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Prevailing Paradigms Circa 1990

• Neoclassical Economics
  – Macro: Ranis & Fei: Matching Labor Supply and Demand
  – Micro: Todaro: Theory of Income Maximization

• New Economics of Labor Migration
  – Household strategies to manage risk, overcome market failures, and reduce relative deprivation

• Segmented Labor Market Theory
  – Piore: Dual Labor Market Theory
  – Portes: Enclave Theory

• World Systems Theory
  – Dependency Theory
  – Globalization and Global Cities

• Social Capital Theory
  – Networks
  – Organizations
  – Cumulative Causation
International Migration at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: The Role of the State
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Foundations of Immigration Policy in Receiving Societies

• Macroeconomic Conditions
  – Recessionary Periods $\rightarrow$ Restriction
  – Boom Periods $\rightarrow$ Openness
  – Key role of inequality

• Scale and Nature of Immigration
  – Large inflows of culturally distant immigrants trigger restriction

• Ideology
  – Neoliberalism and free trade promote openness
  – Populism and nationalism promote restriction

• State Capacity
  – Strength of bureaucracy
  – Demand for entry
  – Strength of protections for human rights
  – Independence of judiciary
  – Tradition of immigration
Latin American Migration to the United States 1965-2010

• Critical determinant of the volume, pattern, and distribution of post-1965 immigration has been state policy, not social or economic fundamentals
  – Typically implemented with no real understanding of the underlying dynamics of immigration
  – Often for reasons having little to do with immigration itself
  – Almost always with unexpected and counterproductive consequences
First Fateful Decision: Reform of Immigration System During Civil Rights Era

• U.S. Policy Shifts in 1965
  – Amendments to Immigration and Nationality Act
  – Unilateral Termination of the Bracero Program

• Had Little Effect on Number of Immigrants from Mexico
  – Migration Continued Under Other Auspices
  – Change in Composition of Migration
  – Shift from Legal to Unauthorized Migration
Second Fateful Decision: Cold War Intervention in Central America

• U.S. Military Intervention in Central America During the 1980s
  – Surge of Refugees from El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Honduras
    • Nicaraguans Allowed Granted Temporary Protected Status and Allowed to Become Legal Permanent Residents under NACARA
    • Salvadorans, Hondurans, and Guatemalans forced to Enter as Undocumented Migrants
      – Few Given Temporary Status
      – Even Fewer Allowed to Adjust to LPR
Figure 1. Trends in civil violence in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua

Proquest Historical Newspaper Search on "war," "killing," "death" & name of country
Figure 2. Probability of taking a first undocumented trip to the United States from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua
Composition of Undocumented Population of US in 2008

Mexico: 62%
Central America: 14%
Other: 24%
Rise of Undocumented Migration Creates New Political Dynamic

• Enabled New Framing of Latino Immigration and Immigrants
  – Immigration as Crisis
    • Favored Metaphors: Flood and Invasion
  – Immigrants as Threat
    • Illegals
    • Subversives
    • Criminals
    • Terrorists
    • Invaders
    • Occupiers
    • Terrorists
Rise of Latino Threat Narrative

Distribution of Alarmist Covers by Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Text Used on Magazine Covers Reveals Two Framing Metaphors

• Marine
  – depicting immigration as a “tidal wave” that was “flooding” the United States and threatening to “inundate” its culture

• Martial
  – Border portrayed as “battleground” “under attack” from “alien invaders”
  – Border Patrol Officers were “outgunned” “defenders” trying to “hold the line” against attacking “hoards”
  – Aliens were a “time bomb” waiting to “explode” and destroy American culture and values.

• Over time a Gradual Shift from Marine to Martial Metaphors
Figure 4. Feedback loop between apprehensions and border enforcement 1965-1995

Direct Effect of Entries on Percent Conservative Via Apprehensions: 0.848
Indirect Effect Through Enforcement Feedbacks: 0.691
Probability of taking a first undocumented trip predicted from trends in violence and violence plus rise in access to social capital.
• Ronald Reagan (1985)
  – “Terrorists and subversives are just two days driving time from [the border
crossing at] Harlingen, Texas”
  – Communist agents will “feed on the anger and frustration of recent
Central and South American immigrants who will not realize their own
version of the American dream”

• Samuel P. Huntington (2004)
  – “Unlike past immigrant groups, Mexicans and other Latinos have not
assimilated into mainstream U.S. culture, forming instead their own
political and linguistic enclaves—from Los Angeles to Miami—and rejecting
the Anglo-Protestant values that built the American dream.”
  – “The United States ignores this challenge at its peril.”

• Lou Dobbs (2006)
  – “invasion of illegal aliens” part of a “war on the middle class.”

• Patrick Buchanan (2006)
  – Illegal immigration part of “Aztlan Plot” hatched by Mexicans
seeking to recapture lost lands
  – “If we do not get control of our borders and stop this greatest
invasion in history, I see the dissolution of the U.S. and the loss
of the American southwest—culturally and linguistically, if not
politically—to Mexico.” (Time, August 28, 2006, p. 6)
• Texas Governor Rick Perry
  – It’s a “very real possibility” that individuals with the extremist group ISIS may have crossed into the United States at the southern border.
  – “Individuals from ISIS or other terrorist states could be taking advantage of the situation. I think it's a very real possibility that they may have already used [the border for entry].”

• Rep. Jeff Duncan (R) of South Carolina
  – “Wake up, America,” Mr. Duncan said before storming out of the hearing. “With a porous southern border we have no idea who’s in our country.”
The Border as a Political Symbol

• In theory: Renato Rosaldo (1997):
  – “The U.S.-Mexico border has become theater, and border theater has become social violence. Actual violence has become inseparable from symbolic ritual on the border—crossings, invasions, lines of defense, high-tech surveillance, and more.”

• In practice: Reo. Beto O’Rourke (D) of Texas
  – “There’s a longstanding history in this country of projecting whatever fears we have onto the border. In the absence of understanding the border, they insert their fears. Before it was Iran and Al Qaeda. Now it’s ISIS. They just reach the conclusion that invasion is imminent, and it never is.”
Figure 7. Feedback loop between deportations and internal enforcement 1965-2009

Effect of 1993 Terrorist Attack
On Deportations: 0.236
On Cons. Reaction: 0.063

Effect of 2001 Terrorist Attack
On Deportations: 0.615
On Cons. Reaction: 0.159
Restrictive immigration legislation enacted by Congress toward Latin Americans 1965-2010.

1965 Hart-Cellar Act
- Imposed first-ever annual cap of 120,000 visas for immigrants from western hemisphere

1976 Amendments to Immigration and Nationality Act
- Put western hemisphere under preference system and country quotas

1978 Amendments to Immigration and Nationality Act
- Combined separate hemispheric caps into single worldwide ceiling of 290,000

1980 Refugee Act
- Abolished refugee preference and reduced worldwide ceiling to 270,000

1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act
- Criminalized undocumented hiring and authorized expansion of Border Patrol

1980 Refugee Act
- Abolished refugee preference and reduced worldwide ceiling to 270,000

1990 Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act
- Sought to cap visas going to spouse and children of resident aliens

1996 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act
- Authorized expedited removal of aliens and deportation of aggravated felons

1996 Illegal Immigrant Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act
- Increased resources for border enforcement, narrowed criteria for asylum, and increased income threshold required to sponsor immigrants

1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act
- Declared documented and undocumented migrants ineligible for certain entitlements

1997 Nicaraguan and Central American Relief Act
- Allowed registered asylum seekers from Central America (mostly Nicaraguans) in the US for at least 5 years since December 1, 1995 to obtain legal status; but prohibited legalization and order deportation for those who lacked a valid visa or who previously violated US immigration laws (mostly Hondurans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans)

2001 USA Patriot Act
- Created Department of Homeland Security, increased funding for surveillance and deportation of foreigners; authorized deportation of aliens without due process

2004 National Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Protection Act
- Funded new equipment, aircraft, border patrol agents, immigration investigators, and detention centers for border enforcement

2005 Real ID Act
- Dramatically increased the data requirements, documentation, and verification procedures for state issuance of drivers licenses

2006 Secure Fence Act
- Authorized construction of additional fencing, vehicle barriers, checkpoints, lighting and funding for new cameras, satellites, and unmanned drones for border enforcement

2010 Border Security Act
- Funded hiring 3,000 more Border Patrol agents and increased BP budget by $244 million
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operation Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td><strong>Operation Blockade</strong></td>
<td>Border Patrol’s (BP) militarization of the El Paso Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td><strong>Operation Gatekeeper</strong></td>
<td>BP’s militarization of the San Diego Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td><strong>Operation Rio Grande</strong></td>
<td>BP program to restrict the movement of migrants across the Texas and New Mexico border with Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><strong>Operation Safeguard</strong></td>
<td>BP’s militarization of the Tucson Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><strong>Operation Endgame</strong></td>
<td>Plan launched by Immigration and Customs Enforcement to detain and deport all removable aliens and &quot;suspected terrorists&quot; living in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><strong>Operation Frontline</strong></td>
<td>Program launched by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to address “vulnerabilities in immigration and trade” by focusing on immigration violators with an “enhanced public safety or national security threat”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><strong>Arizona Border Control Initiative</strong></td>
<td>Multi-agency effort supporting Homeland Security’s anti-terrorism mission through the detection, arrest and deterrence of all those engaged in cross-border illicit activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><strong>Operation Stonegarden</strong></td>
<td>Federal grant program administered through the State Homeland Security Grant Program to provide funding to state and local agencies to improve immigration enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td><strong>Secure Borders Initiative</strong></td>
<td>Comprehensive multi-year plan launched by ICE to secure America’s borders and reduce illegal migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td><strong>Operation Streamline</strong></td>
<td>Program mandating criminal charges for illegal migrants, even first time offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td><strong>Operation Return to Sender</strong></td>
<td>Sweep of illegal immigrants by the ICE to detain those deemed most dangerous, including convicted felons, gang members, and repeat illegal migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td><strong>Operation Jump Start</strong></td>
<td>Program authorizing the deployment of United States National Guard troops along the United States–Mexico border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td><strong>Secure Communities Program</strong></td>
<td>ICE program to identify and deport criminal aliens arrested state and local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td><strong>Operation Rapid REPAT</strong></td>
<td>Program Remove Eligible Parolees Accepted for Transfer by allowing selected criminal aliens incarcerated in U.S. prisons and jails to accept early release in exchange for voluntarily deportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>Operation Scheduled Departure</strong></td>
<td>ICE operation to facilitate the voluntary deportation of 457,000 eligible illegal migrants from selected cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td><strong>Operation Copper Cactus</strong></td>
<td>Deployment of Arizona National Guard troops to assist Border Patrol in apprehension of illegal migrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Militarization of the Border 1986-2010

Figure 1. Border Patrol budget in millions of 2013 dollars
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• Effects of militarization on \textit{border outcomes} 
  – Transformed the geography of border crossing 
  – Increased use of coyotes (border smugglers) 
  – Increased cost of using coyotes 
  – No effect on probability of border apprehension 
  – Increased risk of death during border crossing 

• Effects of militarization on \textit{migrant behavior} 
  – No effect on likelihood of first undocumented trip 
  – Decreased likelihood of return from first trip 
  – Decreased likelihood of additional undocumented trip 
  – Decreased likelihood of returning from additional trip
What's the MMP?

The Mexican Migration Project (MMP) was created in 1982 by an interdisciplinary team of researchers to further our understanding of the complex process of Mexican migration to the United States. The project is a binational research effort co-directed by Jorge Durand, professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Guadalajara (Mexico), and Douglas S. Massey, professor of Sociology and Public Affairs at Princeton University (US).

Since its inception, the MMP’s main focus has been to gather social as well as economic information on Mexican-US migration. The data collected has been compiled in a comprehensive database that is available to the public free of charge for research and educational purposes through this web-site.

The MMP is a unique source of data that enables researchers to track patterns and processes of contemporary Mexican immigration to the United States. The project is a multi-disciplinary research effort that generates public use data on the characteristics and behavior of Mexican migrants.

Aims and Scope of the Project

- To gather and maintain high quality data on the characteristics and behavior of documented and undocumented Mexican migrants to the United States.
- To make the collected data available to the public for research and educational purposes, while maintaining the confidentiality of our respondents.
- To continue to investigate the evolving nature of transnational migration between Mexico and the United States.
### U.S. Context
- Log of Border Patrol Instrument
- Rate of Employment Growth
- Residence / Work Visas (000)
- US Minimum Daily Wage

### Mexican Context
- Crude Birth Rate
- Rate of GDP Growth
- Homicide Rate
- Mexican Minimum Daily Wage

### Demographic Background
- Age
- Age-squared
- Female
- Married
- No. of minors in household

### Human Capital
- Labor force experience
- Education
- Cumulative U.S. experience (months)
- No of previous U.S. trips
- Unskilled job
- Skilled job

### Social Capital
- Parent a U.S. Migrant
- No of U.S. migrant siblings
- Spouse a U.S. migrant
- No. of U.S. migrant children
- No. of U.S. born children
- Prop U.S. Migrants in Community

### Physical Capital
- Land
- Home
- Business

### Region of Origin
- Historical

### Community size
- Small Cities (10,000-99,999)
- Town (2,501-9,999)
- Rural Villages (<=2500)
Figure 2. Observed probability of crossing at a traditional location and probability predicted from Border Patrol budget.
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Figure 3. Observed probability of crossing with a coyote and probability predicted from Border Patrol budget
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Figure 4. Observed trend in coyote costs and costs predicted from Border Patrol budget and place of crossing

Cost in 2013 Dollars
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Figure 5. Observed probabilities of apprehension on first attempt and eventual entry and apprehension probability predicted from trend in Border Patrol budget.
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- Probability of eventual entry
- Predicted from Border Patrol budget
Figure 6. Observed deaths at the border and deaths predicted by trend in Border Patrol budget
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Figure 7. Observed probability of first undocumented migration and probabilities predicted from trends in Border Patrol budget and average age
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Figure 7a. Probability of first undocumented migration predicted from U.S. fundamentals, Mexican fundamentals, and all factors combined.
Mexican Population Pyramids 1990-2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, International Data Base.
Figure 8. Observed probability of return within 12 months of first undocumented trip and probability predicted from Border Patrol budget.
Figure 9. Observed probability of taking an additional undocumented trip and probability predicted from Border Patrol budget.
Figure 10. Observed probability of return from a later undocumented trip and probability predicted from trend in Border Patrol budget.

- Observed
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Consequences of the War on Immigrants

• From 1986-2010 the U.S. spent $34.6 billion in border enforcement and in doing so:
  – Transformed what had been a circular flow of male workers going to three states into a settled population of families living in 50 states
  – Reduced out-migration while leaving in-migration unchanged to double the net rate of undocumented migration and population growth
  – Created a population of 11 million undocumented U.S. residents: 60% of Mexican immigrants and two-thirds of all Central American immigrants
  – All while attempting to end an undocumented flow that would have ended of its own accord after 2000
Mass Illegality Among Latino Immigrants

Percent Undocumented in Selected Immigrant Groups

- Mexico: 56.7%
- Honduras: 63.1%
- Guatemala: 62.6%
- El Salvador: 51.1%
- Ecuador: 40.6%
Lessons Learned

• Immigration policy is often made without any regard to realities of immigration
  – Civil Rights
  – Latino Threat
  – Cold War
  – War on Terror

• Immigration policy can have a powerful effects on patterns and processes of immigration
  – Patterns of Departure and Return
  – Geography of Entry and Settlement

• These effects are often unexpected and unintended
  – Circulation to Settlement
  – Latinization of the US Population
The Future of Migration Theory

• Need to Incorporate State Behavior into Theories of Immigration
• Important Role Played by Demographic Transition
• Limitations of Current Social and Economic Theories
  – Promise of Prospect Theory
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