International Journal of Sociology of the Family, Vol 34, No. 2 (Autumn) 2008

THE INCLUSION OF CITIZENSHIP STATUS IN INTERSECTIONALITY: WHAT IMMIGRATION RAIDS TELLS US ABOUT MIXED-STATUS FAMILIES, THE STATE AND ASSIMILATION

MARY ROMERO
Arizona State University

This research is based on a case study of an immigration raid that resulted an internal investigation of the participating police department, an investigation by the state attorney's office and two law suits. Documents provide detailed data pointing to state practices that intimidate and stigmatize mixed status families, deter political, social and cultural integration of communities, and socialize citizens to a second-class status. Examining immigration law enforcement practices highlights the significance of an intersectionality analysis in studying immigrant and transnational families in the U.S. Immigration policy and law enforcement practices establish the basis for identity and positionality of race, class, ethnicity, and gender, particularly as policies promoting family reunification are eliminated. These families also find themselves caught in the wide net of racial profiling. I argue that intersectionality challenges traditional approaches of analyzing immigrant families in the US.

Without warning, immigration officials broke into homes in San Rafael, California on the early morning of March 6, 2007. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers denied one father's request to call a family member or friend to care for his seven-year-old, Kebin Reyes. Even though the father presented the son's U.S. passport as evidence of citizenship, he was instructed to wake the child and both were taken into custody. Kebin was held in a locked room all day and was only given bread and water. Family members arrived to the detention center and requested Kebin's release but he was not released until the evening.

Since approving the operation of massive raids across the county, Michael Chertoff has maintained that the goal of the raids are to catch and deport criminal aliens, increase worksite enforcement, and crack down hard

on the criminal infrastructure that perpetuates illegal immigration. Yet, the reports of terrorized families being attacked by ICE agents in their homes, in shopping malls and while engaged in school activities continue to appear in the media. Children are detained and deported and left without information about the whereabouts of their parents. Kebin Reyes has become the poster child for abuses resulting from Operation Return to Sender. Like many family homes targeted in the immigration raids, ICE agents entered residences without warrants and unannounced. They encountered parents, children and other family members who did not share the same legal status. In most cases, arresting family members without authorized status involved separating parents and children.

A recent report by the National Council of La Raza and the Urban Institute (2007) found that, on average, one child is affected for every two adults arrested. In three cases studied—work-site raids in Massachusetts, Colorado and Nebraska—about 500 children were affected by the arrests of about 900 adults. They are representative of mixed status families residing in the United States and worldwide. The changing immigration legislation away from family reunification in the U.S. and towards state propositions attacking immigrant families highlights the existence of mixed status families. Reports issued by Human Rights Watch (2007) and the National Council of La Raza and the Urban Institute (2007) identify the collateral damage that mandatory deportations have in separating families and placing US children at risk. Focusing on worksite raids, immigrant advocacy groups call attention to the consequences of deporting employed immigrant family members. Economic hardship, instability, family fragmentation, school interruption for children, as a well as emotional trauma and psychological health issues, are all part of the collateral damage.

In the following paper, I examine immigration raids as a research site to gain a window into state practices that intimidate and stigmatize mixed status families, deter political, social and cultural integration of communities, and socialize citizens to a second-class status. Central to immigration law enforcement practices is the intersectionality of race, class, ethnicity as well as citizenship status. While research has addressed the way that schools (Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Valenzuela, 1999) and peer groups (Bettie, 2003; Gonzales, *et al.*, 2008) make distinctions among first and second generation family members (Farley and Alba, 2002; Portes, 1996; Portes and Rambaut, 2001; Suárez-Orozco, *et al.*, 2001) and the significant difference in identify formation (Marata, 2001; Suárez-Orozco, *et al.*, 1995; Murata, 2001) and assimilation (Hurtado, 1997; Rumbaut, *et al.*, 2001), fewer studies have focused on the role of the state in shaping differences and similarities in mixed status families' lived experiences (i.e., exceptions include Rodriquez

and Hagen 2004; Adler, 2006). Researchers are beginning to investigate the significance of immigration policy in shaping the family structure (Gratton, *et al.*, 2007).

Immigration raids are ideal research sites for understanding the significance of an intersectionality analysis in studying immigrant and transnational families in the U.S. I begin with an overview of immigration policies impacting the opportunities for family reunification and the increased likelihood of family separation by deportation. Next, I review research and legal writings on immigration law enforcement to identify practices that highlight key identities and social structural positions in citizenship inspection impacting immigrant families. Immigration policy and law enforcement practices establish the basis for identity and positionality of race, class, ethnicity, and gender, particularly as policies promoting family reunification are eliminated. These families also find themselves caught in the wide net of racial profiling. Drawing from previous research I conducted on a case study of an immigration raid that resulted in a state investigation and two lawsuits (Romero and Serag, 2005; Romero, 2006), I argue that intersectionality challenges traditional approaches of analyzing immigrant families in the US. Building on the critical race analysis of law enforcement and immigration policy, I point to the significance of the intersectionality of race, class, gender and citizenship in studying immigrant families. This analytical approach points to the embedded assumptions traditional sociology of immigration incorporate and the potential that the sociology of race, class and gender offers to understanding how the state shapes families (Romero 2008). I conclude with a discussion of missed opportunities in studying immigrant families situating their intersectional social structural positions within the state. Attending to the state's construction of citizenship identities, this discussion aims to suggest ways of breaking out of the traditional assimilation research models that dominate the field and ways of integrating intersectionality into the sociology of immigrant families.

INTERSECTIONALITY IN IMMIGRATION LAW AND ENFORCEMENT

Immigration Policy and Families

Family reunification had been a central focus of immigration policy for decades. However, when racial demographic shifts resulted in an increased number of non-European immigrants (persons not identified as white), family reunification policies came under attack. Since the 1980s, immigration sentiment has moved away from providing the means for family reunification by narrowing the categories for legal immigration, constructing policy debates that position family visas in opposition to employment-based visas, passing legislation to limit public benefits for legal residents and

characterizing unauthorized immigrant families as the source of social and economic problems (Hing, 2006; Johnson 2007). Many of these efforts against immigrant families are combined in legislative efforts and apparent in public debates over immigration. Over the last two decades, numerous proposals have arisen to eliminate families' categories introduced in the 1965 immigration amendments, such as questioning the significance of siblings in an effort to limit family reunification to the parent and child relationship (Hing, 2006). Federal legislation restricting family unification increased the difficulty legal immigrants have in sponsoring their spouses and has frequently restricted women and children's migration to the U.S. (Johnson, 2003; Lindsley, 2002). Other legislation has continued to narrow eligibility requirements to immigrants as workers and closing access to their family members by using the "public charge" classification and denying access to public benefits.

Significant changes have occurred at the federal level that have created the stage for local and state anti-immigrant initiatives. Several draconian measures impacting immigrants resulted from the terrorist attacks of the Oklahoma Bombing and 9/11. The Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility ACT (IIRIR) passed in 1996, broadened the definition of aggravated felony and initiated mandatory deportation without judicial review (Griffith, 2004). Many communities have been shocked to find legal permanent immigrant residents deported because of previous criminal convictions that include misdemeanors. Following the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the federal government instituted the USA PATRIOT Act, the Homeland Security Act (HSA), the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act (EBSVERA). In addition to eliminating the Department of Immigration, immigration was merged under the Department of Homeland Security, and the War on Terror and the War on Drugs became a campaign against narco-terrorism that focused on immigrants. Essentially, these legislative acts blurred the distinction between the act of a person entering the US without official document and a person committing a crime. Thus, the state sealed the status of "alien" and "criminal" as one in the same: "[c]riminal aliens (deportable for their post-entry criminal conduct), illegal aliens (deportable for their surreptitious crossing of the U.S. border), and terrorists (deportable for the grave risk they pose to national security) are all deemed dangerous foreigners for whom criminally punitive treatment and removal are uniformly appropriate and urgently necessary" (Miller, 2005: 113).

The Department of Homeland Security (2003) released a report, "Endgame: Office of Detention and Removal Strategic Plan, 2003-2012, Detention and Removal Strategy for a Secure Homeland", outlining their ten-

year deportation plan. Under the slogan of "public safety and national security" the differences between terrorists, murder, human smuggling, or child pornography were blurred with immigrants who are working illegally in the US and raising their families. Between 2002 and 2006, workplace arrests of undocumented immigrants increased more than sevenfold, usually resulting in removing the primary wage earners from the family, as well as separating and fragmenting families (National Council of La Raza, 2007). Since the beginning of the detention and removal program, news accounts have reported an unusually high number of immigration raids targeting families. Reports of immigration law enforcement agents entering residents without warrants or unannounced (particularly at predawn) have increased over the last two years. Even armed federal agents with rifles and bulletproof vests have conducted a raid in a Chicago mall while families shopped. Concerns about the civil rights violation of family members have emerged. Along with Kebin Reyes's story from the Bay Area, similar accounts are reported in East Hampton, South Bend, Los Angeles, Chicago, Fresno, Long Island and Santa Fe. Unfortunately, data available through the Department of Homeland Security is limited to the number of individuals apprehended and deported. Records are not kept on the actual number of legal residents and US citizens detained and released. Nor are there public records revealing the number of private residents or public places with children that were raided. By outlining the Office of Detention and Removal's (DRO) mission around concerns of public safety and national security, the collateral damage to families and communities is ignored and minimized. A closer look at previous research on immigration law enforcement practices suggest attributes that place specific families and family members at risk before the law.

Intersectionality and Immigration Law

In addressing the significance of intersectionality and immigration law enforcement, it is useful to begin by interrogating the social construction of "alien" and citizen. Kevin Johnson (2004: 154) reminds us of the significance of race in the construction of citizenship in US:

> Fabricated out of whole cloth, the "alien" represents a body of rules passed by Congress and reinforced by popular culture. It is society, with the assistance of the law, that defines who is an "alien," an institutionalized "other," and who is not. It is a society, through Congress and the courts, that determines which rights to afford "aliens." . . . Like the social construction of race, which helps to legitimize racial subordination, the construction of the "alien" has helped justify the limitation on noncitizen rights imposed by our legal system.

The three major social structural positions that the state has used to construct "alien" are race and ethnicity, gender and class.

Throughout US history, racialized immigration laws and citizenship has been a major theme, from the classification of slaves from Africa, indigenous populations to the treatment of immigrants from Europe, Asian and Latin and South America. The most widely cited examples of the significance of race in determining citizenship and legal migration into the US are the Chinese exclusion laws, the Gentleman's Agreement between U.S. and Japan, *United States vs Thind* (ruling immigrants from India were ineligible for naturalization because Indians were not classified as white), the 1924 national origins quota system, and the Immigration Act of 1965 (limiting the number of migrants from the Western Hemisphere) (Johnson, 2004; Chang, 1999). US immigration laws have also included or excluded women based on prostitution laws (i.e., The Alien Prostitution Importation Act of 1875), failure to recognize gender-based asylum (i.e., cases of rape and genital mutation), assumed public charge status or lacking moral values (i.e., sexually active women, lesbians), and by incorporating the male privilege of coverture (Johnson, 2004; Luibhéud, 2002; Ono and Sloop, 2002).

While the Statue of Liberty is inscribed with the phrase, "Give me your tired, your poor," US immigration law has consistently advocated for the opposite. Statutes and laws barring the entry of "paupers" date back to the beginning of the nation state. Terminology most frequently used against the poor has been the exclusion of persons who are likely to become public charges. Contemporary examples include the public assistant provisions in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) (Chang, 2002), the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Marchesvsky and Theoharis, 2006). Of course this public charge reference is also extended to the elderly and the disabled (Johnson, 2004).

The consistency in which the state excludes specific racial, gender and class categories of persons from citizenship or legal entry into the US, has resulted in the use of physical appearance as a proxy for citizenship. Uniformity of exclusion reinforces gendered-racialized and class-based images of the "illegal alien". Robert Chang (1999) argues that persons racialized as non-white in the US carry a "figurative border" because they are stigmatized as "aliens". Even though US legal history establishes the identification and treatment of persons classified as "alien", the social construction of a specific racialized, gendered and class-based body as an "illegal alien" is reified in public discourse, media and the everyday practices of immigration policing and surveillance.

Intersectionality and Citizenship Inspection

More scholarly attention is also being given to the everyday practices of citizenship inspection (Lugo, 2000; Heyman, 2001, 2004; Inda, 2006).

Among the most common aspect of immigration law enforcement is the targeting of persons with particular physical characteristics rather than assessing specific behavior as "probable cause" and "reasonableness" for citizenship inspection. Using racial profiling to target persons of Mexican ancestry was formally approved in the 1975 landmark case of *U.S. v. Brignoni-Ponce*. The Supreme Court ruled that "Mexican appearance" could be used to assess "probable cause" and "reasonableness" under the Fourth Amendment as long as it was not the sole factor used to justify stops (Valencia, Garcia *et al.*, 2004). In addition to skin complexion and other physical characteristics are visual signs that correspond to images of "illegal aliens"—frequently indicators of poverty or cultural attributes, such as Spanish-speaking, speaking English with an accent, style of dress (Benitez, 1994; Vargas, 2001). Consequently, characteristics of one's "Mexicanness" place them at risk before the law.

Similar experiences found in the racial profiling of Latinos and African Americans in the War on Drugs (Russell, 1998; Milovanovic and Russell, 2001) have also been found in the random citizenship inspections that occur away from the border. Heavy surveillance of Mexican American neighborhoods is maintained by a constant presence of police and border patrol agents. Militarized raids in Mexican American and Latino immigrant communities function to establish "a state of permanent insecurity" as experienced throughout the 1950s (Acuña, 2000: 306). Stopping and interrogating specific racialized bodies "who appear not to 'belong' to a given place" used in "field investigations" (Marx, 2001: 323) reinforce social segregation and limit the freedom of moment (Weissinger, 1996; Heyman, 2004). These two practices result in poor and working-class Latinos experiencing racially motivated stops and searches. Stops and searches in the presence of white citizens serve as a public spectacle of "public safety and national security", as well as reinforces the images of specific racialized bodies as "alien" and criminal. Heavy surveillance of targeted communities, outside the view of white middle-class citizens, increases the likelihood that racially motivated stops and searches may result in civil rights violations, as well as abuse (Benitez, 1994; Vargas, 2001; Phillips, *et al.*, 2006, 2002). These everyday policing practices occur alongside the general public immigration and custom inspection at border crossings and the growing airport security. These uniformed and regularized inspections function to minimize the different levels of inspection and mistreatment of racialized Latinos in immigration raids.

In summary, the pattern of immigration law enforcement places mixed status immigrant families at risk before the law in the following ways: (1) discretionary stops based on ethnicity and class; (2) use of intimidation and

other forms to demean and subordinate persons stopped; (3) restricting the freedom of movement of Mexicans but not others in the same vicinity; (4) reinforced stereotypes of Mexican as "alien," "foreign," inferior and criminal; and (5) limited access to fair and impartial treatment before the law (Romero, 2006: 463). Examining the experiences that these "at risk" factors pose to parents, children and extended kin suggest state sanctioned practices that shape inclusion and exclusion of family members. These "at risk" factors highlight the significance of race (color), class, gender, culture, and citizenship in mixed status family members' interaction with state representatives and suggest areas of unexplored dynamics that shape immigrant families and community relations, as well as individual choices.

THE CASE OF MIXED STATUS FAMILIES IN IMMIGRATION RAIDS

In the summer of 1997, the Chandler Police Department and Border Patrol agents from Casa Grande Station and Tucson engaged in several joint immigration raids in Chandler, Arizona. After the fourth raid, the Mexican American community and immigrant advocates protested the violation of civil rights and the endangerment of children. This last raid became known as the "Chandler Roundup" because of the way the community experienced law as enforcement carrying out the cowboy legacy of treating Mexicans as "stray" cattle rather than human beings. Government officials responded by holding public meetings and the Attorney General began an investigation. One law suit was filed on behalf of families who were stopped and detained. The other law suit was filed by the business owners who lost revenue as a consequence of the raid. In response to the Attorney General's report and the allegations made in two law suits, the Chandler Police Department contracted with an independent investigation that was conducted the following summer. Data from the reports and law suits contained descriptions of the ninety-one that were filed, testimonies given to the Attorney General's office, summaries of depositions, minutes of community meetings, newspaper articles, memoranda between city officials, police radio dispatch audio tapes, deportation forms and police field notes. Depositions from the first lawsuit included parents' complaints over the treatment of their children and described the trauma they experienced. Transcripts of the depositions mirrored the data presented in the attorney general's report. Data from local and national newspapers were systematically collected from July 1997 to December 1999. Complaints were coded for class, gender, age, and citizenship status. Since the witness testimonies and depositions provide detailed descriptions of encounters with police and immigration officers, each were coded according to the five patterns of immigration law enforcement identified by social science and legal scholars.

Immigration Enforcement Practices

Analyzing various sources of data on the raid provides a list of the type of immigration law enforcement practices used during the raid. Police records clearly show that the area targeted for the series of raids had both the lowest income level and the highest residential population of persons of Mexican ancestry in the city. The stop and searches conducted of workers during the first days of the operation frequently occurred at gas stations, sites where day laborers waited for jobs, or during the drive to and from work. Other reported stops occurred while walking down the street, driving, biking, using a public telephone, shopping and putting gas in their cars. Complaints, witness narratives, residents' comments at community meetings, newspaper articles and depositions indicate that worksite and residential raids occurred later in the five-day operation and may have been a result of residents fearful of walking, driving or shopping. Incidents of house-to-house searches occurred in single family housing, apartment complexes and trailer courts.

Interview summaries with officers contained descriptions of using the traffic enforcement with a spotter that is routine for special D.U.I. enforcement. In this case, vehicles leaving targeted housing units were followed if they were identified as "migrant workers". However, most officers following the vehicles did not pull drivers over until probable cause was established. These stops included minor offences such as a broken tail light, failing to signal before turning, a broken windshield, a missing headlamp, a turn into the wrong lane or not making a complete stop at a stop sign. The following radio dispatch summary offers a profile of the policing practice that was used:

> The vehicles were described by make, model and/or color, as well as direction of travel. A total of forty-three (43) vehicles were specially singled out in a two hour period of time from 4:00 to 6:00 a.m. The officers identified seven (7) vehicles because of known violations of law warranting a stop. However, of the remaining thirty-six (36) vehicles called in, seven (7) calls describing vehicles were made despite the officers stating that there was no probable cause to believe that violations of the law had occurred. The other twenty-nine (29) vehicles were singled out without articulation of what, if any, violation of law may have been observed by the reporting officer.

In the final day of the raid, more worksites were targeted. All reports indicate that police and INS agents requested permission from employers on construction sites before the raid. However, done of the employers were arrested and charged with violation of IRCA. Only workers were arrested during the raids.

The selective citizenship inspection that occurred during the operation incorporated aspects of race, class and cultural profiling. Race and class is

most apparent in the area targeted for the raids. Apartment complexes and trailer courts offering rentals that rely on renters that avoid credit and employment checks attract low income Mexican immigrant workers. Identification of older and less expensive models of vehicles are visual indicators of class background of the driver. With the increasing number of indigenous Mexicans entering the labor market in the area, physical characteristics and clothing are also deduced as suggesting race and ethnicity. Activities at the time of the stop do not identify illegal behavior but are class related activities since walking and biking is not a choice of transport during the 100-degree weather in July. The use of public telephones is also a class marker when cell phones and land lines in the home are a norm. Family usage of their front yards for play or visiting with neighbors is culturally confined to Mexican and Yaqui communities in the Phoenix area. Cultural profiling is implicated in the choice of businesses targeted. A newspaper quote taken from a blond, blue-eyed undocumented Irish immigrant employed at a local law firm about her lack of concern about the raid illustrates the level of public recognition of race and class profiling: "I don't have to worry. I blend in very well" (Amparano 1997a: A1). The profiling of race, ethnicity and class is further supported by the *Record of Deportable Alien* that the police filled out for each person deported during the raid. Prior to use, the INS computer printed forms had for the following categories typed in advance: for "Country of Origin" either "Mexico" and/or "Mexican" was typed in; for "occupation", "Laborer" is printed; for "Hair", the color "Black" is printed; for "Eyes" the category is filled in with "Brown"; and for "Complexion", "Med" is typed in.

Mixed Family Experiences

Narrative accounts given to the Attorney General's office offer additional details surrounding family encounters with law enforcement officers. Witnesses' recollections of stops and searches uncover the state's role in processes of assimilation and identify formation of immigrant families that is seldom addressed. Racial, ethnic and class-based profiling used in raids and citizenship inspection send clear messages about the social construction of citizenship in the US. The experiences of being treated as a criminal or observing family members treated with disrespect by the law contributes to the socialization and identity formation processes. I selected five narratives to analyze various aspects of mixed status family experiences that place them at risk before the law. These narratives highlight issues immigration policy and law enforcement pose in understanding racial aspects of ethnic identity, pressure to break extended family ties, second-generation ethnic and class identity formation, socialization processes that include or exclude immigrants to "Americanize". The first two narratives involve children's experiences in

the raid who were with extended family members. These two testimonies involve issues concerning intergenerational conflicts created by the state. The third narrative is taken from a white US citizen who observed the disregard for children's safety in the raid. The last two witness accounts are given by mothers. Each of the five accounts point to way the state distinguishes between family members on the basis of citizenship status and reinforces race and class privilege while male privilege is not conferred upon Mexican men. Narrative accounts were summarized in the Attorney General's final report and persons were identified by the first letter of their last name.

Witness "E" was stopped by a police officer patrolling the area on a bike. At the time, she was walking to the drug store with her grandchild. Although the action of walking to the drug store is a rare occurrence in middle-class neighborhoods in Chandler, particularly in the heat of July, walking is common form of transportation in low-income areas. Therefore, "E's" account poses the question of the behavior or other factors than "Mexican appearance" that contributed to "probable cause" in the stop for citizenship inspection.

> E is a grandmother who immigrated from Mexico ten years ago. She is a widow of a United States citizen. In July 1997, she was walking to the pharmacy to pick up medication for her diabetes and was accompanied by her seven year old granddaughter. Half a block from Arizona Avenue, they were approached by a Chandler police officer on a bicycle who motioned for them to stop. When E stopped, the officer approached them and began questioning her in English, asking if she had papers. E asked if the officer wanted to see her papers and he said yes; he then took her papers and residency card and scrutinized the card front and back. Next he asked if the girl had papers and what her name was. The girl looked very serious and wide-eyed. E told the officer that her granddaughter had been born in Nogales, Arizona. The officer then told E that she should carry her granddaughter's birth certificate wherever she went and that she should further get a letter from the girl's mother verifying that E was the grandmother. He then said that she should teach her granddaughter to say, "I'm an American citizen." The officer did not tell E why he stopped her and he took no notes. The officer asked the granddaughter if she was in school and she told him she was in the first grade. He then said good-bye and drove straight ahead as he left.

Other than "E" and her grandchild's physical appearance and the act of walking within a low-income Hispanic community–both of which suggest race, ethnicity, class, age and gender–there does not appear to be any other factors that might be construed as "probable cause" or "reasonable suspicion" of illegally residing in the US. Both the child and grandmother are likely to conclude that physical appearance was the sole criteria leading to the police questioning their right to be walking to the pharmacy in Chandler, Arizona. As a representative of the law, the police officer treats citizenship as a legal

status inscribed on the body, which serves to reinforce white and middle class privilege. Having produced her residency card and passing immigration inspection, the police tried to intimidate "E" by informing her of the need to carry documented proof of her relationship to the child. Embedded in this statement is the implied threat that the police may remove her grandchild from her care. Grandmothers in general are not required by law to possess written parental consent when caring for their grandchildren. The police officer's comment is an official challenge to "E's" authority and ability to care for her grandchild. The latitude in discretionary action and force is evident in the police decision to stop and question "E" and in his instructions that "E" needs additional documentation to be with her U.S. born grandchild.

The citizenship inspection conveys numerous messages to "E's" grandchild. This is likely to be the first time that she feels unsafe with her grandmother. Observing "the law" question her right to be walking with her grandmother is intimidating, frightening and conveys a strong message that they do not belong to the larger community of law-abiding residents. The officer's direct questioning of the child appears to be in a tone that is not comforting nor demonstrates concern about scaring her. The child is socialized by the officer that she must claim an identity as an "American citizen". This classification serves to distinguish herself from her grandmother who is a legal resident but not a citizen of the US. Learning to say "American" rather than a U.S. citizen socializes the child to an imperialist form of citizenship identity. As a citizen of Mexico, "E" is also an "American citizen". However, the "Americanization" process involves a specific world view that is exclusionary of all other countries in the Americas.

The next narrative describes a residential raid. "B's" account describes how his family was targeted for citizenship inspection. "B" reports police methods commonly used in drug raids. The raid occurred after 11:00 pm when the family had gone to sleep.

> The family was awakened by a loud banging on the front door and bright lights shining through the windows. When B looked around, he saw two Chandler police officers, with an INS/Border Patrol agent behind them. All officers were bicycle officers. The officers demanded to be allowed into the trailer and when B asked if they had the right to come in, he was told, "We can do whatever we want, we are the Chandler Police Department. You have people who are here illegally." Although B denied that there were any undocumented aliens there, the officers insisted on entering the trailer, rousing everyone from bed. The family members were all in their sleep clothes, but the officers refused to allow them to dress. None of the officers indicated that they had warrants authorizing them to enter the dwelling. Two of the children were United States citizens, and except for the brother-in-law, all the rest were legal aliens; the brother-in-law had entered the country legally but his visa had expired and was in the process of getting it renewed. When the officers discovered that the brother-in-law did not have

> proper papers, they called the Chandler Police Department back up vehicle and took him away in a patrol car. B attempted to give his brother-in-law street clothes when the officers were taking him away, but the officers would not allow this and took him away in his sleep clothes. He was later readmitted to the United States with the renewed visa he had been awaiting. The others were detained in the trailer for approximately ninety minutes; they were not searched but they were questioned even after they showed the papers demonstrating that they were legally in the United States. The police told B that they had spoken with the park manager and that he had given them permission to search the trailers, had given them a map, and had marked on the map where Hispanic residents lived. The four children involved in this incident are still fearful when someone knocks at the door of the trailer, and continue to be nervous when they see police officers on the street.

The force and discretion used by officers to conduct an investigation into citizenship and immigration status implies that family members have no rights and the police can act with impunity. The threat posed in the statement, "We can do whatever we want, we are the Chandler Police Department" relegates the Mexican family to a state of inferiority and indicates that they have no civil or human rights. Detaining the family after citizenship or immigrant status has been established, as well as denying the brother-in-law street clothes before being placed under arrest, further humiliates the family. The additional excessive force further terrorizes the family. No precautions were taken to shield the children from the interrogation or the excessive force used in the raid. Rather than embracing the security that they are US citizens, the children experience the police as a threat to their personal safety. Being witness to the degradation ceremony, the children witness their father and uncle treated with disrespect and unable to protect them. As second generation in the U.S., the children did not experience a sense of belonging. Rather, the children were presented with an image of integration into the larger society that requires separation from family members who are not US citizens because they place them at risk before the law and results in them being relegated to second-class citizenship.

Although the police claimed that they were not "busting down doors in search of illegal immigrants", "B's" account of his brother-in-law's arrest falls in line with the draconian measures passed in the Anti-Terrorism and Effect Penalty Act and Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility that were in existence a year prior to this incident. Raiding the home at night frames the act of living and working in the US without authorization as a danger and threat to society, and the expectation that one will be treated the same as drug dealers and murderers. While this might not have been the first time that "B's" family members were asked for proof of citizenship, this incident was conducted in a manner that treated them as dangerous criminals and a threat to society.

The following account further identifies the disregard for children's safety during the raid and highlights the different treatment of children assumed to be an immigrant. The account also illustrates how the children of parents identified as Mexican are placed at risk before the law. This narrative is taken from an interview the Attorney General's Office conducted with the manager of the local supermarket, which was targeted during the five-day raid. He recounted how officers attempted to publicly separate families by citizenship in the store. They requested his assistant store manager to use the loudspeaker and instruct customers who were "illegal aliens" to voluntarily submit to be arrest to the officers in the store. However, she refused to do so. The police then stationed themselves in the parking lot and began following only customers who appeared to be of Mexican ancestry. One incident involving children with their father was particularly disturbing.

> A man with two small children, about three to four years of age, was contacted by officers as he walked out of the store. The man talked to the officers as he walked to his truck. He opened the door on the passenger side of the truck and placed his children in the vehicle. He then walked around the truck to the driver's side. At this time a Border Patrol officer approached the passenger door and placed the wheel of his bicycle behind the door to prevent it from being closed. A Chandler police officer placed his bicycle wheel behind the driver's door in a similar fashion. The Chandler officer talked to the man for a few minutes, then began to try to pull him from the truck cab. The Border Patrol officer then rounded the cab and helped the Chandler officer. They pulled him from the cab, handcuffed him, and placed him in a police van. The children were crying and very upset. An officer returned to the truck in about five minutes, stayed there for some time, then made a phone call. Later, another officer arrived and removed the children. In the meantime, a woman customer went to the truck and tried to comfort the children. They were left in the truck for a total of 15 or 20 minutes.

The police and immigration officer created a public spectacle in handling the encounter with excessive force. The manner that they conducted the stop showed no concern for the small children. The situation did not call for immediate action that left the children without a parent. The children witnessed their father treated disrespectfully and as a dangerous criminal who required the physical force of being pulled from his vehicle and placed in handcuffs. The incident terrorized the children and the father was forced to abandon them alone in the truck. The children may have been too young to comprehend that only persons of Mexican ancestry were under surveillance but they clearly understood that the men in uniform were not their friends or persons who provided security or safety for children. It is interesting to note that parents in the Phoenix metropolitan area have been prosecuted for child endangerment when leaving children in cars in the summer. Yet, the police

and the Border Patrol officer left the children in the truck for 15-20 minutes in July's triple digits weather.

The last two accounts were given by women who position their narrative from the standpoint of mothers. Both are US citizens of Mexican ancestry. "Q"'s testimony was significant in the investigation because law enforcement officers claimed the raid had stayed clear of schools and thus, did not target children. However, her children experienced having their citizenship questioned as they walked home from school and were deeply frightened by the police.

> On July 30, 1997, Q was running [a] little late picking up her daughters, age 7 and 10, from Fry School in Chandler so the girls started walking home. When Q caught up with them, half a block from school, the girls were crying. Q asked why they were in tears and they told Q, 'It is your fault," and asked, "What is a birth certificate?" The girls pointed down the street and said that the officers told us to keep our birth certificates with us or they will send us back to Mexico. Both girls kept saying, "Mom, we don't know Mexico." In order to verify who had stopped her daughters, Q put the girls in her vehicle and began to drive in the direction the girls said the officers had gone. Q saw three Chandler Police officers on bicycles not far from the school. No INS/Border Patrol agents were in sight. Now, when someone is at the door, the girls hide, bundle up with each other, and ask their mother not to open the door because "maybe it is the police." Before this incident both girls were always eager to go with her on errands; now, they cry so she will let them stay at home. Both girls insist on having their birth certificates pinned to their clothes or around their necks and no longer want to walk home from school or play outdoors.

"Q's" account indicates the impact that the citizenship inspection had on her children. While they did not make the connection between their ethnicity and the country of Mexico, they understood that they were at risk before the law. Unlike their white counterparts, these children cannot assume that their citizenship will not be questioned. The officer's threat that each girl had to carry a birth certificate or be deported to Mexico served to intimidate and terrorize the children. Like the children who watched their father being pulled from the truck and arrested, the police are not a symbol of safety or security but of danger. Having questioned the children without their mother's presence erased their mother's ability to protect them from intimidation and weakened her ability to provide them with security and a feeling of well-being.

"F's" account is prefaced with the statement that she is a US citizen, born in California and her family roots in the US go back two centuries. "It was always important to her family that they fit in and she is proud of the fact that she does not have accent. She is dark-complected." However, as her narrative reveals, she is rethinking her assumptions about citizenship and identifying strategies to assure that her rights and privileges as a citizen are not denied her

in the future. "F" encountered officers as they were paroling the grocery store parking lot on their bikes. Leaving the store with her three small children, she spoke to them in Spanish as she walked to her car. The summary of her account illustrates the emotional impact of the stop and the influence the experience had in reconstructing her own identity, as well as the recognition that "Mexicanness" places her children at risk before the law.

> A police officer on a bicycle came up to her and asked her in English for her papers. She responded in English. "Newspapers?", not understanding what he meant. The officer then asked her for her immigration papers and she answered that she was a United States citizen. The officer asked if she could prove it and she attempted to show him her driver's license but he said that she needed to show another ID, such as a social security card or passport. She told the officer that she did not have an accent, but he continued to insist on proof of her citizenship. He told her that if she did not have proof he would detain her. She told him that she had her birth certificate in the trunk of the car. He followed her to the car and looked at the birth certificate, thanked her for her time and left. She asked why she needed to prove citizenship and he said that citizens had complained about an immigration problem. The entire incident took approximately 10-15 minutes.
>
> She feels that she has to watch what she wears and that she cannot look unkempt. The officer made her feel stereotyped on the basis of what she was wearing. She felt that she did not belong. A number of people were going in and out of the store and one couple looked at her. F did not see anyone else stopped. The only time she has gone back to Chandler has been for the meeting at the church. She has not gone back to the store because she does not feel welcome; she feels violated. This has also affected her plans to have her children spend some time with relatives in Mexico. She canceled their trip because she does not want to risk her children picking up an accent. . .

Similar to the other accounts, "F's" encounter with immigration law enforcement occurred in the presence of her children. There is no indication that the officer showed concern for "F's" small children as they stood in the July heat in the parking lot. They observed their mother being treated as having done something illegal and treated as a criminal suspect. They watched her frustration at finding the documentation the officer demanded.

Prior to this encounter, "F" believed that she had integrated into mainstream society. She assumed the absence of a Spanish accent when speaking English identified her as different as Mexican immigrants. However, even after demonstrating her ability to speak middle-class English, she found herself stopped and detained in public. She expressed humiliation at being treated as inferior to the white citizens in the parking lot. "F" is mortified that her appearance and bilingual abilities were construed as the stereotypical "illegal alien"–uneducated, poor and dirty. She became aware that skin color functions as a proxy for "reasonable suspicion" in immigration

law enforcement. In order to protect herself and children from being treated as less than any other U.S. citizen, she began plans towards cutting links with her transnational family networks and from the Mexican community. Her middle-class privilege gives her the option to live and shop in predominately white neighborhoods, which immigration law enforcement agents never target. She knows that even the Mexican immigrant landscapers, construction workers and household labor move freely without surveillance in middle-class neighborhoods throughout the Phoenix metropolitan area. "F" realizes that without white skin, her class status will be questioned. Consequently, she has become more conscious about the external markings of class, such as clothes. These additional strategies to eliminate as many signs of "Mexicanness" from her family are attempts to lower the risks involved in having dark skin. "F"'s narrative demonstrates the kinds of painful decisions that parents make to assimilate into a culture that privileges whiteness and European ancestry.

DISCUSSION

Using the Chandler Roundup as a case study, the everyday practices of profiling "illegal alien" that place certain transnational families and family members at risk before the law were analyzed. Complainants willing to give witness testimony identified a consistent list of gendered, cultural and class-based activities that placed them are risk before the law. Residing, shopping or working in low-income areas populated with Latinos placed racialized Latinos at more risk of being stopped for citizenship inspection than persons who appeared to be white, regardless of their citizenship status. Visual signs of class, such as dress or car driven, also placed working poor Latinos at more risk than middle-class Latinos. Persons who passed for white or Black were never questioned about their citizenship or for proof of their immigrant status. Citizenship inspection only occurred in low-income areas. Mexican American and Mexican immigrant families were targeted on the basis of their "Mexicanness" indicated by color, ethnicity, and class. During immigration inspections, family members of all ages and gender were demeaned, humiliated and embarrassed. Stops and searches were conducted without "reasonable suspicion" of criminal activity. Police used discretionary power and force in stops and searches, which increased the level of intimidation of family members. Excessive force was reported by persons stopped and observers at the scene of the raids. Children were interrogated and intimidated outside the presence of their parents. Mexican children were not treated as a protected class and precautions were not taken for their safety.

Immigration law enforcement is one way that the state takes an active role in the processes of assimilation and identity formation of immigrant families. Law enforcement and society's images of immigrant families are constructed

in specific intersectional classifications of race, class, gender and ethnicity. Engaging in cultural or class-based activities contributed to the construction of "reasonable suspicion" and "probable cause". Cultural activities that place transnational families at risk before the law include speaking Spanish, shopping in curio shops or Mexican bakeries, and listening to Spanish radio while driving in low-income areas of the city. Class activities that place immigrant and families of Mexican ancestry at risk before the law include playing or visiting in the front yard, using a public telephone in a low income area, and walking or biking as a means of transportation rather than as a form of exercise. Visual signs of class privilege may trump race and ethnic profiling. Racialized mixed status immigrant families are more likely to fit society's view of the "illegal alien" when they are among the working poor and are carrying out the daily activities of shopping and going to school in low-income neighborhoods. When citizenship status is assumed to be inscribed on one's body, racialized immigrant families are constantly being bombarded with messages that they do not belong regardless of their actual immigrant or citizenship status.

Assimilation of transnational families includes their experiences with stereotypical views of "illegal aliens" and identity formation is influenced by observing the state's treatment of their parents, grandparents and other family members. The children of low-income transnational Latino families are more likely to observe their parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles treated as criminals. They experience their parents' inability to protect them from police interrogation or intimidation. Immigrants of European ancestry, including the poor, are unlikely to be targeted in immigration raids or for random citizenship inspections. However, Mexicans and other racialized Latinos/as who do not fit the class-based racialized notion of US citizens are targeted.

Analyzing immigrant children's experiences in their families and neighborhoods within the context of the law and immigration enforcement highlight experiences that mitigate generational differences, identify formation, and coerced assimilation that are frequently ignored in traditional approaches. Immigrant and non-immigrant communities tend to be characterized as mutually exclusive. Shared private space of the home and public spaces, such as neighborhoods, shopping areas, employment sites, and churches, are minimized or ignored. Immigration family research rarely addresses the impact that racialized and class-based law enforcement practices or anti-immigration sentiment have on parents' choices to either socialize their children to celebrate or eliminate their "Mexicaness". Discussion of generational conflict and assimilation rarely focus on the experience of children who find their parents or extended family members placing them at risk before the law or resulting in a loss of citizenship

privileges. Assimilation in mixed family situations may require children to cut their ties with their families and eliminate all cultural characteristics in order to assure their complete integration into US citizenship. An intersectional analysis of generational class and gender differences within mixed status immigrant families poses questions about the distinct positionality of family members imposed by state regulation of immigration policies that are enforced in ways that highlight race, gender, age and citizenship differences.

An intersectional lens used to study immigrant families and the state highlights other factors that constrain and influence the processes of assimilation and identity formation. As immigration policy in the U.S. moves further away from family reunification and federal legislation collapses immigration, drug and terrorism into one, mixed status families are at increased risk before the law. Family research on mixed status families needs to capture the way that law enforcement agents and legislation shape notions of citizenship that is racialized, gendered and class-based. Proposing this research trend in the field of immigration and families is a timely one because of the changes in immigration legislation and anti-immigration sentiment against immigrants as families. Women who are mothers and wives are more commonly finding their paths to immigrant and citizenship status blocked on the basis of being classified as a "public charge". Immigration preference for workers over families is again being constructed with a gendered image of the worker as male rather than female. The distinct immigration and citizenship statuses within a immigrant families, particularly extended transnational families, separate families on the basis of rights and opportunities. Siblings born in their parent's homeland will have different opportunities to assimilate than their siblings or cousins born in the US. State's authorized distinctions between transnational immigrant family members are revealed when examining the strategies and everyday practices of immigration law enforcement.

REFERENCES

Acuña, Rodolfo (2000). *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, New York: Longman.

Adler, Rachel H. (2006). But they Claimed to be Police, no *la migra*!" The Interaction of Residency, Status, Class, and Ethnicity in a (Post-PATRIOT Act) New Jersey Neighborhood. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(1): 48-69.

Amparano, Julie (1999). *Let's Rid Our State of Hatred*, Arizona Republic. Aug. 2, p. SD5.

——(1997). Brown Skin: No Civil rights? July Sweep on Chandler Draws Fire. *Arizona Republic*. Aug. 15, p. B1.

Benitiez, Humberto (1994). Flawed Strategies: The INS Shift from Border Interdiction to Internal Enforcement Actions. *La Raza Law Journal*, 7: 154-179.

Bettie, Julie (2003). *Women Without Class: Girls, Race and Identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Chang, Robert (1999). *Disoriented: Asian Americans, Law, and the Nation-State*. New York: New York University Press.

Department of Homeland Security (2003). Endgame: Office of Detention and Removal Strategic Plan, 2003-2012, Detention and Removal Strategy for a Secure Homeland, U.S. Documents.

Farley, Reynolds and Richard Alba (2002). The New Second Generation in the United States, *Immigration Migration Review*, 36(3): 669-701.

Gonzales, Nancy A. Miguelina Germán, Su Yeong Kim, Preethy George, Fairlee C. Fabrett, Roger Millsap and Larry E. Dumka (2008). Mexican American Adolescents' Cultural Orientation, Externalizing Behavior and Academic Engagement: The Role of Traditional Values. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41: 151-164.

Gratton, Brian, Myron P. Gutmann, Emily Skop (2007). Immigrants, their Children, and Theories of Assimilation: Family Structure in the United States, 1880-1970, History of the Family, 12: 203-222.

Griffith, Kati L. (2004). Perfecting Public Immigration Legislation: Private Immigration Bills and Deportable Lawful Permanent Residents, *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal* 18(2): 273-3004.

Heyman, Josiah McC. (2004). Ports of Entry as Nodes in the World System. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 11: 303-327.

——. (2001). Class and Classification of the U.S.-Mexico Border, Human Organization, 60: 128-40.

Hing, Bill Ong (2006). *Deporting Our Souls: Values, Morality, and Immigration Policy*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Human Rights Watch (2007). Forced Apart: Families Separated and Immigrants Harmed by United States Deportation Policy. Volume 19, No. 3(G), 86 pages.

Hurtado, Aída (1997). Understanding multiple group identities: Inserting women into cultural transformations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53 (2): 299-328.

Inda, Jonatan Xavier (2006) *Targeting Immigrants: Government, Technology, and Ethics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Johnson, Kevin R. (2007). *Opening the Floodgates: Why America Needs to Rethink its Borders and Immigration Laws*, New York: New York University Press.

——. (2004). *The "Huddled Masses" Myth: Immigration and Civil Rights*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

——. (2003) Public Benefits and Immigration: The Intersection of Immigration Status, Ethnicity, Gender, and Class. *University of California Law Review*, 42: 1509-1575.

Lindsley, Syd (2002). The Gendered Assault on Immigrants In Jael Siliman and Ananya Bhattacharjee (Eds.) *Policing the National Body: Sex, Race, and Criminalization*, (pp. 175-198). Cambridge, Massachusetts: South End Press.

Lugo, Alejandro (2000). Theorizing Border Inspections, *Cultural Dynamics*, 12(3): 353-373.

Luibhéud, Eithne (2002). *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality at the Border.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Marx, Gary (2001). Identity and Anonymity: Some Conceptual Distinctions and Issues for Research," in Jane Caplan and John Torpey (Eds.) *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, Pp. 311-327. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Miller, Teresa (2005). Immigration Law and Human Rights: Legal Line Drawing Post-September 11: Symposium Article: Burring the boundaries between immigration and crime control after September 11th. *Boston Third World Law Journal*, 25: 81-123.

Milovanovic, Dragan and Katheryn Russell (Eds.) (2001). *Petit Apartheid in the U.S. Criminal Justice System, The Dark Figure of Racism.* Durham: Carolina Academic Press.

Murata, Katsuyuki (2001). The (re)shaping of Latino/Chicano Ethnicity through Inclusion/Exclusion of Undocumented Immigrants: The Case of LULAC's ethno-politics. *American Studies International*, 39 (2): 4-33.

National Council of La Raza and The Urban Institute (2007). Paying the Price: The Impact of Immigration Raids on America's Children, Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.

Ono, Kent A. and Johna M. Sloop (2002). *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Immigration, and California's Proposition 187.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Phillips, Scott, Jacqueline Maria Hagan, and Nestor Rodriguez (2006). Brutal Borders? Examining the Treatment of Deportees During Arrest and Detention. *Social Forces* 85: 93-109.

Phillips, Scott, Nestor Rodriguez, Jacqueline Hagan (2002). Brutality at the Border? Use of Force in the Arrest of Immigrants in the United States. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 30: 285-306.

Portes, Alejandro (1996).The Second Generation, New York: Russell Sage.

Portes, Alejandro and Rubèn G. Rumbaut. Eds. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rodriguez, Nestor and Jacqueline Maria Hagan (2004). Fractured Families and Communities: Effects of Immigration Reform in Texas, Mexico, and El Salvador. *Latino Studies* 2: 328-51.

Romero, Mary. (2008). Crossing the Immigration and Race Border: A Critical Race Theory Approach to Immigration Studies. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 11 (1): 23-37.

——. (2006). Racial Profiling and Immigration Law Enforcement: Rounding up of usual Suspects in the Latino Community. *Critical Sociology*, 32 (2-3): 449-475.

Romero, Mary and Marwah Serag (2005). Violation of Latino Civil Rights Resulting from INS and Local Police's use of Race, Culture and Class Profiling: The Case of the Chandler Roundup in Arizona. *Cleveland State Law Review*, 52 (1&2) 75-96.

Rumbaut, Rubèn G. and Alejandro Portes (2001). *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Russell, Katheryn K. (1998). *The Color of Crime: Racial Hoaxes, White Fear, Black Protectionism, Police Harassment and Other Macroaggressions*. New York: New York University Press.

Stanton-Salazar, Ricardo D. (2001). Manufacturing Hope and Despair: The School and Kin Support Networks of U.S.-Mexican Youth. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Suárez-Orozco, Carola and Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco (2001). *Children of Immigration*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

——. (1995). *Transformation: Migration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation Among Latino Adolescents*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Valencia, Reynaldo, Sonia R. García, Henry Flore, and José Roberto Juárez Jr. (2004). *Mexican Americans & the Law*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Valenzuela, Angela (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vargas, Jorge A. (2001). U. S. Border Patrol Abuses, Undocumented Mexican workers, and international human rights. *San Diego International Law Review*, 2(1): 1-92.

Weissinger, George (1996). *Law Enforcement and the INS, A Participant Observation Study of Control Agents*. NY: University Press of America, Inc.