

EVENTS, REPRESENTATION, AND IMMIGRATION: THE POLITICAL
DISCOURSE OF ARIZONA'S SB1070

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

GEOGRAPHY

MAY 2013

BY

Jay A. Ireland

Thesis Committee:

Advisor:

Reece Jones, Chairperson

Krisna Suryanata

Ehito Kimura

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Understanding and Problematizing SB1070

Chapter 3: The Politics of Representation

Chapter 4: The Role of Fear in Event Based Politics

Chapter 5: Conclusion

References

Appendix A: SB1070 Vote Results in State Senate

Appendix B: SB1070 Vote Results in State House of Representatives

Appendix C: Example Russell Pearce e-mail obtained from ACLU

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

It was the Treaty of Guadalupe that added the final element to Rio Grande society, a border. The river, which had been a focal point, became a dividing line. Men were expected to consider their relatives and closest neighbors, the people just across the river, as foreigners in a foreign land. A restless and acquisitive people, exercising the rights of conquest, disturbed the old ways. (Americo Paredes, 1958, page 58)

On April 23, 2010, Arizona's Governor Jan Brewer signed the Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhood's Act into law. When the bill was introduced into the Arizona Legislature in January of 2010, it was given the name State Bill 1070 (SB1070) and the debate began. Arizona lawmakers signaled to the rest of the country, and to the federal government, that undocumented immigration was not going to be tolerated in the State of Arizona. According to the bill, it would be a misdemeanor crime to reside in the state without authorization, police officers would be required to check the immigration status of individuals during all lawful stops, and a series of regulations would be in place designed to make day-laboring more difficult. The Hispanic population in Arizona has long been disenfranchised because of their status as a minority but even with that unhappiness, their numbers continue to grow, as does their political importance. With approximately 1.3 million Hispanic residents, 25 percent of Arizona's population according to the 2010 census, in the state at the time of the passage of SB1070, why would Arizona pass a bill that seeks to so aggressively target undocumented immigrants?

The principal author of SB1070 was an Arizona state senator named Russell Pearce, who considered himself a staunch opponent of what he felt was an 'invasion' of

illegal immigration (Pearce, 2010). Pearce's day-to-day experiences in the Maricopa County Sheriff's Department, Department of Motor Vehicles, and in the Arizona legislature affected his political stance in regards to immigration related issues. Pearce's own personal interactions with undocumented immigrants, including an incident when he was critically wounded by suspected gang members in 1977, were cited by Pearce throughout the debate of the bill as the main reasons for his desire to see the bill passed. The need to do something about what Pearce claimed was the 'illegal problem' in Arizona was further intensified when his son, a police officer himself, was also seriously wounded by an undocumented immigrant in 2006.

Also influential to SB1070 was Governor Jan Brewer, who had only been in office for a year when the bill came to her desk for signature. Arizona's previous governor since 2003 was Janet Napolitano, who left her post in Arizona when President Obama asked her to take over as the Secretary of Homeland Security. As Arizona's Secretary of State, Jan Brewer was next in the line of succession to Napolitano and was thrust into the national and international spotlight when SB1070 was passed.

The timing of the move was necessary for the passage of the bill because Napolitano, a registered member of the Democratic party, long declared that as governor, she would veto any bill that eroded the trust between the "local jurisdictions and the communities they served" (Nowicki, April, 3, 2010). In fact, during Napolitano's tenure as governor with a Republican controlled legislature, Napolitano vetoed a record number 180 bills and would have vetoed SB1070 if she was in office (Benson and Pitzl, 2008; Nowicki, 2010). Russell Pearce, in an appearance at the Arizona State Senate, remarked that this type of bill, or at least portions of it, had been sent to Napolitano in the past and

was vetoed 17 different times (Arizona State Senate Records, 20 January, 2010). The fact that Pearce wrote SB1070 in December of 2009, a year after Napolitano's absence, was no coincidence. Brewer, a Republican with little previous documented statements regarding immigration, had no objection to the bill and signed the bill into law with Napolitano gone.

The legislation signaled a sharp division between the United States federal government, that has plenary powers over immigration, and the state of Arizona in regards to the proper handling of the border. The federal government believed that it was doing enough to secure the border with Mexico and those like Pearce and Brewer disagreed. This disagreement, and the eventual Supreme Court battle that the legislation would incur, created a highly publicized debate about the bill's motives and necessity. The battle between the federal and the state powers was set against the backdrop of the first term presidency of Barack Obama. President Obama's status as the first African-American leader of the United States further complicates the notion that opposition to the federal government was nothing more than xenophobia at its core. It is through this debate, and through a review of the bill's historical development, that I can show how the different political actors involved in SB1070 crafted their message and what those discourses meant for the people intended to receive them.

Pearce and Brewer used different narrative styles and physical messages to advance their desire to pass and defend SB1070, but the goal to pass the legislation was the same. Whether the audience was aware of it or not, both politicians created categorical understandings that were meant to simplify the way people understood themselves and their surrounding world. These simplifications were meant to untangle

the multi-faceted manners in which people could see undocumented immigration and see them the way that the politicians wanted. In essence, Brewer and Pearce throughout the debate of SB1070 made claims about the inherent nature of undocumented immigrants, what they were after, and who they were in order to reduce them to sub-human and dangerous individuals that must be stopped at all costs.

With this reductionist viewpoint created, and then reified by events that political actors chose to scare their intended audience into believing those categories were real, residents were forced to self-identify using that newly constructed representation. The fear instilled by invoking events such as the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the stagnant economy of the Great Recession, and the murder of a popular rancher on the border was meant to show: A) just how bad things really were down on the border and B) just how important it was to pass this legislation.

Some people claim that this bill came into fruition because the condition of the border had deteriorated to the point where this kind of move was necessary. The claim here is that the feeling of the entire state of Arizona had already trended toward accepting a bill like SB1070 in June of 2010 and that the political maneuvering by Brewer and Pearce was nothing more than a reflection of that mood. A fact often quoted by Brewer after she signed the bill into law was that according to a Rasmussen Report survey conducted in April of 2010, approximately 70% of Arizonans supported SB1070 (Bodfield, 2010). Issues regarding the accuracy of telephone generated surveys aside, the problem with the assumption that this bill came about as a result of popular desire is that these same people had already been affected by political entrepreneurs. The other point against this line of inquiry is that there were numerous efforts to change Arizona

immigration policy in the twenty years leading up to the development of SB1070 that didn't produce the same legislation. It was through the confluence of different events coupled with the use of self-identification that enabled the narratives from Brewer and Pearce to gain traction.

The framework of critical geopolitics allowed me to show how people know and understand world politics with the usage of SB1070 as a case study. Central to this understanding is the need to show, “the link between geographical specifications of cultural identity, and the invocation of specific geographies of danger” (Dalby, 2008, pg 415). Dalby argues that critical geopolitics remains important today to expose the motives of political actors that use the geographies of danger in order to create policies that run counter to the ideals of a just world. The reason these geographies of danger are so resonant within populations of a state is the efficacy of using images of fear to elicit an immediate response. With the lens turned towards the politicians of SB1070 in this manner, I show that as Dalby and Ó Tuathail both posit, understanding what happened in Arizona in 2010 is an interpretive process of the discourses involved. This type of analysis guides my overarching research question: How does the use of fear affect the politics of representation and self identification?

This thesis seeks to analyze the development of SB1070 and the politics that surrounded the bill. Also, I move to understand why the socially constructed borders in the minds of people on the issue of identification are just as hardened as the US-Mexico divide. By understanding the historical context of SB1070, I will show that the bill is a mix of a political manipulation of understanding and fear mongering. The operational research questions that guide my inquiry are:

1. What narratives were used to justify SB1070 in April of 2010?
 - a. Why were these narratives successful?
 - b. Why were these issues important at the time of the debate? Why was this issue salient both locally and nationally?
 - c. What specific events and images were used to support each actor's narratives?
2. How do each of these narratives seek to transform social praxis?
 - a. What is the importance of race in each of these narratives?
 - b. How does American nationalism play into these narratives?

Throughout the thesis, I argue that SB1070 came into existence and was passed because of Jan Brewer and Russell Pearce's use of reductionist representations of undocumented immigrants. These representations were made more successful and reified by a series of events highlighted throughout the debate of SB1070 to include the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the economic recession in the United States, and the murder of a well-known rancher in the lead-up to the bill's passage. I conclude with a discussion about the implications of politics based on fear and division among people for the purpose of political maneuvering.

Methodology

Born and raised in Phoenix, Arizona, I felt the bill did not align with what was congruent with the experiences of my childhood. Growing up in Phoenix for me revolved around trips to my family's favorite Mexican food restaurants, Cinco de Mayo block parties, Mexican heritage celebrations at school, or countless other interactions with what could be identified as the culture of the Mexican-American. In school, we learned Spanish in various classes all the way until the fifth grade when the curriculum

became more specialized. I remember many different classrooms covered in index cards with the Spanish words for objects all throughout my youth.

All of these interactions led me to believe that I somewhat identified with the Mexican heritage. I understood from a young age that I could not check the block that labeled me as Hispanic on forms, but part of me liked the fact that our proximity to the border meant that our city had a blend of cultures. I was still an American but all that meant was that I identified with both Mexican and American values. It wasn't until I got older that I learned about issues related to immigration and border control policies. Almost overnight, there was both a literal and figurative wall placed between the Mexican and the American.

This positionality centered where I began my research into the development of SB1070. In order to uncover the various narratives used, I employed Norman Fairclough's concept of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to Arizona State archives regarding the debate around the bill, emails from particular politicians, and different sources of speeches/press releases/interviews. In *Language and Power*, Fairclough states that the goal of CDA is to understand, "the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part. This process includes in addition to the text the process of production, of which the text is the product, and the process of interpretation, for which the text is a resource" (Fairclough, 1989, page 24).

According to Wodak, Fairclough believes that language is simultaneously constitutive of who people believe themselves to be or how they live their lives (i.e. their social world) and systems of knowledge (Wodak, 1995). This concept shows how state

actors (i.e. state politicians and other groups) created their narratives, how the people ended up receiving those narratives, and how SB1070 was ultimately passed.

Fairclough offers “critiques of sociolinguistics and the ethnography of communication because of their absence of a social theory that elucidates power relations” (Bloome, Talwalker, 1997, page 105). Those relations of power between the politicians and the potential voters, once identified in my research, gave me the ability to see how certain discourses were created. “Discourses emerge as particular ways of construing (representing, interpreting) particular aspects of the social process that become relatively recurrent and enduring...” (Chouliaraki, Fairclough 2010, Page 1215).

To guard against creating systems that are too rigid to be useful, Fairclough and Chouliaraki posited that CDA “should be less toward tight definitions of context or rigorous methodological protocols and more towards stronger conceptual links between discourse, power, and other ‘moments’ of the social process that emerge as theoretical and empirical problems” (Chouliaraki, Fairclough 2010, Page 1214). While Fairclough will admit that there must be some limited definition of terms in a CDA, he believes that the beauty of the method is in its flexible nature.

James Paul Gee approaches discourse analysis in a similar manner by stating that “(t)he validity of an analysis is not a matter of how detailed one’s transcript is. It is a matter of how the transcript works together with all the other elements of the analysis to create a ‘trustworthy’ analysis” (Gee, 2011, page 117). The importance of an analysis is measured on the ability of the analyst to take what is said and place that speech in a given context. No event is unrelated and because of that, it was my job to show what these

politicians claimed in a given time period and the circumstances surrounding what they said.

The research questions show my desire to avoid the ontological debates behind the “true” meaning behind a particular politician or the “actual” reasons behind the passage of SB1070. While I was tempted to dissect politicians and explain what they really meant, that particular inquiry was problematic for a whole host of reasons. First of all, I cannot speak for anyone else accurately without making large reaches, because it is impossible to speak for other people without being reductionist. I made no positivistic claims about truth or ontology but rather sought to look at what those truths meant to people.

I used CDA to analyze the speeches, press releases, interviews, and public hearing records of the politicians that I have selected. Using CDA allowed me to use Fairclough’s framework of the emergence, hegemony, recontextualization, and operationalization of the immigration discourse. The critical geopolitics lens focused my inquiry to the actors involved in the creation of SB1070 and the CDA method gave me the methodology to dissect possible uses for the particular images, events, and stories used. Both theoretical tools sharpened the focus of my research and gave me the ability to pull out details that were not apparent with the simple language of the speeches alone. Many times, more was meant in a particular speech or press release than what was outwardly said.

While the development of SB1070 had roots in a long standing tradition in Arizonan politics and social life, I limited my research to a select group of politicians. Jan Brewer, the Arizona governor of the time of the signing and Russell Pearce were the

most vocal supporters of the bill, so they took the forefront of my investigation. Another reason for their prominence in my thesis is the fact that the two had different styles and languages to convey similar messages. I also included the statements of less prominent elected officials in the state of Arizona that appeared at various times of the debate, but showed how those individuals related back to positions taken by Pearce and Brewer. These individuals were included because as elected officials, their public statements could be seen as the official stances from governmental officials in Arizona.

In order to acquire speeches from the various politicians, I utilized the websites of each of the politicians because these website were a good place to get a baseline understanding of how Brewer and Pearce saw themselves. In the case of Jan Brewer, I used her official website that contained an extensive media section with a database of official press releases and speeches by the governor. Russell Pearce, despite having been recalled, maintained an active website with what he considered his political achievements throughout the years.

Another source that I used extensively was a collection of emails sent by Russell Pearce from a government computer obtained through the Freedom of Information Act. Dan Pochoda, the legal representative of the ACLU in Arizona, filed a petition to receive all communication from Pearce and was granted that access in the summer of 2011. The emails received were approximately 10,000 pages of correspondence with all the recipients names redacted to conceal the privacy of those that were not public servants. Those individuals that were public officials, and had the email addresses that corresponded with government computers, were left open to view.

The fact that many of the names of the recipients of the emails were removed, and that many of the emails were simply Pearce sending the message to his own personal email address, obscures the full context of what is being said. It is possible to argue that without the intended recipient of the communication that nothing can be gained from their analysis. I argue that this could not be further from the truth. The emails that Pochoda released to the public, paint a clear picture of who was supposed to receive those emails, and provide an unfiltered view of what Russell Pearce believed on the topic of undocumented immigration. The inflammatory nature of the emails and the occasional outright bigotry makes it apparent that Pearce did not believe these emails were going to be shown to anyone other than the recipient. In addition, the emails were meant to be private because the rhetoric that Pearce uses in public appearances is much more restrained than what is written in the emails.

Finally, in regards to the politicians, I utilized public records from the Arizona Legislature to navigate through the different audio, video, and transcribed proceedings related to the debate, amendment process, and eventual vote in relation to SB1070 in the months that lead up to the passage of SB1070.

To obtain the different interviews and public statements made by the various politicians, I used three different Arizona based newspapers as sources. I chose the *Arizona Republic* because it was from Phoenix, the site of the Arizona State Legislature, and had the highest distribution in the state. The second newspaper was the *East Valley Tribune*, based out of Mesa, where Russell Pearce and the majority of the Mormon population reside. Finally, I used the *Arizona Daily Star* that had the six highest

circulation and is located in Tucson, which is largest city in Arizona close to the Mexican border.

There were clear disadvantages to the number of people and the types of people that I chose to study with this issue. First, the lack of the Mexican undocumented immigrant's voice painted only one side of this issue. While this was problematic, I intentionally studied only one side because of my wish to appeal to public policy makers to see this issue more critically, and I believe that they would be more accepting of this type of analysis than of an ethnographic type. The desire to look at this issue from the policy maker and policy enforcer lens does not mean that I do not think that an ethnographic inquiry is not important.

CHAPTER 2: UNDERSTANDING AND PROBLEMATIZING SB1070

No inquiry into the development of immigration politics, specifically SB1070, can begin without a brief history of the creation of the border between the United States and Mexico. As Jones points out, “There is a tendency to assume that at some previous point in history all borders were secure...The idea of a past golden age of security is not true for the US-Mexico border, or most other borders for that matter” (Jones 2012, page 28). This assumption can lead people to believe that these borders are real objects and have always been there. “(B)orders are socially imagined distinctions that were not inscribed onto the land until the very recent past” (Jones, 2012, page 28). When it is understood that borders have been somewhat of a recent phenomenon, then it is possible to examine the processes involved in the development of those boundaries.

The modern day state generally operates from the point of view that its hegemony over the territory has always been in place but as Jones argues, that simply isn't the case with the United States:

Prior to the arrival of the Mexican and American states, Native Americans were living in these areas. However, these societies did not exhibit the territorial state structures of sovereignty, and their lands were consequently treated as *terra nullius* by European powers and later by the newly independent US and Mexican states (Jones, 2012, page 28)

As the United States and Mexico fought over the land, the people that inhabited the area were in constant limbo. The installation of a defined and permanent border on the map created fixed states in the mind of the politicians, thus “distinguishing between

desirable and undesirable immigrants and, more important, citizens and 'aliens' and their concomitant social relations” (Nevins, 2004, page 37).

Despite a physical border wall on much of the US-Mexico divide, the presence of a discernible division is a relatively new thing. The United States, either through conquest, annexation, or cooperation, has constantly reshaped and redefined its border over the past 150 years (Jones, 2012; Nevins, 2004). The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 was one of the most important events in reference to the development of the current modern day border because it set most of the boundary as it remains today (Jones 2012).

With the border established, the United States began to secure its borders from immigrants from Mexico. The desire to close the doors to the United States to Mexicans wasn't always the official policy. The Bracero Program starting in 1942 granted Mexican citizens legal access to the United States for the purpose of employment. World War II made labor short with many of the men in the country fighting in the Pacific and Germany, and the lobbies representing businesses in need of workers in Washington D.C. pushed for the easing of immigration restrictions. While the Bracero program brought in hundreds of thousands of Mexican laborers until its termination in 1964, there is evidence that many undocumented migrant workers came and left the United States seasonally “much the same way that US workers migrated internally” (Robinson 2010, page 383). In spite of the fact that these laborers did not wish to reside in the United States as permanent residents, their efforts in the various businesses was enough to welcome their return the following season.

The decline of the American economy in the early 1990's resulted in the desire to secure the border as people looked for possible culprits for the lack of prosperity. The resultant policy appeared in the form of a larger Border Patrol and the beginning of the creation of border walls (Heyman and Ackelson, 2008; Nevins, 2004; Jones, 2012). Operation Gatekeeper in 1994 was an attempt by the federal government of the United States to curb what was then considered unwanted immigration, and led to a dramatic increase in the size of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) as well as immigration courts with the power to deport. This move to improve security was accompanied by legislation meant to discourage immigrants from staying in the country.

One of the first major legislative efforts designed to make life untenable for undocumented individuals was in California. Prop 187 created in 1994, called for the denial of public services, education, and health care to immigrants that were not US citizens. According to Nevins, Operation Gatekeeper was actually a response by the federal government to head off prop 187 and the state level management of what was considered the federal plenary power of immigration enforcement (Nevins, 2004). California's attempt to legislate a portion of undocumented immigration in the early 1990's showed a growing divide between what the states, especially those nearest the border, believed needed to be done in regards to immigration policy and what the federal government thought was necessary.

This division between the state and federal governments, led to the development of bills like SB1070 that attempted to test the boundaries between the two. SB 1070, like all legislation, had a long history in its development and really cannot be understood without a comprehensive examination of Arizona's interactions with undocumented

migrants. While SB1070 was signed into law in the spring of 2010, the state government, as well as a large group of people within Arizona, had been interested in the development of a more comprehensive immigration policy than what existed at the federal level.

Beginning in the 1980's, when the federal government began to reshape the country's immigration policies to stop the flow of people, states that existed in direct contact with the border (California, New Mexico, Texas, Arizona) began to re-examine their own state laws involving undocumented migrants (Andreas 2000; Ackleson 2005; Coleman 2007; Ackleson, Heyman 2008). Despite the early dependence on undocumented migrants to develop areas within the Southwest, there was a move to close the border to prevent the Hispanic population from growing too large.

Following California's lead, the state of Arizona attempted to change immigration policy because of the claim that the federal government did little to assist the state with immigration related problems. In November of 2004, Arizona passed the Protect Arizona Now act known as Prop 200. Prop 200 required polling officials to screen everyone attempting to vote in Arizona elections to verify citizenship and also required proof of citizenship to receive state public benefits. Similar to California's Prop 187 in 1994, the bill's aim was to make life so difficult for undocumented migrants that they would give up their search for employment in the United States and return home. California's Prop 187 was ruled as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court and seemed to be likely ending for prop 200. Arizona's prop 200 was embroiled in the Supreme Court with the eventual ruling that the portion of the law regarding polling sites was preempted by the Federal National Voter Registration act of 1993.

Arizona continued to develop tougher immigration policies in December of 2007, with the Legal Arizona Workers Act (also known as the Employer Sanctions Law). The law required all businesses to verify the citizenship status of potential employees through the use of the federal E-Verify computer software with the assistance of the Department of Homeland Security (Horne, 2012). The bill also makes it a felony to possess the identity of another individual and claim to be someone that you are not (i.e. undocumented migrants in possession of a fake identification or someone else's papers). Before this law was created, identity theft was a misdemeanor and if an undocumented migrant was convicted of a felony, he could be eligible for immediate deportation.

In a rush to get the bill passed, legislators ignored the fact that crimes perpetrated by legal residents of the state would be affected by the creation of a felony for something that was once a misdemeanor. Outraged that the possession of another person's identification in an attempt to purchase items such as alcohol, cigarettes, or pornography, would lead to a felony, residents of the state called for changes to be made to the legislation. The bill was immediately amended after the passage of HB 2745 to specify that only those individuals 21 or older, and using a fake identity for the purposes of employment, would be considered to be charged with a felony (HB2745, 2008). People seemed satisfied with the new version of the bill as residents of Arizona would be protected from excessive punishment for a seemingly minor infraction under the Eight Amendment, while residing in the country without authorization fit the crime of a felony.

Despite receiving approximately 56% of the statewide vote, Prop 200 was opposed by a bi-partisan coalition including Republican senators John McCain (R), Jon Kyl (R), and representative JD Hayworth (R). Senator McCain spearheaded the

opposition to the bill because he believed that it did little to solve the problem of illegal immigration and worked to unnecessarily burden the businesses of the state. As the ranking Arizona political figure, McCain convinced the rest of the rank and file Republicans to fall into line and oppose the bill (except for a few, most notably, Russell Pearce). This bill is important in the development of SB1070 because it set the stage and the precedence for an increase in the desire by some in Arizona to get tougher and tougher on the issue of undocumented migration. Despite coming out against Prop 200, JD Hayworth, a staunch proponent of tougher immigration laws in the state, applauded the Hispanic population in 2004 for voting in support of Prop 200 (47%) in an interview with Wolf Blitzer in 2010 (Blitzer, 2010).

SB1070's principal sponsor was Arizona state senator Russell Pearce. Russell Pearce served as a large part of my inquiry into the development of SB1070, as well as those around him, as he propped himself up to be the champion of the bill during its initial creation and signing. After signing the bill into law, Jan Brewer took the reigns as Arizona's chief proponent, both locally and nationwide, ostensibly from Russell Pearce as Pearce became the first Arizona state senator to suffer the embarrassment of a general recall. The recall of Pearce had many different possible explanations, including the fact that Russell, a Mormon, turned his back on the Mormon community in his constituency that didn't agree with his unapologetically hawkish stance on undocumented immigration.

As politically charged and polarizing figures, Brewer and Pearce were key members of my inquiry into SB1070 but also included other members of Arizona's political stage. An analysis into the narratives used by various groups, both for and

opposed to the legislation, and the language used to champion their various causes revealed a great deal about motives. This language, can show both stated goals of the speaker and what is meant in omission when read against the grain (Spivak, 1988).

Literature Review

For this inquiry, I used the lens of critical geopolitics as a theoretical framework. This particular approach, simply stated, “recognizes that how people know, categorize, and make sense of world politics is an interpretive cultural practice. To understand this process requires studying geopolitics as discourse and the cultural context that gives it meaning” (Ó Tuathail, 2006). Geopolitics refers more specifically to a comprehensive study of statecraft as a set of social practices (Ó Tuathail and Agnew, 1992). The problem within geopolitics is to understand how the reductive narratives used by individuals of statecraft are created and for what purposes.

In the case of SB1070, this refers to a comprehensive examination of the discourse surrounding immigration as it played out in Arizona in June of 2010. The actors within this debate, specifically Jan Brewer and Russell Pearce, used certain images and events to persuade the public to agree with their stances on immigration. The resulting narratives from the speeches, press releases, images, and stories from these state actors caused the public to perceive the topic of immigration, and in most cases the immigrant themselves, a certain way. The public acted as a canvas to which the statecraft actors painted their particular narratives (either for or against SB1070).

Mathew Coleman writes about immigration geopolitics and ideas of how the border is reconstructed through the border enforcement. The United States began to shift the ideas of what the border was after 9-11 to include not just the physical construction of the barriers between states but also included the policing and enforcement on the interior (Coleman, 2007). This concept fits well into my research into SB1070 because the bill does not focus on the physical border but instead focuses on how the local police will enforce the border policies on its interior. Coleman's assertions explain why the national security narrative was used for the passage of the bill because the threat of international terrorism gave people a tangible reason to hunt down "terrorists" within the nation's borders. It wasn't enough to simply try to stop terrorists at the borders, because if they got into the country, they still needed to be weeded out. The problem with this narrative is that many times, it is not terrorists that are rounded up and thrown out of the country, it is the undocumented migrants that this particular legislation targets.

A discussion about identification and an analysis into American nationalism illuminates why people feel that large increases in Mexican immigrants pose a threat to what it means to be American. "Most Americans speak of their attachment to their country as patriotism or, in extreme form, superpatriotism" (Lieven, 2004, page 166). Anatol Lieven discusses American nationalism in his piece entitled, "America, Right or Wrong," in an attempt to show how this phenomenon has dire consequences in the "war against terror". Lieven's use of the American Creed and the American Thesis/Antithesis is useful for my inquiry into SB1070 as it describes American nationalism and how it sees the rest of the geopolitical world. "This long-standing tendency in American culture and politics reflects the continuing conservative religiosity on many Americans;

however, it also has always been an expression of social, economic, ethnic, and above all racial anxieties” (Lieven, 2007, 169). In essence, I believe the oft cited feelings in the immigration debate of “wanting things to return to the good old days” and “protecting American culture from advances by immigrants not wanting to assimilate” can be linked to some form of xenophobia.

As for the politics of representation as a whole, chapter three will deal specifically with how political entrepreneurs reify the representations in an attempt to create an enemy other. Much as Reece Jones finds that walls creating borders, “sought to define who belongs within a state by creating and reifying boundaries both on the ground and in people’s minds,” (Jones, 2012), I argue that these representations conjured up of the undocumented immigrant were created for the sole purpose of solidifying people’s idea of what it means to be un-American. Conversely, these representations also attempted to show what it means to be a good American as well.

Chapter four will focus on what I believe to be the main reason for the success of Brewer and Pearce (success here being defined as the passage of SB1070). The creation of categories by a political entrepreneur does not necessarily guarantee victory in the political arena. It is imperative for politicians to get the voters to understand how legislation will affect them personally. Robin writes how political leaders will use fear as a method of eliciting a desired response from an electorate (Robin, 2004). Given that politicians will use fear in attempt to garner support, the remainder of the chapter will explain how particular events were utilized to both reify those aforementioned representations and create a feeling of impending doom if nothing is done.

As for the topic of immigration and in particular, immigration as it relates to the Mexico-America border, I will use authors that speak to issues of the criminalization of immigrants, the issue of “whiteness”, and other complicated racial and social factors at play in the development of SB1070. Doris Marie Provine and Roxanne Doty write that a combination of the development of the physical border, the partnership with local police, and the initiatives laid out by ICE led to the “construction of a landscape of institutionalized racial violence embedded in our current immigration regime” (Provine, Doty, 2011).

To show the different ways that political entrepreneurs use representation to achieve their goals, I would like to discuss post-colonial and feminist understandings about representation. The section is meant to show that while the ends of each academic inquiry may be different, the deconstruction of a political elite’s method remain similar.

Academics across varying intellectual fields have dealt with the idea that the state has the ability to impose certain self-understandings. In post-colonial studies, a common theme is the idea that the imperial powers of the West came into areas and imposed a set of understandings that were advantageous to the colonizer (Said, 1978; Fanon, 1952). These ways of self-understanding and self-location were important because it allowed the colonizer to get the colonized to internalize their own inferiority. In essence, the colonizer, whether it be through the census, mapping, or other techniques, created categories that the colonized were supposed to fall into and the people would begin to understand themselves through those created categories.

Political entrepreneurs were not the only people responsible for domination. Agency must also be analyzed to better understand the different ways that those who

were intended to hear the politician's messages were meant to be received or internalized. In the case of the colonial example, the political entrepreneurs (i.e. the colonial magistrates) needed the subjugated peoples to internalize that they were in fact inferior, and the imperial powers possessed some sort of knowledge that, out of the kindness of their hearts, in turn handed down to the uncivilized natives. In effect, the imperial leaders wanted to give the colonized the impression that the domination was in their own best interest because the colonized did not know any better. The concept of representational manipulation for the purpose of domination and subjugation is repeated in other academic threads as well.

In one feminist academic theory, patriarchy shows how males can impose a particular way for women to understand their social location through various institutions designed to keep women from achieving the same status as males (Chenoy, 2010). Again, with this case, the political entrepreneur being the men in power, use how women understand their role in the world (i.e. a woman's place is in the home) to further their own political purposes. Much as in post-colonial studies, this example shows how the people in power create certain categories or ways in which people understand their self location and then those people internalize those categories.

In the case of patriarchy, the use of the representation of women is similar in that the idea that women belonged in certain gender roles (in the kitchen, taking care of the kids/home, office administrative work, etc.) worked to label large swaths of people that may have had no commonalities besides gender in the first place. Men, in a position of power over women in terms of the workplace and the political world, used particular representations of self understanding to achieve continued political sexual hegemony.

In Cerullo's deconstruction of constructivism in academic work, she writes, "(i)n highlighting the subjective nature of gender, constructionists do not deemphasize the effects of gender categories. Rather, they argue that socially defined maleness and femaleness severely constrict human behavior," (Cerullo, 1997, page 388). By showing how the very act of classifying the anatomical differences between men and women, Cerullo displays how those categories are further reified. Once the realness of those categories cannot be denied because of scientific research, it is easier for people in the position of power to then espouse characteristics associated with those genders.

Anzaldua's concept of her "Mestiza" follows both methods of inquiry and can show how she was supposed to self-identify at the hands of those in political power. From a post-colonial point of view, Anzaldua was drawn into an exploitative economic situation for the benefit of the people that hired her in the maquiladoras, and her cultural understandings of the world were violently removed by the state for the purpose of re-identification. Anzaldua was no longer a mixture of her life experiences and was replaced with simply what it meant to be a good American. Anzaldua's uncultured Mexican heritage must be forgotten in the place of a much more civilized understanding of the world that was American culture. With the categories in place, Anzaldua must choose which category she belonged to, whether it be female, Hispanic-American, Hispanic, gay, straight, and then accept that there are certain understandings that come along with each one.

From the perspective of a feminist critique of representation, Anzaldua was forced to accept that she was female in the capitalistic system and there were certain gender roles associated with that categorization. Women belonged either at home or in the

maquiladoras. Further complicating the essence of her being was that she didn't feel that she fit the mold of what it meant to be female because in the United States at the time of her youth, her sexual orientation further disoriented her concept of who she was. Once Anzaldua accepted that she was a lesbian, which has inherent and essential differences from a heterosexual (and a gay male for that matter), she was expected to act within the set of norms attached to that group.

CHAPTER 3: THE POLITICS OF REPRESENTATION

Introduction

I remember being caught speaking Spanish at recess—that was good for three licks on the knuckles with a sharp ruler. I remember being sent to the corner of the classroom for “talking back” to the Anglo teacher when all I was trying to do was tell her how to pronounce my name. “If you want to be American, speak ‘American’. If you don’t like it, go back to Mexico where you belong.” (Anzaldua, 1987, page 75)

Gloria Anzaldua’s, *Borderlands – La Frontera: The New Mestiza*, shows how difficult the United States can be for someone brought by their parents across the border without legal authorization. Anzaldua paints a portrait of what it was like to grow up in the United States as a woman of Mexican descent in an area that seemed desperate to make her fit into the mold of a good, American girl. The assimilation was made even more complicated for Anzaldua as she dealt with her own struggles to come to terms with her sexuality, thus pitting her against not only her new culture in the United States that was not accepting of who she was at the time but also against the Catholicism she grew up with.

The multiple layers of who Anzaldua believed she was complicated the image of what her teachers, peers, and church leaders believed she should become. Ultimately, Anzaldua comes to the conclusion that so much is lost with the discipline of language and that, “(w)hat we are suffering from is an absolute despot duality that says we are able to be only one or the other” (Anzaldua, 1987, page 41). The fact that people were viewed as Hispanic, Mexican, Anglo, American, Straight, or Homosexual, neatly placed people into

different categories that had a set of inherent characteristics associated with each for Anzaldua.

The Mexican or Catholic side of who she was told her that her lesbianism was considered dirty or impure. The American part of who she wanted to become told her that Spanish was corrupt and a language for the stupid. The female in her was informed by the males in her life that her place was in the home or in the factories with other women. In essence, Anzaldua was conflicted with every glance into the mirror.

Anzaldua's experience growing up and her struggle with who she thought she was demonstrates the complexities of the process people must go through to self-identify. That process, I argue, never happens inside of a vacuum. The politics surrounding SB1070 show how this process of representation and the subsequent identification was influenced by various political elites for their own purposes and how those influences affected people's lives. There were many different methods employed by these political actors, and those will be discussed throughout this paper, but this particular chapter will focus on the role of representation and identification.

Throughout the debate about SB1070, both the opponents and the supporters claimed to represent the true feelings of one group or another. Jan Brewer would consistently stand in front of the cameras and say that she represented Arizonans that were sick and tired of the federal indifference to the problems at the border (Rough, 2011). Opponents to the legislation would say that Mexican-American's felt this law was racist at its core and was intended to harass people of color. Another would stand up and claim to be representatives of unemployed workers in the state of Arizona and demonstrate how illegal immigrants were stealing their jobs. At one point, members of

the Mormon Church came out and said that the legislation was unacceptable because the church believed part of their mission was to proselytize to undocumented migrants (Gonzalez, 2010).

What all of these people claimed was that they spoke for every person within that group that they were associating themselves with and that there was a homogeneity in that group. I find it problematic for Jan Brewer to claim that she represents every Arizonan throughout the state when in reality, her assertions are probably made from a narrow selection of representative survey groups. The problem is not the validity of her claims. The issue is that the possible repercussions from the fact that she even makes the claim in the first place can tear apart potentially like individuals and are difficult to quantify.

This chapter examines the shortcomings of believing that groups of any size exist outside of the social realm and challenges the idea that there is something essential in those groups that make the members of those organizations uniform (Brubaker, 2004). This is not to say that there are not groups of people that identify themselves as Hispanics, Mexicans, Arizonans, or any other number of names but rather, those people are just representing themselves in a way that is advantageous to who they believe they are. Brubaker argues that, “(t)he study of ethnicity- even the study of ethnic conflict- should not, in short, be reduced to, or even centered on, the study of ethnic groups,” (Brubaker, 2004, page 4). This chapter will also show the consequences of wielding this particular political tool in the debate around SB1070 by showing the manner in which people choose sides once those sides are created.

After a theoretical discussion of how categories are created into representations by political entrepreneurs, and how those representations are in turn replicated, I move on to show the different ways undocumented immigrants were essentialized during the debate of SB1070. The most prevalent representations were: the non-assimilating immigrant, the immigrant as financial drain, and the criminal immigrant. After an analysis of each of the methods employed to create these ways for people to self-identify, and thus how they were reified, I conclude with the implications of this type of politics.

The Power of “Identity”

Before I get into the specifics of SB1070, I would like to reiterate a few points made by Brubaker and Anderson about how people see the world, how they see themselves in that world, and how they see others around them. Brubaker argues, the term “identity” tends to have an assortment of meanings and uses ranging from the core aspect of selfhood, or in the Foucaultian sense, that identity is in a constant state of shift (Brubaker, 2004). The term “identity” is used by academic scholars in different ways but they all suffer the same problem according to Brubaker. If it is assumed that the term itself has different definitions given the context that it is being used and that identity can change, then it is not possible to use a single, fixed word to describe representation. Brubaker’s point resonated with me because it showed how entrenched people can become when it comes to self-identification. When Brubaker challenges the usefulness of a word like identity, it shows that there is a greater need to re-imagine how people define who they are, which is exactly what I look to accomplish.

What seems at first as a semantic game played by Brubaker is upon further review an attempt to show that academic literature is saturated with discussions focused on 'identity'. "The problem is that 'nation', 'race', and 'identity' are used analytically a good deal of the time more or less as they are used in practice, in an implicitly or explicitly reifying manner..." (Brubaker, 2004, page 32). Brubaker explains that in an attempt to save the concept of "identity" as a whole, academics have muddied the waters so much that nothing can be gained from the continued use of the word (Brubaker, 2004). Instead, Brubaker posits that academics should say what they really mean as opposed to trying to jam different meanings into a word that was not meant to stand in for so many different concepts. For instance, if self-understanding is a process that can be affected by numerous different inputs and there is no essential being to that self-understanding, then just say that. Put another way, "it is not clear why that which is routinely characterized as 'multiple, fragmented, and fluid' should be conceptualized as identity at all" (Brubaker, 2004, page 33).

Identity is further called into question by Stuart Hall when he said that, "(i)dentification turns out to be one of the least well-understood concepts – almost as tricky as, though preferable, to 'identity' itself; and certainly no guarantee against the conceptual difficulties which have beset the latter" (Hall, 2000, page 16). Hall goes on to argue that the, "discursive approach sees identification as a construction, a process never completed – always 'in process'" (Hall, 2000, page 17). It is through an examination of the development of self identification that it is possible to understand how people come to their various understandings of themselves in a political process. Hall also believes that identity endures through continued real interactions with those around them but the

power of the political elites cannot be ignored (Hall, 1997). This is especially true in regards to immigration politics as many people's 'real' interactions with undocumented immigrants can come from second hand sources, whether they be from political speeches, the news, or anecdotes from others.

For Brubaker, the problem with the constructivist methodology and language in the social sciences is that it leads to insipid conclusions. While Brubaker focuses on the "groupness" of certain people, Cerullo similarly focuses on the "we-ness". Cerullo argues that, "every collective becomes a social artifact—an entity molded, refabricated, and mobilized in accord with reigning cultural scripts and centers of power" (Cerullo, 1997, page 387). For Cerullo, methods of inquiry that ignore the ways in which people create methods of self-identification ignore the staggering amount of academic evidence that show otherwise (Cerullo, 1997).

When "groupness" or "we-ness" are considered a variable as Brubaker would suppose, it is possible to see how there are variances within the groups that are often claimed to be homogenous. I argue that this assumption must first be understood and acknowledged in the analysis of SB1070 because it is from here that we can see that natural tendencies amongst large swaths of people that might not even know each other rarely exist. Constructivist language from the political position of power can immediately be targeted and approached with utmost suspicion.

I used Brubaker's language construct to examine the role of political entrepreneurs in identification, self-understanding, and groupness. Self understanding is a process that can be affected by wide-scale environmental factors and can change throughout time. Not only can those identifications shift, it is possible for those to

undergo radical changes given a certain set of circumstances. All manners in which people see their place in the world is a social process through which people acquire that self understanding. I am concerned with the manner in which politicians can use the concept of representation to further their own political agenda and in the process, affect how people adapt their various self-understandings.

The voting public does indeed have a role in the process, and it is not my assertion that people are simply sheep without their own volition in self identification. It should be noted however, that that process of self identification can be influenced by political entrepreneurs in a manner that is not transparent. Relating back to Hall's point that people reify their self identification through continued real interactions, I argue that politicians offer 'evidence' to support those politically constructed representations. The ability for politicians to use their large media platforms can greatly influence large groups of populations and that is why I chose to study SB1070 with a critical lens to their maneuverings.

As in the earlier discussion about identity, when a political entrepreneur uses their pulpit to push a certain method of self-understanding across a group of people coupled with violent images, it is essentializing on purpose. Attempting to speak to thousands of differentiated and dissimilar peoples is difficult as the political powers must tailor their message for each person. When a representation that places those peoples into neat little boxes, (whether it be race, sex, sexual orientation, etc.) the intention is clear. The people that receive that message are encouraged to place themselves into those categories, thus giving up different self-understandings that may have been previously across other categories. Once the categories are created and made to be essentializing, it is much

easier to tailor a specific message to that group as opposed to going from door to door trying to convince each person of a particular message. This essentialism, helps create and reify these representations that the political entrepreneurs then, in turn, use for their own purposes.

Understanding Brewer and Pearce's Personal Relation to SB1070

Shifting to a discussion about SB1070, I would like to engage the two primary political figures in SB1070, and how they personally relate back to the development of the bill. With an understanding of the two's political and personal background, I hope to give more context to why their involvement in the bill was so important.

Russell Pearce, the self-proclaimed architect and leading proponent of SB1070, began his time in Arizona state politics as a law enforcement officer. Pearce worked in the Maricopa County Sheriff's office from 1977-1991, including a post as high as the Chief Deputy under Sheriff Joe Arpaio. In numerous interviews, and on Pearce's own political website, Pearce refers to one singular event as the most defining moment of his life. On July 2, 1977, Pearce approached three suspicious teenagers that he believed to be gang members in possession of beer and was attacked as a result. The fight that ensued left Pearce severely wounded first by the teenager's dog and then he was shot by one of the men with his own pistol. As a result of his bravery, Pearce was awarded the Medal of Valor for his actions that day, a fact that he is extremely proud as evidenced by his website, and his reference to this award in a number of interviews.

Following Pearce's position in the Sheriff's Office, he then moved to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), where he oversaw an initiative to ensure all residents show a birth certificate to receive a license in the state of Arizona. Pearce's time at the DMV opened his eyes to the frequent attempts by undocumented immigrants to gain access to a system they were not authorized to be a part of in order to get the benefits of driving in the state.

The last thing that Pearce references when talking about what defines him as a politician was the shooting of his son while in the line of duty. The shooting occurred in 2004 and was done at the hands of a suspected gang member that resided in the country without authorization. Sean Pearce's wounds were not fatal but left him in critical condition for weeks thus, cementing Russell Pearce's desire to rid the State of what he considered were dangerous illegal immigrants.

After leaving the position of Director of the DMV amidst accusations of impropriety that he was later cleared of, Pearce was elected to the State of Arizona House of Representatives in 2000. During his time in the House and the State Senate to which he was elected to in 2006, Pearce is most known for his tough stance on immigration. Pearce's commitment to the rule of law led to the authorship and passage of Arizona Prop 200 in 2004, which ensured all residents show identification before voting and required proof of citizenship for all state services. Pearce also authored and passed various laws that refused undocumented immigrants the right to bond if they are accused of felonies, the right to ever receive punitive damages, and an initiative to make English the official language of the State of Arizona. In each instance, Pearce proudly declared that he was the champion for the rights of Americans and Arizonans.

Most notably, Pearce is known for his creation of SB1070. Pearce enlisted the help of political analyst, and strategic policy maker, Kris Kobach, a Kansas state politician, in order to assist with SB1070 and the bill was further developed in a December of 2009 meeting with the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) in Washington, DC. The bill hit the Arizona State Legislature in January of 2010 where it was accepted by both the House and the Senate.

An NPR investigation into the development of SB1070 and the role of ALEC, found that there was an inextricable link between the two. ALEC is a private-public enterprise that meets together to interface about public policy issues as they relate to businesses. Most notably, ALEC membership at the time of the conference in December of 2009 included Exxon-Mobile, Reynolds American, and the National Rifle Association. Also present was the largest private prison corporation in the country, Corrections Corporation of America. “According to Corrections Corporation of America reports reviewed by NPR, executives believe immigrant detention is their next big market. Last year, they wrote that they expect to bring in ‘a significant portion of our revenues’ from Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the agency that detains illegal immigrants” (Sullivan, 2010). While Pearce vehemently denied speaking with members of the private prison industry at the meeting closed to the public, the connection between the two is hard to deny.

Governor Jan Brewer, a fiscally and socially conservative Republican, is less linked to undocumented immigration through her political career but is still an important player in SB1070 due to her role as the national champion for the bill once it was passed. Where Pearce’s website described his heroic actions while in the line of duty, and

personal narratives of struggle with undocumented immigration count in almost ten pages, Brewer's biographical information is much more succinct. Brewer was first elected to the Arizona State House of Representatives in 1983 and then again to the State Senate in 1986. Brewer remained in the Senate until 1996, at which point she was then elected to the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. With the charge of removing the State's massive debt, Brewer was elected as Chairperson in 1998 and again in 2001. It was when Brewer was elected as the Arizona Secretary of State in 2002 that she would soon be thrust into the national spotlight.

In 2009, then Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano was asked by President Barack Obama to head the Department of Homeland Defense. Second in command as Secretary of State, Brewer took over for the vacated position. While not in the state legislature during the 2000's when many of the bills regarding undocumented immigration previously mentioned were passed, as the Secretary of State in 2002 when Prop 200 came to fruition, Brewer oversaw the process to ensure voter identification and the verification process for social services. When SB1070 came across Brewer's desk in the summer of 2010, Brewer declared that she believed it was her duty to sign the bill into law because of her desire to limit the role of the federal government. Almost overnight, Brewer became in a nationally known player in the development and the debate around SB1070.

A contextual understanding of both Brewer's and Pearce's relationship to SB1070 is important moving forward because both have different ways they came to their stances on undocumented immigration. While it is impossible to know what any one person believes at a given time, it can be assumed that Brewer and Pearce approach the issues surrounding SB1070 differently. Brewer appeared to come to her support of SB1070 as

result of her wish to shrink the size of the debt in the state, and to challenge the role of the federal government. That desire coalesced with the arrival of SB1070 that sought to bring the federal government to heel in regards to immigration and bring attention to the issues at the state level. Pearce's connection to immigration is much more personal as he and his son both bear the scars of what Pearce believes are the costs of undocumented migration.

The different representations created by both Brewer and Pearce demonstrate that while their vitriol and rhetoric may have been different, their goal to pass SB1070 were still the same. For Brewer, the passage of SB1070 showed that Arizona had a right to police its citizenry how they deemed necessary and to point out how ineffective the federal government was in matters of immigration. Brewer gained so much notoriety in her disdain of President Barack Obama's handling of border related issues because the conservative right was desperate for any example of a state standing up to the federal government. While Pearce also wanted SB1070 to pass, his reasoning focused much more on what he saw was the inherent nature of the undocumented immigrant. For Pearce, the desire to push out all people that were not in the state legally was a personal goal rooted in years of interactions with immigrants.

SB1070 and the Call to Nationalism

Jan Brewer explained in detail through a press release right before she signed SB0170 into law that she pushed this issue so hard because she knew that it was the right thing to do. Throughout the press release, Brewer made repeated references to a group of

people, whether implied or specifically stated, that she refers to as Arizonans or as Americans.

I believe Arizona, like America, is governed by laws. Good laws...well-intentioned laws ...laws that confer respect and that demand respect in return. In his third State of the Union address, President Theodore Roosevelt said, 'No man is above the law and no man is below it; nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it. Obedience to the law is demanded as a right; not asked as a favor.' (Brewer, 2010).

Brewer tells the audience by reading what isn't said here that those people that do not follow laws are not true Americans and to look at the issue from any other angle is unpatriotic.

In an attempt to demonstrate the difference between Mexico and America, Jan Brewer declared that "(w)e cannot delay while the destruction happening south of our international border creeps its way north" (Brewer, 2010). The invocation of the "south" vs. "north" sets the stage for a clear 'us vs. them' narrative where the voters of Arizona from the outset of the debate are either for America (pro SB1070) or against America (against SB1070). Jones points out that in the language about the need to differentiate between states that often, "(t)he people on the other side were described in dehumanizing ways that made them appear unworthy of modern human rights that are guaranteed by each of these democracies" (Jones, 2012, page 2).

David Campbell's, *Writing Security*, demonstrates how American identity was established during the Cold War by pitting themselves against the Soviet Republic. American self-understanding was centered around the ideas of freedom, justice, and equality and the Soviet Republic signified slavery and injustice. Campbell further explains that "the ability to represent things as alien, subversive, dirty, or sick has been pivotal to the articulation of danger in the American experience" (Campbell, pg. 3, 1998).

Russell Pearce and Jan Brewer by often referencing what it means to be an American (insert Arizonan as well), create the dangerous “south” as an effective tool to rally for political support for SB1070. Again, Campbell calls the period after the Cold War a crisis of representation and shows how important it was for American identity to find an opposite to construct its own identity (Campbell, pg. 171, 1998). Post 9/11, the people in the United States were shown the power of the other and were swamped by politicians talking about those dangers (i.e. international terrorists). This narrative in the immigration debate is no different than the association of ‘Arabs as terrorists’ to construct the American identity. In this case, when Jan Brewer constructs the South, instead of referring to Mexico, she is creating an undefined, ambiguous other.

It also says a lot that Brewer uses the term “the south” to describe the problems facing Arizona. Does she mean that everything geographically south of Arizona is a potential threat or is she referring to just the Border area of Mexico? The fact that this enemy is shapeless and nameless makes this other that much more likely to induce panic amongst those designed to receive the message (Jones, 2012). Brewer seeks to create an American identity of law-abiding citizens by creating an other (i.e. the south) that represents a disregard for law and order.

Also arguing that narratives of disorder in Mexico were invoked for specific political purposes, Jones argues, “(t)hese areas of disorder are seen as threats to modern democracies because without a sovereign authority to enforce order, other non-state actors can operate undetected” (Jones, 2012, page 40.) For Jones, this meant that the United States, fearing a failed state in Mexico, was forced to militarize the border and create an elaborate series of border walls to keep out the theoretical rush of unwanted

refugees. In a similar fashion, SB1070 sought to ensure American sovereignty only instead of enforcing immigration law at the border, it would happen within the state as opposed to at the physical border.

Pearce spoke along the same lines as Brewer about the need to maintain American supremacy of culture against an enemy other across the border but his rhetoric was much more steeped in images of violence and despair.

Pearce, in testimony given to the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration meant to keep SB1070 in place, went on to describe the desperate situation Arizona faced at the time of the bill's passage. "The flood of illegal aliens—many of whom are terrorists, violent drug dealers, and gang members—is nothing short of an invasion" (Pearce, 2010). Pearce also goes on to explain that illegal immigrants threaten the very sovereignty of the nation by residing within the state boundaries. Pearce finished his testimony much in the same way Brewer finished her speech when the bill was passed by stating that the United States is, "a nation of laws" (Pearce, 2012).

These examples draw on what Anderson called "imagined communities" in the respect that both Brewer and Pearce called on a group of people, Arizona State residents in this case, to agree with their representation of the world. Anderson explains that print media, and newspapers specifically, gives people the impression that as they read their morning paper, millions of other people are reading the same thing, coming to the same conclusions (Anderson, 1983). In this sense, they are in a community that is in their own heads as they will most likely never meet any of the people they are supposedly reading this paper with. This concept of the imagined community is made even more powerful

with the proliferation of television as networks began to offer twenty-four hours news coverage, thus making people feel even more connected than ever before.

Anderson effectively identified that there were key moments of identity construction, in this case being the situation at the Border in 2010, and remade the collective images of a national self (Cerullo, 1997). It is this imagined community that these political entrepreneurs are seeking to create and manipulate for the purpose of legitimizing SB1070. Despite the fact that there may be people that identify themselves as Arizonans, Americans, or Mexican-Americans on all sides of this debate, there are no such things as ontologically real aforementioned groups. Brubaker argues that these types of distinctions that are discrete and bounded should be looked at, “rather in relational, processual, dynamic, eventful, and disaggregated terms” (Brubaker, 2004, page 11). People may believe that they are members of those groups, thus having consequences in the real world, but the idea that someone can make claims to represent large swaths of populations with any one particular opinion is fallacy.

What is more telling is not that the politicians are trying to actually represent the thoughts of the members of the community they claim to be a speaker for, but rather is that by creating this representation of what it means to be a good Arizonan/American, they make it so that people are forced to choose one side or the other. When these categories are essentialized for the purpose of self-identification, then there is no room to straddle both, multiple, or no side of the ideological divide.

In a series of communications received by the Arizona’s ACLU under the Freedom of Information Act, Pearce makes it clear he believed undocumented immigrants were the greatest threat to the state over anything else. Many of the emails

retrieved were penned by Pearce on his government computer and then sent off to his personal address for further forwarding. In one such email, Pearce explains:

If you watched the Mexican flags flying above the demonstrators and their chants, you understand they have no intention of assimilating into the American way of life. Their goal is to populate themselves into majority numbers until they can run Americans out of our own country. The failed and corrupt government of Mexico will manifest itself in America to create the same kind of misery for all Americans (Pearce, 2007).

In the same email, Pearce writes:

The United States faces the greatest internal threat to its existence since the Civil War. It faces disintegration of its culture; of its language; of its cohesiveness as a nation of free people. It faces massive infusion of unrelenting poverty; of crime; of diseases; of civil violence; of corruption at all levels; and worst of all, the United States faces balkanization that will destroy the fabric of its ability to function as a peaceful nation (Pearce, 2007).

These two emails show Pearce's panic and outrage that he wanted to portray to the outside public and from the tone of most of the emails, they appear to be written to either other politicians or campaign supporters. By invoking images of the destruction of everything that is supposed to be American, namely the American flag, Pearce creates an enemy other than that is anyone that has citizenship ties to a country that is not American. Pearce shows here that he believes, or at least he would like the recipient of this communication to believe that the cost of inaction would be the destruction of what it means to be American.

Jones labels this representation of an immigrant refusing to assimilate as an 'uncivilized immigrant'. For Jones, "This narrative draws on the idea that immigrants do not want to assimilate into American culture and instead cling to traditional beliefs that are a threat to the modern American way of life" (Jones 2012, page 43). What Pearce

ultimately seeks to do with this type of language is make the possibility of multiple affiliations in the context of nationalism impossible. People that believe they have the ability to blend their self-identification are harder to reach with political messaging. In order to simplify the process, Pearce and Brewer both rule out the ability of the receiver of these messages to view themselves as part Mexican, part American, or neither in the nationalistic sense.

Pearce also made constant references to what he believed to be an invasion from an outside force seeking to do harm. In an email to supporters, Pearce said, “How long will it be before we will be just like Mexico? We have already lost our language; everything must be printed in Spanish. We have already lost our history since it is no longer taught in our schools” (Pearce, 2010). Pearce is doing a few different things in this type of claim. First, he wants to continue to develop his enemy other of the illegal immigrant that does not want to learn English and is out to destroy what he believes to be what being American truly is all about. Secondly, Pearce places people that may speak Spanish in the privacy of their own homes in an awkward position and were ostracized when Pearce says that speaking English is what being American is all about.

The creation of this enemy other is also meant to make it repulsive to want to identify with anything that is not American. The creation of an other that is subhuman allows people to view problems associated with undocumented immigration as nothing but a statistic (Jones, 2012). While Pearce told Congress that he desires to enforce the laws, “with compassion but without apology,” (Pearce, 2012) the previous attacks on the humanity of undocumented make it difficult to believe that claim. In another email to himself, Pearce said:

It is significant, however, that each demonstration is larger than the last, and the demands of the protestors are continuously for rights that are reserved for citizens do not enjoy. Most of the protestors are not legal citizens, legal residents, or even legal visitors in our country. They are illegal. They have no right to request or demand anything (Pearce, 2006).

This email speaks to protests that took place all over the United States when the United States House of Representatives tried to pass HR 4437 that would have increased the penalties for harboring an undocumented immigrant and the act of illegally entering the United States. In response, hundreds of thousands of people took the streets across the country, including in Arizona, to protest an incomplete attempt to revise American immigration policy. Throughout many of the protests, there was a mixture of American and Mexican flags flown in the various groups, thus reifying in many people's mind the idea of the unassimilating immigrant.

It is also tough to believe Pearce when he says that laws should be upheld with compassion when he says that undocumented individuals do not have any rights at all. Make no mention in any of his emails that the people Pearce refers to are human beings and should be given the respect of human life that are accepted throughout the world. Pearce, by labeling people not residing in the country legally not worthy of receiving anything, tells recipients these people are again, subhuman. It is also odd that Pearce would preach about American values and how undocumented immigrants seek to destroy everything that that makes America great, and then rail against people for practicing their right to free speech.

Pearce again contradicts himself about the need to enforce tougher border policies by comparing what he thinks are effective policies of other countries (Pearce, 2010):

- IF YOU CROSS THE NORTH KOREAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU GET 12 YEARS HARD LABOR.
- IF YOU CROSS THE IRANIAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU ARE DETAINED INDEFINITELY.
- IF YOU CROSS THE AFGHAN BORDER ILLEGALLY, YOU GET SHOT.
- IF YOU CROSS THE SAUDI ARABIAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU WILL BE JAILED.
- IF YOU CROSS THE CHINESE BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU MAY NEVER BE HEARD FROM AGAIN.

Pearce shows that these states have much more effective border enforcement policies while ignoring that many of the states listed here are some of the worst offenders of social justice and equality in the entire world. This is another call to nationalism from Pearce to defend the sovereignty of what he believes makes the United States what it really is and what defines the state.

Both Brewer and Pearce were making two sides to the debate. On one side, was the illegal immigrant that had no respect for American law and its virtues. On the other were good, law abiding patriots. The manner that the call to nationalism was used was troublesome because of the delicate way in which the way people identify themselves according to race. When Brewer and Pearce made claims that this legislation was about being a good American/Arizonan citizen, then it implies that membership of this community is blind to racial concerns and any loyalty to something other than ideals of the nation is unpatriotic. In essence, thinking about SB1070 in a way other than in terms of nationalism means that you are not a true American/Arizonan. This particular use of representation and self identification oversimplified the issues behind SB1070 to the point where people were forced to choose between competing loyalties to family, history, or friends.

Undocumented Immigrant as Criminal

Much of the debate and the reasoning for SB1070 was the notion that undocumented immigration brings a plethora of crime related problems to include drug smuggling, rape, murder, kidnapping, and violence. The creation of this particular representation was stated more directly than the threat to American nationalism as the costs were more visible in the opinion of the politicians.

In a controversial interview with Fox News days after she signed SB1070 into law, Jan Brewer declared that, "(w)e cannot afford all this illegal immigration and everything that comes with it, everything from the crime and to the drugs and the kidnappings and the extortion and the beheadings and the fact that people can't feel safe in their community. It's wrong! It's wrong!" (Brewer, 2010). The implication of Brewer's statement was that undocumented immigrants not only bring crime to the state of Arizona, they bring the most violent crimes imaginable.

In a follow-up report, a group called Politifact, interviewed medical examiners throughout the Arizona border region to find where the most violent beheadings have taken place and they were not able to find a single instance of the type of violence that Brewer insinuated. On the contrary, Dr. Eric Peters, the chief medical examiner for Pima County also found Brewer's comments to be false. As the medical examiner for the largest county population-wise on the border of Arizona, including the city of Tucson, Dr. Peters stated:

We probably have handled the most deaths from border crossings. We have had approximately 1,700 deaths in the last 10 years. We haven't had a single death due to a beheading or having a beheading associated with

it... It's exceedingly rare for the deaths to have anything to do with any type of violence at all, and certainly no beheadings (Farley, 2010).

With a backlash from the media as well as from Brewer's gubernatorial opponent, Brewer backed away from her claim that immigration led to beheadings in an interview with the Associated Press. "I misspoke, but you know, let me be clear, I am concerned about the border region because it continues to be reported in Mexico that there's a lot of violence going on and we don't want that going into Arizona" (Brewer, 2010).

While Brewer's comments were proven to have been false, the image of beheaded bodies strewn about the desert as a result of the crime brought by undocumented immigrants was visceral. These comments were another example of the power of this type of language when constructing the representation Brewer wanted the people watching the interview to believe.

Russell Pearce often spoke about the human costs associated with undocumented immigration in reference to murders at the hands of people that resided in the State illegally. In one such instance, Pearce wrote to State Senator John Huppenthal that:

9,000 are killed "each" year at the hands of illegal aliens. 25 each day, 12 by stabbings and shootings and 13 by DUI and related crimes, This is from Congressional Homeland Security Report, (4 to 10 million illegals crossed into the U.S, last year alone) (Pearce's email to Huppenthal, 2006)

Pearce went on to list what he labeled were the "true" costs of immigration:

Death and maimings of police officers and citizens by illegal aliens
(SHORT LIST)

Officer Shane Figueroa killed by illegal aliens Serial child rapist in Chandler, illegal alien Phoenix Officer Nick Erfle - Murdered. Phoenix Officer Marc Atkinson - Murdered. Phoenix Officer Robeli Sitek - Murdered. Kris Eggle-park ranger in southern Arizona - Murdered. Border

Patrol Agent James Epling - Murdered. Maricopa County Deputy Sean Pearce critically wounded while serving homicide warrant - shot & critically wounded. Maricopa County Deputy Lew Argetsinger shot while executing a search warrant for homicide - shot by homicide suspect. Sgt. Manuel H. Tapia was shot by a drug suspect - Murdered. DPS Officer Robeli K. Martin, murdered - by, illegal alien 19-year-old ex-convict; Agent Richard Fass, 37, of the United States Drug Enforcement Agency, murdered; Agent Alexander Kirpnick, 27, Border Patrol, murdered; Jason Schechterle suffered fourth-degree burns when his patrol care [sic] was struck - the driver was an illegal alien. Gilbert mother killed by illegal alien fleeing from Mesa PD (had prior arrest and not deported) Jason, Decorated Iraq war veteran stabbed in his own front yard by illegal alien.

The one thing that was common in almost every single one of the emails released by the ACLU from Russell Pearce was the idea that the undocumented immigrant brought violent crime to the state. As shown by the previous list, in each case that Pearce listed off the names of the officers involved in violent crime, Sean Pearce, Russell Pearce's son, was listed. The fact that Pearce and his son were both attacked by individuals that were undocumented clearly affected Pearce's reasoning for the development of SB1070.

The problem with the list that Pearce provided to Senator Huppenthal and others in his emails to supporters, was that it was completely without context. When dates were provided in the lists, there were no more than a few words to describe the circumstances surrounding the alleged attacks, nor were there results of the investigations around those incidents. This method of representation was meant to convince the audience of that communication about the shared characteristics of all people Pearce labeled as criminal illegals or invaders. Once this representation is created, the intended audience has two choices. The first is to accept Pearce's reductionist paradigm that all people that enter the United States without authorization are violent criminals. The second is to take the

opposite that all people that enter the country are innocent bystanders of a system meant to exploit their hard work.

The problem with this type of constructivist language is that neither representation of the undocumented immigrant is accurate at all times and in all places. The fact that Pearce may be accurate in asserting that there are numerous instances where undocumented immigrants have committed violent crimes is irrelevant. Conversely, the fact that large groups of people come to United States without authorization are just trying to make a better life for themselves is also irrelevant when it comes to the politics of representation. The point is that by creating the dualism of violent criminal illegal versus innocent worker leads to the dehumanization of the people this issue affects.

In the same email to Senator Huppenthal, Pearce continued to define what he viewed as the behavior of the undocumented immigrant by describing the situation at the border. "What we find is a mass invasion of historic proportions: individuals running through backyards, breaking down fences, slaughtering cattle, cutting their dogs' throats if they bark, and terrifying people" (Pearce, 2006). Pearce reiterates his point, and that of Brewer, that the state of Arizona is under attack by an invasion of illegal aliens that are inherently violent. Relating back to the previous section about an attack on American identity and what it means to be American, Pearce says:

In another case of justice denied, the murderer of Phoenix high school student Tanee Natividad merely crossed the border into Mexico to escape law enforcement. A local television station was able to track down the murderer in a bar just a few miles across the border without much effort. Max LaMadrid has no reason to hide because the Mexican government actually helps violent criminals escape American justice. According to then Arizona Attorney General Janet Napolitano, action by the Mexican Supreme Court making it more difficult to extradite criminals has "created an incentive for people to flee into Mexico as a safe harbor." At one time, Mexico would not extradite criminals who might be subject to the death

penalty; the Mexican court recently extended this "protection" to any Mexican who might receive a life sentence, thereby giving a free pass to rapists, kidnappers and child molesters (Pearce, 2006)

This narrative shows Pearce's desire to claim that Mexico is a failed state and cannot properly control its own citizenry. Pearce does this to explain why it is necessary to implement SB1070 and tough immigration policies because of the deteriorating conditions in Mexico as problems leached to the United States. These conditions as a result of the criminal actions of the 'illegal alien invasion' lead him to believe that the State of Arizona had to do something to stop the growing problems associated with undocumented immigration.

Undocumented Immigrants as Financial Drain

The ease of which Brewer and Pearce identified undocumented immigrants with a non-assimilating individual and a criminal immigrant was equal to the ease to label them as a financial drain on the state government and to the law abiding tax payer. While the first two representations dealt with the way in which immigrants threatened the physical safety and their identity of an Arizonan, the idea that undocumented individuals were an economic burden was meant to hit the people where it hurt the most: The pocket book.

In the same email to Senator Huppenthal that laid out the criminal statistics in the previous section, Pearce lays out the economic costs associated with immigration:

1. \$11 Billion to \$22 billion is spent on welfare to illegal aliens each year.
2. \$2.2 Billion dollars a year is spent on food assistance programs such as food stamps, WIC, and free school lunches for illegal aliens.
3. \$2.5 Billion dollars a year is spent on Medicaid for illegal aliens.

4. \$12 Billion dollars a year is spent on primary and secondary school education for children here illegally and they cannot speak a word of English!
5. \$17 Billion dollars a year is spent for education for the American-born children of illegal aliens, known as anchor babies.
6. \$3 Million Dollars a DAY is spent to incarcerate illegal aliens.
7. 30% percent of all Federal Prison inmates are illegal aliens.
8. \$90 Billion Dollars a year is spent on illegal aliens for Welfare and Social Services by the American taxpayers.
9. \$200 Billion Dollars a year in suppressed American wages are caused by the illegal aliens.
10. The illegal aliens in the United States have a crime rate that's two-and-a-half times that of non-illegal aliens. In particular, their children, are going to make a huge additional crime problem in the US.
11. During the year of 2005 there were 4 to 10 MILLION illegal aliens that crossed our Southern Border also, as many as 19,500 illegal aliens from Terrorist Countries. Millions of pounds of drugs, cocaine, meth, heroin and marijuana, crossed into the U. S from the Southern border. Homeland Security Report.
12. The National Policy Institute, "estimated that the total cost of mass deportation would be between \$206 and \$230 billion or an average cost of between \$41 and \$46 billion annually over a five year period."
13. In 2006 illegal aliens sent home \$45 BILLION in remittances back to their countries of origin.
14. "The Dark Side of Illegal Immigration: Nearly One Million Sex Crimes Committed by Illegal Immigrants In The United States".

Conservative Total cost is a whooping ... \$338.3 BILLION (Pearce, 2006).

Pearce centers his representation of the undocumented immigrant on the financial costs, specifically how the costs would affect the state budget if the problem were addressed in the manner Pearce would like it to. Throughout the description of the 'illegal aliens', Pearce reduced the people, their story, and their lives to numbers on a page. The fact that this email was sent to another state politician shows the motivation of Pearce behind the drive to approve SB1070 and how easy it is for Pearce to forget these are real people that he is talking about. That is never better displayed in this previous quote when Pearce claims that the crime rate of 'illegal aliens' is two and half times that of 'non-illegal aliens'.

Pearce then moves to say that the real problem is not just that these people are breaking laws, but also that they are having children that are going to be a 'huge' problem in the future. The children have not broken any laws but the fact that will break those laws years down the road make them a 'huge' threat to Arizona.

Pearce again references the cost of educating the undocumented in his testimony to Congress by arguing, "In Arizona alone, the annual cost of illegal immigration is approximately \$2.6 billion and that is just to educate, medicate and incarcerate illegal aliens in Arizona. Nationally, the cost is in the tens of billions of dollars and the taxpayers foot the bill" (Pearce, 2012). Although the education of those that are undocumented will most likely result in the betterment of those that Pearce previously labeled 'huge' threats to the future of Arizona, Pearce seems upset with trying to do something about it. Pearce also ignores the potential positive impacts of educating all children, including those of undocumented parents.

In response to sharp criticism of Arizona's hard-lined stance on immigration, tourism numbers fell enough to the point where Jan Brewer had to declare that she would create a public relations campaign in an attempt to restore Arizona's damaged image (Gilbertson, 2010). The program would have cost the state millions of dollars to get off the ground but when the budget was slashed, only \$250,000.00 ended up getting earmarked. The result was a brief national advertisement campaign that showed Arizona as a beautiful state full of natural wonders but was ultimately unsuccessful to change the image of a state plagued with violence. In a push to gain support for SB1070, Brewer overplayed her hand by claiming that cartel violence was out of control in the state of

Arizona and then looked foolish when she turned around and said that maybe it wasn't as bad as she first postulated.

The representation of the immigrant as a financial drain was meant to further show how the problems at the border were extreme and how many of the problems could be connected to the undocumented migrant. In the next chapter, I will speak specifically to how these economic representations were also meant to associate the undocumented with a lack of employment opportunities because of the sluggish economic conditions at the time of the debate.

Representations Creating Exceptional Space

The language of Pearce and Brewer created the representations of the undocumented immigrant as threats to American sovereignty, criminals, financial drains, and potential terrorists. The reason why these representations were used to explain the need for SB1070's implementation, despite some of the reaching provisions within the law, was because of the immediacy and severity of the problem. The need to more strictly enforce immigration laws, and in turn, affect the daily lives of legally residing Arizona state residents, was shown by the dire straits of the border as a result of undocumented immigration.

Pearce and Brewer used the term 'invasion' to describe the movement of 'illegal aliens' to show how desperate the situation had become. In their eyes, there was a state of emergency in Arizona and in order to stave off the tide of violence, drastic measures had to be taken place. Neocleous describes how the constant state of emergency after

9/11 and the Global War on Terror, has led to policies that run counter to the espoused ideals of the modern liberal state (Neocleous, 2008.) As it relates to the US-Mexico border, Jones explains that, “the border zone becomes a place of hyper-sovereignty where the state and its agents work to quickly make legible the people and things that come into its territory” (Jones 2012, page 109). This move, and its emphasis on the speed in which the agents must move because of that state of emergency, is precisely why Pearce and Brewer chose the language they did regarding how undocumented immigrants should be viewed.

As the threat of terrorism is no longer a linear, singular enemy as with Russia during the Cold War, paired with the state of emergency after 9/11 created a situation where enforcement of the border has shifted from the physical location of the United States boundary to the interior (Coleman, 2007). This shift from the boundary to the interior is directly reflected in SB1070 and need to empower the local police to move within Arizona to root out potential undocumented individuals.

Conclusion

The language used by Brewer and Pearce surrounding undocumented immigration and SB1070 centered on the creation of an enemy other designed to reduce the undocumented to the point of being sub-human. According to Brewer and Pearce, all people that fell into their created category of the undocumented immigrant had the worst of intentions and were outright dangerous. By creating the category of ‘illegal alien’ and ‘invader’, Brewer and Pearce painted a picture for voters that was bleak and getting

worse every day. According to both, the only way to improve the quickly eroding situation that was the US-Mexico border was to pass SB1070 and ignore the racial profiling that would certainly follow.

I argue that using these representations forces people to make impossible and unnecessary choices between ways of self-identifying that are not in the best interests of a just world. For many in the Southwestern United States, there are considerable connections to both sides of the border that include familial ties, cultural histories, sites of pleasure and vacation, and childhood memories. Brewer's and Pearce's political manipulation of representation is reductive and disallows the ability of many to consider themselves parts of a whole, not defined by one but by all.

On the other hand, I feel that sticking to any sort of representation and associating ontological realisms to that category, especially for political purposes is problematic and dangerous. It is only through the knowledge that this type of politics exists and is effective can people begin to pick up on certain language cues.

If all of that is accepted, and we can now see that Jan Brewer and Russell Pearce used these different methods of representation for political purposes, then we must now examine why these particular narratives were so successful. Arizona politicians, Pearce in particular, had long attempted to create stringent and all encompassing immigration reforms. Why was it so successful in the period before the bill's passage? What was the situation on the ground that led people to follow so willingly into a divisive and controversial decision? The answers to these questions and more lie in the event based tactics used by these same political entrepreneurs which acted as a catalyst for the representations they attempted to push on the populace.

CHAPTER 4: THE ROLE OF FEAR IN EVENT-BASED POLITICS

Introduction

We need more fear in politics... Every time we [Republicans] go back to 9/11 in New York, we lead the people back to the feeling of security threats...Every time Democrats talk about Katrina, Bush's number goes down. Fear takes us back to the emotional experience we had back then... The only one who's ever accused of using fear tactics in a campaign is the guy who loses, and that's a rule (Alex Castellanos, political media consultant and Institute of Politics fellow to a panel of Harvard students, reported by Liao, 2008)

This quote from an expert in the use of the media in American politics, given at one the most prestigious universities in the country, shows at the core what sways public opinion and wins elections. The students in attendance received the lecture with mixed reactions with some stating that it was wrong to assume that a positive campaign would never be well received, and how irresponsible it was for someone in the role of a mentor to teach such negative tactics. Castellanos responded simply. The candidate that walks the line between the right amount of fear and outright fear mongering will win the debate (Liao, 2008).

Even a casual observer of American politics can witness this principle in action in the months leading to an election of any level. The use of fear is even more on display in battleground states where candidates or issues are tightly contested. Voters are contacted nightly with various attack ads on television or radio with claims that are meant to scare the audience into believing whatever the message is. These messages often are prioritized over more positive ones because as Castellanos pointed out, fear sells.

Chapter three argued that there are no essentially ‘real’ categories with ontologically true characteristics as most of these are just socially constructed ways to self-identify. Once this is accepted, it is easier to see why political entrepreneurs mobilize these socially constructed representations for their own purposes. In the case of SB1070, I have shown to this point a few different examples of how different political entrepreneurs, namely Jan Brewer and Russell Pearce, used different representations in an attempt to get the bill passed.

The efforts to categorize undocumented immigration were on display by Russell Pearce when he testified to the United States Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Border Security. “The invasion of illegal aliens we face today – convicted felons, drug cartels, gang members, human traffickers and even terrorists – pose one of the greatest threats to our nation in terms of political, economic and national security” (Pearce, 2012, page 2). Pearce was called by the Senate to answer the question of Arizona’s legitimacy to raise such legislation despite the federal supremacy in matters dealing with immigration. Pearce set the stage with this quote for how he was going to construct an image into the voter’s mind about what he views are the essential characteristics of an undocumented immigrant. The remaining testimony referred to the countless problems in Arizona that the federal government ignored and was why Arizona had to act on its own.

That begs the question: Why were these methods so effective? First and foremost, it must be accepted that the political entrepreneur’s use of different representations was successful because the legislation passed and the bill remains intact today. As previously discussed in the historical background section, Arizona has gone

through a long maturation of this process of immigration reform and SB1070 was not pulled out of thin air. This bill represents a much more encompassing and controversial piece of legislation.

This chapter examines the precise situation in Arizona around the time of the bill's inception and passage. I focus on the various techniques used by Jan Brewer, Russell Pearce, and others to create representations for their own political purposes. To understand how it might be possible that this legislation was passed in June of 2010, it is important to examine some of the most influential talking points. Both Pearce and Brewer consistently referenced different events throughout the debate leading up to the bill's passage and it is through an understanding of why these events were used that we can continue the discussion about the politics of representation.

Previously, I laid out why political entrepreneurs create various representations in an attempt to force people to choose sides. This section shows one of the most effective methods of political maneuvering and deals with the different events that politicians chose to highlight during their discussions about SB1070. I focus on three different events that led to distinct and effective narratives. The first event that I highlight is 9/11 and the security narratives that followed as related to the Arizona state border. The second event is broadly defined as the recession in the United States that began in 2007 and persisted, especially in Arizona, throughout the entire time SB1070 was debated. The third event (or series of related events) is the presence of Mexican Cartel related violence in Arizona and around the Mexico-Arizona border.

What this section will not do is claim that the usage of these events is the reason why the legislation passed or try to understand why these events happened in the first

place. What I would like to do is show first that the political entrepreneurs used different events for the purpose of creating saliency for their representations.

The Role of the Event in Politics

There are deeper epistemological problems here that I will not discuss, such as how we recognize what constitutes an "event" and how we draw boundaries around it. It should eventually become clear that "events" are themselves defined and delimited by the stories with which we configure them and are probably impossible to imagine apart from their narrative context (Cronon, 1992, page 1351).

According to Sahlins, "what makes an act or incident an event is precisely its contrast to the going order of things, its disruption of that order" (Sahlins, 1991, pg. 45). The three events that I discuss will definitely be considered a disruption of the order in the lives of Arizona residents.

While many academic sociologists will agree that events are an important variable or phenomena to study, there is a wide range of different methods in which to study what these events mean in the larger sense. Tarrow argues that there are three different ways of looking at events in an inquiry (Tarrow, 2012). The first method treats the events as a variable that "counted as a unit of analysis in contentious politics" (Moore, 2011, pg. 296) and essentially those counts are analyzed without looking at the social processes within those events. This type of research, "has rarely paid analytic attention to the contingent features and causal significance of particular contentious events" (McAdam and Sewell, 2001, pg. 101).

The second approach, deals with events not as singular, unrelated events but rather, as a series of connected events that are interrelated (Moore, 2011; Tarrow 2012).

With the critical gaze less on the specific event, this approach sets, “the task of identifying specific combinations of contentious performances (repertoires) that repeatedly occur during episodes of contention” (Moore, 2011, pg. 296). This approach shows the importance of events while admitting that to study one particular event without context misses the larger point of what the event might be all about.

The final approach examines events as changing and constantly evolving social systems (Moore, 2011). The approach aims to remove the rigid nature and emphasis on too much structure, thus inhibiting a scholar’s ability to account for perspective (Sewell, 2005.). This particular method of inquiry is interesting to me in that, of the three, this is the only way to understand how and why things happen as they do. Without first understanding the context in which an event occurs, and then examining how those events are received by the people, it is difficult to understand much about the event at all.

While it is helpful to see how events are interrelated, it is much more critical to study why these particular events were chosen by the political entrepreneurs. I find it unnecessary to discuss how, or even if in the case of the cartel violence, the particular events took place in Arizona during the debate surrounding SB1070 because of a few different reasons.

First, I must show that the economic recession of 2007, the attacks of 9/11, and the cartel related violence are particular events, whether it be as singular, unrelated entities or as with the previous discussion about events, a series of related issues.

Secondly, I must examine and demonstrate how these particular events were mobilized as tools in the hands of the political entrepreneurs. A politician generally has limited opportunities to reach the voting public and because of that, it requires that person

to have a narrowly crafted message designed for a specific purpose. Given that assumption, I operate with the idea that these events that Brewer, Pearce, and others chose to emphasize, were done so for a very specific reason. What was that reason and why was that message so well received?

Fear as the Most Powerful Motivator

Political entrepreneurs use various events to reify representations (insert race, sex, ethnic groups, illegal immigrants, etc.), but particular types of events are most effective at getting the message across. Jan Brewer, Russell Pearce, and others used different events to focus on when they pushed their own representations and understandings about the world to the potential voters. I think, in short, the answer lies in the fact that political leaders are going to say whatever is necessary to either get elected or get their particular legislation passed. In this case, was done with images that were often extremely violent and brutal.

Burke wrote before the American Revolution in reference to the persuasiveness of invoking fear of death and pain or issues of love and happiness. Burke concluded that “(t)he passions therefore which are conversant about the preservation of the individual turn chiefly on pain and danger, and they are the most powerful of all the passions” (Burke 1757). In essence, while most political actors will speak out against acts of violence or terror, most will still utilize those images for their own gains. Put another way, “(t)hough most modern writers and politicians oppose political fear as the enemy of

liberty, reason, and other Enlightenment values, they often embrace it, in spite of themselves, as a source of political vitality” (Robin, 2006, pg. 4).

Robin goes on to discuss the method in which political actors will use the most terrible images imaginable to create a unified front of people dedicated to ensure those images do not happen again (Robin, 2006). What makes this particular inquiry into how politicians use fear as a method for crafting an effective political message unique is that Robin posits that only certain types of events have the ability to wake people up from a happy slumber. Robin believes that fear has always been a more effective method of affecting political vigor than any sort of appeal to positive feelings (Robin, 2006).

It is easy to see this principal in action by opening the morning newspaper. The newspaper industry has often been parodied in literature and cinema as the best example of Robin’s idea that people are more concerned about what they are afraid of than what they feel good towards. William Randolph Hearst and Joseph Pulitzer made Yellow Journalism famous in America in the late 1800’s because of their ability to do and say anything that would sell newspapers (Lee; Solomon, 1990). In essence, Hearst and Pulitzer knew what people wanted to read.

With the assumption that people will be much more motivated by fear than with other virtues such as empathy, social good and justice, it is possible to see why political entrepreneurs choose specific events over others to discuss in their political speeches. Much as in the daily newspapers, if politicians were to stand in front of their electorate and talk about the positive impacts of undocumented migration, their message would be merely a footnote in the intended audience’s mind. On the converse, however, if that same political entrepreneur were to construct representations of murder, death, and

impending doom, the audience is much more likely to immediately pick a side of the argument.

Fear as a method to motivate potential voters is effective and relates directly back to the earlier discussion about the selection of different events by the politicians to reify specific representations. “The event is part of a cyclical and dynamic process leading to the crystallisation of group identity at certain points in time. This is especially evident when an event is attached to collective identities, creating an impetus for collective action” (Barbour, Jones 2013, pg. 7). In essence, the event chosen by the political entrepreneur is made much more potent if it is one that is designed to scare the intended audience. The fear in this sense, is another political tool wielded by those in power.

For those that believe that fear is not a part of the political experience in America because of its enlightened ideals, Robin argues that there are two kinds of fear that exist in America. “These two kinds of fear--the first, uniting the nation, the second dividing it—reinforce each other, with elites reaping the benefit of their combined force. The collective fear of danger distracts from the fear between elites and the lower orders, or it gives the latter added reason to fear the former” (Robin, 2006, page 161). This plays out in the politics in Arizona surrounding SB1070 that political entrepreneurs like Jan Brewer and Russell Pearce fear the power of the voting electorate (i.e. the lower orders). In order to obscure that fear, Brewer and Pearce create fear about the ‘invasion of illegal aliens’ in order to distract people from the bigger point.

Robin goes on to explain that fear from the elites towards the lower orders is not enough to preserve their rule. The relationship could not function if it were just a top down system of interaction with a series of consequences for those that break the norms.

“It is an affair of collusion, involving the grunt work of collaborators, the cooperation of victims, and aid from those bystanders who do nothing to protest fear’s repressive hold” (Robin, page 162). I now turn to the relationship between the people that have the ability to propagate fear, those that are meant to internalize it, and how it is manifested.

The Terrorist Attacks of 9/11

When the World Trade Center Towers came down on September 11th, 2001, so too did the American feeling of indestructibility and untouchability from foreign enemies. The problem was made even more contentious because the people that committed these terrible crimes came from outside the United States, thus thrusting the issue of immigration concerns into the spotlight.

Boundaries have shifted throughout history as technological advances allowed state expansion so that, “the precise role played by boundaries changed from defensive military lines, to markers of sovereignty, to sites for preventing the movement of undesired people” (Jones, page 9). Before the attacks of 9/11, it was the Mexican immigrants who were the undesired people that the United States wanted to prevent the movement of. When the images of the towers crashing to the ground were televised to the entire world, it served as a reminder that people in the country were vulnerable. This feeling of insecurity led to the idea that in order to keep the people safe from terrorists, the border needed to be, “understood as an exceptional space where any actions, regardless of their severity, are acceptable to maintain order and control” (Jones, 2012, page 104).

Despite the fact that none of the individuals that carried out the attacks in New York came through the United States-Mexico border, and despite the fact that most of them came here legally, political entrepreneurs in Arizona exploited the violent images associated with the towers crashing to the ground for purposes of advancing SB1070. These efforts were nothing more than xenophobic fears about the continued growth of the group of people identifying themselves as Hispanics by equating them to Arabic terrorists. Nothing typifies these efforts more than an email from Russell Pearce that laid out what he thought was one of the major foreign policy concerns about securing the border of the United States:

Had law enforcement enforced our immigration laws we would have averted 9/11. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 underscored for all Americans the link between immigration law enforcement and terrorism. Four of the five leaders of the 9/11 attack were in violation of our immigration laws and had contact with law enforcement but were not arrested. Nineteen alien terrorists had been able to violate our immigration laws, overstay their visas or violate their Immigration statuses with impunity, and move freely within the Country without significant interference from federal or local law enforcement. The abuse of U.S. Immigration laws was instrumental in the deaths of nearly 3,000 people on that tragic day in America (Pearce, 2012).

Pearce's violent connection between the terrorist attacks of 9/11 of border security conflates the issues that Arizona deals with on a daily basis, which is supposedly why SB1070 was made in the first place.

The other interesting part of this discussion about SB1070 and the use of the attacks in New York is the fact that it plays to earlier discussion about an attack from an enemy other. "Post-9/11, one of the ramifications of this event is the increased division between what are described as the civilised Western world and the barbaric uncivilised places that foster terrorism" (Gregory and Pred, 2007). This further reifies Jan Brewer's

claim that the problems of the south are heading their way north by implying that not only is Mexico filled with people that want to come across the border, steal Arizonan jobs, run drugs through the state, and kill innocent people, but there could also potentially be terrorists. (Brewer, 2010)

Pearce better shows this point by stating:

Who in their right mind thinks we need to import 4,000,000 people from the Third World into our country annually? What is the benefit?...it's like injecting yourself with cancer cells to see what will happen. It's like importing leper colonies and hope we don't catch leprosy. It's like importing thousands of Islamic jihadists and hope they adapt to the American Dream" (Pearce, 2010, exhibit 7).

Pearce here equates immigrants from Mexico and other places south of Arizona's border to cancerous cells trying to destroy the body of Arizona as a whole.

Despite the fact that these comments may be somewhat extreme and should be taken in the context that they were not meant for everyone to see, that doesn't mean they do not better explain how Pearce and others rationalize their position on SB1070. Pearce has repeatedly claimed that immigration is an invasion and it is easy to see why he would try and compare immigration to 9/11. The use of violent imagery to compare two things that would not normally have an association (immigrant vs. assailant flying a plane into a building) is meant to instill fear into the people that are to receive this message.

The use of 9/11 as an event to further cement the representation of the undocumented immigrant as a potential terrorist on top of the other representations that Brewer and Pearce have created shows the importance of using fear when creating these visions. While 9/11 was nine years removed, and as already mentioned, had nothing to do with the US-Mexico border, it was still an effective way to instill fear into the minds of the potential voter or legislator.

Undocumented Immigrants as a Threat to American Livelihood

The recession of 2007 rocked the citizens of the United States to the very core. People that were used to decades of steady economic growth were suddenly forced to face the realities of a slumping economy. Quick to assign blame, political entrepreneurs from all sides of the political spectrum found causes for the downturn. In early 2010, easy targets for Arizona legislators were undocumented migrants. Before I began my discussion of the various efforts to utilize the recession as a political tool to instill fear in people, I would like to set the stage by pointing out some economic indicators to show the situation in Arizona during the debate of SB1070.

The number of unemployed residents in Arizona in January 2010 was at 338,072 (seasonally adjusted) for a total of 10.8% while the national unemployment rate was lower at 9.8% (AZstats.gov, 2012). Wages in the state had dropped to its lowest levels since 2004, and were still below the national average. The median home price in Phoenix, Arizona in January of 2010 was approximately \$139,960.00 where only a few years before in January of 2007, the price was \$314,970.00 (Census. gov, 2012). The drop of over half (~55.5%) of the value of the home was much higher than the national average of 14.2%.

I argue that whatever the extent of the recession, or whatever level of recovery was underway in January of 2010, it is safe to assume that Arizona had not fully recovered from the sharp drop as a result of the economic crisis in 2007. The fact that many of these economic statistics were lower than the national average would also play a

role in many of the Arizona state legislator's assertion that the federal government was callous to the problems of the state (Rough, 2010).

In an interview given shortly after the Bill's passage, Jan Brewer stated that before signing SB1070 into law, she deliberated the bill extensively and was extremely "cognizant of what the impact of illegal immigration was doing to the state of Arizona in relation to cost" (Rough, 2010). Brewer and Pearce were both on record stating the costs of undocumented immigration from various different sources as higher education costs, health care costs, incarceration costs, police enforcement costs, and numerous other examples.

The importance of Brewer and Pearce's references to the economic costs associated with immigrants is clear when you couple that with the earlier discussion about fear as a motivator. At a rally on June 5th, 2010, designed to gather support for SB1070, Russell Pearce, "... justified SB 1070 by reciting the hard costs of illegal immigration to Arizona taxpayers — \$2.7 billion in a time of high unemployment and record foreclosures" (Sterling, 2010). Pearce went on to explain that illegal immigrants were costing the people of Arizona entirely too much money and in his personal opinion, enough was enough.

In an email that was never intended to reach the public eye, obtained through an ACLU Freedom of Information Act Request, Pearce goes on to explain in detail the various ways undocumented immigrants cost the taxpayers of Arizona. As mentioned in the introduction, some of the recipients of the emails were redacted if they were not public servants, but it is clear from the tone that Pearce is trying to convince other people that SB1070 is necessary and inaction is not in the best interests of the people of the state.

Some of the emails date as far back as 2007 and show the development of his disdain for undocumented migrants.

In one of the earliest emails obtained by the ACLU, Pearce penned a message in 2007 from his government computer and forwarded it to his personal email address. The message went on to describe the financial impact of the ‘illegal invasion’.

The number now is certainly in excess of 600,000 people (perhaps 1,000,000). That's more than one out of every ten people who live in our state! One out of every ten people you pass on the road. One out of every ten people you see at the store; and MORE THAN one of every ten people you see in our classrooms and probably one out of every two in our emergency rooms (Pearce, 2007).

The same email goes on to explain that the economic burden of the undocumented immigrant is one of the greatest drains on the American economy, which during the time of the email, was at the height of the Recession. Pearce explains that through attrition and deportation, “18 million unemployed American workers will enjoy jobs that must rise to the market value of a First World nation. It means those CEOs at major corporations will not be able to pay for their Lear Jets and fifth \$10 million Aspen home, but Americans will get the job done” (Pearce, 2007). The claim that the sudden removal of what Pearce labels ‘invaders’ would lead to 18 million jobs in America is unsupported by any other economic data, as is the case with much of Pearce’s economic assumptions. It is also interesting to note that Pearce, a staunch capitalist, makes a Marxist point about the exploitation of workers by the bourgeoisie that shows again, Pearce was willing to say whatever was necessary to get his point across.

Pearce shows that his brand of enforcement will be effective in another email to Karen S. Johnson, an Arizona state senator when he relays a story about witnessing a changing ethnicity of the work crew in one of the neighborhoods he drove past on the

way to work. According to Pearce, “Yesterday there were two men who were obviously NOT Hispanic -- very white and very American looking -- like college kids. Hooray! It looks like the illegals are starting to depart” (Pearce, 2007).

In an email to another State Senator, John Huppenthal, dated the 30th of June, 2009, Pearce explains, “In 2000 there were an estimated 600,000 illegal aliens in Arizona alone and that's a conservative estimate. Arizona voters are paying hundreds of millions of dollars each year for illegal aliens, providing medical care for them and subsidizing their living expenses and much more, then the crime that comes with the illegal alien invasion”(Pearce, 2009). Pearce goes on to implore the Senator to take the invasion more seriously and set the stage for the creation of SB1070.

What follows is a bulletized list created by Pearce in an email in 2009:

- How long do we ignore the damage to America, in murders, maimings, kidnappings, car jackings, gangs, Identity theft, \$2.7 billion annually here in Arizona just to Educate, Medicate and Incarcerate illegal aliens. And what about the 17 to 30 million Americans out of work ...and we still allow employers to higher [sic] "illegal" workers.
- Federal prisons have over 35% illegals incarcerated, and 20% of Arizona prisons are filled with illegals who have committed felonies.
- Our State is broke; \$3.5 billion deficit and we have many serious decisions to make. One is that we do not have the money to care for any who are not here legally. It has to stop.
- Finally, we create cultural and linguistic apartheid by creating a slave class of workers unassimilated while growing in numbers and antagonistic strength. This condition creates a perfect formula for rioting and violence that will tear our nation to pieces! Ask Paris, France! (Pearce, 2009)

When read in the context of the economic situation in Arizona, it is clear why Russell Pearce used the specific examples that he did and it revolves entirely around scaring the intended recipient of the email. Pearce continues to harp on the economic statistics, whatever their validity may be, because he wants people to do a few things

almost immediately. The first is related to the previous discussion about representation and categorization.

By removing the personal characteristics of the undocumented immigrant and categorizing all people in that category as “illegal immigrant”, Pearce moves to establish essentializing characteristics to all people within that group. For this particular case, Pearce establishes the representation all people that come without authorization, are immediately criminals seeking to steal legally residing residents’ jobs. Responding to the criticism that migrant workers generally only do jobs others do not want to do, Pearce says, “The illegals no longer work on the farm [sic]. They move into every Middle Class job in America and they undercut wages for America’s working poor and destroy the living wages of the Middle Class” (Pearce, 2007).

I think it is important here to again revisit why Pearce frames many of his arguments around the central event I defined as the recession of 2007. As an example of the order being disturbed, the recession created an already forming anxiety that Pearce knew too well and this was his chance to pass what he has labeled “his life’s work” (Pearce For Arizona, 2010). With a slower than hoped for recovery and foreclosures happening at rates never before seen in the current generation’s lifetimes, the various political entrepreneur’s use of the dire economic times created an effective fear of losing their own jobs and financial stability. Whether or not it was reality that people were losing their jobs because of the presence of an undocumented immigrant was irrelevant as the point was already made.

The usage of the economic burden of the undocumented migrant narrative was successful in that it forced people to either view the category of illegal immigrant as a

financial drain or a helpful member of that economy. During better economic times, it might be an easier pill to swallow to view those people that are not here legally as potentially beneficial but when there is so much financial hardship, it is much harder to ignore the calls to fear and anxiety.

As with all things, SB1070 was not only centered around an economic narrative, even though it did play a major role, and there were other ways in which the political elites utilized fear as a weapon. If someone doesn't believe that undocumented migrants were a threat to them financially, then it would be up to politicians to convince them that they were a danger to people physically as well.

Murder on the Border Mobilizes the Immigrant as Criminal

Arizona's close proximity to the US-Mexico border always guarantees that its residents will have ample opportunity to interact with other Mexican citizens if they desire whether it be for vacations, cheap prescription drugs, or possibly to visit family. The close proximity means that it also has the possibility to include some of the more criminal elements as well. With the economic conditions seemingly getting worse every year in Arizona in January of 2010, there was also a string of highly publicized violent episodes that became tied to the Mexican drug cartels and eventually to the immigrant as well.

The debate over SB1070, and the rhetoric that followed, seemed to focus primarily on the economic drain of undocumented migrants but also centered a great deal on the criminal nature of immigrants. Brewer and Pearce rushed to add to the

representation they were hoping to reify of a job stealing immigrant by labeling all people that enter into Arizona from Mexico as criminals. At one point during a debate for the Governor's office, Brewer made comments that alluded to her opinion that it was possible that criminal activity was the only reason that Mexicans come to United States. Brewer clarified her position about the criminal nature of immigrants by saying, "I believe today, under the circumstances that we're facing, that the majority of the illegal trespassers that are coming into the state of Arizona are under the direction and control of organized drug cartels and they are bringing drugs in" (Rough, 2010).

Pearce further explains the problem of the criminal illegal immigrant in an email, "Phoenix, Arizona ranks number two in the world in kidnappings and home invasions, number three as the most violent city in America; and Arizona is the home invasion, car jacking, identity theft capitol of the world as a direct result of our illegal alien invasion" (Pearce, 2009). While these numbers appear to be misleading and a little suspect, I would like to focus instead on what he is trying to say in the message. Pearce wants who reads this narrative to believe that the illegal alien invasion is linked directly to the incredibly violent acts that make Arizona one of the most unsafe places in the world to live.

A bizarre murder of an undocumented immigrant in Chandler, Arizona, added fuel to the fire to the controversy surrounding SB1070. A man that had only been in the state for a few days was drinking with some people that he knew in an apartment and when he woke up the next morning, one of the men had been stabbed to death. The police arrived on the scene to find the suspect asleep in another room with no knowledge of what had happened to the victim who had also been decapitated (Merrill and Jacobs,

2010). While the murder was a blow to those opposing SB1070, the story didn't gain much traction because it was an immigrant who was killed.

The murder of a popular rancher along the border exploded the already heated rhetoric around the debate of SB1070. On March 27, 2010, a man named Robert Krentz was murdered on his property in Cochise County along the Chiricahua Mountains (Wagner, 2010). Krentz was out on his ATV inspecting his land when he saw a group of what he thought were immigrants and his last transmission on his handheld radio was to his wife that he was going to see if he could offer assistance. Later that evening, Krentz's body was discovered near a set of footprints that showed a group of people fleeing to the south and what appeared back towards the border (Wagner, 2010).

The reaction to Krentz's murder was intense as members from both political parties lined up to call for justice for the rancher's murder as Senator Jon McCain, Senator Jon Kyl, and Arizona Governor Jan Brewer demanded that anyone in the federal government assist with immigration (Kelley, 2010). State Senator Gabriel Giffords went as far as to send a letter to President Obama stating that, "this cold-blooded murder is a sober reminder that the safety of U.S. citizens on American soil is under attack" (Giffords, 2010). Former Congressman J.D. Hayworth added that Krentz was "a martyr for this cause, a symbol of efforts to combat illegal immigration and border violence (Wagner, 2010). The use of the term martyr here is a poignant example of how people were trying to utilize Krentz's murder to instill fear as the term martyr has become associated with jihadist terrorists in the modern sense.

The representation of the violent criminal immigrant now had a very public and well respected victim. Jan Brewer people gave people a simple choice when she made

her speech after she signed SB1070 into law by stating, “We cannot sacrifice our safety to the murderous greed of drug cartels. We cannot stand idly by as drop houses, kidnappings and violence compromise our quality of life” (Brewer, 2010). Despite the fact that it was never proven who murdered Robert Krentz, the identity of who actually committed the act of violence was no longer necessary in the political arena. When Pearce, Brewer and other’s associated this crime with an immigrant, then that connection was set in stone with the constant barrage of media coverage of the event.

The people intended to receive these simplistic understandings of border issues were first told that undocumented immigrants were going to steal their jobs and basically take away Arizona resident’s ability to make a living. Couple that with the very graphic stories about beheadings, drug violence, and now the sad story of Robert Krentz, and it is easier to understand why these two events were chosen as a focal point for the campaign for SB1070. While the murder of the rancher came at a time when the debate surrounding SB1070 raged in both Arizona and nationally, it was the reference to another extremely violent act in American history that further exemplified what message Jan Brewer and Russell Pearce wanted to craft with their different narratives about undocumented immigration.

Conclusion

Jan Brewer stated in a celebratory press release after signing SB1070 into law that she “believe(s) every one of us wants to be safe, and none of us wants to compromise on the subject of civil Rights” (Brewer, 2010). Brewer went to considerable lengths in the

press release to reinforce the idea that even though the potential for civil rights violations would be possible with the passage of SB0170, she believes the ends to justify the means. Brewer reiterated that America and Arizona were legislated by laws that were, “Good laws ... well-intentioned laws ... laws that confer respect and that demand respect in return” (Brewer, 2010). The problem with this statement is that it just doesn’t hold up to be true when you look at the costs of enacting an immigration enforcement policy away from the border. At the core of the legislation is the need to first identify individuals that might possibly be within the United States illegally. Brewer claims that this law confers respect but simply is not the case when one thinks about how a police officer would make the judgment call of who is legally present in Arizona without using race as their main determinant.

The debate around SB1070 seems to focus too often on whether or not one side of the argument is distorting numbers, whether it be crime statistics or economic data. The desire to constantly bicker back and forth about the rightness of one side or another simply plays into the hands of the political entrepreneurs and only moves to further reify the representations created for political purposes. To avoid the rigid structure laid out by those narrow categories is to envision a world where groups of people can be parts of all different categories and can exist in different levels. Put another way, we should be looking for what binds us all together “...instead of seeking common unity by appeals to a centre of sovereign authority, methodological consistency, canonicity, and science, they offer the possibility of common grounds of assembly between them. They are therefore planes of activity and praxis rather than one topography...” (Said, 1984, pg. 358).

To understand how and why these particular events were used during the debate of SB1070 is to better see what political entrepreneurs would like to accomplish by invoking these images. As laid out in the previous section, these representations that Brewer and Pearce created of the undocumented immigrant were not accurate for every single person that comes across the borders and it is unwise to take their representations as fact. More to the point, making ontological claims about bounded and static categories such as race, ethnicity, gender, and citizenship is wrought with mines that lead to more division as opposed to understanding. Amongst the groups of people coming across the border into the United States are people that want nothing more than the opportunity to make a decent living for themselves and their families. Regardless of political affiliation, to conflate who they are with a criminal, a terrorist, or a drug cartel member because of the color of their skin or where they come from is flat out wrong. This kind of thinking does nothing but increase the growing racial divide in the United States and in Arizona in particular.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The passage of SB1070 opened the door for local police officers to conduct the job that was once the federal responsibility of immigration enforcement. Supporters of the bill said that SB1070 did not make it illegal to reside in the United States as the federal law already made that distinction. What SB1070 did do, however, was require all police officers to verify the citizenship status of anyone they questioned was in the state of Arizona legally. It was this requirement and the potential for the harassment of legal residents that might appear Mexican that led to my desire to understand how the bill came into being. Throughout the thesis, I argued through the lens of critical geopolitics that SB1070 was a result of political manipulation and fear of the enemy other.

SB1070 was problematic from the outset as it required an amendment, HB 2162, to address what Jan Brewer herself labeled as:

...legal questions raised by some who expressed fears that the original law would somehow allow or lead to racial profiling. These new amendments make it crystal clear and undeniable that racial profiling is illegal, and will not be tolerated in Arizona (Brewer, 2010).

The fact that SB1070 needed an amendment after the bill endured six months of legislative review by the State Senate, the House of Representatives, and the governor, should have sent up warning flags about the potential problems moving forward.

Immediately following the passage of the bill, the executive director of the Arizona ACLU, Alessandro Soler Meetze, came out against SB1070 and stated that:

Governor Brewer and the Arizona legislature have set Arizona apart in their willingness to sacrifice our liberties and the economy of this state. By signing this bill into law, Brewer has just authorized violating the rights of

millions of people living and working here. She has just given every police agency in Arizona a mandate to harass anyone who looks or sounds foreign, while doing nothing to address the real problems we're facing (Meetze, 2010).

President Obama echoed Meetze's concerns when he argued that, "In the United States of America, no law-abiding person - be they an American citizen, a legal immigrant, or a visitor or tourist from Mexico - should (ever) be subject to suspicion simply because of what they look like" (Obama, 2010). President Obama's opposition to the bill led to an awkward moment between the President and Jan Brewer on the runway at Phoenix's Sky Harbor International Airport. Brewer wagged her finger at the President of the United States in a highly publicized exchange in an attempt to communicate her disapproval of the federal government's indifference to Arizona's problems related to immigration. The finger-wagging photo went on to symbolize the divide between the state and federal governments as well as Jan Brewer's role in the creation of SB1070. The photo was also championed by groups that opposed the President and Brewer relished the chance to have such national significance.

I argued in this thesis that SB1070 was the result of fear based political manipulation of representation at the hands of Jan Brewer and Russell Pearce. Both politicians spoke of the undocumented as if they were diseases that needed to be cured at all costs. The rhetoric was further enhanced when they paired the message that the immigrants were sub-human with events designed to create a vision of panic and disorder. Pearce and Brewer successfully created a situation in which people were willing to accept a policy that impinged on the rights of Arizona residents when the politicians invoked the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center, the economic recession, and the cartel violence on the border.

The grisly images that Brewer and Pearce used to describe the actions of undocumented immigrants made Arizona appear to be the site of constant cartel violence. While these images may have been effective at evoking certain emotional responses, they were also effective at scaring potential tourists and investors. The economic costs of conducting politics in such a manner may have been unfortunate but the social costs were much higher. These violent events, I have argued, when paired with politically manipulated representations of the undocumented immigrant created a scenario where voters were forced to drop pre-conceived notions of self-identification. I argue that anytime someone loses a portion of who they are, especially because of a political debate, we are further from a peaceful world than before.

The political opposition to the bill was also matched by different groups of citizens that believed the legislation was too divisive. The Los Angeles City Council voted 13-1 to halt all public funded transportation of government officials to Phoenix in May of 2010, in an attempt to show their displeasure of Arizona's crackdown on immigrants. Businesses throughout the country also threatened a boycott of Arizona related merchandise and the tourism industry suffered. In a sign of just how controversial SB1070 was, the professional basketball team in Phoenix, the Suns, concerned with the image of Arizona, officially changed their team uniforms to say "Los Suns" during a key stretch of a nationally televised playoff run.

Few pieces of legislation evoked such emotional responses in the State of Arizona in recent years and I argue that it was the actions of the political entrepreneurs that stirred up these heated responses. Think about the aforementioned example of the basketball team. The act of watching a professional basketball game should be one where people

forget about who they are or where they are from to cheer for their favorite team. People that show up to the game with “Los Suns” written across the chest of the team now are aware of the need to be sensitive to others that identify themselves as of Hispanic descent. Instead of forgetting about race, religion, or class to root for a common goal, people were divided in the stands along racial lines. While the goal of the publicity move was to show sensitivity, and ultimately shed light on the racist potential for SB1070, it also worked towards the politician’s behalf by highlighting people’s differences.

The implications of this type of politics are evidenced by SB1070 and the effects of increased police scrutiny for nothing more than appearing to be undocumented. In this thesis, I posited that the use of representation by political entrepreneurs does nothing towards advancing the cause of creating a world with more justice and freedom for all. Brewer and Pearce used different words throughout their speeches but their goal was always the same: division. It is through this division that political entrepreneurs create the space for their particular arguments. These socially constructed fissures offer a home for potentially harmful policies and outright xenophobia.

Pretending that these categories have certain unquestionable characteristics will only lead to reductionist language about what is considered as the enemy. In the case of SB1070, the enemy was the undocumented immigrant that wanted nothing more than to steal American jobs, slit the throats of dogs along the border communities, and destroy the parts of America that make it great. It is in this context that demonstrates how the politics of SB1070, and to a larger extent any issue that elicits the political manipulation of representation, runs counter to the liberal ideas of freedom and equality that the United States was founded on.

When viewed in this light, it is easy to see how people could rush to take sides in the argument, either for or against the bill but this type of monopolization misses the larger point. It is difficult to reduce any one person to a set of terms that identify who they are. Whether that term be White, Black, Male, Female, Democratic, or Republican, these terms cannot possibly encapsulate everything that we are as people. Each person has certain shades of gray in the ways that we identify ourselves and we cannot ignore irregularities in the categories so casually thrown about in politics. This kind of thinking allows for compassion because if you are willing to believe that other people's traditions play a part in your life, you are going to be more understanding of that group's problems. This is, however, dangerous to the political entrepreneur that seeks to manipulate how people self-identify because compassion can often lead to opposition of legislation that might seek to harm groups, particularly groups with limited ability to defend themselves. It is for this reason that the argument laid out in this thesis is important. We must be more aware of the methods our politicians use to pass their agendas and speak out against any form of communication that seeks to split us apart as opposed to that which brings us together. Minority groups, even ones that do not have the legal status required of citizenship, must be protected from an angry majority.

Just as I mentioned from the outset, I consider myself part of the Mexican tradition, just as much as I am a part of the American tradition. I am not whole without the other. That does not, however, mean that I am done becoming whoever I am intended to become. Tomorrow, I will meet new people and have new experiences that will add another aspect of who I am and possibly change the way I view myself, and my position

amongst those around me. Fear mongering and political representation do not allow for the dynamism and acceptance required to maintain a just world.

REFERENCES

- Andreas, Peter. *Border Games: Policing the US-Mexico Divide*. Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Ackleson, Jason. "Constructing Security on the US-Mexico Border". *Political Geography*, Vol. 24, pp. 165-184, 2005.
- Ackleson, Jason; Heyman, Josiah. "United States Border Security After 9/11". *Transforming Borders in the Al-Qaeda Era*. London, Ashgate, 2008.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Verso, London, 1983.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands – La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. 1st Edition. University of Texas Press, 1987.
- Barbour, Brandon; Jones, Reece. "Criminals, Terrorists, and Outside Agitators: Representational Tropes of the 'Other' in the 5 July Xinjiang, China Riots". *Geopolitics*, Vol. 18, Issue 1, 11 September, 2013.
- Benson, Matthew; Pitzl, Mary Jo. "Napolitano Exit Would Clear Way for GOP to Define State Agenda". *The Arizona Republic*, 21 November, 2008.
- Blitzer, Wolf. "An Interview with JD Hayworth". Situation Room, February 15th, 2010. http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2010/02/15/interview_with_jd_hayworth_104423.html, Accessed on 24 April, 2012.
- Bloome, David; Talwalkar, Susan. "Critical Discourse Analysis and the Study of Reading and Writing". *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 1997.
- Bodfield, Rhonda. "Poll: Arizonans Like Immigration Bill". *The Arizona Daily Star*, 22 April, 2010.
- Brewer, Jan. "Statement by Governor Jan Brewer". Released by State of Arizona, Officer of the Governor, 23 April, 2010.
- Brewer, Jan. "Statement by Governor Jan Brewer". Released by State of Arizona, Officer of the Governor, 30 April, 2010.
- Brewer, Jan. "Gov. Brewer: We Can't Continue to be the Gateway for Illegal Immigration" in a Television Interview Greta Von Susteren, Fox News, 17 June, 2010.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

Burke, Edmund. "A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Idea of the Sublime and Beautiful". 1757.

Campbell, David. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1998.

Cerulo, Karen. "Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions". *Annual Review of Sociology*, No. 23, pp. 385-409, 1997.

Chenoy, Anuradha. "Identity Politics and Feminist Praxis". *South Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, No. 3, Vol. 2, 2010.

Chouliaraki, Lilie; Fairclough, Norman. "Critical Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies: Towards an Integrationist Method". *Journal of Management Studies*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2010.

Coleman, Mathew. "Immigration Geopolitics Beyond the Mexico-US Border". *Antipode*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 54-76, 2007.

Coleman, Mathew. "A Geopolitics of Engagement: Neoliberalism, the War on Terrorism, and the Reconfiguration of US Immigration Enforcement". *Geopolitics*, Routledge, London, 2007.

Cronon, William. "A Place for Stories: Nature, History, and Narrative". *The Journal of American History*, pp. 1347-1376, 1992.

Dalby, Simon. "Imperialism, Domination, Culture: The Continued Relevance of Critical Geopolitics". *Geopolitics*, Routledge, London, pp. 413-436, 2008.

"Economic data specific to Arizona". Accessed from www.AZstats.gov on 4 January, 2013.

Edensor, Tim. *National Identity, Popular Culture, and Everyday Life*. Berg, Oxford, 2002.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power (2nd edition)*. London: Longman, 2001.

Fairclough, N. "Critical discourse analysis in trans-disciplinary research". In Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. A. (Eds), *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. Benjamins Publications, Philadelphia, pp. 17-32, 2005.

Fanon, Franz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Grove Press, New York, 1952.

Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction of Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Third Edition, Routledge, New York, 2011.

Gonzalez, Daniel. "SB1070 Fallout Harms LDS Church Outreach". *The Arizona Republic*, 18 May, 2010.

Gregory, Derrick and Pred, Alan. *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*. Routledge, New York, 2007.

Hall, Stuart. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: SAGE Publications, 1997.

Hall, Stuart. "Who Needs 'Identity'?" *Identity: a reader*. SAGE Publications, pp. 15-20, 2000.

Horne, Tom. Arizona Attorney General's Homepage, <http://www.azag.gov/legalAZWorkersAct>. Accessed 18 March, 2012.

"HB 2745: employer sanctions."
<http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/48leg/2r/bills/hb2745p.pdf>. Accessed 22 February, 2013.

Jones, Reece. *Border Walls: Security and the War on Terror in the United States, India, and Israel*. Zed Books, London, 2012.

Kelly, Erin. "McCain, Kyl back bill, call for Guard on border". *The Arizona Republic*, 20 April, 2010.

Lee, Martin and Solomon, Norman. *Unreliable Sources: A Guide to Detecting Bias in News Media*. Carol Publishing Group, 1990.

Leitch, Shirley; Palmer, Ian. "Analysing Texts in Context: Current Practices and New Protocols for Current Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies". *Journal of Management Studies*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2010.

Lieven, Anatol. "America, Right or Wrong" *The Gepolitics Reader*. Routledge, London, 2006.

Liao, Gordon Y. "Fear Plays Role in Politics". *The Harvard Crimson*, 9 November, 2008.

Merrill, Laurie and Jacobs, Kate. "1 arrested, 3 sought in beheading in Chandler". *The Arizona Republic*, 12 October, 2010.

McAdam, Doug and William H. Sewell. "It's About Time: Temporality in the Study of Contentious Politics". *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

Moore, Adam. "The Eventfulness of Social Reproduction". *Sociological Theory*, American Sociological Association, 2011.

Nevins, Joseph. *Operation Gatekeeper: The Rise of the "Illegal Alien" and the Making of the US-Mexico Boundary*. Routledge, New York, 2002.

Nowicki, Dan. "Court Fight Looms on New Immigration Law". *The Arizona Republic*, 25 April, 2010.

Obama, Barack President. "Remarks by President Obama and President Calderón of Mexico at Joint Press Availability". White House Press Release obtained from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-calder-n-mexico-joint-press-availability> on 26 February, 2013.

Paredes, Americo. *With his Pistol in his Hand: A Border Ballad and Its Hero*. University of Texas Press, 1958.

Pearce, Russell. "Testimony from Senator Russell Pearce before the United States Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and Border Security". Released by Judicial Watch Inc., 13 February, 2012.

Pearce, Russell. Personal Correspondence from then State Senator Russell Pearce obtained by ACLU Lawyer, Daniel Pochada. Obtained from <http://www.azcentral.com/kpnx/pdf/Pochada-pearce-emails.pdf>. 2006-2011.

Pearce, Russell. "SB1070 A VICTORY FOR ARIZONA: A Message from Russell Pearce". Sonoran Alliance, 3 August, 2010.

Provine, Doris Marie; Doty, Roxanne. "The Criminalization of Immigrants as a Racial Project". *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Vol. 27, Issue 3, pp. 261-277, 2011.

Robertson, Dawn. "Brewer Announces Tourism Campaign to Combat SB1070 Fallout" *The Arizona Republic*, 14 July, 2010.

Robin, Corey. *Fear: The History of a Political Idea*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.

Robinson, Robert S. "Taking the Fair Deal to the Fields: Truman's Commission on Migratory Labor, Public Law 78, and the Bracero Program, 1950-1952". *The Agricultural History Society*, pp. 381-402, 2010.

Rough, Ginger. "Signing Arizona immigration law was never a question for governor". *The Arizona Republic*, 1 June, 2010.

Rough, Ginger. "Brewer: most illegal immigrants smuggling drugs". *The Arizona Republic*, 25 June, 2010.

Rough, Ginger. "Brewer skewers Obama: critics on immigration in book". *The Arizona Republic*, 21 October, 2011.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1979.

Said, Edward. "Orientalism Reconsidered". *Orientalism: A Reader*. Edited by Alexander Macfie. New York University Press, New York. 2000.

Sahlins, Marshall. "The Return of the Event, Again: With Reflections on the Beginnings of the Great Fijian War of 1843 to 1855 Between the Kingdoms of Bau and Rewa." *Clio in Oceania: Toward a Historical Anthropology*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, 1991.

Sewell, William. *Logics of History*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2005.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?". *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Macmillan: Basingstroke, 1988.

Sterling, Terry. "**Russell Pearce and Other Illegal-Immigration Populists Rely on Misleading, Right-Wing Reports to Scapegoat Immigrants and to Terrify Penny-Pinched Americans**". *Phoenix New Times*, 2 December, 2010.

Tarrow, Sydney. *Strangers at the Gate: Movements and States in Contentious Politics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.

Tuathail, Gearóid Ó; Agnew, John. "Geopolitics and Discourse: Practical Geopolitical Reasoning in American Foreign Policy". *Political Geography*, Elsevier, London, Vol. 11, Issue 2, pp. 190-204, 1992.

Tuathail, Gearóid Ó; Dalby, Simon; Routledge, Paul. "Thinking Critically about Geopolitics". *The Geopolitics Reader*, Routledge, London, 2006.

Wagner, Dennis. "Specifics Emerge in Arizona Rancher's Slaying". *The Arizona Republic*, 16 June, 2010

Wodak, Ruth. "Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis". *Handbook of Pragmatics. A Manual*. J. Benjamins, University of Michigan Press, 1995.

APPENDIX A: SB1070 VOTE RESULTS IN STATE SENATE

BILL STATUS VOTES FOR SB1070 - Final Reading

Y = Yes

N = No

NV = Not Voting

EXC = Excused

V = Vacant

Member Name	Vote	Member Name	Vote	Member Name	Vote
Paula Aboud	N	Amanda Aguirre	NV	Carolyn S. Allen	N
Sylvia Allen	Y	Manuel V. "Manny" Alvarez	N	Frank Antenori	Y
David Braswell	Y	Ed Bunch	Y	Meg Burton Cahill	N
Ken Chevront	N	Jorge Luis Garcia	N	Ron Gould	Y
Chuck Gray	Y	Linda Gray	Y	Albert Hale	NV
Jack W. Harper	Y	John Huppenthal	Y	Leah Landrum Taylor	N
Barbara Leff	Y	Linda Lopez	N	Debbie McCune Davis	N
Al Melvin	Y	Richard Miranda	N	John Nelson	Y
Russell Pearce	Y	Steve Pierce	Y	Rebecca Rios	N
Jay Tibshraeny	Y	Thayer Verschoor	Y	Robert "Bob" Burns	Y

AYES: 17 NAYS: 11 NOT VOTING: 2 EXCUSED: 0 VACANT: 0

APPENDIX B: SB1070 VOTE RESULTS IN STATE HOUSE OF

REPRESENTATIVES

BILL STATUS VOTES FOR SB1070 - Third Reading

Y = Yes

N = No

NV = Not Voting

EXC = Excused

V = Vacant

Member Name	Vote	Member Name	Vote	Member Name	Vote
Edward Ableser	N	Cecil P. Ash	Y	Ray Barnes	Y
Nancy K. Barto	Y	Andy Biggs	Y	Tom Boone	Y
David Bradley	N	Jack A. Brown	N	Judy M. Burges	Y
Olivia Cajero Bedford	N	Chad Campbell	N	Cloves C. Campbell, Jr.	N
Tom Chabin	N	Steve Court	Y	Rich Crandall	Y
Christopher Deschene	N	Adam Driggs	Y	Steve Farley	N
Patricia V. Fleming	N	Martha Garcia	N	Doris Goodale	Y
David Gowan	Y	Matt Heinz	N	Laurin Hendrix	Y
Russell L. Jones	Y	John Kavanagh	Y	Bill Konopnicki	Y
Debbie Lesko	Y	Phil Lopes	N	David Lujan	NV
Lucy Mason	Y	John McComish	Y	Barbara McGuire	N
Nancy McLain	Y	Eric Meyer	NV	Robert Meza	N
Ben R. Miranda	N	Steve B. Montenegro	Y	Rick Murphy	Y
Warde V. Nichols	Y	Lynne Pancrazi	N	Daniel Patterson	N
Frank Pratt	Y	Doug Quelland	Y	Michele Reagan	Y
Amanda A. Reeve	Y	David Schapira	N	Carl Seel	Y
Kyrsten Sinema	N	David W. Stevens	Y	Andrew M. Tobin	Y
Anna Tovar	N	Ted Vogt	Y	Rae Waters	NV
Jim Weiers	Y	Jerry Weiers	Y	Vic Williams	Y
Steven B. Yarbrough	Y	Nancy Young Wright	NV	Kirk Adams	Y

AYES: 35 NAYS: 21 NOT VOTING: 4 EXCUSED: 0 VACANT: 0

APPENDIX C: EXAMPLE EMAIL OBTAINED BY THE ACLU FROM RUSSELL

PEARCE

Administrator

From: russellpearce [russellpearce@cox.net]

Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2011 9:50AM

To: Russell K. Pearce

Subject: Fw: SB1070 RESPONSE

----- Original Message -----From:
russellpearce

To: [name redacted]@yahoo.com

Sent: Monday, May 16, 2011 3:21 PM

Subject: Fw: SB1070 RESPONSE

I am State Senator Russell Pearce the author of SB1070 and almost every other bill in this state to deal with "illegal" immigration and am a national leader in this issue. Here are some of the legislation I have written and has become law. Over 25 states are writing legislation modeled after SB1070. Between 73% and 66% of Americans support SB 1070 from coast to coast.

- We must stay vigilant in the defense of our Constitutional liberties, freedom and the rule of law.
- 1996 wrote legislation to stop Driver License from being issued until one could prove legal presence in the U.S.
- 2004: Proposition 200, in '04; I wrote The Citizen's Initiative known as Protect Arizona NOW (Arizona's Citizens and Taxpayers Protection Act), to require:

1. Proof of citizenship to register to vote. The only state in the Union to require proof of citizenship to register to vote. Requires states to strengthen the integrity of their voter rolls

2. Photo I. D. When voting. One needs ID to rent a block buster movie, you should have one to vote

3. Proof of eligibility to receive non-federal mandated public benefits.

Requires everyone to provide proof of eligibility equally. Such costs vary in the tens of millions of dollars

- In '06 I Authored Proposition 100, a Constitutional Amendment to refuse bond to any illegal alien who commits a serious crime in Arizona (passed by 78%)
- In '06 I Authored Proposition 102 to require that any illegal alien who sues an American Citizen cannot receive ANY punitive damages (passed by 75%)
- In '06 I Authored Prop. 103 making English the Official Language of Arizona (passed by 72%)
- 2007: I Authored: Arizona's Fair and Legal Employment Act; Arizona's Employer Sanctions legislation, the toughest worksite enforcement bill in the nation to stop illegal employers and to protect jobs for legal citizens of Arizona
- 2010: SB 1070 ... I was the author of "Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhood Act" Removes all Sanctuary Policies in Arizona and allows law

enforcement to enforce our laws. "We are a nation of laws. We must have the courage- the fortitude- to enforce, with compassion but without apology, those laws that protect the integrity of our borders and the rights of our lawful citizens." -Senator Russell Pearce

- 2010: SB1108 ... Arizona's Freedom to Carry Act: The strongest 2nd Amendment legislation in the nation allowing lawful citizens their Constitutional right to carry open or concealed. Still allows for a CCW as it has benefit to many i.e. for restaurant carry or reciprocity with other states
- Helped create a statewide task force GIITEM (Gang and Immigration Task Force), 250 officers, going after human smugglers, drug smugglers, drop houses, and criminal aliens in addition to enforcing all of our immigration laws

Why do our elected leaders so easily relinquish liberty and have such little respect for the Constitution and the law?

Arizona is ground zero for stopping this "illegal" invasion. Yes they are illegal and they are invading this nation. Illegal is not a race, it is a crime. The media would have you believe I made "illegal, illegal". Arizona did not make illegal, illegal, illegal was already illegal. It is a crime to enter or remain in the U.S. in violation of federal law 8USC 1324 and 1325. States have inherent authority to enforce immigration laws and yet has failed or refused to do so.

Sanctuary policies are illegal under federal law (8 USC 1644 & 1373) yet we have them all over the United States.

SB1070 simply codifies federal law into state law and removes excuses and concerns about states inherent authority to enforce these laws and removes all so called "sanctuary" policies.

I for one refuse to apologize for standing up for America and the rule of law.

When do we stand up for Americans and the rule of law, if not now, when? We are a nation of laws, a Constitutional Republic.

Well here in Arizona we are going to enforce our laws, protect our citizens and stand firmly behind the rule of law.

DID YOU KNOW: Had law enforcement enforced our immigration laws and, we would have averted 9/11. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 underscored for all Americans the link between immigration law enforcement and Terrorism. 4 of the 5 leaders of the 9-11 attack were in violation of our immigration laws and had contact with law enforcement but were not arrested.

Nineteen alien terrorists had been able violate our immigration laws, overstay their visas or violate their Immigration statuses with impunity, and move freely within the Country

without significant interference from federal or local law Enforcement. The abuse of U.S. Immigration laws was Instrumental in the deaths of nearly 3,000 people.

How long do we ignore the damage to America, in murders, maimings, kidnappings, car jackings, gangs, Identity theft, \$2.7 billion annually here in Arizona just to Educate, Medicate and Incarcerate illegal aliens. And what about the 17 to 30 million Americans out of work ...and we still allow employers to higher "illegal" workers.

THIS IS THE TRUE COST OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

Here is the true cost of illegal immigration, the death and maiming of police officers and citizens in Arizona by illegal aliens

- Rob Krentz murdered on the border during the debate of SB1 070.
- Agent Brian Terry murdered on the border by illegal alien smugglers
- Beheadings in Chandler
- Contract killings in Casa Grande
- Trained and Armed assassians sent into Arizona
- 2. Phoenix Officer Shane Figueroa (killed)
- 3. Phoenix Officer Nick Erfle (Murdered)
- 4. Phoenix Office Glidewell (shot in chest)
- 5. Phoenix Officer Marc Atkinson (murdered)
- 6. Phoenix Police Officer Ignacio Conchos and his partner, Officer John Davis
- 7. Phoenix Police Officer Ken Collins was murdered
- 8. Officers Jim Kliewer and Officer Jerry Kilgore were gunned down
- 9. Police Officer Brian Wilbur was seriously injured
- 10.
- 11. Officers Jim Kliewer and Officer Jerry Kilgore were gunned down
- 12. Phoenix Police Officer Brian Wilbur was seriously injured
- 13. Phoenix Police Officer Mark Atkinson was
- 14. Phoenix Police Officer Jason Schecterle was severely burned
- 15. Phoenix Police Officer Robert Sitek was shot and seriously injured
- 16. Child serial rapist in Chandler
- 17. 15 year old raped in Scottsdale by school janitor
- 18. 15 year old kidnapped and raped in Guadalupe
- 19. Kris Eggle-park ranger in southern Arizona (murdered)
- 20. Border Patrol Agent James Epling (murdered)
- 21. Deputy Sean Pearce (shot by homicide suspects)
- 22. Deputy Lew Argetsinger (shot by homicide suspects)
- 23. Sgt. Manuel H. Tapia was shot by a drug suspect
- 24. DPS Officer Robert K. Martin, 57, was shot to death- his assailant, Ernesto Salgado Martinez, a 19-year-old ex-convict
- 25. Agent Richard Fass, 37, of the United States Drug Enforcement Agency, murdered
- 26. Agent Alexander Kirpnick, 27, Border Patrol, murdered
- 27. Gilbert mother killed by illegal alien fleeing from police in Mesa
- 28. Jason, decorated Iraq war veteran stabbed in his own front yard by illegal alien
- 29. Mother "legal immigrant" killed by illegal alien trying to ram Sheriffs Deputy's

car in Phoenix

30. Tracy "17 year old" killed by drunk illegal alien

The burden of blind-eye police department policies forced upon them by local politicians and police chiefs and open-border philosophies were paid for with the lives of not only our police officers throughout our state, but also our citizens; it could happen to you. THIS IS THE HIGH COST OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION.

LET ME SEE IF I GOT THIS RIGHT:

IF YOU CROSS THE NORTH KOREAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU GET 12 YEARS HARD LABOR.

IF YOU CROSS THE IRANIAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU ARE DETAINED INDEFINITELY.

IF YOU CROSS THE AFGHAN BORDER ILLEGALLY, YOU GET SHOT.

IF YOU CROSS THE SAUDI ARABIAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU WILL BE JAILED.

IF YOU CROSS THE CHINESE BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU MAY NEVER BE HEARD FROM AGAIN.

IF YOU CROSS THE VENEZUELAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU WILL BE BRANDED A SPY AND YOUR FATE WILL BE SEALED.

IF YOU CROSS THE CUBAN BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU WILL BE THROWN INTO POLITICAL PRISON TO ROT.

IF YOU CROSS THE U.S. BORDER ILLEGALLY YOU GET:
IT'S TIME TO WAKE UP AMERICA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

- * A JOB,
- *A DRIVERS LICENSE,
- * SOCIAL SECURITY CARD,
- *WELFARE,
- *FOOD STAMPS,
- * CREDIT CARDS,
- * SUBSIDIZED RENT OR A LOAN TO BUY A HOUSE,
- *FREE EDUCATION,
- * FREE HEALTH CARE,
- *A LOBBYIST IN WASHINGTON
- * BILLIONS OF DOLLARS WORTH OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS PRINTED IN YOUR LANGUAGE

***THE RIGHT TO CARRY YOUR COUNTRY'S FLAG WHILE YOU PROTEST THAT YOU DON'T GET ENOUGH RESPECT**

Just in Phoenix:

On Thursday July 1, 1982, Phoenix Police Officer Ignacio Conchas and his partner, Officer John Davis, entered a Phoenix bar in search of a bank robbery suspect. Both officers were mortally wounded when the suspect began shooting inside the bar. Officer Conchas died a short time later. Officer Davis died one month later on Friday August 6, 1982. Efran Contreras Lopez was a multiple crosser.

On Friday May 27, 1988 Phoenix Police Officer Ken Collins was murdered by an illegal alien carrying out a bank robbery. Rudolfo Romero, one of the killers, remained at large for 12 years in Mexico and was extradited under the assurance that the death penalty would not be pursued.

On Monday September 15, 1997 Officers Jim Kliewer and Officer Jerry Kilgore were gunned down by an illegal alien who had violated the terms of his probation- the illegal alien had shot his ex-girlfriend's new boyfriend. Officer Kliewer was shot in the neck; Officer Kilgore was shot in the head. It should be noted, the first stipulation for a person on probation in the state of Arizona is to be a law abiding citizen. For a judge to place an illegal alien on probation is to create an automatic violation - illegal means "not law abiding" and alien means "not a citizen."

On Sunday December 21, 1997 Phoenix Police Officer Brian Wilbur was seriously injured when he was struck by a car driven by an intoxicated illegal alien.

On Friday March 26, 1999 Phoenix Police Officer Mark Atkinson was murdered in an ambush by illegal aliens.

On Monday March 26, 2001 Phoenix Police Officer Jason Schecterle was severely burned when an illegal alien driving a taxi cab collided into the rear of his police car.

On Saturday April 12, 2003 Phoenix Police Officer Robert Sitek was shot and seriously injured by an illegal alien involved in an armed car-jacking. The illegal alien was a multiple crosser.

On Tuesday September 18, 2007 Phoenix Police Officer Nick Ertle was murdered by an illegal alien during contact reference a civil traffic infraction.

On Sunday October 16, 2007 Phoenix Police Officer Brett Glidewell was shot in the chest by an armed illegal alien who had been stopped for a civil traffic violation. Jose Abel Cabrera-Somosa, who was prosecuted by Andrew Thomas of the Maricopa County Attorney's office and sentenced to 36 years on March 27, 2009, claimed to the court that his conviction was based upon mistaken identity, that his 6 year presence in the country wasn't a crime, that he had been stopped by police 4 times prior to the shooting of Glidewell, and that the entire case against

him was motivated out of racism.

On Saturday October 25, 2008 Phoenix Police Officer Shane Figueroa was killed by an illegal alien who was driving a vehicle while intoxicated. This illegal alien was a multiple crosser with outstanding arrest warrants.

o Shane's death was described by Chief Harris as a "tragic accident involving an undocumented worker." In reality, Shane was needlessly killed by a multiple crosser with outstanding warrants who, according to investigators, urinated on the side of the road while Shane's life ebbed away on the street. Police officers on the front line are committed to the rule of law and are quite black and white when it comes to the rules of engagement. Police officers don't call a drug dealer an "unlicensed pharmacist." They don't call a bank robber an "aggressive borrower with bad credit." A softened tone for those committing the crime of illegal immigration (8 U.S.C 1325 (a)) can be highly offensive to those sworn to uphold the law.

At least 6 officers killed and 6 seriously injured by illegal aliens.

While we are at it, how about the billions in cost to educate, medicate and incarcerate illegal aliens? Not to mention the crime victims of Murders, maimings, home invasions, kidnappings, identity theft, drugs, gangs and the list goes on.

Under SB1070 they will be able to ask and to act.

If law enforcement could not stop someone before this law, they cannot stop them now. If you did not have to carry ID before this law, you don't have to carry ID under this new law. We did not expand law enforcement authority or require any "new" requirements or put new conditions on citizens. We simply took the handcuffs off from law enforcement and allow them to enforce our immigration laws, like any other law.

- The new Arizona law mirrors federal law, which already requires aliens (non-citizens) to register and carry their documents with them (8 USC 1304(e) and 8 USC 1306(a)). The new Arizona law simply states that violating federal immigration law is now a state crime as well.

Because illegal immigrants are by definition in violation of federal immigration laws, they can now be arrested by local law enforcement in Arizona.

·The law is designed to avoid the legal pitfall of "pre-emption," which means a state can't adopt laws that conflict with federal laws. By making what is a federal violation also a state violation, the Arizona law avoids this problem. Look at the Supreme Court Decision of *Muehler vs Men a* a 9- 0 Land Mark Decision by the U.S. Supreme Court on this very issue of preemption, 4th and 14th Amendment issue.

Actually we have some safe guards in Arizona law that the federal law does not have. The fear is not about profiling ... the fear is not about concerns over legal contact ... even

the liberal press understands those issues. The fear is the law will actually be enforced. AND IT WILL. We have put some teeth in this law to make sure it is enforced.

- The law only allows police to ask about immigration status in the normal course of "lawful contact" with a person, such as a traffic stop or if they have committed a crime.
- Estimates from the federal government indicate that more than 80 percent of illegal immigrants come from Latin America.¹² Thus; there is concern that police may target only Hispanics for enforcement.
- Before asking a person about immigration status, law enforcement officials are required by the law to have a lawful contact/a violation of law and "a reasonable suspicion" that a person is an illegal immigrant. The concept of "reasonable suspicion" is well established by court rulings.

Since Arizona does not issue driver's licenses to illegal immigrants, having a valid license creates a presumption of legal status. Examples of reasonable suspicion include:

- A driver stopped for a traffic violation has no license, or record of a driver's license or other form of federal or state identification.
- A police officer observes someone buying fraudulent identity documents or crossing the border illegally.
- A police officer recognizes a gang member back on the street who he knows has been previously deported by the federal government.
- The law specifically states that police, "may not consider race, color or national origin" when implementing SB 1070.
- When Arizona's governor signed the new law, she also issued an executive order requiring the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board to provide local police with additional training on what does and what does not constitute "reasonable suspicion."¹³

Rancher Rob Krentz was murdered by the drug cartel on his ranch a month ago. I held a senate hearing two weeks ago on border violence. One only had to hear the concerns and pleas from these folks to recognize the monumental failure of government to secure our borders and enforce our laws and the cost to our citizens.

Here are just some of the highlights from those who testified.

The people who live within 60 to 80 miles of the Arizona/Mexico Border have for years been terrorized and have pleaded for help to stop the daily invasion of humans who cross their property. One Rancher testified that 300 to 1200 people a DAY come across his ranch, vandalizing his property, stealing his vehicles and property, cutting down his fences, and leaving trash. In the last two years he has found 17 dead bodies and two Qu'ran bibles.

Another rancher testified that on a daily basis drugs are brought across his ranch in a military operation. A point man with a machine gun goes in front, 1/2 mile behind are the guards fully armed, 1/2 mile behind them are the drugs, behind the drugs 1/2 mile are

more guards. These people are violent and they will kill anyone who gets in the way. This was not the only rancher we heard that day that talked about the drug trains.

One man told of two illegals who came upon his property, one shot in the back and the other in the arm by the drug runners who had forced them to carry the drugs and then shot them. They listen to gun fire during the night; it is not safe to leave his family alone on the ranch and they can't leave the ranch for fear of nothing being left when they come back.

The border patrol is not on the border. They have set up 60 miles away with check points that do nothing to stop the invasion. They are not allowed to use force in stopping anyone who is entering. They run around chasing them, if they get their hands on them, then they can take them back across the border.

Federal prisons have over 35% illegals incarcerated, and 20% of Arizona prisons are filled with illegals who have committed felonies. In the last few years, 80% of our law enforcement personnel who have been killed or wounded were done by an illegal alien. The majority of people coming now are people we need to be worried about. The ranchers told us that they have seen a change in the people coming they are not just those who are looking for work and a better life.

The Federal Government has refused for years to do anything to help the Border States. We have been overrun and once they are here, Arizonans have the burden of funding state services that they use. Education costs have been over a billion dollars. The healthcare costs for illegal aliens runs into the billions of dollars. Our State is broke; \$3.5 billion deficit and we have many serious decisions to make. One is that we do not have the money to care for any who are not here legally. It has to stop.

The border can be secured. We have the technology; we have the ability to stop this invasion.

We must know who is coming and they must come in legally so that we can assimilate them into our population and protect the sovereignty of our country. We are a nation of laws. We have a responsibility to protect our citizens and to protect the integrity of our country and the government which we live under.

It will do no good to forgive them because millions more will come behind them, and we will be over run to the point that there will no longer be a United States of America but, a North American Union of open borders. I ask you what form of government will we live under?

How long will it be before we will be just like Mexico? We have already lost our language; everything must be printed in Spanish. We have already lost our history since it is no longer taught in our schools.

And we have lost our borders.

The leftist media has distorted what SB 1070 will do. It is not going to set up a Nazi Germany. Are you kidding? The ACLU and the leftist courts will do everything to protect those who are here illegally, but it was an effort to try and stop illegal's from setting up businesses, and employment, and receiving state services and give the ability to local law enforcement when there is probable cause, such as a traffic stop to determine if they are here legally. Federal law is very clear if you are here on a visa you must have your papers on you at all times. That is the law. In Arizona all you need to show you as a legal citizen is a driver license, MVD identification card, Native American Card, or a Military ID. This is what you need to vote, get a hunting license, etc ... So nothing new has been added to this law. No one is going to be stopped walking down the street. The leftists here and in DC are angry because we dare try and do something. They want the "Transformation" to continue.

Maybe it is too late to save America. Maybe we are not worthy of freedom anymore. But as an elected official I must try to do what I can to protect our Constitutional Republic. Living in America is not a right just because you can walk across the border. Being an American is a responsibility, and it comes through respecting and upholding the Constitution, the law of our land which says what you must do to be a citizen of this country. Freedom is not free.

The Patriot's mission is to inform and arm grassroots Patriots with our forthright message in support of individual liberty, the restoration of constitutional limits on government and the judiciary, and the promotion of free enterprise, national defense and traditional American values -- the information needed to combat the leftist agenda that relentlessly undermines our nation's great Constitution and founding principles.

Throughout history the burden of keeping the flame of liberty bright has fallen on the shoulders of a few men and women. As Founding Patriot Samuel Adams noted, "It does not take a majority to prevail... but rather an irate, tireless minority, keen on setting brushfires of freedom in the minds of men." That describes YOU!

Preamble: We The People of the United States establish and ordain this Constitution of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America. We are being robbed of our Freedoms, we owe it to our children and great grandchildren to leave them a legacy of freedom.