas and practices can be termed the citizenship process (also see Ong 1996), and it affects people born as citizens as well as those choosing to naturalize. Enduring and multifaceted, this process offers elements for citizens' cognitive and emotional imagination of noncitizens. The present task of citizenship theory is how to join elements not usually connected: theories of immigration politics and theories of the historical development of citizen life-worlds.

Existing citizenship theory has two main emphases. The "internalist" explores the historical creation of rights and duties within polities, while the "externalist" addresses the relations between citizens and outsiders. At stake is not the distinction itself but the understanding to be gained by bringing the two together. T. H. Marshall (1950) established the internalist agenda by delineating three types of citizenship rights in the nation-state: civil (the integrity of the person and rights before the law), political (rights to participate in voting, political association, etc.) and social (claims on resources redistributed by the state). He pointed out that nationally accorded rights modify the market-determined distributive outcomes of capitalism. His schematic model of citizenship history is subject to considerable debate (see B. Turner 1986, 1990; Barbalet 1988; Mann 1988), but it has given rise to a shared understanding of the internal features of citizenship. First, rising states consolidated power by negotiating obligations from and concessions to their populaces, in the process creating national citizens (Tilly 1996). Since then, paying taxes and serving in the military or other power-wielding arms of the state have been key citizenship experiences. National ideologies are inculcated by patriotic citizenship education in schools (Shklar 1991). Second, expanded citizenship rights were an elite sop to the less privileged in the context of bitter struggles in the course of developing capitalism (besides the Barbalet, Turner, and Mann citations above, see Hanagan and Tilly 1999). Political struggle in national arenas promotes citizenship because it dispenses with the privileges of old social orders without making specific class-based concessions. In this way, citizenship paradoxically becomes an open and egalitarian (to insiders) form of stratification (with regard to outsiders). Finally, citizenship develops in close coordination with the complex institutionalization of capitalism.

Both in capitalism's early history and in regions of the world system outside the core, one witnesses a fairly close approximation to the pure Marxist model of labor and capital. However, as capitalist production and exchange expand, firms and governments take on somewhat stable segmented patterns, especially in core

nations. Within the labor market, a "primary" market has bureaucratic qualities such as credentialized qualifications, job rights with some degree of security, and definite career ladders. Jobs in this market often provide contractually or governmentally mandated redistributive benefits, such as health insurance and pension plans. Education, often required by these jobs, becomes an important form of governmental redistribution. INS jobs are part of this market. At the same time, an increasingly differentiated capitalism relegates other workers to the secondary labor market, in which jobs are unstable, do not offer an ascending career path, often lack benefits (e.g., do not have health insurance), render people bad credit risks, and are poorly linked to the educational system (Gordon, Edwards, and Reich 1982). These hazards face new Mexican and Central American immigrants. In a strictly legal sense, labor market placement is not identical to citizenship status, but in a socially meaningful sense, primary-market jobs and internal citizenship arose at the same time through the same struggles, support each other's functioning, privilege the same set of workers and households, and merge in lived experience.

Externalist theory addresses what Alexander Aleinikoff (1997) terms "circles of membership," the rights and duties of citizens (ascribed and naturalized), permanent and temporary residents, and undocumented entrants. It views the political legacies of nation-formation as shaping the treatment of immigrants (Brubaker 1989, 1992; Hollifield 1994), and it recognizes that citizenship status fosters anti-immigrant mobilization (hence the term "citizenship politics") (see Stolcke 1995:11–12 and especially T. Turner [1995]). Although citizen/noncitizen is an important distinction, we cannot take for granted—as the immigration politics literature often does—that citizens will perceive themselves to have different standing and interests from noncitizens. The internalist perspective helps clarify how the "citizen" resolution of class struggles might divide those who already have rights from those who have yet to gain them. For example, Maurer (1997) shows how British Virgin Islands locals arrived at a "belonger"/"immigrant" distinction after a unifying, class-oriented labor movement declined and civil service jobs became available to "belongers" only. The point is that citizens perceive and act toward noncitizens on the basis of ideas of membership derived from past political struggles and deformations of pure capitalism, connected to rights and claims delivered by current status.

Cases illustrating the internal/external dynamic are not easy to find because many situations combine ethnicity and nationality, precluding identification of the elements specific to citizenship (Brubaker 1989, Cornelius, Hollifield, and Martin 1994). Germany, for example, until 1999 made citizenship difficult to obtain for persons not of "German" ethnicity. This ethnicized citizenship is not readily comparable to the nonethnicized citizenship held by INS officers of Mexican ancestry. The situation in France, in contrast, substantially parallels the U.S. case. A recipient of considerable immigration from the 19th century on, France gradually shed its Gal-

lic-ancestry-defined membership in favor of nonethnized citizenship by making citizens all those born within French boundaries whatever their origins. The internalist history of French citizenship (Brubaker 1992, Hollifield 1994, Noiriel 1996) shows this pattern to come from the synthesis of central state building (such as public education and military service) and radical social demands, often coming from immigrants themselves, for public benefits and primary-labor-market structures. France continues to receive immigrants, in recent decades heavily from North and West Africa, and is now undergoing struggles over immigration restriction and redefining citizenship with regard to the latitude for cultural variation. In the literature on the French case, however, it is difficult to disentangle the threads of colonialism, racism, and cultural fundamentalism from citizenship inequality as such (Taguieff 1990, Wiewiorka 1996, Feldblum 1999). To my knowledge there is no detailed study of street-level bureaucrats who are French citizens of immigrant ancestry (especially North or West African) and interact with recent migrants in a fashion comparable to Mexican American INS officers. Such street-level figures do appear, however, as pro-immigrant advocates and service-providers in Ralph Grillo's (1985) interesting ethnography of Lyon. More important, his account shows that the institutionalization of redistribution in the modern citizen-state—schools, housing inspections and public housing, hospitals and medical services, transportation, etc.—creates the “immigrant,” rendering the outsider distinct from the citizen as recipient of public charity and not normal public entitlement. One gathers that, leaving aside racism, collective rights and redistributions and thus daily life experiences still stratify.

Italy presents a more complicated but in some ways more telling instance of citizenship politics. Long a migrant-sending country, Italy now receives substantial Eastern European and African entrants. Lacking a coherent citizenship and immigration policy, it handles new migration issues with difficulty. Jeffrey Cole (1997) shows how tolerance based on the long Italian experience of out-migration fares in these new circumstances. Poor urban Sicilians, who in many ways are in competition—or nearly so—with migrants for jobs and services, do empathize with the shared migration experience but still mostly resent it, feeling put at risk by the new migrant presence. However, living in a political context dominated by patronage and marginalization, they do not sense a potential for citizenship-based action to limit or exclude new arrivals. In important ways they are formal but not substantive citizens themselves. Northern Italians, in contrast, encounter migrants not as competitors but rather as occupants of subordinate labor markets and informal economies; they may well benefit from the migrant presence. Yet the Italian north sustains aggressive anti-immigrant movements, in Cole's analysis precisely because of its citizen empowerment (rooted in deep class struggles) and the longer historical separation of northerners from direct experience with the circumstances of

migrant lives. Still, in the Italian case, race confounds the citizenship question.

The Italian and especially the French instances suggest that where citizenship is not ethnicized there is a repeated sequence of exclusion, struggles for inclusion, and withdrawal of expressed empathy with new arrivals when inclusion has been achieved. In this recursive process, membership in the political collectivity apparently serves as a summary sign of diverse social claims and institutional delivery forms, some governmental and some extragovernmental, that are unequally distributed in advanced capitalism. This account, however, relies too heavily on the social actor's omniscient awareness of institutions and privileges. My argument, instead, is that citizenship is a life process within these claims and institutions, one that can be tracked in community history and personal stories, and this ongoing experience should be the focus of ethnography.

Mexican Americans have suffered as much as any group from citizenship discrimination and racism. In the U.S.-Mexican borderlands, the practices of citizenship emerged precisely to repress Mexican immigrants. Linda Gordon (1999) shows how the middle classes of Arizona copper mining towns in the early 1900s shed their own ethnic and religious diversity to become “whites,” in contradistinction to “Mexicans,” by acting as citizens mobilized to protect collective decency. As a result, regional labor markets, education, residence, and politics were segregated by race (Barrera 1979, Montejano 1987, Vélez-Ibáñez 1996). In this racialized social formation, Anglo-Americans treated “Mexicans” not only as a biologically separate group but also as anticitizens, people with a distinctive propensity for short-term labor and then a return to a “natural” homeland in Mexico.

Mexican Americans' responses to this discrimination have varied, with some advocating solidarity of Mexican people in the two nations and others advocating U.S. integration (Allsup 1982, Alvarez 1988, Foley et al. 1977, Navarro 1998, Rosales 1999). Not surprisingly, given the dominant society's notion of Mexicans as the inverse of “citizens,” equal substantive treatment of Mexican Americans as citizens has been a long-standing goal. The particulars of this liberationist theme are important. Pro-citizenship Mexican Americans, whatever their personal sympathy with or interest in Mexico, have opposed the notion that they are naturally most loyal to Mexico and will ultimately return there. Likewise, they have fought for educational, political, and job opportunities in public institutions and primary labor markets, pushing the door open a crack with military service and going on to careers in the governmental civil service—in the state and local police and as prison guards and immigration officers. The United States, with its vast, violent state machinery and its relatively weak unions and public services, gives a peculiarly military and police slant to the achievement of citizenship. At the same time, Mexican Americans have waged their struggle in a discursive and legal landscape slanted toward an individualistic-contractual notion of citizenship rights. In the United States, governmental redistributions and the respect accorded

members of the political community are available only to those who earn them by their productive work and prosperity in a broadly capitalist economy and society (Fraser and Gordon 1998). Each step in the liberation struggle has not only produced legal change but also shaped the Mexican Americans who pioneered and followed.⁴

Pablo Vila (2000) describes Mexican Americans in the Texas border city of El Paso as sharply distinguishing themselves from Mexico and recent Mexican immigrants. Both in their own experience as long-term U.S. residents and in the discourse of the larger society, Mexico is associated with poverty and suffering. Vila's Mexican American informants thus "narrate" a U.S. identity in distinction to Mexican ones. He also found among them extensive support for the INS "Operation Blockade," which drastically slowed undocumented crossing in El Paso. Patricia Zavella (1994), discussing jobs, welfare, and health care with Latinas in California, reports their belief that citizens—people who "belong" in the United States—deserve more redistributive rights and better economic conditions than new arrivals. Opinion polls also show that Mexican Americans hold somewhat restrictive positions on immigration policy questions (de la Garza et al. 1992:100–101), but the patterning of ideas and actions in the Mexican American population is complex. Robert Alvarez (2001) discovered a movement to rediscover ethnic roots among retired Mexican Americans who in an earlier phase of their lives had achieved U.S. integration. Flores and Bienmayor (1997) report on social movements that take action in terms of explicit citizenship rights and capacities in the United States but remain grounded in community culture and ethnic identity. Hence, INS officers are best situated in a range of alternative views of and labile stances on immigration and nationality within the Mexican American community. We might reasonably posit that INS officers are more critical of recent immigrants than the Mexican American population as a whole, but they are not markedly unrepresentative and, leaving aside that question, their case remains intriguing because their development as citizens motivated them to join a law enforcement agency openly and overwhelmingly directed at people of their own national origin.

To focus on the Mexican American officers is not to

4. Ong (1996) argues that achieving U.S. citizenship means accepting hidden racial discourses, and in many ways belonging in the United States does involve subtle models for "whiteness" (Brodkin 1998, Delgado 1997, Delgado and Stefanic 1997, Park 1996, Sanjek 1994). I have been sensitive to the white model among Mexican Americans and noted subtle racial assumptions when they occurred, but INS officers differed considerably in the ways in which they handled the balance between whitening and ethnicity-tolerant versions of citizenship. Some maintained considerable Mexican American cultural affiliation and saw U.S. citizenship as essentially nonethnic; others thought of themselves as rugged individuals who had broken with any version of membership except the purely contractual, while still others clearly did embrace an assimilationist, whitening notion of belonging. Rather than insist on seeing a uniform racial discourse in the face of complex evidence, I concentrate on the explicit and consistent concern of informants with nationality.

isolate them for criticism as if they carried some higher moral burden by the combination of their job and their putative ethnicity. Their duties—exercising force over outsiders, shepherding them through a bureaucratic process and arresting violators—create contradictions and conflicts, but they speak well for themselves, showing pride in having obtained civil service jobs in a prejudiced society and determination to enforce immigration law fairly. In raising the question whether Mexican American officers sense a common fate with Mexican immigrants, then, I do not assume that ancestry is essence but simply point out that this choice was available in life histories to officers and seek to understand why they chose otherwise.

My central argument is that internal struggles to achieve substantive citizenship result in institutionally delivered rights and redistributions that shape external politics of inclusion and exclusion of new immigrants from such rights and redistributions. To identify this process in complex ethnographic material, I emphasize five themes. First, I examine how citizen-officers contrast their legal standing with official migrant statuses. Yet such formal distinctions do not seem important enough either in officer accounts or in daily life to explain why citizenship should form a meaningful divide. Second, I analyze officers' life histories, emphasizing their social mobility from laboring to civil service jobs as a citizenship-forming process without assuming that mobility inherently leads to separation.⁵ Third, I delineate officers' involvement in substantive citizenship institutions from military service to medical insurance coverage and the ways in which they draw on these to distance themselves from new immigrants. Given the synthesis of citizenship *per se* with segmented capitalism, I particularly note references to primary labor markets and the redistributive claims attached to them. Fourth, I address household reproduction as a differentiating force when families of citizens and noncitizens have unequal claims on governments and firms; I highlight especially as a divisive force the officers' concern with their children's future and the competition with other children in such institutional settings (Carrier and Heyman 1997). This also involves gendered aspects of citizenship in the opposition to immigration, again consistent with the internal-external citizenship interplay (Jones 1998, Gordon 1999). Throughout these four analyses there is an emphasis on the experience of citizenship not only as participatory standing in society, its more active version, but also as its passive version, the routinization and bureaucratization of past struggles in the form of benefits handed out to rightful recipients. I suggest that the latter frames

5. Mexican Americans are cognizant of historical segmentation between recent immigrants and longer-established populations, sometimes expressing it as a distinction between "Mexican(o)" and "Mexican American" (or cognate terms). I do not regard length of residence as an alternative explanation for officers' attitudes, however, since by coming from families longer in the United States and more socially mobile they are more involved with citizenship-forming events and processes than new immigrants and temporary border-crossers.

conflicts as having to do with legitimate versus illegitimate receipt of such benefits. The fifth theme is more specific to the INS work culture. Having committed themselves to this job, Mexican American officers participate in strong peer groups that fervently expound a collective self-concept as an embattled but heroic immigration-control force (Heyman 1995a, 2000). There is no doubt that this context shapes what officers say about immigrants and citizenship generally, but a purely workplace-based interpretation begs the larger question why these jobs and their work cultures are available to, desired by, and persuasive for Mexican Americans.

Counterposed to these experience-near analyses are others that emphasize collective social categories and ideologies as shapers of the expressed moral imagination. I assume a categorical notion of shared humanity, whether citizen or not.⁶ By posing the counterfactual possibility of cross-societal empathy, one can understand better through contrast what officers *do* say about immigrants, in which inequality of life paths is emphasized, in pity as much as in criticism, rather than shared fates. Within the discourse separating citizens and immigrants, I contrast discourses that accept and value Mexican American culture within U.S. citizenship with ones that require “whitening” (see n. 4). The categorical position adopted by most officers is that Mexican American ethnicity is fully consistent with U.S. identity and that citizens should significantly outrank new immigrants in rights and redistributions, usually expressed in terms of advocating policies limiting the numbers and kinds of new immigrants. One possible discourse officers did not use, though they made negative references to it, divides shared humanity into broad ethnic groupings (Latin Americans and U.S. Latinos) rather than members of various nation-states. In keeping with the analysis of identity above, I hold that categorical ideologies are insufficient explanations in themselves. Instead, officers’ intimate experiences and self-definition shape their reception and use of these categorical contrasts.

Having explored nation-state citizenship in terms of internal privilege and lack of empathy with outsiders, I address the question of new scales and modes of citizenship, more local or more transnational, suggesting that high-scale inequalities produce privilege and may possibly constrain expressed empathy in these new

6. I am reluctant to insert myself too much into this work. Still, it may be helpful to readers for me to clarify my own positions. I do not share an immigration-restrictionist position with the officers I interviewed, but my approach (Heyman 1998a) has emphasized recognizing the ideas and interests of both restrictionists and liberals. My main concern is with empathy and mutual moral recognition between categorically separated populations; in Heyman (2000:643) I mention my perspective while sympathetically describing the moral dilemmas of INS officers. I have also documented the liberation struggle of Mexican Americans in the U.S. borderlands (Heyman 1992, 1995b) and am drawn to the present subject not by a desire to judge and condemn but by a great interest in and sympathy with officers’ use of governmental jobs and state machinery to render their lives decent and secure. In any case, I have tried to present sufficient evidence—individual testimony and aggregate information—to allow for an open and even-handed consideration of the topic.

modes of citizenship much as they do in nation-state citizenship. Arguably, all participatory citizenship struggles that culminate in the passive receipt of institutionalized labor-market and redistributive rights differentiate insider and outsider life-worlds, establish predictable points of conflict, and, together with explicit agendas of right-populist politicians, promote citizen distance from and lack of sympathy with new arrivals. Whether this is inevitable, however, is very much in question both in analysis and action.

INS Officers, Race, and Immigration: An Overview

Historically, the INS was an explicitly racist organization. Officers were overwhelmingly Anglo-American through the 1960s. During mass sweeps such as Operation Wetback in 1954, the Border Patrol was an occupying force in Mexican American communities (García 1980). Border Patrol Spanish textbooks from 1943, 1977, and 1988, which are influential in training, contain a persistent ethnic stereotype representing all immigrants as humble Mexican peasants seeking jobs (Heyman 1995a:267–68). Mexican Americans entered the INS in large numbers in the mid-1970s, and my 1991–92 interviews and observation indicated no intraorganizational Anglo/Mexican racism in the border region (though I did note gender and white-black conflicts). Latinos occupied one-third of INS officer ranks in the Western Region, where I worked. In 1992 the chief patrol agents of the two largest Border Patrol sectors, El Paso and Chula Vista (San Diego), were Latinos; one of them later became the regional commissioner and then chief of the Border Patrol.

I came to study the INS as part of research since 1982 on the U.S.-Mexican border as an organization of power and on the people in the two nations that are interrelated across it and through it (see, e.g., Heyman 1991, 1994, 1999, 2000, 2001b). This research included a U.S. border city (Douglas, Arizona) where Mexican Americans struggled against profound racism and economic exploitation (see Heyman 1992, 1995b). There, I began to hear the complicated discussions of mutuality and conflict between Mexican nationals and Mexican Americans. I was not initially prepared to understand this, but it became increasingly important in my fieldwork on the INS, which contained such a significant proportion of Mexican American officers. This fieldwork included observations of border patrolling, ports of entry, workplace raids, immigration court, and so forth (see Heyman 1998b, 2001a). In conjunction with observations, I conducted 104 in-depth, open-ended interviews systematically representing the major functions and branches of the INS in the California/Arizona border region and the major demographic components of the INS workforce. These interviews were informed by my previous studies of border populations and communities and my observations of INS officers at work, which allowed for sub-

stantive and probing conversations with the interviewees.

The interviews were representative of Mexican American officers in the regional INS. Of the 104 respondents, 33 were Mexican Americans. Hispanic officers in the INS Western Region form 32% of the regional workforce for the relevant job titles and branches, the same percentage interviewed (U.S. INS n.d. [1992]). For these job titles, the Western Region is 17% female; 20% of the interviewees were women, 9 of them Mexican Americans. Thirteen Mexican American officers worked in the Border Patrol (the uniformed immigration police) and 12 in Inspections (which reviews entries at the border and airports). Eight served in other branches such as Investigations (plainclothes interior immigration police), Adjudications (the branch that processes applications for legal immigration and change of status), and Detention and Deportations. Eight Mexican American interviewees held supervisory rank; 2 were managers of major units.

All the informants expressed opinions about recent immigrants, differentiating among them to varying degrees, and about how restrictive the United States should be in admitting legal immigrants and in border control. Most of them were explicit about how they viewed various national-origin groups. They held two basic positions: they opposed ethnic prejudice and stereotyping inside the United States, and they rejected claims to a pan-Latino or pan-Mexican solidarity of U.S. citizens with documented and undocumented aliens. Consistent with the latter view, they favored more restrictive immigration policies. These restrictionist positions had three components, which although logically distinct actually came together in interviews: they called for effective, intensive border control over undocumented migration, reduced numbers of legal immigrants, and rejection of special legalization programs (converting undocumented residents to legal permanent residents) and were critical of the qualities of recent immigrants. These opinions were common among all INS officers, representing a workable rationale for immigration policing in an era when overt racism is publicly disapproved. Interestingly, Mexican American interviewees clustered around these two propositions (opposition to prejudice and immigration restriction) more strongly than the INS interviewees as a whole.

I first coded interviews on the basis of my assessment of the overall pattern of statements in them on two axes: (1) whether the respondent felt that immigration policy should be tightened or liberalized (for the latter, I did not count doubts about current policy's efficacy, which were widespread) and (2) whether the respondent distinguished between ethnicity (e.g., Mexican-origin) and citizenship (e.g., United States) or conflated Mexican ethnicity with outsider status (tables 1 and 2). In both instances I erred on the side of caution, relegating ambiguous interviews to the "unable to determine" category. This coding was done after the fact (it was not part of the original research design) and in a simple fashion, so it must be viewed within its limitations and specific purposes. It is not the centerpiece of the empirical work

TABLE 1
INS Officer Attitudes Toward Immigration

Category	Immigration		
	Liberalize	Restrict	Unclear
Mexican Americans	0 (0%)	28 (85%)	5 (15%)
Anglo-Americans	7 (10%)	54 (79%)	7 (10%)
African Americans	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)

NOTE: Percentages are of rows, not columns.

but serves as an introduction to the key issues, as a framework for the interviews presented later, and as a way of showing that the selected in-depth cases are representative of the whole.

The results presented in table 3 cluster in three patterns of association among answers to the dichotomous propositions. Respondents who supported extensive immigration and distinguished ethnicity from nationality were labeled "immigration liberals." Those who would substantially reduce kinds or numbers of immigrants were labeled "restrictionists," here differentiated as "citizen restrictionists" if they distinguished ethnicity and citizenship and as "prejudiced restrictionists" if they merged Mexican American ethnicity with Mexican nationality. No other combinations occurred. Any case where either proposition was undetermined in tables 1 and 2 was relegated to "undetermined" in table 3. Mexican American INS officers clustered strongly at the citizen restrictionist position, along with the few African American officers. Anglo-American officers varied. Some of them manifested prejudiced citizenship, and a few defended the line between citizens and aliens less vehemently than the others, permitting themselves serious expressions of skepticism about the course of U.S. immigration policy or envisioning their work as encouraging and serving rather than controlling new arrivals. Even so, citizen restrictionism was also the mode for Anglo-American officers.

Three features of INS history have shaped Mexican American officers as citizen restrictionists. First, they entered the INS in large numbers during a period of declining and then disappearing racism in the organization. Second, they inherited archaic INS stereotypes of Mexican border immigrants, though for many Mexican

TABLE 2
INS Officer Attitudes Toward Ethnicity/Citizenship

Category	Ethnicity/Citizenship		
	Distinguish	Merge	Unclear
Mexican Americans	29 (88%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)
Anglo-Americans	38 (56%)	16 (24%)	14 (21%)
African Americans	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

NOTE: Percentages are of rows, not columns.

TABLE 3
Clusters of INS Officer Attitudes

	Immigration Liberals	Citizen Restrictionists	Prejudiced Restrictionists	Undetermined
Mexican Americans	0 (0%)	26 (79%)	2 (6%)	5 (15%)
Anglo-Americans	7 (10%)	30 (44%)	16 (24%)	15 (22%)
African Americans	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

NOTE: Percentages are of rows, not columns.

Americans this is diminished by their personal knowledge of the region. Third, they received from national politics an increasingly intense mandate to stop "illegal" immigration and "control" the border. One can readily envision how this rhetoric encouraged a citizen restrictionist stance, but it is deeply rooted in officers' personal histories.

Mexican American Officer Aggregate Life Histories

The collective experiences of Mexican American INS officers show the citizenship-forming processes at work in their lives. Eighty-five percent of the officers interviewed had grown up in border cities or counties; only one did not come from a border state. Three were first-generation U.S. residents (they had immigrated), 10 second-generation (their parents had immigrated), 9 both second- and third-generation (depending on the parent), 7 third-generation, and 4 fourth-generation or more. Thus, almost all of these officers had grown up in households already "incorporated" into the United States, to use Leo Chavez's (1992) term for enduring immigrant settlement in and orientation to the new society. Only two officers had had a markedly transnational childhood, moving between Mexico and the United States, but the majority had an immigrant parent. I cannot speculate about what immigrant parents and grandparents taught their children about identification with or resistance to the INS and U.S. citizenship generally, but when these officers discussed their family backgrounds they emphasized positive views of U.S. citizenship.

The historical periodization of U.S.-Mexicans helps to define the political-ideological resources with which individuals articulate claims such as citizen and rejection of prejudice. The 1940-65 "Mexican American generation" sought nonethnicized citizenship, while the 1965-75 "Chicano generation" asserted a complex mixture of ethnic self-identity and citizenship claims for civil and political rights. Political generations emerge in young adulthood, but they do not dictate uniform attitudes; rather, they suggest loosely shared experiences and perspectives (Mannheim 1952[1928]). One officer turned 20 prior to 1940, 2 did so during the 1940-64 Mexican American generation, 17 did so during the 1965-75 Chicano generation, and 13 did so in the post-1975 aftermath of the Chicano generation. Thus, Mexican American INS

agents inherit rights claims from two generations of powerful citizen activists; perhaps this accounts for their pattern of rejecting racist stereotyping while embracing U.S. citizenship.

Just over two-thirds (23/33) of interviewees named both English and Spanish as their native languages. Of the remainder, who were raised as monolinguals, more had grown up speaking only English (7/33) than Spanish (3/33). Although a shift to English does not indicate loss of Mexican-origin ethnic identity (Keefe and Padilla 1987; Vélez-Ibáñez 1996:144-45), it does suggest some linguistic distance from the largely Spanish-monolingual immigrant population with which the INS works. My observations showed clearly that Latino officers who retained Spanish fluency were more effective at reducing the tension in interactions with immigrants than officers for whom Spanish was a second language (most INS officers and all Border Patrol officers take Spanish language courses). To this extent Spanish fluency tempers bureaucratic indifference, but, as interviews below demonstrate, it has little effect on attitudes toward immigrants.

Much more striking, especially in light of citizenship theory, is the difference between parents' occupations and the civil-service jobs of INS officers. Federal officer positions are allocated in rule-governed job markets with stable employment and ascending careers, and they provide relatively high pay and benefits. In contrast, the modal parental occupation is laboring, low-income, and characterized by casual employment or nonascending careers.⁷ While some parental working-class jobs have contractually regulated career ladders and benefits much like the civil service (if not the white-collar location in the U.S. status system), most parents do not have the security that their offspring have. Likewise, most Mexican American INS officers have some college education (27/33), while most of their parents have not. The educational and career track comparison between parent and child proves quite significant in officers' memories about obtaining their INS jobs.

For many interviewees, the first step into a bureaucratized labor market was employment in the U.S. mil-

7. Among the parents of INS officers with a declared occupation, 2 were small-business owners, 1 was a farm owner, 5 were educated white-collar workers in private-sector or government jobs, and 25 had blue-collar, working-class jobs. Of those 25, 8 were in primary labor markets (e.g., unionized mine and smelter workers) and 17 in secondary labor markets (e.g., agricultural laborers).

itary or a state or local police agency. Veteran status adds civil service “points,” and police and prison guards in border municipalities often move up to better-paid INS, DEA, and Customs Service positions. Six officers were military veterans; nine had worked as police officers and two as prison guards prior to joining the INS (just over half of the total [17/33, with no double-counted cases]). By taking these career paths, officers had experienced strictly disciplined organizations with ideologies of the rule of law and patriotic nationalism. Such organizations are opposed in principle to outsiders or lawbreakers. Former soldiers, like police, are thus well prepared for work in a control bureaucracy. More than half of them had undergone these disciplines, a rate higher than for the INS interviewees as a whole. The importance of state-power-based citizenship-forming experiences in this community can hardly be overstated (e.g., on Mexican Americans in the military, see Vélez-Ibáñez 1996: 200–206).

Life histories emphasize the way U.S. government agencies provide primary-labor-market opportunities in the relatively poor U.S.-Mexican borderlands. When I asked Mexican American interviewees about joining the INS,⁸ I posed two specific questions: “What were your thoughts as a Hispanic when you went to work for the INS?” and “Did you discuss your decision to work for the INS with your family or friends?” In reply to the latter question, Mary Carrasco (this and all subsequent names are pseudonyms) said:

Growing up here as a little girl, you see these as really glorified jobs. . . . I’m doing what I always wanted to do. The hometown people are very proud that I achieved such a good goal, a government job

8. A perspicacious reviewer asked if there was evidence that Mexican Americans by joining the INS were self-selected for attitudes concerning nationality, ethnicity, citizenship, and so forth. While this is a reasonable hypothesis, there is evidence to support the counterhypothesis that officers simply represent the large mass of borderlands Mexican Americans who seek “good government [citizen] jobs” and thus unsystematically enter the particular work situations and attitudes of the INS. I had an unusual opportunity to reconstruct the past of one such officer independent of his own testimony, through other people he had known in his youth. He was described as having been a militant Chicano, that is, part of the ideological-political generation most marked by ethnic solidarity across the U.S.-Mexican boundary. The town where he grew up was formally and informally segregated, and he was a relative pioneer in getting a municipal police post, a major target of the Mexican American liberation struggle in that place. He then moved on to the INS. His present opinions (see Heyman 1995a:276–77), distinguished by intelligent argumentation, are not simply a reversal of his past ideology. He stood out among interviewees, for example, in his criticism of fellow officers for their incompetence in Spanish and their stereotyping of Latinos as the target of immigration policing. At the same time, he was very judgmental about current immigrants to the United States, holding them to be of low educational and job capacity on the whole and thus not contributors to the best interests of the United States. In other words, he took the citizen-restrictionist position in my typology. It would be difficult to interpret this in any other way than as an educated, primary-labor-market, and prosperous-lifestyle Mexican American asserting both ethnic equality inside the United States and distance from the conditions of contemporary immigrants.

here in [name of town]. The negative is from the people in Mexico. When I do an apprehension, when I do a case, I’m asked to look the other way, asked to be more compassionate because I’m a Hispanic. My best defense is “Look, I have a job; my family, my children need a place to eat.”

When Carrasco offered the “It’s my job” response, it merits underlining just what this job meant to her. In the town she comes from and in which she works, federal civil service jobs are “glorified,” at least in economic terms. In the past, the largest employer was a copper smelter, where her father was a laborer. Unionized smelter jobs were well-paid and provided security for workers’ families, but while local Mexican Americans were intensely proud of them, they represented status closure, local racial inequality defining them as “Mexican work” (see Heyman 1992, 1995b). When the smelter closed in 1987, the remaining working-class jobs were casual positions in chile-packing sheds and discount stores serving Mexican customers. Only the jobs of prison guards and customs officers compared in social “citizenship” with Carrasco’s INS position. It is significant that she phrased her statement in terms of her family (as a divorced parent, she is the only income provider). In an uninterrupted sequence of statements, she acknowledged her ethnicity in the United States but used her household economy to justify rejecting a broader pan-Mexican grouping.

Statements similar to Carrasco’s were common, because most Mexican American officers have faced the same sorts of impoverished and state-heavy borderlands labor markets. Magdalena Barron, for example, reported that her father was a laborer and U.S. citizen, her mother a housewife and a Mexican national. She had started to work in the INS in her sophomore year in high school as part of a late 1960s youth corps program in her border hometown. After graduating from high school, she went straight to work in the INS, saying “I was born in immigration” and “It was my one and only significant job.” Discussing why she did this, she said, “A job in [name of town] for the government is hard to come by.” Johnny Escobedo, meanwhile, reported justifying INS work to a critical friend:

When I first got in the Border Patrol, my family said, “You finally got a good job. You were in the police department for peanuts. I don’t care what you did, but you were not making good money.” A very good friend in California turned cold all of a sudden because of my work with the INS. He was a resident alien, very nationalistic: “You’re arresting my *compadres*.” I view it as an accomplishment: a better job, better pay, put two of my kids through college. I have had the means to send them to college, to purchase my own home.

Barron’s and Escobedo’s statements refer to the same town and assume similar economic conditions as their frame of reference. Escobedo defends his job against criticism by citing home ownership and college education

for his children—key social-reproductive components of belonging in the 20th-century United States.

Poorer, predominantly immigrant Latinos at the border are less likely to have children in college, and their homes (which they may own) may be more run-down in outward appearance (Griffith and Kissam [1995:chap. 4] relate secondary labor markets in agricultural labor to housing and lifestyle on the border). What role might this lifestyle comparison play? The aggregate data and the several brief quotations sketch an answer in terms of a life-history process among Mexican American officers. The process centers on the difference between parents and offspring in a highly segmented and rather impoverished region of the U.S. capitalist economy and polity. Some of the officers came from families with primary-labor-market jobs, though most did not, but all of them had achieved (by their standards) social mobility into that market in a setting where government agencies offered the rare “good job.” This accomplishment had led them to envision the distinctive value of their jobs and, indeed, their whole way of life, for the future of their children. Achieving first mobility and then preservation of position had engaged them in a citizenship narrowly conceived in terms of their INS duties, patrolling “circles of membership,” and broadly in terms of their legal status vis-à-vis immigrants. Socially encouraged transcendence of their parents’ life-worlds (though what I lack most in these interviews is a solid sense of cross-generational transmission of communal ideas and feelings) also removes them from the equivalent life-world today among immigrants. The aggregate life-historical experience of these 33 people is not simply an agenda I imposed on them; concern with jobs, police experiences, and so forth, cropped up repeatedly in the interviews, raised and pressed home by the officers themselves.

Four Mexican American Officers

My central argument is that there is a relationship between the substantive institutions of citizenship, the individual life history, and the attitudes people express toward outsiders. Such connections can best be made in extended views of particular officers. Here I explore four such cases. This material has the virtue of bolstering ethnographic integrity by presenting complex and sometimes ambiguous interview synopses rather than selecting out of context the anecdotes most supportive of an argument.⁹ I have arranged the cases in a continuum from Chuy Ramírez, who is explicitly concerned with being unprejudiced toward people of Latin American origin, to Jenny González, who is prone to negative stereotyping of people from Mexico. By doing this I have allowed for alternative interpretations of this material, including the informants’ own varied thinking about the relevance or irrelevance of ethnicity/race to their lives.

9. In Heyman (1995a) I present five other Mexican American officer interviews that further confirm my analysis.

Taken together, however, we see the following consistent patterns: (1) expressed moral distance from recent immigrants and border-crossers, signaled not only by criticism but also by an onlooker’s pity and the use of the third-person plural pronoun, “they”; (2) relatively restrictive positions on immigration policy and policy rationale questions; (3) the separation of personal identity, whether ethnic or not, from Latin America; (4) identification with the mission and camaraderie of the INS; and (5) a strong emphasis on the personal accomplishment of getting a good government job with redistributive benefits that support the household economy.

When the officers were interviewed, they spoke directly and indirectly to various audiences. The direct audience was myself, an Anglo-American academic, often perceived as a stereotypical immigration liberal (see n. 6). A fair amount of effort was spent persuading me that the INS’s job was legitimate. In general, officers have the idea that people do not understand the Service and would appreciate it more if they could just hear about its daily work. Three indirect counterparts’ views, usually presented as on-the-job encounters, were introduced and responded to during the interviews. Mexican American INS officers confront appeals from Mexicans or other Latin Americans for preferential treatment on the basis of shared origins and also receive criticism for denying it or simply for enforcing the law. Such encounters induce reflections on citizenship distinctions. Another typical encounter is with Anglo-American tourists returning from day trips to Mexico who assume that they are exempt by race from immigration law (unfamiliar with the border, they lack local knowledge about both the discretionary power of INS inspectors and the large numbers of Latino U.S. citizens in the region). This brings forth reflections on racism and deethnicization. Finally, officers sometimes clash with legal immigrants and U.S. citizens of Mexican and other Latin American origin. Legal residents and citizens at times vocally assert their “right” to be in the United States, free from INS surveillance and control, possibly to distinguish themselves from the more vulnerable outsiders. To comprehend the individual perspective, then, it is necessary to recognize that Mexican American officers are involved in complex and sometimes conflictual dialogues over national origin and citizenship.

Jesus “Chuy” Ramírez was a senior immigration inspector at a major port of entry. Born of U.S.-citizen parents in a border city in 1953, he came of age in the aftermath of the Chicano political generation, and although he expresses no overt allegiance to this generation he does reflect a positive sense of ethnic self-awareness even when he is explicitly critical of immigration liberalism. After high school, he worked as a jail guard and then as a police officer in his hometown. He then joined the Border Patrol for its better pay and benefits; although he sees his job as serving society, he does not emphasize this motivation. After serving for three years elsewhere, he transferred to Inspections in order to return to his hometown.

While fleshing out his life history, I asked Ramírez

whether he had discussed his decision to join the Border Patrol with friends or family. In responding, he used remembered conversations with other Mexican Americans to articulate his distance from Mexican aliens: "My family was kind of proud of me getting a job like this. My friends at the police department, their opinion was, 'Why chase our own people?' But it's our own people who are committing all those burglaries, so I didn't care what they thought." Notice the double-sided use of the phrase "our own people" to criticize what in his mind was a naive assertion of pan-Latino solidarity. He immediately followed with a passage that shows that he was wrestling with sympathy for others versus his need to keep his job (interestingly, he volunteered this statement—it was not induced by questioning): "Sometimes, for example when I have a prosecution case going, you see these people. Personally, I feel very sorry for them, but I remind myself of a job I have to do. I cannot close my eyes to the job I have to do. I don't want to lose my job; my family comes first before these people. I feel sorry." In this statement, he articulated his sensitivity to Mexican lives, having grown up on the border, but his use of the construction "these people" and the pronoun "them" (more distant than his previous critical "our own people") indicated that he pitied them but did not identify himself as belonging to that set of needy people. Ramírez is quite explicit in ranking his commitments: job/social reproduction first, personal sympathy (possibly with an element of shared ethnicity) second. "Family" in this passage is a trope for the social-reproductive trajectory of households in an unequal society. This is a rather direct illustration of the framing effects of differentiated labor markets and attached redistributions.

Perhaps in indirect response to envisioned critics of the organization, Ramírez repeatedly emphasized that he did not discriminate against Mexicans. Here he was explaining to me the process of selectively halting cars at a Border Patrol highway checkpoint; to perform this task effectively, officers profile and disproportionately question Latino-appearing people: "We stopped cars from the south [Mexico] or U.S. border states with Hispanic people in the car. We were not trying to discriminate, but the numbers of Hispanics you catch are tremendous; really it's almost only Hispanics. Personally, I would stop cars with white people; I would question Germans, Europeans. Personally, I wouldn't want to be seen as a discriminating officer." Note the placement of the adverb "personally" to distinguish between his sense of self and the realities of his job. It is clear that he was wrestling with these issues. Another way that he rejected discrimination was to comment on arrogant returning tourists, who presented an example of ethnicized assumptions about U.S. citizenship. When I asked him to free-associate on the phrase "American public" (which I thought might elicit policy ideas about citizens versus foreigners), he responded with this experience-near comment: "They are naive about what the Immigration Service is all about. Local people know more, but tourists walk in ignoring you. They can't understand why you ask for their citizenship. 'Can't you see my blond hair, my blue

eyes, can't you see that I'm not Mexican?'" In this statement, he uses his own knowledge of U.S. citizenship law (which all INS officers memorize in training school and which he considered the most interesting material he had studied) to dispute a racialized version of U.S. citizenship (the self-righteous, presumably Anglo-American tourists). Americans of all origins are equally subject to border inspection. In a place where most INS duties target people of Mexican origin, this encounter offers Ramírez an unusual opportunity to propound unprejudiced law enforcement.

As a port-of-entry inspector, Ramírez could exercise positive discretion as well as turning away, arresting, and prosecuting people (in this, he differed from the interviewees who follow). For example, discussing the issuing of border-crossing cards (which allow the bearer, a Mexican-side resident, to visit the United States for shopping or personal reasons for up to 72 hours and 25 miles), he remarked, "You have to learn to understand the way that they live over there. They have utility bills [evidence of permanent dwelling in Mexico considered in the issuing process] in someone else's name because it costs money to change the name. Personally, I will accept it if I see right away that they are telling the truth." It is arguable that this is a case of empathy, since it involves combining local knowledge with an imaginative awareness of a less completely bureaucratized Mexican life-world.

Ramírez, among all the interviewees, did the most complex balancing of self and work. At the policy level, he had faith in the possibility of an unprejudiced border control and immigration system. At the level of moral expression, he recognized the plight of immigrants at least with sympathy and at times empathized with their life conditions. At the same time, he identified strongly with the breadwinner role for this family, in this case a male-gendered stance that was also associated with his upward mobility as a police officer. Through this role, he found himself enforcing immigration law "almost only" on Hispanics. One senses an internal struggle in his statements, expressive of the dilemmas facing Mexican American officers. His care about avoiding stereotyping and his relative sympathy contrasted with the more condemnatory opinions of the next interviewee, yet they expressed similar sentiments about their career trajectory and present job that were essential to their self-understanding as citizens.

Frank Moreno was a Border Patrol middle manager nearing retirement. He was born in 1941 in El Paso, the son of a Mexican immigrant father and a New Mexican mother, and had grown up as part of the Mexican American political generation, which had left visible traces in his perspective. He had completed one year of college and had had no police or military experience. Moreno was a Mexican American pioneer, having entered the Patrol in 1969 just as it began the transition from an Anglo-dominated to an integrated police force. Before he joined it, however, he had worked as a salesman for nine years and experienced severe discrimination. This had motivated him to take the INS job and shaped his perception of the Border Patrol as a fair organization.

When I asked Moreno about his thoughts on being a Hispanic in the INS, he said, "I faced no discrimination in the Border Patrol." He then mentioned an allegation of discrimination against Mexican Americans in his station that had occurred about ten years after he joined the Service:

As a Hispanic in the Border Patrol I never had any problems. There were a couple of agents in the [name of] Station that claimed discrimination, but I am on record in the media as saying that in my personal case, as one of the senior guys, I was always shown respect. I was asked for advice by the junior guys.

There was one incident I faced as a trainee. I took care of it myself. There were two trainees and a journeyman officer. The journeyman addressed me as "Meskin" [insulting Southwestern Anglo slang for "Mexican"]. "Hey, Meskin, do this," he said. I asked him to call me by my name. "If you do, I'll do whatever you want," I said, but "next time if you address me like that I'll knock you on your flat ass." I guess he got the message, because he never did it again.

Being the only native-speaker [of Spanish] for so long, guys appreciated the chance to check with me. It's how you conduct yourself.

I cannot judge the validity of his contentions about the discrimination allegations, but the way he understood them is important. He established respect for his work inside the INS and defeated racism by personal effort, merit, and character. He took an ethnicizing element—Spanish-language skill—and reinterpreted it as a means of professional accomplishment in a U.S. context. Characteristic of his political generation, Moreno's self-presentation involves first the idea of ethnic-citizen group pride and second the idea that personal success in the institutions of the dominant society is an accomplishment for the whole ethnic-citizen group.

Moreno held decidedly immigration-restrictionist opinions. Responding to my question about his decision to join the Border Patrol, he highlighted the labor-market competition between undocumented aliens and Mexican American citizens, which is particularly severe and divisive in El Paso: "I talked to my family and my wife about joining the Patrol. It was no problem, because the Mexican community suffers because of the illegals. They lower wages. . . . My brother and I joined the Border Patrol together. The place where my father worked was full of illegals. When the word got out about his sons in the Border Patrol, the illegals picked fights with him, and he was eventually fired." He later extended his criticism of immigration from economic competition with illegal immigrants to a negative lifestyle evaluation of poor immigrants of any legal status. In the midst of questions about the details of antismuggling investigations, Moreno extemporized formulaic fears of an invasion of lower-class outsiders:

What I expect are new exoduses—now we are getting Chinese; in the future we will see Yugoslavs,

Russians. The U.S. has a liberal immigration policy. If the liberals keep up with laws to give amnesty, free gifts, they're going to come in. I wonder when the American public will realize that we have to put an end to this some time. Look at the Mariel Cubans—the crime rate rose 500 percent in South Tucson. I was in Miami—they called them "scoria"—trash, garbage, Haitians, poor people. I have a lot of compassion for these people in need, but how can we solve everybody's problem? Immigration officers, contrary to popular belief, have a soft heart; I realize that I would do something if I was in Mexico and starving—the Border Patrol would pay hell catching me.

At the end, after rather harsh statements, he sought to show that he was personally sympathetic to immigrants. In doing this he drew on stock Border Patrol rhetoric about the soft-hearted officer and the stereotypical hungry Mexican laborer involved in a game with the INS (see Heyman 1995a:269–71). However, this pitying rhetoric did not seem to be the core of his interview; a more typical generalization was "How can we solve everybody's problem?" as a way of arguing against a numerically generous legal immigration policy. To sort out Moreno's complex statements, it helps to analyze the above passage in terms of citizenship and ethnicity. His immigration-restrictionist rhetoric was not hostile to his Mexican American ethnicity; he criticized many ethnicities among new immigrants, including Europeans. Rather, citizens were to be distinguished from outsiders because the latter's lifestyle was unworthy. In his view, there was a clear distinction between Mexican Americans, as Americans, and immigrant nationalities. One could argue that he had deeply assimilated INS workplace culture, signaled by his use of standardized INS rhetoric, but just as important was his self-formation in his struggle to become part of it, his small campaign for internalist citizenship. The officer in the next interview was less prone to identify with INS work culture but expressed quite similar ideas about immigrant qualities and the migrant-citizen difference.

For Luis "Louie" Bernal, pride in a Mexican cultural repertoire coexisted with strong criticism of recent Mexican immigration. Born in 1952 to a family that had been many generations in the United States, he had grown up on his father's ranch near the border in South Texas. He had served in the military and had a college education through the Master's degree. He had worked as an agricultural inspector near the border and then moved to the better-paying Border Patrol. He stressed a public citizenship motive for this choice—fighting against cross-border crime, especially narcotics smuggling. At the time of the interview, he was a journeyman officer. His was one of the most thought-provoking conversations I had with an INS officer, and he often manifested considerable critical independence of INS assumptions and practices. Part of this, I think, came from his professional career prior to the Border Patrol and part of it from his distinc-

tive cultural background as a generationally deep borderlander, seen in this discussion of work issues:

The Spanish that is taught at the [Border Patrol] Academy is correct Castilian, but at the border when you meet uneducated persons, it is hard to speak with them in correct Castilian, so I use my border Spanish. In no way can my partner strike up a conversation about smuggling, whereas I have a lot of informants with whom I can use the lingo. . . . Some guys [Patrol officers], when they [aliens] make this sort of lie [a false claim to be a U.S. citizen], just don't have the knowledge. I lived close enough to the line to be able to spot them. Being of Hispanic background, I could spot them by clothing, language dialect, and mannerisms. Somebody who grew up around the border will inadvertently mix English into a mostly Spanish dialogue—"cómo se dice, how do you say it"—whereas if they grew up entirely in Mexico, they will speak entirely in Spanish. I ask about local teachers, about school requirements. There are differences in clothing: the heel of the boot; the leather in the jacket and the belt; the cowboy hat shape—the ones raised in the U.S. use a more Western-style shape of hat; the Mexicans use a more straight-up brim versus the Americans use a more oval one. Trends change on the border; right now the Mexican American style is the country-singer black felt hat.

He uses his local knowledge and self-acknowledged "Hispanic background," however, for law enforcement goals, defending citizenship by defeating false claims to it.

When Bernal applied to the Patrol, in his telling, he had the support of his wife and family. One specific recollection illustrates his self-perception as fair but enforcement-minded: "My family had a maid that was immigrated; she was one of the finest people I've ever known. I asked her what she thought of me going into the Patrol, and she said she thought that they needed good people, that I would be fair. Obviously she had heard some negative things and thought I could use my position to be fair to both sides." This statement emphasizes an ethnically unbiased vision of the U.S. nation in the ideal of "fair" immigration law enforcement. As we turn to his critical comments on immigrants, it seems most appropriate to characterize this interview as drawing a line between deserving substantive U.S. citizens and undeserving new immigrants (whether formal citizens, legal residents, or undocumented), rather than between deserving ethnic/racial Americans and undeserving ethnic/racial Latin Americans.

When the interview shifted from fine-grained personal, regional, and work contexts to the final section, where I presented seven free-association terms about nationality and migration (Heyman 1995a:265–66 n. 11), Bernal was critical of U.S. immigration policy:

Q: Aliens.

A: Problem.

Q: INS.

A: Reconstruction. We need to change the ways we are doing it. One of my biggest criticisms was the amnesty program [the legalization of some formerly undocumented persons resident in the United States, a provision of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act]. I have no problem with people who immigrate legally, through the system. There are lots of professionals who could help the country. But the people I've encountered in the amnesty program have obtained their documents fraudulently.¹⁰ The INS did not screen them enough. We had a babysitter, a young woman, with an amnesty card received for being a farmworker in the U.S.; I could tell that she had never worked in the fields. A lot of high narcotics violators carry amnesty cards. . . . I come from a farm; being around agriculture, I know that it's not an easy life. If we offer these people amnesty, they won't work in the fields anymore; they will go on a social welfare program. It's a lot easier for the people I've encountered.

Here Bernal distinguishes by labor market/lifestyle between those who deserve substantive U.S. citizenship ("professionals") and those who do not ("narcotics violators," "welfare recipients"). Of course, very few Mexican-border immigrants are professionals. Furthermore, as the following passage indicates, he is less sympathetic to legal immigrants (the only immigrants who get welfare, within considerable restrictions) than the stock proclamation of support for legal migration might suggest: "It's very personal the way I feel. We went to the doctor, our kids were held up by these kids on welfare. They get food stamps; they don't understand the language—and it's paid for out of our pocket. It's gotten to be 'What's next?'" Bernal volunteered this statement in the midst of a work-task section of the interview, not at a time when he was being asked for an explicit position on his job or public policy. It came as a sudden, heartfelt burst of "very personal" testimony, and while it does draw on widespread rhetorics about immigrants, they seem to be ones with real emotional importance to him. It grew out of a male-gendered chain of reasoning involving his laboring on behalf of his wife and family and expressed a distinction between their rights to redistributed resources and those of immigrant children. As his remark about the doctor's office reveals, his bureaucratized, prosperous, and predictable citizen life-world, pro-

10. This statement is tendentious. On prime facie grounds we should presume that approved legalized persons deserve their status under the law as it was written. Legalization occurred under two different programs. The Special Agricultural Worker (SAW) program (established for the benefit of agribusiness) allowed more documentation by affidavits than the regular legalization program; the large number of approved SAW applications compared with estimated agricultural workforces does suggest laxity (Juffras 1991:59, Baker 1990:166). This was not true for the main legalization program. INS officers seize on the weaker program because they disapprove of people's gaining access to "citizenship" (in this case legal immigration) through an initially extralegal act (prior illegal residence in the United States).

viding generous health insurance, differs from the life-world of recent legal immigrants who alternate between casual employment and limited welfare support. This disparity of life-worlds makes him not more sympathetic to those without privileges but less so. Bernal has no close personal links to Mexico, but he has deep knowledge of and identification with the Rio Grande borderlands, an area of historical racial oppression (Montejano 1987). One could envision him turning such a local stance into imaginative empathy with border-crossers, but his position is that he and his family are entitled as citizens to primacy in internal rights and redistributions, and thus he justifies his immigration-restrictionist views. (We also note a particular lack of expressed empathy with the female-gendered side of immigrant household reproduction.) This is not to say that he should have chosen the other option but rather to place his choice in its context.

Jenny González, like Bernal, was critical of new immigrants; she differed, however, in her apparent lack of knowledge of the details of their lives and her tendency to categorize them as "Hispanics" and not just non-citizens. Born in 1963 to a three-generation U.S.-Mexican family, she had grown up after the Mexican American and Chicano political struggles had peaked. During her childhood, her father was in the military. Her family eventually settled in her town of origin on the border. Nevertheless, she seemed less comfortable with daily border life than most officers. She had had several years of college and then worked as a housewife and office manager before she joined the Border Patrol. In this decision she had followed her father, who after retiring from the military went into the Patrol. This may have reduced any ambivalence she felt about entering the INS, and it gave her early exposure to Border Patrol attitudes. Her motivation came from her father's emphatic statements of public service—the Border Patrol's mission of controlling law violation at the border. She was also notably critical of "Hispanic cultured-people," as she put it: "In the last few years I grew up in [name of border city], I had an experience with illegal aliens that I didn't like. I had a horse, and people walking through threw rocks at it. They didn't belong there. In school, there were lots of Hispanic-cultured people who felt that people in the States had to take care of them. I think that we should be sure who we got." Three elements of this statement merit comment. First, González moves from illegal immigrants to recently arrived residents of Latin American origin in school, making no distinction about their immigration status, thus widening the set of people who should be restricted through public policy. Second, by using the pronoun "we," she deftly contrasts her own group (people already secure in the United States) with a risky and often troublesome set of outsiders. Third, she hints at the concern with inappropriate redistributions by saying that the latter "felt that people in the States had to take care of them."

A conversation we had after the formal interview illustrates how removed she was from the life-world of undocumented immigrants. Knowing that I had lived in

a Mexican border city, she asked me why so many illegal aliens were apprehended carrying bags of disposable diapers, milk cartons, and packages of chicken. I told her that these items were expensive or in short supply in that border city. The irony was that she consumed the same items but, experiencing a purely U.S. life-world, was insulated from the compelling need for such cross-border (in this case, illegal) shopping. More generally, this illustrates the separation of citizen and outsider experiences of household reproduction and, as was often the case, is particularly unsympathetic with the female-gendered aspects of such activities.

In a passage in which González was asked to assess the Border Patrol as a whole, she commented on the ethics of law enforcement. I took this seriously, as my questions show, but I also noticed an unsolicited immigration-restrictive statement in the middle of the discussion:

A: My father spoke well of the Border Patrol. There is an awareness of the Patrol in [name of hometown], a good image of it.

Q: What are the positive things?

A: Positive in that we are trying to do something to better the community. There are statistics that people come in, some to better their lives, but also people come in to rob, to steal, these are the problems in [name of town]. . . .

Q: What are the qualities of a good agent?

A: Competent and good moral values. A person who doesn't just have a grudge against a nationality, who would prosecute anybody for anything. Not someone who says, "Who cares?"—we have a job; there are laws to enforce. Good judgment. You can't just jump into anything. There are criminal cases—you have to know when to go full force and when you don't have enough, when you lack some evidence. Good judgment of when to use firearms.

She based her criticisms of immigrants on two perspectives from the citizen life-world—viewing laws as equivalent to orderliness and equating citizens with the "community."

Her concern with orderliness and closure emerged strongly at the end of the interview with the free-association items. Three items depict her perspective:

Q: Aliens.

A: Other than [undocumented border-crossing] shoppers, they are looking for a better life, but there is a legal way to do it. But they don't take the time or lack the knowledge of how to do it legally.¹¹ Some are not coming to do harm, but just to find a place to work, and not necessarily bringing a family. Others are bringing drugs to make money.

Q: American public.

A: The American public in general is not aware of

11. In my opinion, González was mistaken when she said that Mexicans do not know how or care to get visas; obtaining a visa, in fact, takes many years waiting in queue, during which people might migrate to earn a living or join family.

what is going on—they don't know that people with welfare, with food stamps live on the south side [of the border]. Let 'em in, but complain about taxes—people just don't know. People who live on the border know, but just don't care, they want money—tell us, catch the bad guys (robbers, etc.) but let the good guys through.

Q: INS.

A: The INS does a heck of a job with the money they get; the Border Patrol doesn't get support within the INS. I think I will stay in the Border Patrol. . . .

González's statements here are complex. She endorses legal immigration as a rhetorical means to criticize undocumented entry. Almost immediately thereafter, she implies that single men looking for work are better than whole families entering—expressing the notion that the reproductive, female-gendered aspect of immigration is most threatening to citizens. Consistent with this is the notion of people sneaking over the border to get welfare. Arching over the contradictory particulars, she identifies law and order with the Border Patrol. Indeed, she identifies so strongly with the Patrol that she sometimes expresses lack of sympathy with immigrants on ethnic grounds rather than just because of differential citizenship status.

These interviewees do not altogether reject immigration, but they hold two emphatic positions, seeing a need for control over and reduction in the numbers of border-crossers, legal and undocumented, and negatively evaluating the personal qualities and lifestyles of recent immigrants of all statuses. I am particularly concerned with the latter as signaling a relative absence of empathy with the immigrant experience. Of course, there was no strict uniformity of opinion. Some officers were pitying (e.g., Ramírez), others critical (e.g., Moreno, Bernal, González). There is always personal making and remaking of general social materials. Nevertheless, in all cases the core qualities of noncitizens were seen as poverty, lack of ambition, and the illegitimate pursuit of redistributed resources for their families. In their poverty, in their impingement on citizen perquisites, and particularly in this disconnect between their secondary-labor-market status and their claims to primary redistributions, the new arrivals are moral outsiders, "they" not "we." How might this absence of imaginative involvement be explained?

Let us first consider the possibility that national immigration-restriction discourse (see Perea 1997) persuades Mexican Americans to contrast themselves with immigrants. The role of public rhetoric is not to be gain-said, but the experience of Mexican Americans such as Moreno in fighting for Mexican rights against Anglo-American racism might be expected to have stimulated some critical thinking about that rhetoric. What, then, in officers' experiences and current circumstances might have inclined them to use such discourses and perhaps internalize them? A possibility is that their opinions are rooted in competition for status and material privi-

lege—the desire to protect citizens' rights and prevent them from being diluted by redistribution to others. The material conflict between Mexican Americans and Mexican migrants in the borderlands is not to be underestimated: there is labor market conflict, as Moreno mentioned, and also the strain of newly arriving families on the municipal governments and school boards of poor border communities, with real effects on the services provided to more established residents. Still, the immediate calculation of conflicting interests does not do justice to the ethnographic material, in which each interviewee presents opinions in a life story made up of personal choices, perspectives, and justifications.

At their heart, the interviews focused on the making and justifying of a career and what it entailed for home life. I elicited narrative career histories but had not expected them to play a central role in discussions of policy positions; this emphasis came from the informants themselves. Officers made a practical decision to take INS jobs and therefore needed to rationalize them as orderly and fair, especially when confronting a variety of outside critics and interlocutors. This need is eminently well served by the citizen-restrictionist policy stance. Rationalization of the job is not, however, to be viewed simplistically, for in citizenship theory the job itself has important qualities and consequences. The primary job market and its corresponding set of social rights and statuses differ significantly from the characteristic life and labor experiences of noncitizens. Important qualities of lifestyle, such as transiency of residence, incomplete commitment of children to formal schooling, and recourse to illegal or marginal sources of income, are difficult for citizens sheltered by secure careers and related sociocultural institutions to understand. Mexican American INS officers have in their family histories, in most cases, experience with the secondary-labor-market way of life. Their civil service jobs are, however, understood to transcend the lifestyles of their parents and hometowns, and the wider U.S. discourse treats social mobility as a result of individual effort, implying that those persons who do not "achieve" these social statuses may have failed to make the appropriate effort (Sennett and Cobb 1972).

As much a commitment to the family of procreation as a reflection on the family of orientation, the "glorified" job is critical to obtaining politically distributed resources fundamental to further social reproduction and mobility in class society, such as health insurance and schooling. Won through internalist citizenship struggles and distributed by a mixture of the state and firms, social-reproductive resources are debated in externalist citizenship politics emphasizing "circles of membership" and consequent rights (see Chavez 1997, Wilson 2000). The job, the career, and the benefits present an insidious deal: they are privileges—genuine accomplishments and desirable qualities of life—paid for by acceptance of inequality or at least silence about it. There is, I would venture, a self-willed reduction in social imagination to one's narrow life-world. In this, the commitment to formal bureaucracy merits comment. Bureaucratic self-dis-

cipline is acting and rationalizing action according to apparently explicit, formal rules (whatever the actual agenda). Failure of bureaucratic self-discipline involves punishment, even loss of the job; one non-Latino officer termed the Service "a subtle kingdom of fear." INS officers have undertaken such self-discipline not only in their present jobs but also in their past military and police experiences; I also locate it in their education and their encounters with public redistributive institutions and in parallel private-sector primary-market jobs in advanced capitalism. It contrasts with the complex improvization of migratory border-crossers and new settlers living and working in marginal borderlands communities. The concatenation of contrasting experiences between segmented life-worlds makes it difficult—though by no means impossible—for citizens to use their imagination to envision the dilemmas and options facing non-citizens. It thus reduces the possibilities for complex and flexible empathy and increases the chances for hierarchizing moral judgments such as pity, patronization, or superiority. This tacit quality of the citizen/noncitizen encounter in turn facilitates the acceptance of explicit immigration-restrictionist ideologies, whether using the rhetoric of citizenship per se or that of race, class, or cultural fundamentalism.

Citizenship, Empathy, and Privilege: Comparative Issues and New Developments

The case of Mexican American INS officers might be regarded as exceptional in the striking juxtaposition of shared national origins between immigration police and migrants. I consider it valuable, however, for comparative purposes precisely because the Mexican American struggle against racism and cultural prejudice in the United States highlights the role of citizenship as an ideology and an experience. In this regard, I take the officers seriously in their stance that their primary identity is citizen, not transnational ethnic. However, there is little comparable material published; we need more studies of street-level bureaucrats (immigration officers, police, hospital and school personnel, social workers, etc.) who share a national origin with a client immigrant population. More broadly, there is a need for studies of citizenship ideologies and experiences in nations with nonethnicized citizenship (e.g., Canada, Argentina, Australia). I am not calling for ignoring racism or cultural fundamentalism in citizen-migrant conflicts, but I do hold that citizenship is a distinctive realm of institutions, practices, and ideologies that merits attention. We might pay attention to the conversion of people of immigrant ancestry into self-identifying citizens who may oppose new immigration. Even a work such as Gerard Noiriel's impressive historical synthesis of immigration to France, which discusses assimilation of past immigrant populations (1996:144–88), does not inform us about the attitudes of such segments of French society toward new immigrants. Yet that conversion seems to

be extensive and important, and I suggest that the labor markets, redistributive benefits, careers, and self-perceived mobility involved in citizenship are crucial to this historical "amnesia" (Noiriel 1995). Most generally, the present case contributes in its small way to the ethnographic literature on anti-immigrationism (in which Cole's 1997 work on Italy excels); it bears pointing out that most studies of anti-immigrationism are general societal-political analyses, analyses of texts and public statements, or analyses of people's categorical identities that are vulnerable to the "magical hat" criticism (e.g., Wrench and Solomos 1993). I suggest that ethnographers pay attention to the institutional life-worlds of immigration opponents and listen carefully for statements drawing on their social-moral imaginations.

But this assumes that we know what citizenship is—that we neatly associate it with membership in the nation-state. Recent work has shown that citizenship can be organized through a wide range of collectivities, ranging from peasant villages in China to the European Union. The analytical principles applicable to the U.S.-Mexican border case hold for this wider range, though with modification. China, for example, has national citizenship, but many important features of citizenship are local. People are registered in localities, and prior to 1979 migration between localities was strictly controlled. Although open labor migration has expanded, certain aspects of permission to work or operate businesses are still allocated locally, and, more important, most social distributions (welfare) are provided only to official citizens of the locality (Chan and Zhang 1999, Pieke and Mallee 1999, Sollinger 1999). Alan and Josephine Smart (Smart and Smart n.d., Smart 2000) have documented this local citizenship in rural areas that have rapidly industrialized and seen influxes of migrant workers. The redistribution of local administrative unit surpluses as dividends and welfare is subject to considerable struggle over inclusion and exclusion, with a particular concern to limit outsider access to reproductive resources such as children's education. The patterns of lack of sympathy and exclusion seem familiar. In the European Union, we witness the possible emergence of citizenship in a large, transnational unit. One way this is being documented is through studies of European "denizens" (Hammar 1993), guestworkers and noncitizen permanent residents who are granted citizen-like rights to political participation and social benefits (Soysal 1994, McNeely 1998). This represents an interesting disarticulation of citizenship: freedom of movement through the Union, national "citizenship" in a possibly vestigial form, and then, relatively independently, access to redistributed resources and legitimate labor markets. In the same time period, however, the EU has developed an aggressive approach to excluding new outsiders, including interdiction that resembles that of the U.S.-Mexican border, forming the so-called Schengenland. Work like Stolcke's (1995) has so far focused on the explicit rhetorics justifying this exclusion; what ethnographers now need to do is document the relationship between moral imaginations, instituted life-worlds in new transnational-governmental

frameworks, and formal ideas and policies about movement and migration (see Trouillot 2001).¹²

Other writers challenge us to reconsider our assumptions about citizenship altogether. The simplest idea is that national or other located memberships are losing ground in the global system to new, networked identities such as diasporas (Clifford 1994; also see Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994 on transnationalism generally). To dwell at length on the ethnography of old-fashioned citizen-restrictionists as I have done is not to deny the existence and relevance of alternative modes of political and cultural affiliation. Still, the strength of nation-state citizenship ideas among Mexican American INS officers, a group of people who are not far removed from the transnational Mexican experience, suggests the persistent power of citizenship. The other kinds of citizenship described just above also suggest that inclusion and exclusion are reproduced at new scales of organization, perhaps because each mode of collectivity involves *some* relationship between instituted aspects of labor markets, redistributions, life-worlds, and moralized relations of insiders and outsiders. While challenging traditional ideas of nation-state citizenship with her notion of “flexibility,” Ong (1999) captures this reproduction of social inequality and cultural governability in new spatial and organizational settings induced by contemporary capitalism. Although some individuals (often highly privileged) maneuver for and are accorded flexible statuses among and between nations, Ong’s account shows that national and local citizenship remains an essential institution and experience for the masses of both modestly privileged citizens and marginalized immigrants.

Why does citizenship retain such presence and power? The INS officer case suggests that we analyze it from three angles. Citizenship includes a participatory component—modes of involvement, ways of drawing people in. I have seen this taking place through the long struggle of Mexican Americans against racism and for unprejudiced membership in the U.S. nation-state. Citizenship also includes a membership component that directly allocates certain burdens (e.g., military service) and redistributions (e.g., public schools) to a particular set of people. Unlike the energizing and inclusive participatory

component (which may come earlier in time), this one tends to produce a passive and possessive notion of privilege. Finally, citizenship offers a synoptic language that helps people recognize in themselves and others the substantive experiences that emerge from complexly stratified capitalism. Although I would not claim that this final component is inherent in the concept of citizenship, the INS case suggests how strongly they go together.

The contributors to *Latino Cultural Citizenship* (Flores and Bienmayor 1997) argue that social movements are reworking the relationship between these elements—both challenging racist assumptions in U.S. citizenship by holding simultaneously to Latino cultures and participation in the public life of the nation and challenging the lines of legal citizenship by moving people such as undocumented immigrants and legal residents, previously nonmembers or limited members, into U.S. public life. My findings are in accord with the first contention but contrast with the second because of the character of my case study. What is useful is not contesting these differences but recognizing the commonality hidden in their contrast—the role of the generalization of empathy. The collection is optimistic about the possibilities for social movements and participatory research to reformulate and expand empathy—probably in part because they focus on moments of active citizenship making. I fervently hope that this is so (it has been my own argument concerning U.S. immigration policy [Heyman 1998a]), but in the present study I examine established citizenship, noting connections between bounded, unequal life-worlds and the way in which people construct their motivations and affect toward outsiders. The literature on citizenship in general reproduces this dichotomy, with those examining creative (often internal) citizenship being more celebratory and those examining restrictive (often external) citizenship being more critical. Convergence of these two lines seems essential to further understanding. In this regard, I urge us to examine the characteristic strengths and limitations of participatory politics when their explicit goal or implicit result is a corporate or governmentally organized channeling of benefits to a delimited populace and to seek alternatives in increasingly generalizable public claims and political arrangements suited to them. These points, in fact, lead beyond citizenship itself.

Contemporary global and national capitalist economies are making more and more unequal the distribution of everyday privilege, whether marked by citizenship or by other invidious distinctions. This creates and re-creates situations in which classes of people have contrasting life-worlds—bureaucratized and nonbureaucratized, resource-rich and resource-poor, cushioned and perilous. The contrast of life-worlds cannot help but be a formative experiential process that shapes the ability to cognize and empathize with other people’s lives. Beyond such boundaries of understanding lie domains of misrecognition and indifference. However, contemporary global and nationalist capitalist economies also force people willy-nilly into shared arenas where they en-

12. In the U.S.-Mexico-Canada case, there is also potential development along these lines. Modest guestworker programs in the United States and Canada have been expanding, and the U.S. and Mexican governments have explored possibilities of linking temporary migratory employment with expanded residential and movement rights and ultimately rights to naturalization. We do not know how far this initiative will progress. There is significant cultural nativist and citizenship-ideology-based opposition to expanded immigration in the United States. The possibility of a dramatic change from intensive border interdiction to a policy that recognizes and attempts to regulate transnational movement does not reduce the importance of examining the still very powerful resistance to this development. An adequate model of immigration policy requires a double-sided analysis of capitalist *interests* in saturated and controlled labor forces and the opposition to immigration that capitalist *society* generates (Heyman 1998a, b). I have suggested that with immigration, capitalists and outsider (migrant) networks have taken the radical roles and established residents the conservative ones. The present work speaks mostly to the latter.

counter each other as dimly labeled social blocs. This encounter and moral misrecognition are widespread (Heyman 2000), and we ought to be concerned with how readily they lend themselves to ideologies of nationalism and exclusion (Wolf 1999). We generally recognize the dangers of nationalism, but citizenship is trickier because the exclusion it fosters emerges from constructive processes of struggle for access to resources and participation. Its resultant life-worlds nonetheless widen the possibilities of separation on local, national, and world scales. "Separation" focuses attention on processes that dissuade us from a moral sense that people share a common fate. Each successful struggle within the high-scale polities of advanced capitalism engenders its own boundaries of lack of sympathy with new arrivals. Perhaps the same challenge holds true for other human issues, for in the end the only unbounded status we share is that of humanity.

Comments

ROBERT ALVAREZ

Department of Ethnic Studies, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, Calif. 92093-0522, U.S.A. (oloberto@ucsd.edu). 21 XII 01

The role of Mexican Americans as immigration officers has been a topic of conventional conversation among U.S.-Mexican border-crossers of Mexican ancestry for as long as I can remember. The stereotypes often shared by Mexican Americans of these immigration officers claim them to be harsher, less empathetic, and stricter both in applying the law and in the interrogation of people of Mexican origin at border-crossing stations. Most Mexican-origin border folk have at least one story of the Chicano/a Border Patrol officer who is "worse than the Anglos." The question asked here by Heyman is asked by countless Mexican-origin crossers, many of U.S. citizenship: What makes these people tick? Why have they chosen a career that focuses on the limitation and persecution of people of their own "race" and ethnicity? How do they justify the actions of the Border Patrol and the treatment of "other" Mexicans entering the United States?

The expectation of Mexican-origin crossers—and in this article one might suppose that the expectation is the same—is that Mexican Americans, because of their ethnic/cultural belonging, should empathize with Mexican immigrants. Heyman dissects the question of why they don't in interesting ways and raises serious issues of ethnicity, citizenship, belonging, and gatekeeping at national boundaries (both at and beyond the geopolitical border). Crucially, he raises issues concerning how we define ethnicity and inadvertently exposes the hierarchical ordering and stratification within the U.S. Mexican population. This complexity is often lacking in our views and interpretations of ethnicity as a seamless cat-

egory (like "culture") wherein a certain moral order is adhered to by all.

Looking across the border into Mexico may provide insights into immigration officer perceptions of the "undocumented migrant type." In Mexico it is not uncommon for much of the upper class (educated, entrepreneurial, "white-collar" professional) to hold views of the underclass (the potential and actual undocumented) that parallel those expressed by Heyman's interviewees. Although many upper-class Mexicans empathize with their compatriots, the latter are nonetheless seen as ignorant, uneducated, noncontributing, and, because of their poverty, often law-breaking souls.

This raises the issue of class and ideology that is tied to broader economic and nation-state imperatives. It is obvious that the Border Patrol officers express a nationalistic-individualized American ideology. They are, after all, guardians of the state. The ideological qualities of the American state—centered on the individual and on hard work and competitive effort—made it possible for them to both aspire to and be rewarded with the jobs they hold. Competition for these jobs is crucial (as Heyman mentions). My own research experience with American entrepreneurs (and this includes Mexican Americans) is that individual forthrightness in the face of strong competition defines the business world and becomes part of successful business ideologies. Does competition also influence the ideology of Border Patrol officers and help shape their behavior toward their "clients"? The individualistic aura of border officer ideologies parallels an American business ethic that sees the unsuccessful as "other" and often exploitable. For the Border Patrol officers, the undocumented are those who are least like them, regardless of their ethnic background. They are ignorant, unsophisticated, poor, and noncompetitive. This may be a stretch, but the importance of competition does raise questions both about ideology and about culturally specific social behavior.

The primary question—how ethnic Mexican Americans see Mexican-origin migrants—is more complex than portrayed here. Given the diversity of immigrants from Mexico (and Latin America), it might be easier to ask: Why *would* immigration officers identify with this population? It is composed of rural and urban poor, refugees, indigenous campesinos of numerous ethnicities, and others. Even a "Mexican" identity becomes blurred in the light of this diversity. In some ways, it is not difficult to understand why the Border Patrol and most Mexican Americans do not identify with this new diaspora.

Heyman raises important questions about local-level behavior and national (state) participation through citizenship. The labor market is, as he notes, an essential part of this participation. Yet the larger picture that we as social scientists are drawing is one in which the global state is marked not by labor markets in which the process of hierarchical advancement (as in the primary market) is a measure but by increasingly separate classes made up, on the one hand, of subalterns (service sectors) and, on the other, of managerial professionals. Heyman's

work on the INS and the Border Patrol is crucial in raising the questions that surround the participation of the undocumented through citizenship. His focus on empathy and the more sentient qualities of behavior is refreshing and illustrates their importance in anthropological endeavors.

CLAUDE BARITEAU

*Department of Anthropology, Laval University,
Québec, Canada G1K 7P4 (claude.bariteau@ant.
ulaval.ca). 1102*

For Heyman, life experiences associated with the citizenship of Mexican American officers (notably, their participation in the “primary” labor market, their respectable social status, and their enjoyment of social privileges and civil rights) inhibit them from “us[ing] their imagination to envision the dilemmas and options facing noncitizens” and reduce “the possibilities for complex and flexible empathy” with those noncitizens. The consequences are (1) the expression of “moral judgments such as pity, patronization, or superiority” and (2) “the acceptance of explicit immigration-restrictionist ideologies.” In other words, Mexican American officers are blind agents, operating organically within American governmentality.

As any good theoretical innovator would do, Heyman suggests the need to compare his results and argues (1) that citizenship requires some adjusting, (2) that national “citizenship” is trickier than nationalism, and (3) that the nation-state is a historic mistake. There is nothing very new in his thesis about the impact of the nation-state on the process of immigration and nothing very surprising in the statements of the Mexican American officers. I will briefly discuss these points before questioning certain ideas that frame his argument.

First, each nation-state is constructed around a pact, defines a certain social order, and promotes values with the support of national institutions and symbols. Gellner (1983) has described this process well, and Anderson (1991) has demonstrated that both the nation-state and nationalism are the result of social imaginaries of shared belonging. Following them, the nation-state is a historically grounded social product, and citizens participate in its reproduction and transformation. Within this approach, we have witnessed notable shifts in recent years. The cultural-homogeneity thesis has been transformed into a definition of citizenship founded on a common public culture. Its basic tenets are the valorization of the neutrality of the law, the rejection of fundamentalism, the promotion of individual autonomy, and respect for cultural and social differences. This public culture becomes, for Habermas (1994) and Schnapper (1996), the canvas of a “living together” with which new immigrants are invited to associate themselves and become “naturalized.”

Second, Heyman shows that “Mexican American” (a local idiom used to segregate citizens in cultural terms) officers do their best and are irreproachable. What is sur-

prising about this? They became Americans through their initiation into a new politics of integration, and now it is their duty, as American citizens, to respect the law. According to Heyman, they play the game like black American officers. Are the laws unsuitable? Perhaps. If this is the case, it is only as citizens that Mexican American officers can challenge them by participating in the debates of the public sphere. If they do, they will be, like other citizens, influenced by their experience. The importance point here is that, acting as citizens, they separate ethnicity (or any other affiliation) from citizenship. I don’t find any convincing data in this article proving that the Mexican American officers practice discrimination.

Furthermore, is it their substantive economic and social privileges that produce an absence of moral empathy among them? And can we claim that these are the basis for the development of their “narrow life-world”? I have my doubts. Other American citizens have the same general ideas about Mexicans, illegal immigrants, or new immigrants from Mexico without having the same substantive background. It is also possible that legal Mexican Americans who exist outside the “primary” labor market make the same statements. Why does Heyman not take these possibilities into account? From my point of view, without this kind of verification his interpretation looks like the result of a bias created by the use of a grounded theory that forces us to search for coherence in the information we have at hand. When we find this coherence, we are tempted to extrapolate before checking for the congruence of the theory. Instead, we need a clear conceptualization of the entire range of factors which introduce variations in the understanding of different citizens. In this regard, I don’t find Heyman’s theoretical survey exhaustive, and I have reservations about the adequacy of his model of two different markets for tackling the source of the officers’ thinking.

Finally, if I was surprised to read very few comments on the everyday conditions of illegal immigrants, American residents, and American citizens, I was astonished to find nothing about the conditions which might favor the manifestation of moral empathy. Are these to be understood as exclusively cultural? Can we not imagine that a social politics facilitating better participation in U.S. citizenship (in Barber’s [1984, 2000] sense) would affect empathy? Isn’t it possible that an effort to raise public awareness of international responsibilities would produce more empathy? I really don’t know, but since September 11 we have been confronted by the greatest challenge of our time, in which space is again becoming the principal preoccupation of citizens. While I share Heyman’s concern about the future of humanity, I think that it is not only by criticizing the construction of citizenship that changes will occur. It is primarily through greater emphasis on democracy in nation-states, in bilateral and regional contexts, and in international organizations that new perspectives of common living in and between countries will emerge and that conservative and protectionist approaches will be challenged. If we abandon this position, we will be left defending something

along the lines of the discouraging discourse of certain postmodernist anthropologists.

JEFFREY COLE

Department of Anthropology, Dowling College, Idle Hour Blvd., Oakdale, N.Y. 11769-1999, U.S.A.
(*ssbooth@attglobal.net*). 27 XII 01

Heyman shows how and why Mexican American INS officers working along the Mexico–United States border support more restrictive immigration policies and distance themselves from the Latino foreigners whom they encounter in great numbers. He marshals impressive ethnographic support for these findings. His extended analysis of interviews with four officers reveals a range of opinions regarding Latinos at the same time as identifying significant commonalities.

In Heyman's holistic treatment, individual life history, experience in (primary) labor markets, and claims on government attention and allocations shape views of self and foreigner. Cognizant of the racism endured by their parents' generation in particular, these officers distinguish between immigrant ethnicity and citizenship and eschew the generalized racial categorization of Latinos as inferior espoused by a quarter of their Anglo colleagues. While they describe themselves as conscientious, even sympathetic, enforcers of the law, Mexican American INS officers carefully set themselves apart from Latino border-crossers. As U.S. citizens possessing coveted government jobs in depressed borderlands, they see themselves as accomplished individuals and good providers entitled to a range of services and benefits. Foreigners, by contrast, can neither harbor such expectations nor legitimately demand such entitlements.

Significantly, the historic struggle of Mexican Americans for equal opportunity works to accentuate rather than attenuate this crucial distinction. Claiming an overarching identity with all Latinos regardless of nationality would effectively nullify what the officers regard as security rightfully won through achievement. Anglo colleagues, whose identity remains unencumbered by the ethnicity of border-crossers, may more readily question immigration restrictions and blur the distinction between citizen and foreigner. Heyman in fact categorizes 10% of the Anglos interviewed as "immigration liberals."

Empirically rich and theoretically informed, this article offers a probing analysis of an important contemporary theme. I find two points particularly noteworthy. First, Heyman's nuanced and inclusive treatment of citizenship reveals the multifaceted character of identity, with a focus on views of American self and foreign other. This study convincingly demonstrates the value of disaggregating attitudes on immigration and related themes. Too often anthropologists identify anti-immigrationism or cognate racism without analyzing why and how people hold or reject such views.

Second, he shows how citizenship and employment in particular create experiential and moral divides between

populations. In a time of large-scale global population movement, this means that financial security and nationality insulate many citizens in developed countries from the lamentable condition of foreign workers within their borders. An analysis of food production in the United States, for example, would reveal how much of the meat, fruits, and vegetables we enjoy daily are the product of immigrant (usually Mexican) labor. As Heyman's article reminds us, anthropologists possess the skill and the obligation to make visible both these unseen laborers and our own all-too-common indifference to their plight.

RALPH GRILLO

Department of Social Anthropology, Arts C124 Falmer, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9SJ, U.K.
(*r.d.grillo@sussex.ac.uk*). 18 XII 01

Heyman's account of the beliefs and values of Mexican American immigration officers working along the Mexican-American border is very interesting and the subject highly unusual. Indeed, I know of few if any truly comparable studies. He argues that these officers "emphasize their standing as U.S. citizens," thus distancing themselves from non-citizen Mexican migrants and presenting a "sense of being different from . . . recent border-crossers" with whom they come into contact in their daily work. On the basis of his interviews, Heyman contends that "there is a relationship between the substantive institutions of citizenship, the individual life history, and the attitudes people express toward outsiders." While welcoming this paper and finding a great deal of interest and value in it, I am not entirely convinced by this argument. Nonetheless, the appeal of the data from a comparative point of view should be stressed. On reflection it is surprising that so few comparable anthropological studies come to mind. Offhand, and thinking of countries such as the U.K. or France, where we might expect to find immigration officers of immigrant ancestry and/or who belong to recently arrived ethnic minority populations, I can recall none which would enable Heyman directly to test his argument outside the context of the U.S.A. Are there no such officers, or have anthropologists simply avoided them? In their case, the issue deserves further exploration.

In a slightly broader perspective, however, one might locate potentially comparable data in colonial or post-colonial contexts. I am thinking of populations such as the Gurkhas, long-time stalwarts of British imperial armies, who continue to be an integral part of our forces. In the case of France there are the Antillais or the Harkis. The former, from Francophone Caribbean islands such as Martinique, constitutionally French Overseas Departments, are French citizens and thus eligible for employment as state functionaries. The Harkis are the descendants of Algerians who sided with the French in the struggle for Algerian independence and were evacuated to France along with the *pieds noirs*. These are all examples of the colonized who identified with the colo-

nizers and in certain respects were more “colonial” than their masters. I do not wish to equate the situation of Mexican Americans with that of colonial or ex-colonial populations in France or Britain. The differences are huge. One is that groups such as the Gurkhas and Antillais, it could be argued, gained collectively from their identification with the colonizer. Nonetheless, there are similarities (an emphasis on the value of the citizenship or subjecthood, perhaps, and family histories of service in its name) which might repay attention.

Heyman’s data also illuminate the beliefs and values of what he calls “street-level bureaucrats” within a defined occupational culture. He is kind enough to mention my study (1985) in Lyons, France, which also concerned people working with immigrants, though very few of them were of immigrant origin and none of those were in positions of power or authority. Again, it is interesting how little work in anthropology focuses on such lower-level institutional functionaries. A new collection (Grillo and Pratt 2002) dealing with immigration in Italy includes *inter alia* chapters by Bruno Riccio, Ruba Salih, and Elisabetta Zontini describing relations between Italian bureaucrats and migrants from, respectively, Senegal, Morocco and the Philippines. Once again, very few of these bureaucrats are of non-Italian origin, and Heyman’s paper is a valuable wake-up call to those of us engaged in research on migration in Europe to seek out examples with which to compare his data.

One aspect that is discussed by Heyman but requires closer attention is the occupational culture of the institutions in which the functionaries are located. In the case of the immigration officials (and that of some of the functionaries studied in France and Italy), that they are employed by the *state* (in the United States the federal government) is itself potentially of significance. Secondly, there is the culture of their specific branch of the state. It is not surprising to find that immigration officials are tough on immigrants. It goes with the job, and such attitudes are likely to be reinforced by the “canteen culture,” the casual exchange of information and beliefs, gossip, jokes, jibes, and innuendoes in the coffee shop or the bar that is identified as an important factor in studies of racism and sexism in police forces in the United Kingdom, for example. That Mexican American officials express themselves as being somewhat tougher than “Anglos” is again not surprising given the likelihood that they may feel obliged to ensure that in the eyes of their Anglo colleagues they are not “soft” on immigration or susceptible to special pleading. After all, they are *compadres*, aren’t they?

Is it, then, their *citizenship* (which gains them access to well-paid state jobs) or their *situation* which shapes the attitudes of these officers? Surely the ethnographic net has to be cast much more widely over the Mexican American population at large to enable us to determine that?

DANIEL T. LINGER

Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Cruz, Calif. 95064, U.S.A. (touro@cats.ucsc.edu).
18 XII 01

Heyman emphasizes the double-edged aspects of American citizenship: the assertion of equal rights within its boundaries and the assertion of special rights vis-à-vis outsiders. He asks why Mexican American INS officers choose to define their moral community primarily in terms of American citizenship rather than Mexican-origin ethnicity. His answer is complex. He argues that the officers’ attitudes (summarized in the stance he calls “citizen restrictionism”) are codetermined, probably overdetermined, by public rhetoric, biography, and occupational structures. The officers’ perspectives draw upon American internalist citizenship discourses of rights and responsibilities and externalist citizenship discourses of circles of membership, threatened borders, and welfare cheating. When allied with personal goals of job security, status, and family advancement, a felt need to justify career choices, and specific generational concerns, such discourses, argues Heyman, become powerfully motivating. Moreover, the very organization and demands of the job of INS officer reinforce restrictionist attitudes by encasing officers in a cocoon of regulation, order, and privilege, thereby creating lifestyle and experiential barriers to empathy with undocumented migrants.

I strongly endorse Heyman’s use of interview and life-history materials to explore why American discourses of citizenship have motivational force for this group. His is a serious attempt to rectify a common failing of social-determinist approaches: the supposition that discourses simply insinuate themselves into appropriately positioned subjects. I also admire the intricacy of his argument and find it plausible—but I do not find it wholly persuasive, and its not-entirely-surprising empirical conclusions suggest that we might be well advised to reconsider our ethnographic treatment of empathy and identity.

Heyman proposes that one cannot understand the officers’ attitudes without attending to their biographical particularities and to the imperatives, privileges, and ideological aspects of their profession. The interview material does seem to highlight the significance of some of these factors for variations *among* the officers’ perspectives, but there is a larger unanswered question. One rationale for focusing on Mexican American INS officers would be the expectation that their attitudes differ systematically, *as a group*, from those of Mexican Americans generally. But Heyman writes that the officers’ attitudes are “not markedly unrepresentative” of “the Mexican American population as a whole.” If so, then for officers and nonofficers alike citizenship trumps ethnicity. In short, the very status of INS officer, a key variable in Heyman’s argument, loses obvious explanatory value. To reverse the sense of Max Gluckman’s famous aphorism, perhaps a Mexican American INS officer is a Mexican American.

The paper concludes that there is not much ethnic solidarity between Mexican American INS officers and Mexican migrants. To be sure, toward the beginning of his paper Heyman writes that he does “not assume that ancestry is essence.” He poses the question of “Mexican-origin” identification as merely a choice available to officers. But his later phrasing of the central analytical challenge—“How might [the officers’] absence of imaginative involvement [with migrants of Mexican descent] be explained?”—suggests that such imaginative involvement is in fact the expectational ground of the essay.

But why? Lived hybrid or hyphenated identities often diverge radically from unhyphenated ones, and people all over the world commonly reject identification across such lines (or even, for that matter, within them). Why *should* we suppose that the Mexican American INS officers, or Mexican Americans generally, would be inclined to accord Mexican migrants special consideration? And if we do not suppose such a thing—if we have no more reason to expect a Mexican American INS officer to favor a Mexican than a German or a Vietnamese—then where is the surprise in the article’s conclusion?

In short, this conclusion is startling only in a conceptual universe in which ties of blood, culture, or other presumed essence are hypothesized to be vital. I am not, of course, suggesting that such ties are necessarily weak, but neither should one suppose that they are dominant components of identity and determinants of moral community. Heyman’s article is valuable as one more empirical nail in the coffin of the fantasy that ethnicity is empathetic destiny.

We should perhaps rather be surprised at our (anthropologists’) continued tendency to group people under ethnic rubrics, to imagine that such conventional rubrics carry substantial weight, and to be puzzled when they do not. A lot of people outside our profession, and we ourselves in our daily lives, have a more nuanced sense of human connectedness than this. If it is indisputable, as Heyman states, that “the only unbounded status we share is that of humanity,” it is equally true that, for most of us, what we regard as our moral community will never be that large. But in partial compensation it will include a more diverse and eccentric collection of people than conventional anthropological classifications would suggest. An ethnographic investigation of moral communities, one that is not beholden to tired categories, is a project whose time has come.

ANA CRISTINA BRAGA MARTES

*Department of Sociology, Fundação Getúlio Vargas,
São Paulo, Brazil (acbmartes@fgvsp.br).* 19 XII 01

One of this article’s most interesting aspects is its addressing the processes of identification and alterity of a group (employees of the regional INS) that lives, literally and symbolically, on the threshold between worlds, one with links to remote cultural and national roots that would sentence it to poverty and the other marked by access to benefits and opportunities through personal ef-

forts. Furthermore, their forefathers having managed to cross the border and settle on its far side, members of this group must now punish those who attempt the same journey. What, then, is their stand in the face of such an ambiguity-laden scenario?

The article is based on long-lasting research (begun in the 1980s) and careful field observation, including in-depth interviews. The analysis focuses on the interpretation of four cases through which the author attempts to understand how Border Patrol officers justified their roles and duties, which included the interrogation, arrest, and deportation of Mexican and Central American immigrants. As a starting point, he assumes that interviewees might take one of two stands: regarding themselves as having common roots with Latinos, which might unfold into some sort of cross-national ethnic solidarity, or assuming the position of American citizens, distinguishing themselves from the Latinos and thereby denying ethnicity any relevance. Put in such terms, the cycle closes, inasmuch as citizenship is defined both as belonging (American citizens) and alterity (recent immigrants). Although, according to the author, other stands can be located on a continuum between these extremes, the general tendency is to deny one and embrace the other. In other words, the Mexican American INS employees examined reject any shared ethnicity and deny the relevance of their ancestors’ nationalities as a source of identity. This double denial, he concludes, is grounded in a specific type of citizenship based primarily on the group’s integration into the primary labor market, which, in turn, provides access to a differentiated, restrictive benefits system.

I welcome research such as this, which explores the manner in which immigrants—whether recent or not, naturalized or not—experience and perceive the social meaning of citizenship values and exercise or refrain from exercising their social and civil rights in the United States. In this sense, as the article emphasizes, a substantive as opposed to a formal concept of citizenship is required. Should such an approach be used, however, one might ask how many generations would be needed for an immigrant with Mexican ancestors to be taken simply as an American (citizen).

The article leads to other issues. Might there not be, somewhere in the American literature on immigration, an assumption that it is the responsibility of so-called ethnic minorities to attach themselves to their cultural and national roots, while no such assumption is made in connection with the descendants of European immigrants? In other words, it might be appropriate to investigate why white Americans (an ethnic or racial category?) are not publicly invited to define themselves ethnically while nonwhites (be they Asian, African, or Latin) are. Is not ethnicity being used as a dissimulated type of racial categorization? Still within the framework of a substantive approach not only to citizenship but also to ethnicity, one might ask: Are white Americans (Nordic, Anglo, Irish, Italian, German, etc.) “more American” than Mexican Americans when one considers third- or fourth-generation immigrant families? In sum, how can

the notion of full citizenship coexist with that of ethnicized citizenship?

Whatever the answers may be, I share Heyman's fundamental concern: Why don't his interviewees show greater empathy with people whose recent life experiences are so similar to their own families' not-too-distant past or even greater racial tolerance? To answer this question, he analyzes his interviewees' life histories and their integration into the primary labor market and its systems of benefits. I believe that this approach may prove exceedingly rich. However, other institutional aspects, particularly political ones, might also be explored. The integration of Mexican Americans into primary-labor-market positions that valued ethnicity would probably lead them to adopt a different stance (one might think of civil servants who provide support to "ethnic minorities"). This means that there is a political dimension (one, therefore, that organizes interests) that guides the positioning of groups as regards the expression of ethnicity rather than superimposing ethnicity as the expression of a shared cultural heritage.

In this regard, it might be interesting for the author to expand this important and competent research to other segments of the primary labor market and examine how different circumstances affect the construction of citizenship notions as belonging (including access to social benefits and policies) and alterity.

VICTOR M. ORTIZ

*Mexican and Caribbean Studies Program,
Northeastern Illinois University, 5500 N. Saint Louis
Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60625-4699, U.S.A. (v-ortiz@
neiu.edu). 21 XII 01*

Heyman's article provides an insightful reflection on a poignant condition that extends beyond immigration. Shifting the focus from identity (e.g., "the magical-hat approach") to identification, he looks at the parameters of belonging in a globalized world. Beyond the "who is in" and "who is out" questions often asked with regard to citizenship, he draws our attention to a particular set of gatekeepers.

Because of the geographical proximity of Mexico to the United States and the strong persistence of its culture through ancestral ties, Mexican Americans are frequently seen as closer to Mexico than to the United States. Perceived as Mexican nationals, they are fenced off from common sense about U.S. culture, citizenship, and national loyalty. Children who have never set foot in Mexico are often told to "go back where they came from," and in bank board meetings a "Mexican"-sounding last name is often still an unquestioned ground for exclusion. Since the 1960s, however, there has been a constant increase of Mexican Americans in the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Why are these "eternal foreigners" patrolling a geopolitical boundary that they seem to carry in their bodies or last names?

Heyman looks at this apparent incongruence from dif-

ferent angles. He examines the meaning and motives INS officers of Mexican ancestry assign to their involvement in an enforcement agency that persecutes "their people." Rather than any automatic identification of the Mexican American agents with the Mexican undocumented immigrants they persecute, he finds an overall tendency to subordinate ethnic identification to their roles as enforcers of immigration policy. Such an identification is avoided in a clear separation from professional and non-professional loyalties. In turn, shunning ethnic or empathic connections allows these agents to achieve social mobility. The officers justify their role as gatekeepers in terms of their need to provide for their families and to protect the country from unwanted newcomers.

Heyman shows that the agents' relation to immigrants is influenced by practical considerations of social and economic alternatives. Social mobility gains or goals preempt their questioning of the fairness or ethical implications of the policies they enforce. With different emphases, in the officers' view, immigrants mostly compete for opportunities or disrupt law and order. Their contributions are, if recognized, disqualified: even if undocumented workers may help, they do not have the right to be here. At stake, Heyman insists, are labor-market considerations. One of the officers said, "I'm just doing my job," and that job entails defining the contours of the playing field for the legitimate competitors, that is, "citizens." By enforcing the contour, the boundary, the agent is inherently included within the in-group, sidestepping the persistent perception of Mexican Americans as "eternal foreigners."

The officers' maneuver is limited, nevertheless, by its individualistic overtones. The maneuver at once collectively reinforces the divisions they individually attempt to bypass. Part and parcel of the incongruent—yet functional—logic of immigration policies, the officers seem to manage to have their cake and eat it but at a very high social cost. Incongruently, at least at first sight, immigration policy toughens at a moment of intensified integration between Mexico and the United States. Business yes but people no, the policy seems to say. But is this really the case? The failure to stop the flow of workers from Mexico to the United States is conveniently explained by the INS as a result of its overwhelming volume and the inadequacy of the resources allocated by the federal government. Little attention is paid, within the recognized mission of the agency, to understanding the causes of the flows. Just as the officers failed to acknowledge the built-in demand for workers—and drugs, for that matter—in the United States, the agency and most of the immigration policy makers refuse to acknowledge the skewed distribution of costs and benefits that the problem they exploit generates. Thus, the alleged solution to the problem contributes to its persistence.

Heyman's article integrates different approaches to look at the big picture neglected by those who implement immigration policy. It sets the stage for addressing a conceptual discussion of key interrelated notions (i.e.,

citizenship, nationality, ethnicity, belonging, and entitlement) within a concrete set of contexts influencing the implementation of policies (e.g., labor markets, life histories, regional characteristics, and cohort considerations). The article concerns INS officers, literally the “border patrol” and other policers of boundaries and interactions, but the analysis provokes reflections beyond them. He helps us to see the multiple balances that these officers and, by inference, all of us construct not only in terms of self-pronouncements but in reference to the concrete implications of our positions in ethical, ethnic, economic, cultural, and political divides as these divides change yet persist.

GUSTAVO LINS RIBEIRO

Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, D.F 70910-900, Brazil (gustavor@unb.br). 20 XII 01

Heyman’s work is an example of how anthropologists can contribute to the understanding of public policies and institutions that affect the lives of millions. In recent years, he has devoted himself to the study of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (see, e.g., Heyman 1995*a*) to see how power and prejudice are conflated in everyday categorizations of migrants. In fact, this is a field of inquiry in which we would expect to see many more ethnographies. However, in spite of insights such as Eric Wolf’s (2001 [1963]:178–79) on the need to be cognizant of “large-scale bureaucratic organizations” as a “new form of social closure” and Laura Nader’s (1974: 284) on the contributions that anthropologists could make to “our understanding of the processes whereby power and responsibility are exercised in the United States,” we still lack a significant body of anthropological literature on powerful institutions.

Luckily, Heyman is a more than welcome exception. His new article is a deepening of his ethnography of the INS—one of the most important state agencies shaping the migratory experience in the United States. This time he has chosen to study a complicated intersection of migration, state and police power, citizenship, ethnicity, and identity. His critique of the “identity line of inquiry” is well taken but overstated. There are studies on identities, including some of mine (Ribeiro 1994, 1995, 1999–2000), that relate identities to the historical and political economic processes structuring people’s positions and social representations within interethnic systems. Also, it is well established today that identities are defined not only in opposition to others but in intricate and contradictory dialogical interaction.

If there was an interesting by-product of the postmodernist wave, it was to make the notions of subject and identity more complex by way of a critique of essentialism and an acknowledgment that (1) both notions are social and historical constructs and (2) exposure to fragmentation—that is, to facets not necessarily articulated in an organic and coherent whole—is constitutive of our

life-world experiences. “Hybridity” is perhaps the notion most used to deal with this more complex understanding. Although it has become a catchword, thus sometimes obscuring more than it reveals, I would be happier if I had seen a notion of identity and of processes of identification more open to hybridity and contradictions in Heyman’s text. This would have helped to explain many of the ambiguities—typical of migrant and minority identities—that the Mexican American officers live vis-à-vis their position as members of a state institution destined to repress and control immigration and the ambivalences they feel regarding their relationships with their communities of origin.

The fact that they are *officers*—a *police force* serving the nation-state—needed to be stressed more. Nation-states everywhere have officials who are directly dedicated to defending their interests. Diplomats, military, and federal police agents are among them, but perhaps none are more important than INS officers in their daily operations on borders and with “aliens.” Borders are a physical-geographical consubstantiation of the nation-state, places where one can see that nation-states are real entities. “Aliens” are the physical-social consubstantiation of nationalities, people who allow one to perceive that the homogeneity of the nation-state is an issue and not a natural fact. In reality, INS officers work in liminal areas with liminal people. Liminality is full of ambiguities, and nation-states, especially when citizenship is at stake, are not much inclined to respect them. This is exactly why we need to transcend the nation-state framework if we are seeking new forms of citizenship in the contemporary globalized world. Global or transnational citizens will necessarily have highly fragmented identities and ambiguous allegiances.

I want to dwell a little more on Heyman’s interest in the citizenship angle of his problematic. It is here that a stronger link between the legal aspects of being a citizen and the positions occupied in an ethnically segmented labor market would have been more productive. The notions of primary and secondary labor markets are useful, no doubt, but the conception of ethnic segmentation of the labor market (Wolf 1982) is much more sensitive to the way in which economic and political power have historically shaped labor markets and created interethnic systems in which different ethnic groups occupy different power positions. The functionality of having *Mexican* Americans working on that border is related both to the liminality mentioned above and to the manipulation of the ethnic segmentation of the INS labor market by managers. In this sense, a study of other officers with hyphenated identities would provide a most interesting comparative framework, one in which Heyman’s study would certainly be a necessary starting point.

Reply

JOSIAH M.C. HEYMAN

Houghton, Mich., U.S.A. 24 1 02

I am pleased to respond to these fair-minded and stimulating comments, which demonstrate the importance of borders, migration, and citizenship as topics in contemporary anthropology. Here I aim more to widen and deepen our inquiries than to defend my position.

The commentators point out the limitations of this or any single study in establishing portable theories. Bariteau notes the problem of “a grounded theory that forces us to search for coherence in the information we have at hand.” I am in the company of ethnographers far better than I in having this problem. The proper response is to follow out the lines of analysis from one case study to a wider range of lives and contexts. A number of the commentators ask about such possibilities: Linger suggests that perhaps for this matter a Mexican American INS officer is just a Mexican American, and indirectly Grillo’s comments on INS work culture suggests that perhaps a Mexican American INS officer is an INS officer. Alvarez offers thought-provoking comments on ideologies of individual success and class biases that span Mexico and the United States (also see Heyman 2000). The work of Vila (2000) raises the question whether U.S. citizenship and nationalistic ideologies rooted in prosperous lifestyles (what I analyze here) affect Mexican Americans who are themselves not part of the primary labor market and especially prosperous. The point is not that there is a unique confluence of elements among Mexican American INS officers such that only they have such experiences and ideas. There are, however, certain reasons for focusing on this case: because of the particular situation of Mexican Americans in this region and in the INS, citizenship ideology as such comes to the fore, without such complicating factors as racial ideologies (but, as the commentators point out, other confounding elements remain in this case). Having analyzed citizenship itself, we can more readily trace its appearance in contexts where it compounds with other processes and then perhaps subject my overly “grounded” theoretical speculations to appropriate critique and modification. At least, that sort of progress is my hope.

Linger asks whether looking at Mexican American attitudes toward migrants from Mexico and elsewhere in Latin America does not rest on a certain “expectational ground” about the essential unity of Mexicans or Latinos. This is a very reasonable way to phrase this concern, and I cannot dismiss it. My first interest in this topic (within my larger INS ethnography) indeed came from the seemingly paradoxical position of Mexican American INS officers, but the discovery process—looking into exactly what officers said about their work and how they practiced it—redirected me toward examining their stated position of having no essential ethnic connection to current immigrants or even any essential ethnicity

among themselves. “Ethnicity” was not just my own framing of the topic, however. Many officers broached the topic on their own. Interactions fraught with tension between Latino INS officers and border-crossers of Mexican origin is, as Alvarez indicates, a common topic of conversation in U.S. and Mexican border communities, and racial framing of Mexican Americans as “Mexicans,” while essentializing in the extreme, is a fundamental feature of society in the western U.S. borderlands. The article thus walks a narrow path between the social realities of named groups and the respect for individual stances seen in the case studies. In this regard, the flaws that come with subject clustering and problem framing are inevitable. As I read it, Linger’s concern is broader, having to do with how we might go about constructing moral communities and public collectivities. I will return to that theme at the end of my comments.

Ribeiro wonders whether the labor-market experiences I delineated might be better analyzed as ethnic segmentation. INS jobs per se are not allocated to an ethnic segment, but this is not the key point. INS officers themselves experience and discuss their segmentation in terms of primary and secondary kinds of jobs and lifestyles (though of course not using such terms). I adopted their perspective as an analytical pivot because I was most interested in what formed their motivations and moral sentiments. Ribeiro’s suggestion does, however, call attention to some interesting things about the INS case with regard to the remaking of ethnic segmentation from the point of view of national politics. Under the Carter administration (1977–80), the INS was for the first time directed by a Mexican American, Leonel Castillo, and the agency made a concerted effort to recruit Latino officers. This was clearly an effort to alter the ethnic segmentation of INS job allocation to legitimate a politically suspect organization. Some Mexican American officers (e.g., Frank Moreno) had entered the largely Anglo-American INS prior to this time, but Carter’s and Castillo’s actions definitely transformed the organization despite much covert racist resistance. Since then, it has not been necessary to recruit a distinct Mexican American ethnic segment into the INS because the location of many INS operations at or near the border and the requirement for learning Spanish in the Border Patrol facilitates their entry without an explicit policy. Martes notices this peculiar half-ethnicized situation when she asks if descendants of European immigrants would be similarly referred to in terms of their ancestry. The answer is that such categories have faded almost beyond notice (expect as a personal idiosyncrasy, like being red-haired or brunette) so that European ethnics in the INS and elsewhere are above all whites or just unmarked (and thus “essential”) citizens. However, in the past a social struggle for inclusion from below and above also took place for non-British Euro-Americans (e.g., Brodtkin 1998). No one has written a history of INS officers that addresses the entrance of, say, Italian Americans as inspectors at large coastal ports of entry, so we simply do not know how the deethnicization of stigmatized Europeans affected the INS. But I suspect that there were

processes of recruitment and personal formation like those that I outline in the present article, in which people in transition are simultaneously ethnicized and non-ethnic citizens and segmented labor markets can be analyzed both as “ethnic” and as “primary/secondary.”

This ambiguity forms the ground for several comments about identity. With Ortiz, I find it helpful to distinguish between the person’s active identity and the external, more political process of identification (see Heyman 2001a). One interesting feature of the present case is that INS officers work out their identities as front-line actors in the imposition of identifications on others. This probably forces more personal resolution and possibly polarization from others than most people (including most Mexican Americans) undergo. Ribeiro rises to the defense of the concept of identity, pointing out important work by scholars such as himself grounding identity in political economic processes and challenging me to make better use of complex models of identity. Alvarez’s and Linger’s comments point in the same direction, though indirectly. The criticism is well-taken, and I want to follow through by considering comments by Martes and Grillo. Martes, in the course of a highly useful line of comments about adding a political dimension to the analysis of labor markets and citizenship ideology, provocatively asks whether other civil servants might adopt a different stance toward ethnic minorities based on the work duties and political contexts of their jobs. We do not have systematic research to answer this question, but it seems to me likely that complex potential identities and relationships to others (Ribeiro’s hybridity) might indeed be experienced, synthesized, and expressed differently by Mexican American teachers, social workers, lawyers, and other professionals who occupy roles and political fields advocating for recent immigrants rather than arresting them—indeed, this might well hold for U.S. citizens in such occupations generally. In this case, the primary labor market might still produce divisions, but the political framework might lead to notions of vanguard leadership, advocacy, or paternal sympathy (sometimes also seen in the INS). This is, of course, pure speculation. In somewhat similar fashion, Grillo asks whether involvement in INS work culture might not offer an alternative explanation for INS officer attitudes to immigrants. I think it does and indicated a number of points in the interviews where it can be discerned (also see Heyman 1995, 2000). As so often happens in ethnography, one analytically distinct aspect of experience cannot easily be untangled from others, and this is the case for the reinforcing combination of citizenship ideology, class prejudice, primary labor markets, consumption, political framing of the occupation, and small-group work culture. However, evidence for non-INS Mexican Americans of similar attitudes toward recent immigrants from Mexico and of support for intensification of border law enforcement (Vila 2000) suggests that work culture is not the only cause of the attitudes found in the INS case. My criticism is directed at views of identity that may invoke fluidity and hybridity but emphasize surface categorization or verbalization; I am

interested in deeper aspects of identity, including hard-to-grasp (incompletely verbalized) but important moral sentiments, bonds, and boundaries (e.g., my concern with empathy). There are substantial problems in adopting such an approach, especially in justifying inferences about people’s interior lives, but it strikes me as ethnographically richer and closer to full human experience.

One of my principal concerns and that of several commentators is what sorts of social contexts might favor inclusive, nondeterministic, and empathetic relationships among people. Ortiz eloquently reminds us of what is at stake: although the United States is generous with legal immigration, its individual law-violation/arrest approach to undocumented immigration ignores (partly deliberately) social causes and interests, resulting in a “skewed distribution of costs and benefits” and a problem whose “alleged solution . . . contributes to its persistence.” I am firmly convinced that the study of citizenship is central to these concerns, precisely because it is constructive as well as restrictive. Thus, *pace* Bariteau, we cannot do without it, but still we must wrestle with its concrete tendencies, whether for closure or inclusion. How do we construct the public arenas and write the social contracts to unify existing and new populaces? My article and the comments on it identify both perils and possibilities. Cole delineates one of the challenges when he points to the tendency for the lives and labors of immigrants to be removed from public recognition (via physical separation, social invisibility, and commodity fetishism). He also emphasizes the importance of obtaining a deeper understanding of the opposition to immigration; I am convinced that successful social compacts around migration (Heyman 1998a) will take some concerns of citizen restrictionists into account while remaining critical in other regards (e.g., of racism). Alvarez, in revising my primary/secondary-labor-market construct, mentions another challenge: a trend toward the segmentation of professionals and service-providing classes. A broad aim of my article is to understand the public moral implications of just such emerging divisions; I remain convinced that valuable inferences can be drawn from civil servants (like INS officers) for a variety of prosperous classes, although the applicability across cases is not neat and simple. Clearly, further research must be directed to experiences and ideologies of technical-managerial classes and those of contemporary service relationships.

So far, I have discussed barriers; to close, I will sketch a range of possible openings. First, Linger suggests that people construct diverse sets of immediate relationships that often defy social reifications. His point is well-taken, and I reply by asking what sorts of arrangements favor less versus more stereotyping in the creation and maintenance of such relations. To raise the scale of aggregation somewhat, the contributors to the collection *Latino Cultural Citizenship* (Flores and Bienmayor 1997) emphasize how located social movements forge connections across different citizenship/nationality positions, though framed in a pan-Latino ethnic identity. Perhaps framing local and regional sets of common concerns and

activities as shared among a highly inclusive set of “citizens,” including migrants and new residents, provides part of the answer. Bariteau raises the question of how entire nations might forge inclusive social contracts and open public arenas, and finally he asks how moral connections, albeit relatively thin, might be encouraged across international boundaries. There is much important research and analysis to be done. Together with committed and careful researchers around the world, I share a certain level of concern about citizenship but also genuine hope.

References Cited

- ALEINIKOFF, T. ALEXANDER. 1997. “The tightening circle of membership,” in *Immigrants out! The new nativism and the anti-immigrant impulse in the United States*. Edited by Juan F. Perea, pp. 324–32. New York: New York University Press.
- ALLSUP, CARL. 1982. *The American G.I. Forum: Origins and evolution*. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas.
- ALVAREZ, ROBERT R., JR. 1987. A profile of the citizenship process among Hispanics in the United States. *International Migration Review* 21:327–51.
- . 1988. “National politics and local responses: The nation’s first successful desegregation court case,” in *School and society: Learning content through culture*. Edited by Enrique T. Trueba and Concha Delgado-Gaitan, pp. 37–52. New York: Praeger.
- . 2001. *Los re-mexicanizados: Changing identity and long-term affiliation on the U.S.-Mexico border of California*. *Journal of the West* 40(2):15–23.
- ANDERSON, BENEDICT R. O’G. 1991. Revised edition. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London and New York: Verso. [CB]
- BAKER, SUSAN GONZÁLEZ. 1990. *The cautious welcome: The legalization programs of the Immigration Reform and Control Act*. Rand Corporation Report JRI-05, Urban Institute Report 90-9. Santa Monica, Calif., and Washington, D.C.: The Rand Corporation and The Urban Institute.
- BARBALET, J. M. 1988. *Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- BARBER, BENJAMIN R. 1984. *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [CB]
- . 2000. *Globalizing democracy*. Print Features 11(20). [CB]
- BARRERA, MARIO. 1979. *Race and class in the Southwest: A theory of racial inequality*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- BARTH, FREDRIK. 1969. Editor. *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- BASCH, LINDA G., NINA GLICK SCHILLER, AND CRISTINA SZANTON BLANC. 1994. *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- BRODKIN, KAREN. 1998. *How Jews became white folks and what that says about race in America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- BRUBAKER, WILLIAM ROGERS. Editor. 1989. *Immigration and the politics of citizenship in Europe and North America*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- . 1992. *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- CARRIER, JAMES G., AND JOSIAH MC C. HEYMAN. 1997. Consumption and political economy. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, n.s., 3:355–73.
- CHAN, KAM WING, AND LI ZHANG. 1999. The hukou system and rural-urban migration in China: Processes and changes. *China Quarterly* 160:818–55.
- CHAVEZ, LEO R. 1992. *Shadowed lives: Undocumented immigrants in American society*. Ft. Worth: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- . 1997. “Immigration reform and nativism: The nationalist response to the transnationalist challenge,” in *Immigrants out! The new nativism and the anti-immigrant impulse in the United States*. Edited by Juan F. Perea, pp. 61–77. New York: New York University Press.
- CLIFFORD, JAMES. 1994. Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology* 9: 302–38.
- COLE, JEFFREY. 1997. *The new racism in Europe: A Sicilian ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CORNELIUS, WAYNE A., PHILIP L. MARTIN, AND JAMES F. HOLLIFIELD. Editors. 1994. *Controlling immigration: A global perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- DE LA GARZA, RODOLFO O., LOUIS DESIPIO, F. CHRIS GARCIA, JOHN GARCIA, AND ANGELO FALCON. 1992. *Latino voices: Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban perspectives on American politics*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- DELGADO, RICHARD. 1997. “Citizenship,” in *Immigrants out! The new nativism and the anti-immigrant impulse in the United States*. Edited by Juan F. Perea, pp. 318–23. New York: New York University Press.
- DELGADO, RICHARD, AND JEAN STEFANCIC. Editors. 1997. *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- FELDBLUM, MIRIAM. 1999. *Reconstructing citizenship: The politics of citizenship and immigration in contemporary France*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- FLORES, WILLIAM V., AND RINA BIENMAYOR. Editors. 1997. *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- FOLEY, DOUGLAS E., CLARICE MOTA, DONALD E. POST, AND IGNACIO LOZANO. 1977. *From peones to políticos: Ethnic relations in a South Texas town, 1900–1977*. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas.
- FRASER, NANCY, AND LINDA GORDON. 1998. “Contract versus charity: Why is there no social citizenship in the United States?” in *The citizenship debates: A reader*. Edited by Gershon Shafir, pp. 113–27. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- GARCÍA, JUAN RAMÓN. 1980. *Operation Wetback: The mass deportation of Mexican undocumented workers in 1954*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- GELLNER, ERNEST. 1983. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell. [CB]
- GORDON, DAVID M., RICHARD EDWARDS, AND MICHAEL REICH. 1982. *Segmented work, divided workers: The historical transformation of labor in the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- GORDON, LINDA. 1999. *The great Arizona orphan abduction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- GRIFFITH, DAVID, AND ED KISSAM. 1995. *Working poor: Farmworkers in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- GRILLO, R. D. 1985. *Ideologies and institutions in urban France: The representation of immigrants*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GRILLO, R., AND J. PRATT. Editors. 2002. *The politics of recognizing difference: Multiculturalism Italian style*. Basingstoke: Ashgate. [RG]
- HABERMAS, JÜRGEN. 1994. “Struggles for recognition in the democratic constitutional state,” in *Multiculturalism*. Edited by A. Gutmann, pp. 107–48. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [CB]
- HAMMAR, TOMAS. 1993. “Political participation and civil rights in Scandinavia,” in *Racism and migration in Western Europe*. Edited by John Wrench and John Solomos, pp. 115–28. Oxford: Berg.
- HANAGAN, MICHAEL P., AND CHARLES TILLY. Editors.

1999. *Extending citizenship, reconfiguring states*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- HEYMAN, JOSIAH MC C. 1991. *Life and labor on the border: Working people of northeastern Sonora, Mexico, 1886–1986*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- . 1992. The oral history of the Mexican American community of Douglas, Arizona, 1901–1942. *Journal of the Southwest* 35:186–206.
- . 1994. The Mexico-United States border in anthropology: A critique and reformulation. *Journal of Political Ecology* 1: 43–65. http://www.library.arizona.edu/ej/jpe/volume_1/ascii-heyman.txt.
- . 1995a. Putting power in the anthropology of bureaucracy: The Immigration and Naturalization Service at the Mexico-United States border. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 36:261–87.
- . 1995b. "In the shadow of the smokestacks: Labor and environmental conflict in a company-dominated town," in *Articulating hidden histories: Exploring the influence of Eric R. Wolf*. Edited by Jane Schneider and Rayna Rapp, pp. 156–74. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 1998a. *Finding a moral heart for U.S. immigration policy: An anthropological perspective*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.
- . 1998b. State effects on labor exploitation: The INS and undocumented immigrants at the Mexico-United States border. *Critique of Anthropology* 18:157–80.
- . 1999. Editor. *States and illegal practices*. Oxford: Berg.
- . 2000. Respect for outsiders? Respect for the law? The moral evaluation of high-scale issues by U.S. immigration officers. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, n.s.*, 6: 635–52.
- . 2001a. Class and classification on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Human Organization* 60:128–40.
- . 2001b. On U.S.-Mexico border culture. *Journal of the West* 40(2):50–59.
- HOLLIFIELD, JAMES F. 1994. "Immigrationism and republicanism in France: The hidden consensus," in *Controlling immigration: A global perspective*. Edited by Wayne A. Cornelius, Philip L. Martin, and James F. Hollifield, pp. 143–76. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- HOLSTON, JAMES, AND ARJUN APPADURAI. 1996. Cities and citizenship. *Public Culture* 8:187–204.
- JONES, KATHLEEN B. 1998. "Citizenship in a woman-friendly polity," in *The citizenship debates: A reader*. Edited by Gershon Shafir, pp. 221–47. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- JUFFRAS, JASON. 1991. *Impact of the Immigration Reform and Control Act on the Immigration and Naturalization Service*. Rand Corporation Report JR-09, Urban Institute Report 91-08. Santa Monica, Calif., and Washington, D.C.: The Rand Corporation and The Urban Institute.
- KEEFE, SUSAN E., AND AMADO PADILLA. 1987. *Chicano ethnicity*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- MC NEELY, CONNIE L. Editor. 1998. *Public rights, public rules: Constituting citizens in the world polity and national policy*. New York: Garland.
- MANN, MICHAEL. 1988. "Ruling class strategies and citizenship," in *States, wars, and capitalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- MANNHEIM, KARL. 1952 (1928). "The problem of generations," in *Essays in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- MARSHALL, T. H. 1950. *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MAURER, BILL. 1997. *Recharting the Caribbean: Land, law, and citizenship in the British Virgin Islands*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- MONTEJANO, DAVID. 1987. *Anglos and Mexicans in the making of Texas, 1836–1986*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- NADER, LAURA 1974. "Up the anthropologist: Perspectives gained from studying up," in *Reinventing anthropology*. Edited by Dell Hymes. New York: Vintage Books. [GLR]
- NAVARRO, ARMANDO. 1998. *The Cristal experiment: A Chicano struggle for community control*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- NOIRIEL, GÉRARD. 1995. Immigration: Amnesia and memory. *French Historical Studies* 19:367–80.
- . 1996. *The French melting pot: Immigration, citizenship, and national identity*. Translated by Geoffroy de Laforcade. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- ONG, AIHWA. 1996. Cultural citizenship as subject-making: Immigrants negotiate racial and cultural boundaries in the United States. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 37:737–62.
- . 1999. *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- PARK, KYE-YOUNG. 1996. Use and abuse of race and culture: Black-Korean tension in America. *American Anthropologist* 98: 492–99.
- PEREA, JUAN F. Editor. 1997. *Immigrants out! The new nativism and the anti-immigrant impulse in the United States*. New York: New York University Press.
- PIEKE, FRANK N., AND HEIN MALLEE. Editors. 1999. *Internal and international migration: Chinese perspectives*. Richmond, U.K.: Curzon Press.
- RIBEIRO, GUSTAVO LINS. 1994. *Transnational capitalism and hydropolitics in Argentina*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida. [GLR]
- . 1995. "Ethnic segmentation of the labor market and the 'work site animal': Fragmentation and reconstruction of identities within the world system," *Uncovering hidden histories*. Edited by Jane Schneider and Rayna Rapp. Berkeley: University of California Press. [GLR]
- . 1999–2000. *Macunaima: To be and not to be, that is the question*. *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 4(2)–5(1): 60–77. [GLR]
- ROSALES, F. ARTURO. 1999. ¡Pobre raza! *Violence, justice, and mobilization among México Lindo immigrants, 1900–1936*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- SANJEK, ROGER. 1994. "The enduring inequalities of race," in *Race*. Edited by Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, pp. 1–17. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- SCHNAPPER, DOMINIQUE. 1996. Beyond the opposition: Civic nation versus ethnic nation. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* suppl. 22:219–34. [CB]
- SENNETT, RICHARD, AND JONATHAN COBB. 1972. *The hidden injuries of class*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- SHKLAR, JUDITH N. 1991. *American citizenship: The quest for inclusion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- SMART, ALAN, AND JOSEPHINE SMART. n.d. Local citizenship: Welfare reform, urban/rural status, and exclusion in China. *Environment and Planning A*. In press.
- SMART, JOSEPHINE. 2000. Contested citizenship and class formation: Post-1978 labour migration in South China and its social-economic impact. Paper presented at the 99th annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, Calif.
- SOLLINGER, DOROTHY J. 1999. *Contesting citizenship in urban China: Peasant migrants, the state, and the logic of the market*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- SOYSAL, YASEMIN NUHOGLU. 1994. *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- STOLCKE, VERENA. 1995. Talking culture: New boundaries, new rhetorics of exclusion in Europe. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 36:1–24.
- STRAUSS, CLAUDIA. 1992. "Models and motives," in *Human motives and cultural models*. Edited by Roy D'Andrade and Claudia Strauss, pp. 1–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TAGUIEFF, PIERRE-ANDRÉ. 1990. The new cultural racism in France. *Telos* 83:109–22.
- TILLY, CHARLES. 1996. "Citizenship, identity, and social history," in *Citizenship, identity, and social history*. Edited by Charles Tilly, pp. 1–18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- TROUILLOT, MICHEL-ROLPH. 2001. The anthropology of the state in the age of globalization: Close encounters of the deceptive kind. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 42:125-38.
- TURNER, BRYAN S. 1986. *Citizenship and capitalism: The debate over reformism*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- . 1990. Outline of a theory of citizenship. *Sociology* 24: 189-217.
- TURNER, TERRENCE. 1995. Comment on: Talking culture, by Verena Stolcke. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 36:16-18.
- U.S. INS (IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE). n.d. (1992). INS Western Region Work Force Representation. MS.
- VÉLEZ-IBÁÑEZ, CARLOS. 1996. *Border visions: Mexican cultures of the Southwest United States*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- VILA, PABLO. 2000. *Crossing borders, reinforcing borders: Social categories, metaphors, and narrative identities on the U.S.-Mexico border*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- VINCENT, JOAN. 1974. The structuring of ethnicity. *Human Organization* 33:375-79.
- WIEVIORKA, MICHEL. 1996. Identity and difference: Reflections on the French non-debate on multiculturalism. *Thesis Eleven* 47:49-71.
- WILSON, TAMAR DIANA. 2000. Anti-immigrant sentiment and the problem of reproduction/maintenance in Mexican migration to the United States. *Critique of Anthropology* 20: 191-213.
- WOLF, ERIC R. 1982. *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [GLR]
- . 1999. *Envisioning power: Ideologies of dominance and crisis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 2001 (1963). "Kinship, friendship, and patron-client relations in complex societies," in *Pathways of power: Building an anthropology of the modern world*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [GLR]
- WRENCH, JOHN, AND JOHN SOLOMOS. Editors. 1993. *Racism and migration in Western Europe*. Oxford: Berg.
- ZAVELLA, PATRICIA. 1994. "Reflections on diversity among Chicanas," in *Race*. Edited by Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, pp. 199-212. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.