

【연구논문】

Latino Ethnicity and Other Influences on the Immigrants' Rights Movement in the United States

Bradley Tatar
(KAIST)

On May 1, 2006 and again on May 1, 2007, protests occurred in cities across the United States as hundreds of thousands of immigrants and their supporters filled the streets and brought traffic to a halt (Fulbright, Hoge and Hua, 2007; Madrid, 2007; Tareen, 2007). Although the protesters were most numerous in the cities of Chicago, Los Angeles, New York and Washington, D.C., thousands of protesters were also mobilized in smaller cities, such as Denver, Milwaukee and Phoenix (Whitcomb and Gorman, 2007; Madrid, 2007; Oberman, 2007). Immigrants who illegally reside in the United States marched together with citizens, and with legal residents who are not U.S. citizens; together, they demanded better treatment for immigrants, and an end to the increasingly aggressive targeting of immigrants by the US Department of Homeland Security Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Protesters were unanimous in demanding a path to legalization for undocumented migrants, referred by the news media as “illegal immigrants.”

The May 1 protests for immigrants' rights became a lightning rod for prejudice and negative feelings expressed toward Mexicans and Latinos in general. According to the Pew Hispanic Trust, 12 million illegal

immigrants now reside in the United States; furthermore, they estimate 56% of illegal immigrants are Mexicans, and 22% are from other Spanish-speaking countries (Ohlemacher, 2007). Latin American immigration is changing the face of the United States, as states, cities and towns traditionally seen as “white” are now finding that white children are the minority in local schools (Peterson, 2007). As Spanish-speaking immigrants and their English-speaking children increase in numbers, anger has swelled among those who label them as dangerous outsiders. Town councils and state legislatures have passed new kinds of legislation designed to exclude undocumented immigrants from receiving medical care or social services; to bar them from occupying private habitations; and to ban them from being in public places (LeBlanc, 2007). Others have equated the undocumented immigrants with foreign terrorists such as those who carried out the attacks of September 11, 2001 (Bohrer, 2007).

In the current political climate, the May 1 protests of 2006 and 2007 have received skeptical, or else hostile reactions from some quarters of the American public. However, those participating in the demonstrations see it as continuation of the civil rights struggle against racial segregation and oppression. The civil rights movement secured guarantees of equal rights for all Americans, regardless of ethnic or racial origin.

The immigrants’ rights movement is a novelty because for the first time, non-citizens have entered the political sphere to demand legal rights and recognition in the U.S. Is it possible to view it as a civil rights movement? The 1960s civil rights movement fought for the political, social and economic rights of U.S. ethnic groups to win freedom from discrimination and segregation. The goals and participants

in each movement are clearly different, but the immigrants' movement of today may become a civil rights movement if it employs strategic discourses of ethnic identity. It can become a movement against ethnic discrimination if its participants self-identify as members of the Latino/Hispanic ethnic group that is native to the U.S.

To study social movements by examining discourses, we assume that discourses are constitutive of social relations, and are not merely reflections or representations of social relations (Laclau, 2005:68). "Discourse" may be understood as the socially accepted use of language in combination with certain ways of "thinking, valuing, acting, and interacting" (Gee, 1999:17). The key term is, "socially accepted," and the key question is, accepted by whom? Combining language with specific social practices, "[p]eople try to make visible to others (and to themselves as well) who they are and what they are doing" (Gee, 1999:20). Socially accepted ways of acting and speaking serve the purpose of social positioning, by which actors imagine a multi-dimensional social field and portray themselves as occupying a particular location in that field, a position from which the actor expresses a social identity (Castells, 1997; Somers, 1997).

Hence, recent sociological work on social movements has highlighted narrative and other types of discourse used in framing (Poletta, 1998; Benford, 2002). These studies have applied Erving Goffman's concept of "frame" as the definition of a situation used by social actors when they selectively interpret situations and experiences (Heaney and Rojas, 2006; Hunt, Benford and Snow, 1994). The sociologists using the concept of framing study the ways that leaders and members of social movement organizations use discourses to create and maintain boundaries, identify antagonists, identify the social problems and

motivate members to take a specific course of action to rectify the problems (Hunt, Benford and Snow, 1994). However, the major shortcoming of these analyses is that they focus on the social movement organization (SMO) as the institution that regulates and directs the social movement through the use of framing.

Discourses are central to social movements, but they should be studied without exaggerating the power of SMOs to regulate the movement. For example, Aldon D. Morris' influential research on the civil rights movement demonstrates that African-Americans mobilized effectively in mass demonstrations only after the leading civil rights organization was rendered ineffective and superseded by new organizations. In 1956, the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] was dismantled by state governments throughout the American South, through court injunctions and legislative initiatives (Morris, 1984:31). The NAACP had focused on litigation against segregationist laws and on voter registration, but once its local chapters were dissolved, massed, collective protest against segregation became the only avenue for the expression of African-American aspirations. The movement's growth occurred because the civil rights movement leaders were able to express the aspirations of their followers with words "that symbolized and simplified the complex yearnings of a dominated group" (Morris, 1985:11). In other words, they produced discourses about identity that expressed the aspirations of the civil rights demonstrators.

Discourses serve to orient social protest movements because discourses express the aspirations and goals of the protesters. However, to understand discourses of protest, it is necessary to know the social relations between groups of persons and social institutions which have

a bearing on the development of a social movement. The following section examines the context of the May 1 immigrant rights protests as a statement against anti-immigrant (nativist) discourses, and in relation to the social relations of ethnicity and citizenship.

Nativism Versus Immigrant Rights: Two Different Ways of Being American

Like the civil rights protests did in the 1960s, the recent May 1 demonstrations by immigrants in 2006 and 2007 also expressed complex yearnings. However, the immigrant demonstrations did not produce a coherent narrative that could express the experiences of every immigrant, since there is great variation in country of origin, legal status of sojourn and family composition. Nevertheless, some discourses—even fragments of discourses—can be seen as statements of identity if they are understood as part of a long-running “conversation” between opposed discourses. A conversation exists when there is a debate between two positions, the debate is predicated on different values and ways of thinking, and when the symbolic value of institutions is part of the debate (Gee, 1999:33). Margaret Somers uses a different term, “relational setting,” but similarly referring to ongoing patterns of relations between institutions, narratives and social practices (Somers, 1997:89). The current immigrant rights movement is conditioned by an ongoing conversation that includes two main topics or storylines: the first is assimilation, a concept used in America to determine who belongs to America and who is foreign, and the second is about social relationships between citizens and the state.

First, immigrant social movement discourses must be seen in the

context of a historical conversation about “American-ness.” It is not a conversation that is limited to political positions that are pro- and anti-immigrant. Instead, it is a conversation between those who want to claim American-ness, a sense of belonging to the U.S., and those who want to exclude others by creating limits to what can be seen as acceptably “American.” The nativist stance as represented by Huntington (2004) is that Latin American immigrants threaten American culture because they do not assimilate to American cultural norms. The immigrants create ethnic communities in which Spanish is the language of both official and private business, religious and cultural differences are preserved, and a sense of separateness is maintained from the American “mainstream.” Hence, the exclusion of immigrants from the American national community is based on the use of the concept of assimilation, which postulates that our immigrant ancestors are fundamentally different from the recent immigrants, because our own forefathers were happy to Americanize (Chock, 1998).

In contrast, both Spanish-speaking immigrants and U.S.-born Latinos feel their cultural difference from the mainstream is perfectly American, and they are proud of their cultural contributions to the U.S. (Flores and Benmayor, 1997). Portes and Rumbaut (2006:65) have argued that when immigrants and their children lay claim to an ethnic identity, it is a strategy for adapting to American society. As an ethnic collective, immigrant groups position themselves to demand rights and to assert the value of their contributions to the American society. If this is true, then we should expect the May 1 immigrant protest marches to express Latino ethnic solidarity and demands for recognition of Latino rights. However, this was not the idea expressed by most of the demonstrators when interviewed by journalists. Instead of ethnic identification, the

protesters staked a different kind of claim to belonging in American society, based on their social relationship with the U.S. government.

In addition to the assimilation narrative, there is another key to understanding the relational setting of the conflict between immigrants and nativists. The conflict is not simply a debate about belonging, but about the ethics of social relationships between citizens and the state. For example, in 2005 the Minuteman Militia was created to protect the United States from undocumented immigrants, and sent armed contingents to patrol the border of the U.S. and Mexico. The Minuteman patrols were organized not simply to protest illegal immigration, but to send the message that the U.S. government is not doing its job of protecting citizens from undocumented immigrants (Kelly, 2005). The feeling of "betrayal" by the government is widespread in the discourses of nativists. Another example is the anti-immigrant activist who became angry when he learned that public funds were channeled by the State of Maryland to a nonprofit agency that provides social services to immigrants. The agency in question is CASA de Maryland, which provides English lessons, computer classes and assistance in finding jobs for immigrants, including some who have entered the U.S. illegally. The aggrieved citizen, Walter Abbot, lost his house and his business failed, for which he blames illegal immigrants (Flanagan, 2008). Abbot wrote an angry letter of protest to Maryland governor Martin O'Malley in which he threatened to kill the governor. After his arrest by the police, Abbot has sought to justify his letter by arguing, "[CASA] helps find them a job - an American's job that they help take away. They took away my job." Asked if he is prejudiced against Latinos, Abbot replied, "I have no problem with them. It's our government that's doing this to us" ("Man Facing Jail . . .", 2008). In this discourse, the nativist asserts the

unethical nature of a government that betrays its citizens by helping non-citizens. The reasoning is that the U.S. government does not protect its citizens from immigrant invasions, so citizens must take the law into their own hands.

The protest marches by immigrants on May 1, 2006 and 2007 were profoundly shaped by the nativist reactions against undocumented immigration. Unlike the nativists, who proclaim the illegitimacy of a U.S. government that “does not do its job,” the immigrants as *potential citizens* proclaimed the legitimacy of the U.S. government and their relationship to it. Hence, the protesters affirmed their ethical relationship to the United States government while simultaneously expressing their ire at the particular policy of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which is ratcheting up the level of dragnet raids carried out at homes and workplaces with resulting deportations (Constable, 2007). In addition, the immigrant rights protesters voiced their opposition to a bill [HR4437] passed by the U.S. House of Representatives that would have made it a felony crime for any person to assist an immigrant who has entered the United States illegally (Archibold, 2006). Although the bill was not approved by the U.S. Senate, nativists throughout the country pushed forward state and municipal ordinances authorizing local authorities to apprehend undocumented immigrants (Fears 2007; LeBlanc, 2007). These local offensives have inspired the protest by immigrants.

Nevertheless, the protest cannot be viewed as a new expression of Latino ethnic politics, as it has been portrayed by Portes and Rumbaut (2006:152). Mexican-Americans often argue that their own Mexican ancestors did assimilate to American culture, in contrast to the new wave of illegal immigrants whom they deem incapable of assimilating.

“There’s no comparison, they don’t have the respect we had back then . . . they don’t have morals,” argued one Mexican-American (Campo-Flores, 2000). Hence, some Latinos adopt a nativist perspective. After the May 1, 2006 immigrant protest, a group of Latinos opposed to immigration was formed under the name You Don’t Speak for Us (“Col. Rodriguez Has His Say,” 2007). However, what is more important is that the organizations which protect Latino ethnic rights in the United States did not participate in organizing the May 1 protests. For example, NCLR [National Council of La Raza], MALDEF [Mexican American Legal Defense Fund], and LULAC [League of United Latin American Citizens] are officially opposed to illegal immigration and they support the enforcement of all national immigration laws. These organizations are devoted to defending the civil rights of Latinos who are U.S. citizens or legal residents. In contrast, the organizations that have organized the rallies are those that are specifically focused on the rights of immigrants, such as CASA de Maryland, Central American Resource Center, Coalition for Humane Immigrants Rights, and American Friends Service Committee. The division between Latino ethnic politics and pro-immigrant politics indicates that the immigrants are using a non-ethnic rationale for organizing. What the immigrants (legal and illegal) share with U.S. citizen Latinos is their cultural origin in the U.S. territorial expansion into Mexico and Puerto Rico.

Ethnogenesis: Origins of the Hispanic/Latino Ethnic Group

The appearance of a Hispanic/Latino ethnicity in the U.S. reflects the trend toward acceptance of the group in U.S. society. In the civil rights era of the 1960s, Mexican-Americans joined African-Americans in

demanding their civil rights. Organizations were founded to define and safeguard their interests, including NCLR, MALDEF and Raza Unida (NCLR, 2007; Pycior, 2001). Another group, LULAC [League of United Latin American Citizens] was founded as early as 1921 (Orozco, 2001). Presently, these organizations continue to serve U.S. citizens of Latin American descent, ethnic Latinos. However, these organizations do not equally safeguard the rights of non-citizen immigrants. Hence, the “Latino” culture is divided between U.S. citizens with an established “ethnic” identity, and immigrants who are just struggling to establish themselves in the U.S. The constant appearance of new immigrants where ethnic Latino communities already exist requires a continuing process of “ethnicization,” by which new immigrants can be made into ethnic Americans. If the new immigrants cannot be ethnicized, they will be rejected or disavowed by the U.S. Latinos. Therefore, the trend toward acceptance of Latinos in the U.S. is problematized by a long history of stigmatization by which Latinos have been portrayed as aliens who threaten American society.

Arlene Dávila (2001) has studied the ethnicization process, which she believes conceals the inequalities behind a superficial cultural uniformity of all Spanish-speakers in the United States. The category of “Hispanic” or “Latino” is not a racial category, but a cultural one, based on ancestry, language and cultural membership (Gibson and Jung, 2002). The problem with the category is that Latinos in the United States do not share a single culture because they (or their forebears) come from many different countries (Dávila, 2001; Rodriguez, 1997). Latinos of the United States trace their origins to the Caribbean (Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic or Cuba), Mexico, Central America (Nicaragua, Panama, Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras), or South

America (Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Venezuela, Paraguay, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile and Bolivia). Although united by the Spanish language, immigrants from each of these countries arrive with major differences in class background, education, occupation and social resources (Dávila, 2001). For Dávila, the process of creating the Latino ethnic group reinforces social hierarchies by concealing the fact that some Spanish-speakers are more easily victims of racism than others. Assuming the cultural equality of all "Latinos" conceals the fact that Puerto Ricans and Mexicans have a history of direct colonization by the United States, which has caused them to be treated as vanquished (and alien) races. Hence, the idea of a unified Latino ethnic group ignores the fact that some (Mexicans, Puerto Ricans) have been targets of racism far more often than others (white Cubans, Argentines).

Mexicans have been heavily discriminated against because they are socially labeled as "deportable labor" rather than as *potential citizens* (De Genova, 2005). Discrimination against Mexicans has deep historical roots going back to the conclusion of the Mexican-American War in 1848. The war enabled the U.S. to consolidate its previous annexation of Texas, and to acquire territories that later became the states of California, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Wyoming and Utah. The Mexicans residing in these lands now found themselves forced to flee or to live in the United States. For this reason, the pro-immigrant movement in the U.S. uses the motto, "I didn't cross the border, the border crossed me." The motto reminds us that Mexicans have lived in the lands now part of the United States for a longer time than the U.S. itself has existed.

The belief that Mexicans are members of an inferior and alien culture was used as justification for the conquest and annexation of Mexican

territories. However, in the early 20th century, Mexicans freely crossed the border into the United States to seek work in agriculture, mining and industry, and there was no effort to regulate their entry (Ngai, 2003). In 1921 and in 1924, Congress imposed restrictions on immigration, but Mexico was not included in the restrictions; however, in 1929, unauthorized entry into the United States was made a crime (Ngai, 2003). In 1930, the United States began a campaign of deportations to deport Mexicans and “repatriate” them to Mexico, but the campaign did not distinguish between illegal immigrants and those who were U.S. citizens (Koch, 2006). As many as 400,000 persons were displaced to Mexico; many fled voluntarily when armed government agents entered their houses to intimidate them (Hecht, 2005; Koch, 2006). Many of those deported were legal residents or even U.S. citizens, some of whom could not speak Spanish (Hecht, 2005). The purpose of the deportations was to respond to the Great Depression of the 1930s by reserving jobs exclusively for “white” Americans.

If Mexicans were rejected by the United States during the 1930s, they were welcomed in the 1940s through the Bracero Program. However, the increasing numbers of men working illegally in agriculture led to a backlash in the United States. Newspapers reports riled the public by portraying illegal immigrants as responsible for a wave of criminal activities (Koestler, 2001). The result was Operation Wetback 1954, which resulted in the arrest and deportation of 80,000 Mexicans; an additional 500,000 were said to have fled back to Mexico voluntarily (Koestler, 2001).

The expanded efforts to find and deport undocumented Mexican workers produced a social climate hostile to American citizens of Mexican ancestry. Border patrol agents were empowered to apprehend

and question any person who appeared to be Mexican, until citizenship could be established. U.S. citizen Latinos were lumped together with non-citizens through the use of racial language. The English word "wetback" has extremely derogatory and racist connotations in English, referring to the crossing of the Rio Grande river by undocumented immigrants. At the time of Operation Wetback, any American citizen of Latino background might be called a "wetback" to insult his ancestors and to denigrate his claim to be an American. With this pressure of intensified racism, Mexican-American citizens in the U.S. tended to emphasize their successful acquisition of American culture and English language. For example, children were often punished at school or at home if they spoke Spanish (Campo-Flores, 2000). With great pride in their successful Americanization, some Mexican-Americans now feel angered and disgusted by recent immigrants from Mexico, who do not learn English nor adopt American values (Campo-Flores, 2000). This cultural divide separating U.S. Latinos and recent Latin American immigrants raises a serious question: can any political or social movement express a common interest uniting U.S. Latinos with Latin American immigrants?

The Assimilation Concept and American Nationalism

Samuel Huntington (2004), a respected political theorist, has argued that Latino immigrants do not assimilate to American culture or values, and they threaten the survival of America's true culture, which is derived from the Anglo-British tradition. Other authors sounding an alarm against the Latino immigrant are Michelle Malkin (2004), Victor Davis Hanson (2004), and Patrick Buchanan (2002). The immigrant's

capacity of “assimilation,” the immigrant’s acquisition of American social and linguistic norms, is a central and defining concept of American nationalism (Chock, 1998).

Assimilation is the most politicized notion in immigration policy, as it has been used to determine who can be permitted to attain legal status (De Genova, 2005). Immigration regulations differentiate “between deserving and undeserving immigrants” (Ngai, 2003). The story of immigrant assimilation is one of American triumph, by which the foreign immigrant is transformed into a virtuous American who “makes good” through toil and thrift (De Genova, 2005: 85). For Americans, this symbolizes the ability of the United States to subjugate foreignness and therefore to subjugate all other nations (De Genova, 2005: 86). Reviewing the history of American research on immigration, De Genova shows that researchers assumed the process of assimilation to be a natural and normal result of migration.

Initially, the preoccupation of researchers and policy makers was to determine whether Mexican workers were settlers who would remain in the U.S., or sojourners who would return to Mexico after working in the U.S. Mexican migrants were assumed to be men who left their wives and children in Mexico, so they were not initially viewed as a threat, or at least as an easily deported threat (De Genova, 2005). However, by the 1970s, there was widespread fear that Mexican women were entering the U.S. illegally in order to bear children who could claim U.S. citizenship; furthermore, it was feared that these women or their citizen offspring would claim U.S. welfare entitlements (Chock, 1998:147). Hence, women and children came to represent social disorder, or a decomposition of society as social resources are absorbed by the undeserving (Chock, 1998:147). In the popular news media,

illegal immigrants are assumed to be incapable of assimilation, because they violate the laws of the U.S. when they enter its borders illegally.

In a stance that is critical of the assimilation paradigm, cultural anthropologists have advanced a theory of "transnationalism," which proposes that immigrant communities do not necessarily assimilate to the host culture. Instead of the "immigrant," anthropologists described a "transmigrant," who "lives in two or more nation-states," but remains committed to the country of origin (Schiller, 2001:4). Schiller (2001:3) argued that transmigrants construct "social fields" across borders, through economic remittances and business activities, family relationships, friendships, religious activity, and not least of all, political activism. Even though Schiller (2001:5), in her original formulation argued that "transmigrants, with all their home ties, do become a part of U.S. society," the emphasis is on the maintaining of commitments to the home culture.

Meanwhile, sociologists continue to assert that assimilation is an empirical reality, particularly for the children of immigrants who face strong pressures to assimilate (Alba and Nee, 2004). Currently, scholars continue to study transnational social fields while also taking account of the immigrant's encounter with the American system of racial stratification (De Genova, 2005; Smith, 2005). One such approach, "segmented assimilation" takes account of the fact that the children of immigrants face social barriers which may deter their full acquisition of U.S. culture (Portes, 2007). Although fully American, the children may be excluded from mainstream American society and can be more likely to join stigmatized subcultures, such as street gangs (Portes, 2007).

Nevertheless, although U.S. scholars have tried to move beyond simplistic notions of assimilation, the American public has continued to

use assimilation as the key concept for classifying immigrants as “deserving” of legal residency or else “undeserving.” The classification creates a tautology, because a foreigner who enters the United States illegally begins a new existence by violating U.S. laws—she or he is therefore most likely to continue breaking laws and will therefore cause harm to American citizens (Ngai, 2003). Historian Mae M. Ngai was writing of the early 1920s, but as of 2007, the same argument currently permeates the news media in the United States and is now used to justify new legislative and juridical measures to locate and punish illegal immigrants. For example, when MSNBC News reported on the Tulsa, Oklahoma city council’s resolution to permit municipal police to check immigration status of Latinos, a political science professor from Tulsa was quoted as saying, “I’m very concerned that this last wave (of immigrants) has no interest in Americanizing” (Huus, 2007). The professor argued:

I think that when someone comes in this country illegally, it starts a tradition or culture . . . You come in illegally; everything you do from that point on is illegal. And so it's almost impossible to get a driver's license or insurance so you just start breaking one law after another. I think it's seductive. I think after a while . . . you don't pay too much attention to rule of law that this country was established on (Huus, 2007).

Currently, anti-immigrant measures are gathering political steam in the United States. While the Minuteman Militia has made headlines by attacking immigrants as they cross the border illegally (Kelly, 2005), laws are being passed by state legislatures, town and city councils to prohibit undocumented immigrants from renting a house, using health

care facilities, or enrolling children in schools (Fears, 2007; Rubinkam, 2007). Federal enforcement agencies are increasing funding to beef up border security, as well as instituting a crackdown on employers who hire illegal immigrants (Hopfensperger, 2007). A giant wall is now being erected on the U.S./Mexico border, which critics allege is equivalent to the Berlin Wall during the Cold War (Gray, 2006). In addition, raids are now routinely conducted throughout the United States, to deport undocumented immigrants even when this separates family members; often parents and children have differing citizenships (Constable, 2007; Gorman, 2007).

Immigrant Rights Protests Against Nativist Nationalism

As the national political climate has become more aggressively anti-immigrant, immigrants are demanding their civil rights. Throughout the U.S., states and towns are proposing resolutions to expand law enforcement measures against undocumented immigrants and to deny government services to them. Most of these laws are patterned after California's Proposition 187, a ballot initiative approved by voters in 1994, but subsequently overturned by a federal court for violating several provisions of the U.S. Constitution (Mailman, 1995). However, the basic idea behind Proposition 187, and many of the recent political initiatives, is that immigrants are coming to the United States only to receive "handouts" in the form of medical, educational and welfare benefits. Especially punitive measures have been adopted by the town councils of Hazleton, Pennsylvania and Manassas, Virginia ("Va. County OKs Immigration Crackdown" 2007).

Although many of the new legal measures are aimed only at

undocumented immigrants, there are indications that U.S. citizen Latinos are also feeling victimized by the anti-immigrant sentiment and discriminatory laws. For example, an ordinance in Hazleton, Pennsylvania was passed in 2006 to punish landlords who rent a home or apartment to an undocumented foreigner, and to revoke the business license of any firm that employed an undocumented foreigner (Freedman, 2007). The ordinance was struck down by a federal judge on July 26, but it reflects the intensity of tension between Latinos and non-Latinos in the town. A Pentecostal church minister, Reverend Edwin Mieses, has directed his Spanish-speaking congregation to provide services and advocacy for immigrants. A U.S. citizen and son of immigrants, Mieses reports that members of his family and his congregation have suffered unwarranted police interrogations and have received unfriendly treatment from local town citizens (Freedman, 2007). Although Pentecostals are usually averse to politics, the Reverend explained his political awakening:

We are involved not so much by choice but because we're forced to be involved . . . We want to keep the lines of church and politics separate, but we are affected by what has caused fear in our people, fear of being persecuted for being Latinos. I'd rather be encouraging people, inspiring people, but we have to make the Gospel relevant to the world (Freedman, 2007).

Although Hispanic Pentecostals have been one of the most politically conservative social groups in opposition to abortion and same-sex marriage, they are now defensively aligning with liberal advocates of immigrant rights (Freedman, 2007).

In contrast, undocumented immigrants who participated in the May 1 protests did not feel that their ethnic affiliation was an important contribution to their grievances. Instead, they saw the issue as the relationship between the individual and the society, or between the individual and the state. One undocumented 48-year-old Mexican man argued, "We serve this society, so it must give us opportunities. We're all citizens of the world, there is nothing called an illegal citizen. No one is illegal before God." (Fulbright, Hoge and Hua, 2007). Another man, who is a legal immigrant explained, "We all come here and support the economy of the United States . . . All we want are the same rights" (Fulbright, Hoge and Hua, 2007). Another demonstrator said, "After working 22 years here, paying taxes and being a good citizen, I think it's fair they give me residency." (Tareen, 2007). Hence, the immigrants argued that they are already *de facto* part of U.S. society and economy, therefore they should be permitted to become members of the polity.

Clearly, the demonstrators' demands were focused on the issue of legalization, also referred to as "amnesty." Currently, amnesty is precisely what is most virulently opposed by the nationalist currents of the U.S. public. Hence, the enemy of the immigrants' rights movement is exclusionist nationalism, and the goal of the movement is clearly legalization of some form. The problem is that there is no clear way in which the demonstrations can directly influence U.S. politicians to attain the goal. The immigrants' rights movement in this formative stage has been effective in mobilizing a diverse group of persons. However, the movement does not seem to provide any clear strategy for achieving the goal of legalization for undocumented immigrants. Furthermore, the mobilizations did not provide a forum for the discussion of what a legalization program would look like. That discussion was limited to the

sessions of the U.S. Congress, where a bipartisan reform bill supported by President Bush was defeated in June of 2007.

Dying to Become Americans: Latinos in the Military

While the May 1 protest movement may fall short of uniting U.S. Latinos and immigrants, this unity may be achieved by the U.S. military. Perhaps the most telling sign of assimilation to American culture would be patriotism. Furthermore, military service in wartime is the expression of American patriotism *par excellence*. Yet, although increasing numbers of Latino immigrants are serving the United States military in Iraq and Afghanistan, their loyalty to the United States is still under suspicion for many American nativists who see them as opportunists. Furthermore, there are indications that the increasing wartime enlistment of Latino immigrants—both legal immigrants and the undocumented—is symptomatic of social barriers preventing their full assimilation into American society. Many immigrants are trying to overcome the barriers through military service but this has certain negative repercussions for the immigrant community.

While military recruitment of African-Americans has been on the decline, the recruitment of Latinos for active service in the U.S. military has increased dramatically, including large numbers of immigrants (Banales, 2007). Immigrants now comprise 5% of the total active duty U.S. military force, so President Bush has expedited the naturalization process by allowing applications for citizenship without the 3-year residency period that used to be required (Lee and Wasem, 2003). Over 32,000 soldiers have become U.S. citizens since the requirement was waived (Carroll, 2007). Furthermore, there is an unofficial policy of

providing legalization for undocumented immigrants who are parents or spouses of soldiers who died while serving in the U.S. military. According to a Homeland Security official, "We recognize that [a death] would be an extenuating circumstance . . . [because] their loved ones gave their lives for our freedom" (Carroll, 2007). The idea behind the policy is that the sacrifice of a family member for U.S. military and political interests is sufficient proof of a family's patriotism or loyalty to the United States.

However, even a fallen soldier's family could be deported from the United States. The father of soldier Armando Soriano, who was killed in Iraq in 2004, will be deported because of a previous arrest and deportation in 1999 (Carroll, 2007). The worried father reflected on his pending deportation, "I worry for my family; they are all here . . . and Armando, he is buried here" (Carroll, 2007). Another father whose son died in Iraq now tours the United States trying to convince immigrant children not to enlist in the military. He tells them, "Immigrants are generally the first on the front lines," and alleges that the military falsely told his son that he would need to serve only a year in exchange for citizenship, a university education and a career in law enforcement (Campbell, 2007). Whatever the reasons why the soldiers enlist, it is certain that some immigrants are dying to become Americans. At the beginning of the Iraq war in 2003, President Bush granted citizenship to two U.S. soldiers, one a Guatemalan and one a Mexican, after their deaths in Iraq (Catholic News Service, 2003).

Overall, Latin American immigrants are trying hard to assimilate to the U.S., but their chances of obtaining education and career opportunities are much less than that of the U.S.-born population. For a young immigrant, military service represents much more than a chance

for employment or social advancement, since it is an opportunity to demonstrate once and for all one's commitment to the United States. For example, the parents of Carlos Gil Orozco immigrated from Colombia to the U.S. to give their son a better education (Fernandez, 2007). However, he did not do well in school, receiving low grades. Nevertheless, he studied vigilantly in preparation for the U.S. Marine Corps entrance examination. His sister described her father's joy when Carlos joined the Marines, because "He'd rather have him be a Marine than out on the streets being in gangs or doing drugs" (Fernandez, 2007). This comment expresses the plight of young Latinos who are not prepared for social success in the United States. Some may look to the military as the only way available to gain a respected position in American society.

The increasing enlistment of immigrants in the U.S. military reflects the social pattern that Portes (2007) refers to as "downward assimilation." Immigrant children are pressured to assimilate to the culture of the U.S., but there are social barriers preventing them from assimilating to the privileged strata of the society. As a result, Portes suggests that immigrant children's assimilation may be only partial, and may involve them in stigmatized subcultures outside of the American mainstream. Reports in the mass media have focused attention on Latino gangs of disaffected youth who become criminals, organizing crime networks throughout the United States and Latin America (Thompson, 2004). Repeated headlines in American newspapers refer to "immigrant gangs," and suggest that immigration laws are too lenient and are helping gangs to escape from police (LeDuff, 2005). It is not surprising that immigrant parents prefer a child to enter the military, to insure that the child does not enter a criminal gang.

Research by the Pew Hispanic Foundation suggests that Latinos as a group have lower educational attainments than other U.S. ethnic/racial groupings, and tend to be “concentrated in jobs with minimal educational and training requirements” (Kochhar, 2005:20-1). Of U.S.-born Latinos, 75% work in this occupational category, while the figure is 80% for foreign-born Latinos (Kochhar, 2005:21). This is a structural situation of the ethnic grouping in the society which makes military service attractive to both foreign and native-born Latinos. However, the motivations for military service are much more than economic, since the decision is also based on emotional loyalties to a nation. A father of a fallen soldier, Jorge Rincón explained, “When my son went to the recruiter to join the Army, I went with him . . . We came here for the American dream, and we found it” (Alvord, 2003). His son, Private First Class Diego Rincón was granted citizenship two days before burial (Alvord, 2003).

Nevertheless, for U.S. extreme nativists, the non-citizen soldier is an economic opportunist and is no more patriotic than a gang member. For example, James Fulford writes that in Texas, U.S. National Guard units are “ninety percent Hispanic soldiers, many of whom were a hundred percent disloyal to the United States” (Fulford, 2001). Writing in the *National Review*, Mark Krikorian complains that “with a little mischief from Congress or the White House, things could get really out of hand . . . [already] illegal aliens are flocking to recruiting offices, figuring the president's waiver-of-residency requirements for non-citizens on active duty was just another element in the administration's campaign for an illegal-alien amnesty” (Krikorian, 2003). Hence, those who see illegal immigration as a violation of American sovereignty believe that allowing non-citizens to serve in the military is a ploy for immigrant

amnesty.

Overall, the increasing frequency of military service among citizen and non-citizen Latinos suggests that both groups are finding this to be the best way to assimilate to American society both structurally and culturally. It appears that the military has provided Latinos a kind of shelter against the discrimination that is common in the wider society. However, entering the military has a price. The price is illustrated by the actions of Carlos Gil Orozco's father, who learning of his son's death tried to hit the Marines who brought the news, then bloodied his own head by smashing it into a wall. If the United States is to be perceived as a just society, it should provide a framework for assimilation that does not require a young person to die in order to gain acceptance.

Conclusions

The purpose of this paper has been to evaluate the extent to which Latino ethnic identification is strengthening the immigrant rights movement. As argued here, the movement is strengthened not by the notion of belonging to an ethnic group, but by the expression of identification with the United States and a desire to belong to the civic culture of the U.S. Identification with the U.S. government and its civic culture is illustrated in two forms: on the one hand, the protests of the immigrants' rights movement, and on the other hand, the high incidence of service in the U.S. armed forces by immigrant and U.S. -born Latinos. Both instances show how persons of Spanish-speaking heritage are likely to support the U.S. government and to identify with its

culture, irrespective of whether they consider themselves to be part of a “Latino” or “Hispanic” ethnic group.

Official discourses of the U.S. census and of the ethnic civil rights organizations portray Latinos/Hispanics as an ethnic group united on the basis of language and cultural origin. However, quotations taken from the May 1 protests for immigrant rights show how participants seem to avoid self-definition as ethnic Latinos. Instead, the demonstrators are claiming identities as workers (class), as taxpayers (subjects of the state) and as citizens (subjects of the state). Hence, their demands for recognition by the U.S. are framed within individualized (rather than collective and ethnic) identifications with the nation-state.

High rates of enlistment in the U.S. military suggest an even deeper identification as subjects of the U.S. polity, among young immigrants who grow up in the U.S. and among those American Spanish-speakers born to immigrant parents. The heavy prevalence of military service could also be indicative of a common class position uniting many of the U.S.-born Latinos and those who are foreign-born. Voluntary military service indicates a special kind of commitment to the nation-state; hence, it is likely that the disproportionate number of Spanish-speaking volunteers expresses a desire to be accepted in American society by a group that is often portrayed as marginal or hopeless in relation to the U.S. mainstream. The commitment to the U.S.A. expressed by military service can be seen as one avenue toward mainstream Americanness sought by a group shut out from other routes of acceptance.

What the protesters of May 1 have in common with the green-card soldiers is they adapt to American society by entering an individualized relationship with the nation-state, expressed as personal feelings of loyalty to the U.S. Discursively they imagine themselves as individual

citizens and not as an ethnic collective. Hence, both the immigrant protesters and the green-card soldiers reflect the social practices of immigrants in America, forging individualized relationships with the state to create American identities.

References

- Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Alvord, Valerie. 2003. "Non-citizens Fight and Die for Adopted Country." *USA Today*, May 8. Retrieved on July 3, 2007 (http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-04-08-noncitizen-usat_x.htm).
- Archibold, Randal C. 2006. "Strategy Sessions Fueled Immigrant Marches." *New York Times*, April 12. Retrieved April 1, 2008. (http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/12/us/12immig.html?_r=1&scp=19&sq=sensenbrenner&st=nyt&oref=slogin).
- "Va. County OKs Immigration Crackdown." 2007. *Associated Press*, October 17. Retrieved November 25, 2007 (<http://www.foxnews.com/wires/2007Oct17/0,4670,IllegalImmigration,00.html>).
- Banales, Jorge A. 2007. "Mas Hispanos y Menos Negros al Ejercito." *EFE*, September 17. Retrieved September 9, 2007 (<http://www.univision.com/content/content.jhtml; jsessionid=TQVRKYF3L3K5SCWIAAPCFFQKZAADYIWC?cid=1290015>).
- Benford, Robert D. 2002. "Controlling Narratives and Narratives as Control within Social Movements." Pp. 53-75 in *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*, edited by Joseph E. Davis. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bohrer, Becky. 2007. "GiulianiLinks Terror, Border Security." *Associated Press*, June 30. Retrieved on July 1, 2007 (http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070701/ap_on_el_pr/giuliani_terror_4).
- Buchanan, Patrick J. 2002. *The Death of the West: How Dying*

- Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- Campbell, Monica. 2005. "Dead Recruit's Father Wages Campaign Against 'Green Card Marines.'" *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 22. Retrieved July 3, 2007 (<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2005/05/22/MNGQ2CSURU1.DTL>).
- Campo-Flores, Arian. 2000. "Brown Against Brown." *Newsweek*, September 18. Pp. 49-51.
- Carroll, Susan. 2007. "Father of Fallen Soldier Now Battling Deportation." *Houston Chronicle*, August 6. Retrieved August 6 (<http://www.chron.com/dispatch/story.mpl/front/5029303.html>).
- Castells, Manuel. 1997. *The Power of Identity*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Catholic News Service. 2003. "Cardinal Mahony Asks Bush to Offer Citizenship to All in Military." *Denver Catholic Register*, April 16. Retrieved on July 3, 2007 (<http://www.archden.org/dcr/news.php?e=20&s=1&a=403>).
- Chock, Phyllis Pease. 1998. "Porous Borders: Discourses of Difference in Congressional Hearings on Immigration." pp. 143-162 in *Democracy and Ethnography: Constructing Identities in Multicultural Liberal States*, edited by Carol J. Greenhouse and Roshanak Kheshti. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Constable, Pamela. 2007. "Deportees' Bittersweet Homecoming." *The Washington Post*, June 27. Retrieved June 27, 2007 (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/26/AR2007062602131_pf.html).
- Dávila, Arlene. 2001. *Latinos, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of a*

- People*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2005. *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fears, Darryl. 2007. "Illegal Immigrants Targeted by States." *The Washington Post*, June 25. Retrieved June 26, 2007 (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/06/24/AR2007062401662.html>).
- Fernandez, Lisa. 2007. "San Jose Marine Killed in Tank Blast." *San Jose Mercury News*, September 13. Retrieved October 5, 2007 (http://www.mercurynews.com/ci_6879872?nclick_check=1).
- Flanagan, Jason. 2008. "Immigration Debate Focuses on \$2M in Tax Money Going to Aid Group." *Baltimore Examiner*, March 31. Retrieved April 7, 2008 (http://www.examiner.com/a1311102~Immigration_debate_focuses_on__2M_in_tax_money_going_to_aid_group.html).
- Flores, William V. and Rina Benmayor. 1997. "Constructing Cultural Citizenship." Pp. 1-23 in *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space and Rights*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Freedman, Samuel G. 2007. Church Expands Its Mission to Immigration Advocacy. *New York Times*, September 8. Retrieved September 11, 2007 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/08/us/08religion.html?n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/Subjects/I/Immigration%20and%20Refugees>).
- Fulbright, Leslie, Patrick Hoge and Vanessa Hua. 2007. "Hundreds Rally in Oakland, SF for Immigration Rights." *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 1. Retrieved May 2, 2007 (<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/05/01/BAG7QPIR715.DTL>).

- Fulford, James. 2001. "Abolishing America (continued): Foreign Legions?" *VDARE*, August 15. Retrieved August 14, 2007 (http://www.vdare.com/fulford/foreign_legions.htm).
- Gee, James Paul. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Gibson, Campbell and Kay Jung. 2002. *Historical Census Statistics on Population Totals By Race, 1790 to 1990, and by Hispanic Origin, 1970 to 1990, For The United States, Regions, Divisions, and States*. Working Paper Series No. 56, U.S. Census Bureau-Population Division. Retrieved September 14, 2007 (<http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0056.html>).
- Gorman, Anna. 2007. A Family's Painful Split Decision. *Los Angeles Times*, April 27. Retrieved May 1, 2007 (<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/columnone/la-me-kids27apr27,1,5191462.story>).
- Gray, Kevin. 2006. Latin Leaders Set to Condemn U.S. Border Fence. *Reuters*, November 4. Retrieved November 4, 2006 (http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20061103/us_nm/latam_summit_immigration_dc).
- Hanson, Victor Davis. 2004. *Mexifornia: A State of Becoming*. Lanham, MD: Encounter Books.
- Heaney, Michael T. and Fabio Rojas. 2006. "The Place of Framing: Multiple Audiences and Antiwar Protests Near Fort Bragg." *Qualitative Sociology* 29:485-505.
- Hecht, Peter. 2005. "Mass Eviction To Mexico In 1930s Spurs Apology." *The Sacramento Bee*, December 28. Retrieved September 21, 2007 (<http://dwb.sacbee.com/content/politics/story/14021428p-14853951c.html>).
- Hopfensperger, Jean. 2007. "Countdown Begins on Illegal Immigrant

- Crackdown.” *Minneapolis-St. Paul Star Tribune*, August 10, 2007. Retrieved September 13, 2007 (<http://www.startribune.com/462/story/1356612.html>).
- Huntington, Samuel. 2004. *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hunt, Scott A., Robert D. Benford and David A. Snow. 1994. “Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities.” Pp. 185-208 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Huus, Kari. 2007. “Turmoil In Tulsa: The Illegal Immigration Wreck.” *MSNBC*, July 17. Retrieved September 16, 2007 (<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/19466978/>).
- Kelly, David. 2005. “Citizen Border Patrols Hurry Up . . . and Wait.” *Los Angeles Times*, April 3. Retrieved April 5, 2005 (<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-border3apr03,1,5862916.story?coll=la-headlines-nation>).
- Koestler, Fred L. 2001. “Operation Wetback.” Retrieved September 9, 2007 (<http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/OO/pqo1.html>).
- Koch, Wendy. 2006. “U.S. Urged to Apologize for 1930s Deportations.” *USA Today*, April 5. Retrieved September 23, 2007 (http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2006-04-04-1930s-deportees-cover_x.htm).
- Kochhar, Rakesh. 2005. “Latino Labor Report, 2004: More Jobs for Immigrants but at Lower Wages.” *Pew Hispanic Center Report*, May 2. Retrieved November 1, 2007 (<http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=45>).

- Krikorian, Marc. 2003. "Green-Card Soldiers: Should the U.S. Military be Reserved for Americans?" *The National Review*, April 22. Retrieved July 5, 2007 (http://www.nationalreview.com/nr_comment/nr_comment042203.asp).
- Laclau, Ernesto. 2005. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.
- LeBlanc, Steve. 2007. "States Step Into Void on Immigration Law." *Associated Press*, August 6. Retrieved August 6, 2007 (http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070806/ap_on_re_us/immigration_legislatures).
- LeDuff, Charlie. 2005. "Police Say Immigrant Policy Is Hindrance." *New York Times*, April 7. Retrieved October 5, 2007 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/07/national/07crime.html?adxnml=1&adxnmlx=1191528090-YJ3mpFZ9AmsbrDrLyioUpQ>).
- Lee, Margaret Mikyung and Ruth Ellen Wasem. 2003. "Expedited Citizenship Through Military Service: Policy and Issues." *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress*, September 30. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- Madrid, Miriam E. 2007. "Marcha Pro-Inmigrante Realizada en Denver." *La Voz de Colorado*, May 4. Retrieved July 14, 2007 (<http://www.lavozcolorado.com/news.php?nid=1609>).
- Mailman, Stanley. 1995. "Proposition 187 and Its Lessons." *New York Law Journal*, January 3. Retrieved October 25, 2007 (<http://ssbb.com/article1.html>).
- Malkin, Michelle. 2004. *Invasion: How America Still Welcomes Terrorists, Criminals and Other Foreign Menaces to Our Shores*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.
- "Man Facing Jail After E-mail Threat Over O'Malley's Immigration Policy." 2008. *Baltimore Examiner*, March 31. Retrieved April 7,

- 2008 (http://www.examiner.com/a-1311104~Man_facing_jail_after_e_mail_threat_over_O_Malley_s_immigration_policy.html).
- Morris, Aldon D. 1984 *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: The Free Press.
- NCLR [National Council of La Raza]. 2007. Detailed History. Retrieved September 9, 2007 (<http://www.nclr.org/section/about/history/>).
- Ngai, Mae M. 2003. "The Strange Career of the Illegal Alien: Immigration Restriction and Deportation Policy in the United States, 1921-1965." *Law and History Review*, Spring. Retrieved September 18, 2007 (<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/lhr/21.1/ngai.html>).
- Oberman, Mira. 2007. "More than 200,000 Rally in US May Day Immigration Marches." *Agence France Presse*, May 2. Retrieved May 2 (http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20070502/ts_afp/usimmigrationprotest_070502065658;_ylt=AmfW8uvEhKx0VJzGdi_7e.oXIr0F).
- Orozco, Cynthia E. 2001. "League of United Latin American Citizens." Retrieved September 9, 2007 (<http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/LL/wel1.html>).
- Polletta, Francesca. 1998. "Contending Stories: Narrative in Social Movements." *Qualitative Sociology* 21: 419-446.
- Portes, Alejandro. 2007. "Migration, Development and Segmented Assimilation: A Conceptual Review of the Evidence." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 610: 73-97.
- Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Pycior, Julie Leininger. 2001. "Mexican-American Organizations." Retrieved September 9, 2007. (<http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/MM/vzmvj.html>).
- Olemacher, Stephen. 2007. "Number of Illegal Immigrants Hits 12M." *Associated Press*, March 7. Retrieved May 13, 2007 (http://www.breitbart.com/print.php?id=D8G6U2KO8&show_article=1).
- Rodriguez, Richard. 1997. "A Cultural Identity." *The News Hour with Jim Lehrer*, June 18. Retrieved on September 15, 2007 (http://www.pbs.org/newshour/essays/june97/rodriguez_6-18.html).
- Rubinkam, Michael. 2007. "Pennsylvania Town's Tough Immigration Law Struck Down." *Associated Press*, July 26. Retrieved August 5, 2007 (<http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/special/immigration/5002202.html>).
- Schiller, Nina Glick. 2001. *Georges Woke Up Laughing: Long Distance Nationalism and the Search for Home*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Smith, Roger. 2005. *Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Somers, Margaret R. 1997. "Deconstructing and Reconstructing Class Formation Theory." Pp. 73-106 in *Reworking Class*, edited by John R. Hall. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Tareen, Sophia. 2007. "Immigration Rally Turnout Lower Than '06'." *Associated Press*, May 2. Retrieved May 2, 2007 (http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070502/ap_on_re_us/immigration_protests).
- Thompson, Ginger. 2004. "Tatoed Warriors Shuttling Between Nations, Latino Gangs Confound the Law." *New York Times*, September 26. Retrieved July 19, 2007 (<http://www.nytimes.com/>

2004/09/26/international/americas/26honduras.html).

Whitcomb, Dan and Steve Gordon. 2007. "Immigrant-Rights Protesters Take to the Streets." *Reuters*, May 2. Retrieved May 2, 2007 (http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20070502/us_nm/usa_immigration_dc_8;_ylt=AsldL4nToqueuiLYWyvbwEpBH2ocA).

- 투고일자 : 2007.11.26.
- 심사(수정)일자 : 2008.4.7.
- 게재확정일자 : 2008.4.16.

【Abstract】

Latino Ethnicity and Other Influences on the Immigrants' Rights Movement in the United States

Bradley Tatar
(KAIST)

This paper describes the social movement for immigrants' rights, which organized massive street demonstrations on May 1 of 2006 and 2007. The protest movement, which demands the rights of undocumented migrants in the United States, could be portrayed as an ethnic movement for the civil rights of Latinos. However, quotations taken from the protestors show that on the day of the protest they did not see themselves as demanding freedom from discrimination as members of an ethnic or racial group. Rather, they argued that as persons living in the territory governed by the U.S. government, they submit to its laws and proclaim their loyalty to the U.S. polity, and hence feel it is their right to remain in the U.S.

The widespread opposition to political proposals for the legalization of "illegal immigrants" is based on the popular notion that they cannot or will not assimilate to American social and cultural norms. However, this nativist nationalist discourse is shown to be false by the case of the so-called "green card soldiers." The non-citizen soldiers who serve in the U.S. military illustrate non-citizens' deep affirmation of commitment and loyalty to the U.S. polity. Like the May 1 protestors, the immigrants in the military seek to affirm their commitment to the U.S.A., in spite of their cultural and class differences that bar their entry into the American mainstream.

Key Words

patriotism, nationalism, Latino, Hispanic, immigration, illegal alien, protest movement