(Dis)unity and Diversity in Post-9/11 America

Robyn M. Rodriguez[1]

Drawing inspiration from the work of Robin M. Williams Jr., I map out the complexities of ethnic and racial relations in the contemporary United States by focusing on the impacts of 9/11—particularly in relation to immigration policy. Because the attackers entered the country through regular immigration channels (i.e., as foreign students) the U.S. government has introduced policies to enhance border security, restrict immigration, increase the surveillance of immigrant populations, and more actively enforce immigration policy. These national-security-related immigration policies, however, are exacerbating existing tensions and producing new sets of ethnic and racialized conflicts in the United States. In this article, I first provide an overview of the key national-security-related immigration policies that were passed in the wake of September 11, 2001. Then, I review some of the recent sociological literature, as well as draw from my own preliminary research in the State of New Jersey, to illustrate the social impacts of these policies on ethnic and racial relations. I conclude with an outline of the ways the sociology of ethnic and racial relations specifically, as well as other subfields of the discipline, might approach analyses of social conflict in the contemporary United States, post–September 11.

INTRODUCTION

Fifty years ago, in an essay entitled, ''Unity and Diversity in Modern America,'' Robin M. Williams Jr. wrote, ''there exists a great need to periodically examine our assumptions as to the sociological meaning of

[1] Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, 54 Joyce Kilmer Avenue, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854-8045; e-mail: rrodriguez@sociology.rutgers.edu.

unity-in-diversity'' (Williams, 1957). The ''unity-in-diversity'' to which Williams refers is the idea of the United States as a ''nation of nations, a multiple melting pot, a cultural medley,'' in other words, the United States as a country of immigrants. Indeed, throughout his career as a sociologist, Williams showed keen interest in ethnic relations and, concomitantly, race relations. In ''Unity and Diversity in Modern America,'' Williams outlined a research agenda for sociologists concerned with the ways immigration had shaped the United States.

Drawing inspiration from the scholarly work of Robin M. Williams Jr., I map out the complexities of ethnic and racial relations in the contemporary United States by focusing on the impacts of 9/11—particularly in relation to immigration policy. Because the attackers entered the country through regular immigration channels (i.e., as foreign students) the U.S. government has introduced policies to enhance border security, restrict immigration, increase the surveillance of immigrant populations, and more actively enforce immigration policy. Indeed, as terrorist threats continue to plague the United States, the enforcement of immigration policies, whether at the borders or internally, remains significant. These national-security-related immigration policies, however, are exacerbating existing tensions and producing new sets of ethnic and racialized conflicts in the United States.

The social landscape of post-9/11 America raises new sets of challenges for sociologists of ethnic and racial relations in particular, and for all sociologists concerned about broader processes of exclusion in the contemporary moment. In this article, I first provide an overview of the key national-security-related immigration policies that were passed in the wake of September 11, 2001. Then, I review some of the recent sociological literature, as well as draw from my own preliminary research in State of New Jersey, to illustrate the social impacts of these policies on ethnic and racial relations. I conclude with an outline of the ways the sociology of ethnic and racial relations specifically, as well as other subfields of the discipline, might approach analyses of social conflict in post-9/11 America.

"HOMELAND SECURITY" AND THE SECURITIZATION OF MIGRATION

In the immediate wake of the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the U.S. government introduced numerous laws that would impact foreigners attempting to enter the country as well as immigrants (both noncitizen and citizen) currently residing in the United States. The USA Patriot Act is among the most significant of these legislative

initiatives. Signed into law on October 26, 2001, just weeks after the bombing of the Twin Towers, the Act enhances the surveillance of immigrants living in the United States and allows officials to track down and deport those suspected of having terrorist links (Fekete, 2004; Waslin, 2003). Moreover, the Act exempts these cases of deportation from processes of judicial review (Mantle, 2003).

Almost 1 year later, on November 25, 2002, the Homeland Security Act was passed. This Act led to the dissolution of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), replacing it with the newly formed Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Notably, under the new DHS, the policing and enforcement functions of immigration authorities, both external and internal, were increased (Martin, 2003). For instance, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) was established to handle immigration enforcement at U.S. borders (land borders like the U.S.–Mexico border, as well as U.S. entry points via airports). The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) office was created to deal with the enforcement of immigration policy within the interior United States. Moreover, local police units could now be forced to cooperate with federal agencies in immigration enforcement, further extending the government's policing apparatuses (Martin, 2003; Schoenholtz, 2003) These changes made U.S. national security policy increasingly *interiorized* and *localized*.

The interiorization and localization of immigration enforcement marks a trend toward the "securitization" of migration in the United States. Thomas Faist defines the securitization of migration as the construction of "security, the collective management of subnational or transnational threats and the policing of borders and internal realm, rather than just the defense of territory against external attack" (Faist, 2002). With the securitization of migration, noncitizens, particularly immigrants (i.e., those seeking to settle in the United States permanently, as opposed to tourists, temporary workers, or other kinds of noncitizens), have become the subjects of state surveillance. National security or, in its more recent appellation, "homeland security," is not merely concerned with securing national borders against external threats; it is aimed at the perceived threat posed by noncitizens living within U.S. national borders.

Some scholars suggest that post-9/11 policies simply make existing immigration laws more efficacious. Debates of the mid 1990s surrounding undocumented Mexican immigrants led to the introduction of Proposition 187 in the State of California; this legislation would have barred from public services those suspected of illegal immigration (Calavita, 1996). At the national level, the U.S. government responded to public tensions over undocumented immigration, passing the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). But the post-9/11

expansion of the internal and local enforcement capacities under the DHS allowed the government to better execute IIRIRA provisions (Cornelius, 2004a,b). Peter Andreas suggests, "take the word 'terrorism' and put in the words 'drug trafficking' or 'illegal immigration' and the new discourse of border security is remarkably similar to the older discourse that has defined U.S. border relations with Mexico" (Andreas, 2002).

I would suggest, however, that the securitization of migration also describes the process by which the work of national security (i.e., the surveillance and policing of immigrants) is normalized and taken up by ordinary U.S. citizens. For instance, the DHS actively encourages individuals to report "suspicious activity," while state and local authorities ask that "if you see something, say something." Many U.S. citizens have taken up this call. Consider the "Minutemen," who pledge to "use every legal means at our disposal to assist law enforcement authorities in identifying and apprehending those who violate our borders" (Minutemen Civil Defense Corps, 2007). Exclusionary immigration policies and cultures of social exclusion work in tandem.

NEW COMPLEXITIES OF ETHNIC AND RACIAL CONFLICT IN POST-9/11 AMERICA

Much current scholarship characterizes post-9/11 U.S. policies as particularly "anti-Muslim" and "anti-Arab." Moreover, this scholarship suggests that these policies have created a hostile social climate for Muslims and Arabs. For instance, legal scholar Karen Tumlin argues that what has emerged since 9/11 is an "immigration-plus profiling regime," that is, immigration and immigrant policy after 9/11 targets immigrants based on their presumed national origins (i.e., Arab or North African countries) and Muslim religious identity. Tumlin examines executive and legislation actions after 9/11, and offers a close study of judicial actions (Tumlin, 2004).

The interiorization of immigration enforcement coupled with the emergence of a highly securitized immigration policy has had specific effects for Arab and Muslim immigrants in different communities. For instance, in the wake of September 11, immigrants residing in Jersey City, New Jersey (which lies right across the Hudson River from the site of the World Trade Center), starting calling their city "Terror City" to describe the widespread sense of fear many immigrant community members felt as a consequence of the government's local antiterror campaign. According to one report, immediately after the 9/11 attacks, military helicopters hovered over Jersey City's Journal Square as FBI agents forced their way

into a nearby apartment building, arresting Muslim immigrant men living there (Din, 2004). Although the government admits that the post-9/11 anti-terror sweeps in New Jersey and New York, along with the arrests resulting from them, did not have links to terrorist groups, the detention and deportation of immigrants has persisted (Danen, 2006).

Sociologist Louise Cainkar, like Tumlin, argues that "homeland security" policies have specifically targeted Muslims and Arabs. Moreover, she suggests that as a consequence, Muslims and Arabs have become socially marginalized from mainstream U.S. society. Their marginalization is intensified by negative media portrayals, job discrimination, hate speech, and, in extreme cases, hate crimes. Homeland security policies, in effect, have produced a great deal of homeland insecurity for specific groups of people living in the United States (Cainkar, 2004). Evidence from New Jersey suggests that South Asians, both Muslims and non-Muslims, are experiencing increasing tensions from other groups in the form of bias and hate crimes since 9/11 (Crouse, 2006).

The terrorist attacks elicited specific governmental responses after 9/11. These actions clearly impacted Arabs and Muslims. But the more aggressive enforcement of bureaucratic immigration policies (e.g., the change of address policy, which requires that immigrants report a change of address to immigration authorities within 10 days of moving), the enlisting of local and state police in workplace raids, and airport security sweeps have also affected the Mexican immigrant community (Waslin, 2003). Consequently, many have been detained and deported en masse across the United States (Hemingway, 2007).

Indeed, if 9/11 produced public anxieties toward Arabs and Muslims, it also exacerbated already existing tensions around Mexican immigration. These tensions have triggered new legislative debates, the most notable surrounding bill H.R. 4437, introduced by Wisconsin Congressman James Sensenbrenner. (The bill was passed by the House of Representatives in December 2005.) Some of the key provisions of the bill included the intensive militarization of the U.S.–Mexican border and the further expansion of technologies of policing immigrants in the interior. The bill, furthermore, sanctioned local authorities to carry out immigration enforcement. (Under the present immigration regime, local authorities are often enlisted to aid in immigration enforcement, but they are not legally required to do so.) One of the most problematic provisions of the bill, from the perspective of immigrant organizations and their supporters, was the criminalization of undocumented immigrants. The bill requires that immigrants found without documentation be charged with a criminal offense and serve a minimum of 1 year in prison and/or pay a fine before being deported. Moreover, the bill requires that offenders be barred from reentering the United States again. In

addition, individuals or organizations that provide support or advocate on behalf of the undocumented could also be criminally charged.

Though H.R. 4437 never became law, it triggered widespread public debate about immigration in the United States and worsened nativist sentiment among U.S. citizens (mainly whites). Around the country, anti-immigrant groups like the Minutemen Project mentioned earlier were formed to drive out immigrants in their localities. In New Jersey, for example, chapters of the New Jersey Citizens for Immigration Control have been forming. The group is specifically aimed at supporting anti-immigration federal legislation and anti-immigration legislators; it also fights to limit state and local benefits for immigrants. Their web site declares:

> The Migration Policy Institute reports that it costs New Jersey taxpayers about $400 million annually to support immigrants with pubic benefits! Help us fight free hospital care, disability, and other benefits for illegals. We also oppose legislative proposals to give them favorable in-state college tuition and driving 'privileges.' (New Jersey Citizens for Immigration Control, 2007).

In some cases, local governments, emboldened perhaps by national developments toward the localization of immigration enforcement, are taking action. These governments use municipal ordinances to regulate the lives of immigrants in their localities and enhance the enforcement capacities of municipal police. In Morristown, New Jersey, for instance, Mayor Donald Creitello openly called for the ''vigilant enforcement'' of immigrant law locally. Initially, Creitello was not explicit about his aims. He introduced measures to better enforce the town's laws against overcrowding in rental properties and to organize the procurement of day laborers away from the town's train station. Immigrant groups, however, criticized the mayor's initiatives as having particularly negative impacts for Latino immigrants living in Morristown; it is generally Latinos who live in rental properties and work as day laborers. As social tensions mounted, Creitello became more direct regarding his aim to crackdown on undocumented immigrants living in the community (Tapaoan, 2004).

While local nativist groups and governments attempt to further regulate the lives of immigrants, existing immigration laws continue to be in force. Indeed, local New Jersey newspapers frequently feature articles about local raids being conducted by ICE teams. Their objective: to track down out-of-status and undocumented immigrants. Post-9/11 immigration legislation expands the processes of ''illegalization,'' that is, legal immigrants can easily be rendered ''illegal'' or undocumented and therefore deportable. De Genova suggests, for instance, that illegal immigration ''is produced and patterned … the law defines the parameters of its own operations, engendered the conditions of possibility for 'legal' as well as 'illegal' practices''

(De Genova, 2002). Though the legal production of ''illegal'' immigrants has a long history in the United States (see, e.g., the work of historians such as Mae Ngai), I contend that what exists today is an immigration regime that expands the possibilities for immigrants' illegalization in ways never before experienced (Ngai, 2004). This is due not only to the introduction of restrictive immigration policies, but also to expanding surveillance mechanisms enabled by today's information technologies and to the use of local police units in immigration enforcement.

NEW AGENDAS FOR RESEARCH

The post-9/11 political and social landscape requires our close attention as sociologists. In the following sections, I outline the kinds of contributions that can be made to our existing understandings, particularly to immigration and race relations scholarship and to research on post-9/11 ethnic and racial conflict.

The Immigrant Second Generation

Research on post-9/11 ethnic and racial conflict can contribute to theories of the second-generation, native-born children of immigrants, particularly with regard to the role ethnic identity plays in their lives. Zhou and Portes, for instance, propose that the second-generation children of immigrants either: (1) acculturate and achieve a level of economic integration that compares with the white middle class, (2) become a permanent segment of the underclass, or (3) achieve a kind of ''middle ground'' in that they achieve middle-class status through ethnic networks (Portes and Zhou, 1993). They call these different paths ''segmented assimilation'' (Portes and Zhou, 1993). Bandana Purkayastha finds that a model of ''racialized ethnicity'' better explains how the middle-class, second-generation South Asian Americans she interviews achieve middle class-ness (i.e., living in predominantly white communities and mainly interacting with whites) while continuing to draw on their ethnic identities. Purkayashtha's notion of racialized ethnicity suggests that ethnic identities are sustained by second-generation immigrants, not as a means of securing social resources for integration, but rather as a consequence of racializing processes (Purkayastha, 2005). Future research can assess how well these models apply among a diverse set of second-generation immigrants who must contend with a post-9/11 social environment charged with new kinds of anxieties. Indeed, examining the second generation alongside both naturalized citizens and

noncitizen immigrants is important for understanding the significance of citizenship (defined as both legal formal membership and as an identity) and in helping people to negotiate with the challenges of their daily lives.

Citizenship, Belonging, and Political Incorporation

Future research can also contribute to understanding how different immigrant groups construct meanings of citizenship and belonging. Consider studies like that of Caroline Brettell. Brettell compares four immigrant populations in the Dallas-Forth Worth metropolitan area, and distinguishes the ways immigrants define citizenship. Models like Brettell's are important models on which to build if we wish to track the extent to which immigrant perspectives on citizenship and, ultimately, belonging may have changed after the 9/11 attacks (Brettell, 2006). Findings from this sort of research may help scholars to better understand the processes of political incorporation as experienced by different immigrant groups under changing social conditions.

Citizenship scholars have generally focused on either the legal-formal aspects of citizenship or, in contrast, the ways national cultures define who belongs and how these cultural understandings might shape notions of citizenship (Joppke, 1999, 2000). These views of citizenship ultimately come from the perspective of the nation-state and its dominant groups. Alternatively, researchers can examine citizenship and belonging from the perspective of individuals who might be (or aspire to be) formal members of a polity—even though they reside outside its cultural boundaries.

With its focus on the everyday life experiences of immigrants of different legal statuses, Ceclia Menjivar's recent work examines "how the impact of legal status extends far beyond labor force participation and access to services—areas that have been researched—to encompass socio-cultural spheres as well" (Menjivar, 2006). This work provides another important starting point for future studies. Documenting citizen and non-citizen experiences of exclusion on a daily basis becomes vital to better understand how social divisions based on race, religion, and immigration shape social membership and belonging.

Racial Formation

It appears that new racial formations may be emerging in the United States. The state's racial classificatory system officially categorizes as "white" such groups as Arabs. Yet Arabs are simultaneously constructed as an

"other" and ultimately undesirable group in more everyday deployments of race. Moreover, Arabs are being lumped together with those (namely, Indians) who have been classified as "Asian" in the state's racial classificatory system. Comparing the racialization experiences of these groups can powerfully contribute to race relations scholarship. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva suggests that comparative work allows analysts to determine the "specific character of the *racial structure*—the mechanisms, practices and social relations responsible for the production and reproduction of racial inequality" (Bonilla-Silva, 1999). Understanding the specific nature of the U.S. post-9/11 racial structure requires that we do comparative racial and ethnic studies.

Counterterrorism and "Securitization"

By examining immigration policy as it is experienced "on the ground," sociologists can also offer a perspective on immigration policies as they are being approached by local governments and police. Analyses of post-9/11 and 7/7 legislation suggests that the new laws do, in fact, enable local authorities to play a more central role in immigration and national security enforcement. There are as yet no studies documenting exactly how this plays out in local communities. Findings from this sort of research can contribute to an emergent sociology of counterterrorism. Mathieu Delfem suggests that the bureaucratization theory of policing, "predicts a high degree of institutional autonomy of police to determine the means and objectives of its counter-terrorist activities on the basis of professional expertise and knowledge" (Delfem, 2004). In other words, Delfem suggests that though post-9/11 policies have tended to be highly politicized, local police units are likely to operate independently from national politics as their activities are governed by logics of professionalism and know-how. Delfem acknowledges, however, that this theory requires close empirical study—work that sociologists have yet to do. Findings from research of local communities can be used to test the extent to which this theory applies in relation to post-9/11 local immigration enforcement.

Though counterterrorism campaigns are generally carried out by local police authorities, my own research suggests that some "policing" functions (particularly surveillance) are often done by nonstate actors. By examining whether immigrants' relationships with shopkeepers, neighbors, public transport workers, co-workers, teachers, or classmates (i.e., nonstate and nonpolice actors) are characterized by logics of suspicion and scrutiny, this study can contribute to an alternative theory of "securitization" (Walters,

2004). What may be emerging in the United States is a "securitization" of everyday life fueled by fears of terrorism.

REFERENCES

Andreas, Peter. 2002. "The Re-Bordering of America after 11 September," *Brown Journal of World Affairs* VIII: 195–202.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1999. "The Essential Social Fact of Race," *American Sociological Review* 64: 899–906.

Brettell, Caroline B. 2006. "Political and Cultural Belonging: Immigration Status, Citizenship, and Identity among Four Immigrant Populations in a Southwestern City," *American Behavioral Scientist* 50: 70–99.

Cainkar, Louise. 2004. "Post 9/11 Domestic Policies Affecting US Arabs and Muslims: A Brief Review," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24: 245–248.

Calavita, Kitty. 1996. "The New Politics of Immigration: 'Balanced-Budget Conservatism' and the Symbolism of Proposition 187," *Social Problems* 43: 284–305.

Cornelius, Wayne. 2004a. *Controlling "Unwanted" Immigration: Lessons from the United States, 1993–2004*. San Diego, CA: Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California, San Diego.

Cornelius, Wayne A. 2004b. *"Controlling Immigration and Fighting Terrorism: The Uncertain Connection*," Paper presented at the Migration & Terrorism: US & European Perspectives Conference, University of California, Davis, CA.

Crouse, Douglass. 2006. "Bigots Target Hindu Family," In *North Jersey Media Group*.

Danen, Christina. 2006. "NJ Protests against Detention of Arabs and South Asians Defending the Disappeared," *Star-Ledger, March* 30: 2.

De Genova, Nicholas P. 2002. "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 419–447.

Delfem, Mathieu. 2004. "Social Control and the Policing of Terrorism: Foundations for a Sociology of Counter-Terrorism," *American Sociologist* 35: 75–92.

Din, Suleman. 2004. "Terror City," *Colorlines*, Summer.

Faist, Thomas. 2002. " 'Extension du domaine de la lutte': International Migration and Security before and after September 11, 2001," *International Migration Review* 36: 7–14.

Fekete, Liz. 2004. "Anti-Muslim Racism and European Security State," *Race & Class* 46: 3–29.

Hemingway, Sam. 2007. "Mexican Workers Fear Deportation," In *Association Press State and Local Wire*. Burlington, VT: Associated Press.

Joppke, Christian. 1999. "How Immigration is Changing Citizenship: A Comparative View," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22: 629–652.

Joppke, Christian. 2000. "Mobilization of Culture and the Reform of Citizenship Law: Germany and the United States," In R. Koopmans and P. Statham (eds), *Challenging Immigration: Ethnic Relations Politics: Comparative European Perspectives*: pp. 145–161. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mantle, D. Ray. 2003. "What Foreign Students Fear," *BYU Education and Law Journal* 815–834.

Martin, David. 2003. *Immigration Policy and the Homeland Security Act Reorganization*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Menjivar, Cecilia. 2006. "Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants' Lives in the United States," *American Journal of Sociology* 111: 999–1037.

Minutemen Civil Defense Corps. 2007. *Minutemen Civil Defense Corps Border Operations Headquarters*. Minutemen Civil Defense Corps. Retrieved September 21, 2007 (http://www.minutemanhq.com/hq/borderops_pledge.php).

New Jersey Citizens for Immigration Control. 2007. *New Jersey Citizens for Immigration Control Stop the Invasion*. New Jersey Citizens for Immigration Control. Retrieved September 21, 2007 (http://www.njcitizensforimmigrationcontrol.com/).

Ngai, Mae M. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. ''The New Second-Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants among Post-1965 Immigrant Youth,'' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74–98.

Purkayastha, Bandana. 2005. *Negotiating Ethnicity: Second-Generation South Asian Americans Traverse a Transnational World.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Schoenholtz, Andrew I. 2003. ''Transatlantic Dialogue on Terrorism and International Migration,'' *International Migration* 41: 173–192.

Tapaoan, Emelyn. 2004. ''NY-Based Filipino Art Group Joins Manila Exhibit,'' *Filipino Express*, August 23–29: 19.

Tumlin, Karen. 2004. ''Suspect First: How Terrorism Policy is Reshaping Immigration Policy,'' *California Law Review* 92: 1175–1239.

Walters, William. 2004. ''Secure Borders, Safe Haven, Domopolitics,'' *Citizenship Studies* 8: 237–260.

Waslin, Michele. 2003. *Counterterrorism and the Latino Community Since September 11.* Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.

Williams, Robin M. Jr. 1957. ''Unity and Diversity in Modern America,'' *Social Forces* 36: 1–8.