

*Respetar mi Existencia o Esperar Resistencia: Mobilization and Political Participation of the Latino
Immigrant Rights Movement Under Threat*

Yulenni I. Venegas

University of Washington

Undergraduate Honors Thesis

Professors Sophia Jordán Wallace and Megan Ming Francis, Advisors

May 4th, 2018

President Barack Obama deported more people than any other president in U.S. history. Under his administration, 5.2 million immigrants were deported from the United States (Chishti, Pierce, & Bolter, 2017). President Donald Trump has made multiple promises both during his campaign and during his presidency to increase the number of deportations (Dickerson, 2017; TIME, 2015). In the pursuit of this goal, the Trump administration has implemented various anti-immigrant policies such as the attempted cancellation of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which granted temporary reprieve and work permits for undocumented immigrants who had entered the U.S. as children (Shear & Davis, 2017; Wong et al., 2013).

Additionally, the Trump administration has increased raids by Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE), vetoed bipartisan immigration bills proposed by Congress, consistently threatened to build a border wall between the United States and Mexico, and rescinded the Temporary Protected Status (TPS) program for nations such as El Salvador and Haiti (NBC News, 2017; Stolberg & Shear, 2018; Bennet & Mascaro, 2018; Schallhorn, 2017; Bacon, 2017; Lind & Lockhart, 2017; TIME, 2015). Despite overwhelming support amongst Latinos for a pathway to adjust their immigration status permanently, the qualifications for current pathways are so restrictive that for many of those immigrants, a path to legal residence does not exist. (Gonzalez-Barrera, Lopez, Passel, & Taylor, 2013; Latino Decisions, 2014; American Immigration Council, 2016). In effect, pathways towards legal residence do not exist for a significant number of Latinos (Todaro & Maruszko, 1987; Bean 1997; Hanson, Scheve, Slaughter, & Spilimbergo, 2001). In fact, the “line” immigrants are expected to wait in in order to seek a legal pathway to residence is so restrictive that even if someone qualifies for legal migration, the response to their application can take more than a decade (Robbins, 2013; Basu, 2014). Even the few immigrants who do manage to achieve legal residence in the U.S. are still subject to deportation. Some immigrants have even been deported with an offense as minor as a DUI, a crime that a natural-born U.S. citizen may not even face jail time

for, let alone deportation (Han, 2017; Moore, 2017; Cortes, 2017; Bray, 2017). For undocumented immigrants, their very presence in the U.S. makes them subject for deportation and removal proceedings simply for being in the U.S. This is regardless of how an undocumented immigrant may have never committed any wrong doing to the society or how they could potentially even offer things like entrepreneurship and job creation while living in the U.S. In short, for an immigrant, all roads come with the threat of deportation. Thus, current immigration law in the United States is amongst the harshest in our nation's history.

This paper examines how the threat of deportation in Washington State and Arizona affects Latino immigrant rights mobilization.¹ Given the complex variety of factors contributing to threat and mobilization across the United States, this paper first identifies and measures areas and levels of threat based on local immigration law and the levels of cooperation between local law enforcement and ICE. I utilize semi-structured, in-depth interviews of prominent immigrant rights activists and advocates in Washington State and Arizona to measure the influence of threat on mobilization. Through this research, I find that under increasing levels of threat, the Latino community responds with heightened levels of political engagement and specific forms of mobilization. Under lower levels of threat of deportation, the community primarily engages in collective mobility services and local campaigns, whereas under high threat, the community additionally utilizes preemptive organization, alert networks, and national campaigns. Additionally, I argue that due to both the drastic ways that the threat of deportation affects mobilization and the levels of fear it instills, the threat of deportation is an act of state violence towards the Latino community.²

¹ Please see Appendix I for the rationale behind selecting Washington State and Arizona for this research.

² Although not all Latinos as immigrants, the Latino immigrant rights movement is run and operated by the Latino community as a whole. Therefore, for the purposes of clarity and brevity, further engagement will refer to them as “the Latino community” or more simply, “the community.”

Theoretical Framework

This paper engages an understanding of activist action that expands upon previous scholarship's understanding of traditional political participation and mobilization. Some examples of political participation which occur in this study are providing "collective mobility services," which include English education courses, daycare services, and food and shelter services. Providing these sorts of resources are not all forms of action typically recognized as political in the discipline. However, I argue that the provision of resources is highly political due to the fact that they are utilized in a way that stimulates upward mobility for the community and ergo strengthens the ability for the community to engage in politics and challenge deportation proceedings. Providing English education strengthens an immigrant's ability to advance in their workplace, express grievances, assert their rights, and participate in political discourse more effectively. Daycare services provide immigrants with children the opportunity to remain engaged in politics without sacrificing resources to find childcare. Providing food and shelter uplift the community's overall survival particularly due to the legal denial of public services such as government-sponsored housing or food stamps to undocumented immigrants (Broder, Moussavian, & Blazer, 2015). Groups which provide these services are also practicing a great amount of organizational strategy and effort to collect the funds, volunteers, and general resources to uplift the community, which is parallel in levels of organization to other efforts that are recognized as political, such as running campaigns. An additional form of non-traditional mobilization includes the establishment and maintenance of "alert networks," which are run by community members to warn the community of ICE raids that are occurring or will occur in a given space and time frame. Alert networks are acts of mobilization because they require a significant amount of cooperation and organization from multiple sources to attain accurate information of an ICE raid in a relatively short amount of time and also because they are done with the purpose of addressing and combatting against established policies of deportation.

“Preemptive organization” is utilized in this study as an umbrella term for the kinds of mobilization that is done in anticipation and for the purposes of challenging deportation proceedings. Some mobilization tactics which fall under this term include gathering a collective fund through fundraising or donations, establishing individuals to act as trained “intermediaries” between regular participants and law enforcement, and establishing protocols on how to respond to sudden deportation proceedings. These tactics are also considered political due to the parallels between funding and actions done by campaigns, the organization level and effort it requires to find and keep individuals knowledgeable about the law to serve as “intermediaries,” and the level of organization required to formulate plans on how to frame attacks by law enforcement in media platforms and how to defend the community when faced with unanticipated deportation proceedings. The level of dedication and internal organization and collective resourcing required to partake in these activities are utilized so as to directly combat the realities of attack from the law via deportation proceedings. For these reasons, “preemptive organization” is also an indicator of higher and more intense forms of mobilization utilized by the Latino community.

Additionally, this paper distinguishes between mobilization geared towards local-level campaigns versus national-level campaigns. Local mobilization includes campaigns which focus on participation in city council meetings, school boards, or cooperation with local law enforcement. National mobilization on the other hand includes campaigns such as lobbying Congress, running for office, contacting federal bureaucratic entities, and attempts at cooperation with federal law enforcement. Some examples of additional political action or mobilization tactics found in this study include “Get Out the Vote” campaigns, coalition formation, naturalization, voting, “Know Your Rights” campaigns, legal assistance such as access to attorneys, and protests, all of which are well-established and recognized methods of mobilization.

In summary, this study finds and evaluates a total of 21 different forms of mobilization conducted by the Latino immigrant rights movement, several of which are not formally recognized as traditional forms of mobilization. However, these tactics are all forms of mobilization due to the levels of effort and organization necessary to conduct these actions as well as the fact that they are done for the express purpose of being able to make rights claims through political engagement and protect against deportation proceedings.

Theoretical Background

Latino Response to Threat

Attacks from the immigration system have provoked Latino mobilization as far back as the 1960's and have persisted into the current moment. The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) of 1965 removed the quota system that heavily favored immigration from European countries and changed the demographic makeup of the U.S. as more immigrants arrived from locations such as Asian, Africa, and Latin America. As a result, nativism amongst white Americans rose and there was a backlash against these communities, including the Latino community. In response, organizations such as the Center for Autonomous Social Action (CASA) formed and developed chapters across the country and throughout the 60's and 70's to organize Latinos over labor rights protections for documented and undocumented Latinos alike. In the early 1980's Congress circulated the Simpson-Rodino bill which included employer sanctions against hiring undocumented workers. These employer sanctions led Latino immigrant rights activists to predict a rise in discrimination against all Latinos, including legal immigrants and native-born U.S. citizens. On October 18, 1985, their collective efforts resulted in a "National Day of Action for Justice for Immigrants and Refugees" where over 20 cities held mobilizations declaring opposition to the bill and called an end to deportations. Although the employer sanctions provision did pass through Congress in the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), the level of mobilization amongst Latinos in

opposition to the provision is noteworthy. In 1994, Latino immigrant rights activists organized to protest Proposition 187 in California which attempted to establish a citizenship screening system to deny undocumented immigrants from accessing services such as healthcare and public education and force local enforcement to stop and verify people's citizenship status. The Latino community, including organizations like the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, challenged this proposition because it was understood as an attack on the Latino community. As a result, the proposition was overturned and this was one of the mitigating factors which turned California into a state very closely aligned with the Democratic Party (Nowrasteh, 2016; Zepeda-Millan, 2017). In the spring of 2006, millions of Latinos participated in roughly 350 protests occurred across the country in the span of three months to protest draconian immigration bills such as S.B 1070 in Arizona and the Sensenbrenner Bill in the U.S. Congress (Wallace, Zepeda-Millan, & Jones-Correa, 2014). These bills sought to enable local police to stop individuals and ask for citizenship authorization on the basis of race, make the status of being undocumented a federal felony, and criminalize the assistance to undocumented immigrants. This last provision was so expansive that it would even condemn churches, hospitals, and charities, all of which work intimately within the law itself. Due to the large scope of these bills and the criminalization of the Latino community that would arise as a direct result, these bills were understood as direct attacks towards Latinos and were either never passed or particular provisions were ruled unconstitutional (Zepeda-Millan, 2017). In short, Latino immigrant rights activists and advocates have both responded to threat and adapted their mobilizing methods in their efforts to combat the policies of an immigration system which is actively working against immigrants.

Prior work suggests that Latinos consistently respond to threat through high levels of political engagement. Under conditions of threat, Latinos double down on Latino pride, increase their identification with a pan-ethnic identity, and are more likely to engage in rights-claiming though

mobilization in the streets and legal mobilization in higher applications towards citizenship (Jones-Correa, 1998; Cronin, Levin, Branscombe, van Laar, & Tropp, 2011; White, 2015; Barreto, Manzano, Ramirez, & Rim, 2009). This occurs despite the fact that some scholars have at best characterized Latinos as inconsistently political at best (Verba, Schlozman, Brady, & Nie, 1993; Huntington, 2005). Traditional social movement theory overemphasizes the importance of resources, concluding that the assembly of resources from a more privileged middle class is necessary for successful mobilization (Tilly, 1978; Edwards & McCarthy, 2004). However, cases of Latino mobilization run contrary to this norm. Although the farmworkers' sect of the Chicano Movement of the 1960's generally lacked middle class supporters and resources, this movement successfully mobilized and led a historic march from Delano, CA, to Sacramento, CA which social movement theory suggests should not have happened. However, Latinos successfully mobilized by accumulating small resources from the community, such as families opening up their homes and sharing food with the marchers as they travelled roughly 250 miles to strike for a higher minimum wage (Escobar, 1993; Muñoz, 2013) This same lack of resources is reflected in the 2006 protests where over 350 protests occurred in the span of three months and most mobilizing efforts and contributions were from community leaders and volunteers who would cook food or provide water to protestors (Zepeda-Millan, 2017).

Additional scholarship has found that Latino mobilization through voting and response to threat has severe impacts on future policies and political outcomes (Jackson, 2011; Osterling, 2010). The popular narrative in political science that Latinos are not politically active and do not vote is interrupted by literature which finds that, under periods of threat, applications towards naturalization amongst Latinos and the desire for those immigrants to vote go up. Additionally, heightened threat has led to increased voting levels amongst Latinos in general. These two factors produce a significant voting block which is already predetermined on what to vote on and is not

usually accounted for by political elites when proposing policies or when anticipating the outcomes of an election, yet can significantly impact political outcomes. This was the case in California where the introduction of Proposition 187 led to a surge in naturalization and voting amongst Latinos to combat the bill and resulted in a seismic shift in electoral politics that has since permanently turned the state into a stronghold for the Democratic party (Nowrasteh, 2016).

Mobilization through protest and accumulation of resources indicate high amounts of organization. Organizing collective action requires a rather significant amount of time and resources to have activists coordinate the time, location, and route of a protest, demonstration, or educational event, as well as additional factors such as establishing a cohesive message and mundane details such as where participants of these events can find food, water, and childcare, all of which is a significant amount of work and therefore significant amount of political action. People who participate in these events also have to give up sometimes several hours' dedication, potentially even sacrificing time from work or school to be able to travel to and participate in these events, which is significantly more effort than what is required to simply cast a ballot. The fact that Latinos have historically not relied on contributions from elite classes leads to further organizational issues where there must be more effort to accumulate small donations and pieces of resources amongst the community rather than relying upon the larger donations of a small group of elites. In short, mobilization through event organization and protest is vital due to the sheer amount of effort and levels of political participation it requires to organize and participate in this case. The presence or absence of these events as well as the ways that they are carried out therefore work as a measure as to how the threat of deportation affects mobilization.

If Latino political participation and mobilization under the current high levels of threat follow their historical trajectory, increasing levels of threat could lead to intense levels of political participation through naturalization and voting patterns. Should voting patterns and naturalization

be hyper stimulated, this implies a particularly high level of severity and importance that the threat of deportation holds on the community as a whole. The ways that mobilization of Latinos is affected by the threat of deportation are therefore additional indicators of the exact level of that threat, which thus can further help indicate whether the threat of deportation can qualify as a case of state violence.

State Violence

Depending upon the levels of mobilization and the experiences of the Latino communities in this study, this study can suggest the possibility that the threat of deportation and the actions of the civil immigration system is a case of state violence against the Latino community. The majority of the literature on state violence on social movements emphasizes oppression as the use of criminal law and the penal state, with incarceration as the state's metaphorical riot baton (Berger, 2014; Oppenheimer, 1992). This of course is an understandable area of focus due to the fact that the use of criminal law against activists and the passing down of criminal punishment are easily identifiable acts of state violence. These instances of violence have also occurred numerous times within United States history, such as during the incarceration of activists such as Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. and Dr. Angela Davis during the Civil Rights Movement, or of Cesar Chavez and the East LA 13 during the Chicano Movement (Berger, 2014; Escobar, 1993). Additional instances include the ways that social movements have been attacked by the response of militarized police resistance such as the assassination of Freddie Hampton from the Black Panther Party or the pepper spraying of unarmed and kneeling students at the University of California – Berkeley during the Vietnam War. Critical examinations of state violence in the civil law system and more specifically in the immigration system are less common.

Examinations of state violence on the Latino immigrant rights movement is a developing literature, generally forming an examination of the intersection between criminal and immigration

law, or “crimmigration.” Some of this literature exposes a rising perception of criminality attributed to Latinos, such as Leo Chavez’ work which evaluates this phenomenon as the Latino Threat Narrative (2008). Nicholas De Genova also engages this perception of immigrant and criminality attributed towards specifically Mexicans in what he calls “the legal production of Mexican illegality” (2004). Additionally, scholars have found economic incentives with detention centers that run parallel to those found in prisons in what is referred to as the “immigration industrial complex” (Doty & Wheatley, 2013; SPLC, 2016). In those cases, scholars identify similar abuses of labor and detrimental living conditions so as to generate private profit. Hernández (2014) finds that immigrants in violation of civil crime are also subject to solitary confinement, a tactic which is only otherwise utilized in prisons. He goes on to present a compelling case that immigration detention centers and prisons are so similar that they can be interchanged for each other, and pulls upon arguments surrounding prison abolition to argue for the abolition of immigrant detention centers (2017). In other words, this literature recognizes that there are similarities in the treatment of immigrants and convicted criminals, and thus inspires easier justification for increasing levels of abuse in the form of immigration law.

Previous scholarship has already shown the similarities between civil immigration law enforcement and criminal law enforcement, meaning that the consequences of civil law enforcement are similarly or even exactly like the consequences of criminal law enforcement. Thus, the U.S. operates using a law enforcement system that intertwines methods of criminal and civil law by government actors such as local police and ICE agents that cause criminal methods to be applied to civil law situations. However, once outside of the field and outside the discretion of law enforcement agents, the law attempts to separate the two in a court of law, which manifests itself as denying constitutional protections to individuals who have gone through criminal law procedures due to a technicality in what the action is called. Given the fact that literature on state violence has

focused on the ways that criminal law has influenced social movements as definitive cases of state violence, the possibility that the outcomes between the two systems are the same also imply that the actions of the civil immigration system is a case of state violence.

Additionally, previous literature on state violence has also revealed the incrementing and tangible levels of fear that marginalized or oppressed populations face as a result of the state engaging in this form of violence. Some of this fear logically can be geared towards representatives of the state's power and enforcement, such as individual law enforcement agents. Thus, if the Latino community expresses a heightened amount of fear towards civil law enforcement, this is an additional parallel to cases of state violence in the U.S.

If the methods and the outcomes of immigration law enforcement parallel those of criminal law enforcement, then logic suggests that the claims made against the latter can be made towards the former. In other words, should this study reveal parallels between the way that criminal law, which is recognized as a tool of state violence, impacts social movements and the way that threat of deportation affects mobilization, the case can be made that the threat of deportation is also a case of state violence.

Methodology

To conduct this study, I first measured and analyzed levels of threat in each state by utilizing a scale of threat. Then I conducted interviews with activists who organized mobilization in response to threat. Below I outline how I measured threat as well as the interview methodology.

Measuring Areas of Threat

For the purposes of measuring levels of threat, this paper utilizes data on the levels of cooperation between local law enforcement and ICE at the county level as well as a consideration of local immigration law that influences resource attainment and upward mobility. These two considerations are critical because cooperation of agencies increases the strength and probability of

deportation cases being pursued. Thus, the inability of the Latino community to attain resources via upward mobility lowers the community's ability to challenge deportation proceedings and deportation is more likely to occur.

The Immigration Legal Resource Center (ILRC) released a report in December 2016 which outlines the levels of cooperation between local law enforcement and federal immigration enforcement across the country at the county level. This data was updated most recently in January 2018. (Avila, Bello, Graber, & Marquez, 2018). The report, coupled with an interactive map, utilizes the organizations' previously collected data from written policies and ordinances with data received from a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests that detail the levels of assistance local jails and law enforcement is willing to give to federal immigration enforcement. These variables that outline the level of involvement with ICE include the presence or absence of:

1. 287(g) agreements
2. ICE detention contracts, otherwise known as agreements between ICE and local jails to detain immigrants in the jail during deportation proceedings in exchange for pay
3. ICE holds, where the county would hold individuals after their release data until ICE arrives on scene
4. ICE alerts, where the county notifies ICE of release times, dates, or other inmate information
5. limits of ICE interrogations in jail such as a prohibition to allow ICE to enter a jail or requiring the detainee's permission before ICE agents can interrogate them
6. a prohibition on asking about immigration status
7. a general prohibition on providing assistance to ICE to enforce civil immigration laws or against aiding in joint task forces

Using this method, the ILRC calculates a seven-point rubric by which to measure involvement with ICE, with a rank of 0, meaning the most amount of involvement, and a rank of 7 meaning the least amount of involvement. This ranking system is then to be applied to the counties by which interviewed activists and advocates are operating within to measure the objective level of threat of deportation in a given county.

Additionally, this level of threat was combined with a consideration of local immigration law which controls the ability of immigrants to attain upward mobility and resource attainment within a state. These local laws were identified through searching the databases of each state's respective legislature websites for laws that affect upward mobility such as access to higher education that also intersect with immigration law. Local law is of particular importance because although cooperation with ICE does help to measure a particular threat level, the ability for immigrants to be upwardly mobile and autonomous also influence the threat of deportation in that they can serve to restrict or to empower immigrant communities on a day-to-day basis. This impacts the community's ability to attain and distribute resources to combat deportation proceedings or the ways that ICE raids operate and therefore influence the overall threat level of deportation. Some of these local immigration laws under consideration include those that impact access to higher education, access to driver's licenses, and access to public assistance benefits.

Upward mobility through avenues such as higher education influences the threat of deportation by determining the kinds and amounts of resources available to the community. Higher education amongst Latinos has an impact on Latino income (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015; Pew Research Center, 2016)³ which can then be utilized by Latinos who may be placed under

³ Although the rise in income among Latinos as a result of levels of higher education is more comparable to that of white Americans, it is worthy to note that wealth accumulation compared between white Americans and Latinos is drastically different, where Latinos with higher education have less accumulated wealth than do white Americans with only high school education. However,

deportation proceedings. One of the ways that these resources can be utilized is through access to attorneys. Research conducted by the American Immigration Council holds that immigrants in detention centers with attorneys are “four times more likely to be released from detention,” are “11 times more likely to seek relief such as asylum,” and detained immigrants with counsel are “twice as likely . . . to obtain immigration relief” (Eagly & Shafer, 2016). This drastic difference in outcome is dependent solely upon the availability of counsel. When availability of counsel is connected to resource collection and upward mobility, logic follows that access to higher education therefore has an effect on the possibility of deportation.

Additionally, other research has shown that access to higher education impacts an individual’s knowledge of their civil rights, which can be utilized in cases where they are confronted with law enforcement. This knowledge of basic rights also has an impact on the threat of deportation because if a community is able to utilize that knowledge of rights then they are better able to combat deportation proceedings. Of course, not every single member of the Latino community in any particular county is able to access higher education as a matter of practicality. However, the ability of some Latinos knowing their rights impacts the whole community because of their ability to contribute to the community and spreading information through their friends and families.

Interviews of Activists

In order to examine the ways Latino communities and immigrant rights activists are impacted by this threat of deportation and mobilize, this paper utilizes eight intensive interviews with immigrant rights activists and advocates from established immigrant advocacy organizations. These interviews are spread evenly between Washington State and Arizona, spread out across a total

for the purposes of this study, simply having a higher level of income accumulation is impactful and serves to decrease the chances of deportation as compared to other Latino communities.

of six counties with varying levels of threat of deportation, including King County, Pierce County, and Yakima County in Washington and Pima County, Maricopa County, and Cochise County in Arizona. Some interview subjects were initially found as a result of their organization's participation in other studies in the discipline looking at Latino immigrant rights mobilization. For other interview requests, this study employed a 'snowball' technique to find members of other organizations that also work in the field.

Interviews took up an average of 45 minutes, with the shortest interview taking up 32 minutes and the longest taking up over an hour. Interviews were conducted following a general interview protocol. This protocol was designed to steadily build upon different concerns and issues and inquire about ways that resistance occurs to challenges or obstacles set forth by the threat of deportation.⁴ The interview protocol is contained in Appendix II.⁵

Findings

In the context of local immigration law which influences resource attainment and upward mobility, Washington State poses a lower threat of deportation than does Arizona. However, the level of threat at the local level is complicated by the 2018 ILRC report's ranking system of local county cooperation with ICE. After a consideration of these two factors, the study finds the rankings of threat of deportation from lowest to highest threat is as follows: King County, WA; Pierce County, WA; Yakima County, WA; Pima County, AZ; Maricopa County, AZ; and the county with the highest level of threat is Cochise County, AZ.

Additionally, my interview data suggests that in places with higher levels of threat, there are increasing and more intensive forms of political participation and mobilization amongst Latinos.

⁴ The words "threat of deportation" are not explicitly used in the interview protocol to allow for activists and advocates to frame their experiences with more freedom and genuine accuracy.

⁵ Interviews are minimally modified for clarity in removing filler words such as "um" "uh" "so" and "you know?"

Under lower levels of threat of deportation, the community primarily engages in collective mobility services and local campaigns, whereas under high threat, the community additionally utilizes preemptive organization, alert networks, and national campaigns. Additionally, I argue that the experiences of immigrant rights groups are so severe and the impact of the threat of deportation so high, that the threat and usage of deportation proceedings is a case of state violence against the community. I now turn to a detailed discussion of threat in mobilization in six counties across both states.

Areas of Low Threat

King County, WA

It is with a certain level of self-awareness that I recognize the area of lowest threat of deportation is the same county that houses the University of Washington in Seattle, the location by which I am conducting this research. In fact, one of the critical pieces of local immigration law that cause this county to be among the lowest levels of threat of deportation is also tied directly to the University of Washington with H.B. 1079, the REAL Hope Act (2015). This legislation permits undocumented students to have access to in-state tuition for higher education and access to financial aid, both of which are resources that are not granted at the federal level. This results in a higher percentage of undocumented immigrants with the capacity to achieve higher education and overall upward mobility.

Additionally, under the ILRC Report, King County receives a score of 4, due to the lack of 287(g) agreement with ICE, lack of ICE detention contract or practice of ICE holds, and that under King County Ordinance 17886 King County has required that ICE attain a criminal warrant issued by a federal judge prior to being able to access detainees (Gosset, McDermott, Dembowski, Phillips, & Upthegrove, 2014). In short, these are a number of limitations that King County has placed on ICE activity, in effect limiting the threat of deportation against immigrants.

It is no surprise then that the majority of the immigrant rights work in King County is focused on the rights of immigrants in the workplace and engagement in local campaigns. Ismelda* is an immigrant rights activist who was worked in King County for over six years. She began work as a volunteer while still in college and has since gone on to work in the field full time advocating for immigrant rights. She describes the threat of deportation to be “of course, there in the back of the mind of every immigrant.” The concerns that immigrants express is primarily focused on the workplace, where immigrants wonder “whether raids are going to happen, where they’re going to happen” and what rights they have as immigrant workers against their bosses. Although there are certain labor protections under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935 and the Fair Labor Standards Act (1939), both of which are federal laws, there have been cases where labor protections are not applied to undocumented workers in particular, as found under *Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v NLRB* (2002). The case ruled that the NLRA does not hold full protections for undocumented workers under the rationale that it is in conflict with IRCA’s (1986) provision that made it illegal for employers to knowingly hire undocumented workers. Workplace protection is not legally denied to other kinds of immigrants, however the knowledge of that is not always readily accessible. These immigrant’s unwillingness to challenge rights violations is geared in part as a response to the “worry [that] they might get in trouble with ICE.”

Additionally, immigrants who set up their own companies and hire other immigrants worry about similar job violations from those who contract them for their services. Immigrants can become entrepreneurs and hire workers regardless of their immigration status. This legal loophole is a result of the fact that the question of whether IRCA explicitly prohibits people unauthorized to

* To protect the identity of the interview subjects, all names provided are pseudonyms and the interviews are minimally moderated so as not to reveal specific details by which an activist can be identified.

work in the U.S. from owning businesses and becoming “employers” under the law has never been litigated (Mastman, 2008). Therefore, undocumented immigrants are able to legally work in the U.S. as owners of their own businesses and hire other immigrants to work for them. This of course shifts the issue and presents its own questions of what those who then contract businesses for work can do. Legally, those who contract businesses owned by undocumented immigrants can do nothing directly to endanger the status of the employer or an employee of the contracted business, however the knowledge of that fact is not always present. Ismelda describes a couple of situations where individuals who have contacted a business for work do not uphold their end of the bargain, where work may have been completed but the individual is refusing to pay the promised amount, if at all.

Ismelda primarily works on educating the community of their labor rights, leading English education courses for employees and business owners, and providing legal aid in the form of attorneys. The primary reason for this is so that “immigrants know how to assert themselves” and are able to “get enough [resources] so they can . . . get to a better space economically and with their work.” In other words, Imelda’s organization provides collective mobility services to better the overall conditions of the community and inspire upward mobility.

Ismelda states that some of the work to better the community’s conditions are already being done on the ground through the community’s participation in small local government. For example, the community has established roots in such as in attending city council meetings or school board meetings. This is in line with previous literature which suggests Latinos more generally and Latinas in particular are more politically active in small local community involvement (Casellas, 2009; Garcia et. al., 2008; Pardo, 1996). In other words, the Latino community is politically engaged, and the less immediate threat of deportation has influenced the community’s focus on local politics through labor campaigns, city council participation, and school board attendance, as well as through

providing collective mobility services such as English education and providing legal assistance for those claims.

Pierce County, WA

Pierce County Pierce County ranks a 3 in the ILRC report. This is due to its lack of 287(g) contracts with ICE, the lack of an ICE Detention Contracts or the respect of ICE holds, and also the fact that Pierce County does give ICE approximately 4 hours advance notice of the release of an immigrant and allows ICE access to detainees. In short, the levels of cooperation between local enforcement and ICE are at higher levels than in King County.

Additionally, while Pierce County is also positively affected by Washington law which grants access to higher education to undocumented immigrants, a factor which makes Pierce County a higher level of threat of deportation is the heavily restricted access to public assistance benefits to immigrants and the presence of the Tacoma Northwest Detention Center. Although Washington Administrative Code (WAC) does provide financial assistance to immigrants such as through the state-funded Food Assistance Program (FAP), this program is restricted for refugees, Legal Permanent Residents, Cuban or Haitian entrants, and victims of domestic abuse. This excludes various immigrants who do not fall under these categories, most notably, undocumented immigrants even if they are victims of abuse (Washington State Legislature, 2018). Additionally, the Tacoma Northwest Detention Center is one of the biggest immigrant prisons in the U.S. with a capacity of 1,575 detained immigrants (GEO Group, Inc., 2018). Immigrants who are placed in detention yet released on bond are denied access to these services because of their detention. Despite the ways that detention increases the likelihood of poverty due to the removal of a migrant from their work and the nonexistent right to an attorney for civil law cases which obligates hiring a private attorney, immigrants are denied access to any kind of assistance while going through the deportation process.

It is for this reason that Richard's organization focuses exclusively on providing collective mobility services to immigrants going through detention proceedings.

Richard is a board member of one of the prominent immigrant advocacy groups that operates within the county. His organization focuses on collaboration with other organizations to acquire housing services, financial assistance, food services, and work services to immigrants, along with reaching out to the immigrant's family to let them know the situation of their relative. Additionally, Richard's organization focuses very narrowly on local campaigns in regard to their attempts to cooperate with law enforcement who may interact with the community. Forming coalitions to provide these services for the purposes of empowering immigrants in deportation proceedings financial security is in itself an act of upward mobility, and the collective effort it requires to attain these resources and connection is higher in the level of than that presented and occurring in King County.

Richard operates under the rationale that the immigrants he works with "were in effect in prison" due to deportation proceedings. Richard explains that after release, a lot of detainees are "quiet," "overwhelmed," and solitary. What Richard describes is some of the effects that detention has on immigrants, which include a kind of breaking-down effect where autonomy is stripped and influences the way that immigrants' decision making is severely impacted. Other scholars such as Hernández (2014) have made the comparison between immigration detention centers and criminal prisons in terms of the treatment of immigrants in detention centers, where Hernández has found similarities in the similar (lack of) access to medical care, visitation rights, access to attorneys, the similar physical restrictions, forced labor, and punishment that occurs in detention centers such as the practice of solitary confinement (SPLC, 2016). These realities of confinement and deportation have therefore influenced the ways that Richard and his organization advocate for these immigrants once they have been released from detention. With an almost defeated voice, Richard states, "We

don't ask them personal questions. We try to avoid restricting their [choices].” He goes on to explain that when helping immigrants transition from the detention center as they're going through deportation proceedings, his organization places an emphasis on personal choice and very few restrictions to counteract some of the effects that the detention center has had on the immigrants they serve.

In other words, the level of threat of deportation in Pierce County has influenced mobilization through an emphasis of collective mobility services, focusing on local campaigns through cooperation and discussion with local enforcement, and even some coalition formation with other local organizations so as to provide those resources. These forms of mobilization follow the same kind of general trends as those presented in King County, only increased and in a more direct response to the threat of deportation.

Areas of High Threat⁶

Yakima County, WA

The Department of Licensing for the state of Washington does not require proof of citizenship or legal status in order to attain a driver's license (Department of Licensing, 2018). Thus, undocumented immigrants have access to driver's licenses, which is not a right granted at the federal level. This particular local law is critical in Yakima County, whose local economy is largely dominated by the agriculture industry (Meseck, 2016). Areas with heavy agricultural work all but require access to motor vehicles and driver's licenses for the purposes of travelling from one location of the field to the next. Autonomy of movement is vital for immigrants who are working in this sector of the workforce to arrive to and from work and have other options open to them in the

⁶ Although an ideal study would incorporate additional counties and data in order to account for a better balance between areas of high and low threat, these unique conditions of the current moment and limitations of resources makes it so that this kind of division is unavoidable.

case that they must find another job that may be several miles away from their previous one. Relying solely on public transportation would cause immigrants who live and work in this industry undue harm in terms of limiting their ability to work as well as leaving them vulnerable to potential ICE roundups that would occur at bus stops as an easy targeting tactic. Therefore, the ability for individuals to have access to their own vehicles via driver's licenses raises the difficulty of a quick roundup of immigrants and ergo lowers the threat of deportation.

However, the ILRC report lists Yakima County as a level 2 threat. Although Yakima County does not have a 287(g) agreement and does not necessarily honor ICE holds, the county does have a detention contract with ICE, alerts them of any immigrant in custody with ample time to arrive, and does not have any restrictions or limitations of what ICE can ask or do to immigrants in holding. Ergo, while Yakima County is not the highest area of threat, to classify this county as a low threat area would be to erase the struggles that the Latino community has faced in this area.

Under this intermediate space between levels of low and high threat, the Latino community in Yakima county also utilizes a combination of collective mobilization services, preemptive organization, and alert networks. Alejandra is an immigrant rights activist and very active member of her organization who spends most of her time engaging in canvassing, mobilizing, and educating the Latino immigrant community in Yakima County. She describes a scene of wanting to mobilize the community to partake in community events such as attending a city council meeting or a "Know Your Rights" training event, but having members of the community asking if "they have police over there? Do they asking for ID or something like that if we're going to the city council meeting?" In short, she describes difficulty in mobilizing a community that is "not calling 911 if they're witnesses of a crime or domestic violence or they are witness any other crime" due to the fear that they may be deported upon contacting the police. She states that "most of the people are very fear to the pickup [ICE roundups] and more in fear to participate."

In response to these concerns, Alejandra's organization focuses on mobilization through canvassing and door-to-door mobilization to Get Out the Vote. The rationale is that they can appease the concerns and fears of the community by having members go door-to-door rather than simply inviting the community to an event and risk having their status being disclosed simply by their presence at the event and being seen by police. Additionally, Alejandra argues that by getting enough of the Latino community in the county to vote for Latino representatives, it will become easier to address the communities' concerns on immigration. The Latino community in Yakima county is suffering from a lack of political efficacy, a phenomenon that is in line with previous research that states how political efficacy amongst Latinos goes down when the presence of ICE and immigration enforcement activity goes up (Rocha, Knoll, & Wrinkle, 2015). In order to combat this, Alejandra is attempting to talk with the chief of police on "how to recover that trust in the community and how to have an honest conversation with the community" because it's the only way to find substantive change. She is, however, finding resistance both at the hand of the local police as well as the general community which is not ready to fully trust agents which they feel are a representation of their ability to be deported.

Once able to gain sufficient trust of the community so they may participate in events, Alejandra does a significant amount of educating and using community resources to mobilize. The members of the Latino immigrant community she works with "know[s] how to take pictures, how to text the address of the ICE raids," and that they're establishing an alert and network of when and where ICE raids are occurring so that the community itself is utilizing its presence to warn each other and Alejandra's organization can then seek help from other organizations from other areas in the state. Additionally, to appease the fears of the community once they're at events, Alejandra describes that at each event, an organizer is posted at the door to make sure that police and ICE agents do not enter or take pictures, as well as call out a warning if that occurs. Her organization also

takes down the names and numbers of the people who have gone to events to follow up on them and make sure that they are safe.

In other words, Alejandra's organization is engaging in a combination of collective mobilization services and local campaign focus as well as preemptive organization to combat the probability that ICE agents may become involved. In doing so, this organization is acting in a way that maximizes their ability to respond to concerns of the community, shaping their organizational decisions on specific ways to combat the fear and the lack of political trust that the Latino community expresses in Yakima County.

Maribel is another immigrant rights advocate in Yakima County. She describes her work as very grassroots-based due to her organization's tie with the community. A lot of the work that her organization provides is through collective mobility services such as education, providing legal resources, and, similarly to Alejandra, Know Your Rights training. Some additional work that she conducts is in heightened forms of preemptive organization through protocols for ICE to arrive and assisting in further inquiries and applications towards naturalization for immigrants in the community. This last provision follows previous literature on how Latinos respond to threat.

Additionally, Maribel is also part of the raid response group in Yakima County that Alejandra spoke of. One of the larger mobilizing actions that Maribel's organization partakes in involves the implementation of a very clear and established protocol in the case of ICE involvement. Maribel states that her organization has "a whole protocol and policies in place of how to respond if ICE shows up at the door versus if ICE is in the building versus if ICE is at a place where we're having an event and so we do have a lot of that in one place. We talk about it pretty regularly as a staff." The implementation of ICE protocols requires the immigrants who work in Maribel's organization to familiarize themselves with local laws designed to secure civil liberties to protect immigrants who may not be aware of the consequences that they may face. In other words, this is a

form of heightened political participation and civic engagement that arises out of the reality that deportation is a rather strong possibility for the community they operate within.

These levels of heightened mobilization are occurring under conditions that are defined by a lack of political trust amongst the Latinos in this county. Alejandra has touched upon this lack of trust, but Maribel has described it best. She states,

I can't tell you the number of people that have shared that over the years their self-esteem was totally or slowly chipped away, and that's a huge barrier! Making the belief that "I belong," that, "my voice will make a change," the belief that "my vote will actually matter" [resonate] . . . the way that social media frames the issue, that also chips away at people's confidence in the democratic system.

Both Maribel and Alejandra describe a lack of trust in government, or a lack of political trust in their local institutions and the actors within those institutions as a result of the high fear and the threat that they may be deported. Previous research finds that Latino immigrants enter the country with more trust of government than native-born residents, which indicates that the exact level of depletion of political trust is even more drastic than first observed. This kind of low political trust is in line with previous scholarship on the issue, which has found that among Latinos, increased ICE activity has produced very low levels of political trust (Rocha, Knoll, & Wrinkle, 2015). Absence of political trust inspires low feelings of integration and therefore lower participation in the political system, which in turn affects the ability and willingness that the community holds to mobilize in cooperation with the system. The result is a lack of willingness to cooperate with local government, which shifts mobilization tactics into more dramatic and even national forms.

Pima County, AZ

The ILRC report lists Pima County as a level 4 area for threat of deportation. This is due to the county's lack of 287(g) agreement, a formal ICE detention contract, it's refusal to partake in ICE

holds and to formally alert ICE of immigrant detainees. This is a higher score than Pierce County, however that matter is complicated when taking local immigration law into consideration.

Arizona uses an additional law such as the Legal Arizona Workers Act (2008) in an attempt to prohibit undocumented immigrants from working in any capacity within the state, including IRCA loopholes that would allow undocumented immigrants to work as employers by establishing their own businesses. These loopholes limit the resource accumulating capabilities of immigrants living within the state. Additionally, Arizona law prohibits “alien smuggling” that can lead up to five years in prison for “transporting, harboring, or encouraging” an undocumented immigrant. This minimizes the willingness of individuals and the capabilities of organizations to aid undocumented immigrants. For these reasons, Pima County is among the highest areas of threat of deportation included in this study, and influences organization to occur through preemptive organization and calls towards more national campaigns.

For over 25 years Guadalupe, a 6th generation Mexican-American has worked as a prominent immigrant rights activist in Pima County, which is located along the Arizona-Mexico border. Over the years, her work has spanned various different aspects of immigration reform such as addressing the militarization of the border, combatting against S.B. 1070, and seeking environmental reform for immigrant communities. One of the critical concerns she and the immigrant community in Arizona expresses is the separation of families’ due to deportation, the ways that ICE can “divide your community, split you up within an hour or two and you’re on the other side of the border.” This rapid separation via expedited deportation is easier to conduct due to their location closer to the border. The Department of Homeland Security divides its immigration enforcement between ICE, which operates within the interior of the United States, and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) which operates on the borders and coastline of the country. However, CBP also has access of up to 100 miles of the interior of the United States to apprehend, search, and deport any

undocumented immigrant under the legal framework that the immigrant is attempting to enter the country without authorization. Undocumented immigrants who live, work, or travel within the 100-mile zone are thus able to be deported by CBP under the crime of “illegal entry” as though it had just occurred, regardless of the fact that some immigrants may have been living in the U.S. for several years without any criminal activity or disturbance to the U.S. (ACLU, 2018). Some cities in Arizona that fall into this 100-mile zone include Phoenix, Tucson, Mesa, Chandler, and Glendale, which are the five most populated cities in Arizona and account for over 3,000,000 people, or about 43% of Arizona’s total population (U.S. Census, 2010; World Population Review, 2018; ACLU, 2018). This does not include the populations of various smaller towns which also reside in this zone, which means that the amount of people in Arizona impacted by the 100-mile zone is actually an underestimation.

Guadalupe’s organization engages in a number of public demonstrations against oppressive immigration laws such as vigils and protests. With that in mind, Guadalupe’s organization has prepared itself for the strong likelihood of deportation proceedings being utilized as a method of attack against members participating in their events. She states that her organization is “cognizant” that people might be detained at events, and has set up preemptive mobilization to be able to immediately respond to detention proceedings. Some of the preemptive organizing includes the accumulation of a collective fund amongst members of the community, as well as the establishment of intermediaries to serve as a barrier between those partaking in the events and law enforcement. These intermediaries are specifically trained as legal observers to uphold the rights that demonstrators have to mobilize on the street and challenge any heckling or otherwise aggressive tactic that police might try and utilize against their members. However, Guadalupe admits that “it doesn’t matter what we do, sometimes the cops will act aggressively. Then we’ve gotta be organized to mobilize for that.” Organization of protests or demonstrations are already incredibly labor-

intensive tasks. Considerations have to be made for time, locations, transportation, establishing an effective collective message to frame the demonstration under, the provision of food and water depending on the length of the demonstration, along with the ever-present issue of struggling to spread the message and get people to show up and participate. Additionally, preemptive organization has to go through similar organization structure. Collecting funds to aid in deportation proceedings, whether by asking for general donations or appealing to particular donors or patrons requires a significant amount of time, organization, and responsibility. Additionally, recruiting legal observers and a literal legal team requires utilizing collective resources to find individuals who have the necessary legal background and have them dedicate time to observe events with the possibility that they may need to step in for an event that is occurring.

Although the labor of organizing for a general protest and preemptive protest are similar, the primary distinction between the two is in the ways anticipation of deportation and disturbance is considered between the two sets of actions. Organization for a protest is done with the goal of advocating for change in the immigration system. Organization through establishing a pool of funds or setting up legal intermediaries is done with the underlying understanding that they are to be utilized to directly challenge deportation proceedings. Thus, the emotional mindset of the organizer is altered and the acceptance of that labor as necessary is indicative of the imbalance of power structure that intimately embedded in the dynamic. Organizing for cases where all other organization fails and they require protection against law enforcement also requires an accumulation of resources that is directly at odds with the amount of power which the community has. Previous cases of mobilization amongst Latinos have set a historical precedent for immigration campaigns to be framed as illegitimate and even as “un-American” due to the understanding that Latinos themselves are “un-American.” (Wright & Citrin, 2010; Chavez, 2008; Huntington, 2004; Fraga & Segura, 2006; Wallace, Zepeda-Millan, & Jones Correa, 2014). Thus, the community is immediately placed at a

disadvantage against the police, which do not face combatting against such a frame of illegitimacy and “un-American”-ness.

Maricopa County, AZ

In contrast to the legislation in Washington, the state of Arizona outright prohibits the granting of in-state tuition or financial aid for undocumented students with Proposition 300 (2006). This has a particular impact on Maricopa County, which houses Arizona State University-Tempe and Arizona State University-West, both of which are the best public universities in the state. Therefore, immigrants who live in this county are restricted in their ability to engage in upward mobility and achieve the same gains of resource accumulation and rights knowledge to combat deportation proceedings as with other communities.

Additionally, Maricopa County is listed as a level 3 under the ILRC report. This is due to the fact that Maricopa County does not have a 287(g) agreement with ICE or a formal ICE detention contract and it does not honor ICE holds, but there are ICE alerts sent out informing them in advance of immigrants who are being released from detainment. This, coupled with the aforementioned local immigration law and its impact on Maricopa County make this an area with a high risk of deportation.

Rosario is a prominent member in her organization advocating for Latino immigrant rights and uplifting the Latino community as a whole who has been active since 2006 as a volunteer and has since risen up the ranks to her current position. In her own words, the first concern of the immigrant community is that “a lot of people are afraid of deportation,” and that “the overall the fear of being in deportation or detention proceedings” influences their mobilization. The way that Rosario and her organization does this is through preemptive organization via emergency plans. Rosario assists members of the community in establishing packets with critical pieces of information such as all available contact information, the information of their children, the information of

particular attorneys, signed forms granting permission for the attorney to visit and assist the detained immigrant on his behalf, information of temporary guardians for the children, and other information that trusted people have access to should the person be placed in deportation proceedings. Through this kind of preventative action, Rosario and her organization are directly confronting the reality that there is a high likelihood of deportation proceedings that can and will occur in the community.

Rosario also describes ways that her organization has been made aware of a “network of servers that go out and record” ICE raids. She goes onto mention other preemptive organization such as how her organization “always consider[s]” law enforcement getting involved in a demonstration. Her organization has developed a system of intermediaries such as police liaisons, peacekeepers, and marshals that can intervene in the instance that police or other law enforcement wants to engage with people at their demonstrations. Rosario describes that the peacekeepers are informed with how to deescalate situations. In these cases, intermediaries:

. . . Serve as a barrier so there’s no incidents and people are safe in those spaces . . . there are families that are at those events, and we want to make sure that the priority is safety. Having a plan with any action, key roles are a police liaison in charge of talking with the police and several peacekeepers and marshals . . . we have to be prepared for anything.

Similar to Guadalupe’s experience in Pima County, Rosario experiences the same kind of accumulation of resources that is simultaneously an indicator of the differences between the different kind of power relationship that her organization holds versus that of the law enforcement agents that are actively working against her. The very knowledge that intermediaries are present to protect against threat proves that there is a threat by which to defend against.

Some of the other work Rosario engages in is through national level campaigns. Rosario’s organization lets people know the “ways they can advocate for themselves such as making phone

calls to Congress, signing petitions, letting people know it's okay to sign this petition" or that "you can call your Congress representatives, your senators, you don't have to be a citizen to do it." This kind of political action is very direct in response to the actions being taken as a result of these threat levels. While the political campaigns expressed in King and Yakima counties in particular are more narrowly focused on local participation such as through city councils and school boards, Rosario's organization is tailored towards larger and more national campaigns. These campaigns require higher levels of organization to run, particularly in regard to the ability to establish connections and the time commitment of having to navigate Congress versus addressing local politicians and attaining more action overall to affect a national election or policy proposal that is outside the confines of the state in which they reside. Additionally, national campaigns also exemplify the need for a higher political power to combat the local political power. Due to the fact that organizing for petitioning Congress requires more resource attainment than does petitioning local law, the act of seeking national reform through Congress is indicative of the inability for local government to meet the needs of the community. In other words, seeking national campaigns indicates the level of resistance found at the local level to substantive resource attainment. Thus, the increased level of threat of deportation calculated through local law and local cooperation with ICE can reach a point that seeking reform through local means is deemed less effective than through federal.

An additional form of mobilization within higher levels of threat is the establishment of alert systems for law enforcement and deportation proceedings. Taking down information of government action and reporting to others for the purposes of informing the community is a form of political participation that requires the input of several members of the Latino community. Therefore, you see large numbers of the community partaking in political participation. In effect, deportation proceedings have actively shaped her organization's political actions and heightened the political mobilization of the community.

In short, Rosario's organization and the Latino community in Maricopa County is doing a significant amount of political participation as a direct response to the threat of deportation. They are calling Congress, petitioning, organizing networks, establishing groups of trained individuals to maintain the safety of people involved in their events, educating, establishing connections with attorneys and other political organizations.

Hector is another immigrant rights advocate in Maricopa County who has been involved with his respective organization for the past couple of years. He describes the situation in Maricopa that began as "working from even below zero" and how "a lot of communities are still living this fear, anxiety of how the system isn't working for them and they feel marginalized and ostracized because of it." Hector operates under the same conditions as Rosario, though his organization and work focuses very exclusively on civil engagement of the Latino community. Some of the activities that his organization focuses on is canvassing, Getting Out the Vote, and registering people to vote, all of which are exclusively political actions.

Hector's organization practices a lot of coalition formation with organizations which spearhead various intersecting interests such as seeking race and education reform for African Americans in schools and environmental reform for indigenous communities. Most theory surrounding coalition formation focuses on the ways that coalitions disband, such as coalitions between Latinos and African Americans (Vaca, 2004). Coalition formation with organizations that are so distinct from each other are more difficult to upkeep than are coalitions with heavily intersecting organizations, such as two Latino immigrant rights organizations that focus on vocational and housing assistance respectively (Carmichael & Hamilton, 2008). However, in this scenario, a coalition of over 8 different organizations with varying interests has been successfully

formed and maintained, which is testament to the intensity of cooperation and political participation that the Latino community and the whole of Maricopa County is partaking in.

Overall, Hector has also noticed an increase in the amount of political participation of the Latino community in Maricopa County.

Over the years we've grown in numbers and the beauty about it is we've become a wider more progressive movement and there's people that begin to work in this movement and grow in leadership and eventually take the step and decide "I'm going to run for office" . . . Whenever negative policies happen, that alerts a lot of people, that awakens a lot of people. That makes people realize that something shady is going down and we have to get involved . . . then, they are motivated to run for office and be that change.

In other words, Hector describes the ways that even under the increased threat of deportation proceedings and even under the various laws that restrict the rights of immigrants and even under the amount of ICE activity that the county faces, the community responds by engaging in further mobilization and becomes so dedicated to the cause that they eventually run for political office as a result.

Additionally, Hector's organization also partakes in preemptive organization to combat deportation proceedings against the community. Hector's organization has protocols for cases where individuals are being placed in deportation proceedings, and some of the actions that they partake in are in quick collective action and "communicating through our digital platforms," forming petitions, contacting the media via "press conferences," and "have a fund set up to help the family in case a bond is given" to release their community members from detention proceedings. These actions require is a very significant amount of resource accumulation in a relatively short amount of time.

The fact that a protocol for deportation proceedings is saddening, however the amount of rapid political response to these actions are impressive.

In summary, Maricopa county is rich in the amount of mobilization that occurs within the county. Some of this work includes attempts at naturalization, media framing, voting, national campaigns rather than local campaigns, and preemptive services such as collective funds, alert systems, and providing legal observers. All of these forms of mobilization are to some extent additionally combined with other local campaigns and attempts at local engagement such as collective mobility services.

Cochise County, AZ

Cochise County is located on the border of Arizona and Mexico. As well as being privy to other Arizona state laws such as the denial of public assistance benefits to any immigrant, Proposition 300 which bars access to higher education, the denial of drivers licenses to undocumented immigrants, and the implementation of the “alien smuggling” act, under the ILRC, Cochise County has a level 2 threat of deportation. Although this county also does not have a 287(g) agreement with ICE, nor does it have an ICE detention contract like other counties in this study have, this county does honor ICE holds, it alerts ICE of immigrants in detention, has zero restrictions for ICE’s ability to access detained immigrants. This is also combined with the reality that as a county on the border, this county also falls into the 100-mile zone that CBP has access to.

The threat of deportation in this county is the highest out of the counties considered in this study. For this reason, the immigrant rights advocate I spoke with works in an organization that works exclusively with individuals who are in deportation proceedings. Martin describes his work with a community that is, “concerned about a legal path to go into the U.S. – whether that’s the ability to go in with a visa to work and/or be united with family members who live in the U.S. –

because quite a number have U.S. citizen children . . . and [due to] their immigration status they are separated from them and have no legal way to be with them.”

Additionally, Martin’s organization has participated in a number of different forms of political action geared towards preemptive organizing, one of which is through the spreading of information through media. They have “talked about different issues on the radio as a way to try and raise awareness among the public in general” and published “a few reports to address the use of force by border patrol, and we’ve used that as a tool to lobby in Washington DC and to lobby in light of just recommendations that we’ve made to improve training and accountability for border patrol. Utilization of the local radio is a tactic used by the Latino immigrant community in previous cases of resistance which is not traditionally considered a form of political participation (Zepeda-Millan, 2017). But I would argue that the spreading of information that is innately political and instilling calls to action is very explicitly a case of political action and political participation that is occurring on the county level. In this way, Martin’s organization is able to simultaneously inform the community of the abuses that are occurring, how to avoid those abuses occurring to them, as well as preemptively formulate the rhetoric and political framing utilized against the group

An additional form of preemptive organization is through campaigns to implement proper training for CBP. Martin expresses frustration at the relatively slow process of seeking and discovering reform for the training of officers. He states the feeling being “you sit down, you talk, but nothing really changes. Or well I don’t want to say nothing – not a lot changes.” Martin describes various different agents that are coming into play. His organization is, in effect, utilizing the law and lobbying as a form of resistance. Through national level appeals towards CBP to implement training, Martin’s organization is directly challenging the legitimacy of the institution itself and utilizing its own methods against them. Appeals towards providing legal services for

naturalization or asylum seeking also directly challenge the narrative of the lazy Latino, as well as allows the discretion that is normally permitted to CBP agents to appear before a court of law.

Attempting to address the way that CBP agents operate is difficult due to the combined power dynamics and the amount of discretion allotted to them. CBP agents are often operating in spaces that are simply miles of desert, and the fact that those who make claims against them are already in rather vulnerable positions as people who are in deportation proceedings or have been deported and are attempting to re-enter the United States make advocating for change and relief particularly difficult. Challenging abuse depends upon a deep pool of resources so as not to put a strain on individuals who are seeking justice for the abuse that they have been subjected to, including the collection of a collective fund and establishing working relationships with attorneys and other legal advocates, which are forms of preemptive organization. Martin also notes that in the attempt to seek out justice for those that have been brutalized by CBP agent, his organization has been taking those complaints to various different government entities such as the Department of Civil Liberties, the Office of the Inspector General, and the Office of Professional Responsibility and establishing contacts in those entities in attempts to find justice on the matter. In effect, Martin has been engaging in campaigns targeted towards a national scale.

Martin has also described ways that his organization has made demonstrations at the border next to sections of the border wall where various members of the community have participated despite the knowledge and presence of federal immigration agents. The Latino community is thus willing to demonstrate an incredible amount of resilience in their political participation by organizing and partaking in demonstrations that are in front of the physical manifestation of their fears and anxieties. This is a level of intensity in this kind of political participation that has never quite appeared to the extent of other countries.

Additionally, the community that Martin engages with should be noted is the same community that has suffered the same numbing effects that deportation proceedings have instilled in Pierce County, WA. However, whereas members of the community in Pierce County have left with relatively low amounts of political participation, none have exhibited the same amount of resilience as is occurring in this particular county with a significantly higher threat of deportation.

In short, the realities of deportation in this particular county have resulted in various forms of political action by the community, including a collection of community resources, lobbying, setting up training for CBP, seeking higher forms of intervention by engaging with larger governmental agencies, forming connections with individuals in those agencies, spreading information to the community, providing demonstrations, and overall demonstrating an incredible amount of resilience and intensity of this political participation by doing all of this in an area with a substantially high threat of deportation as a direct result of that threat.

Mobilizing as a Form of Protection

The different forms of mobilization and political participation utilized by the Latino community are utilized as forms of protection of the community. In areas of low threat of deportation such as Pierce and King Counties, the primary way that the community mobilizes is through the collection of resources and engaging in local political structures. These forms of mobilization work to protect the rights of Latinos in the workplace, the educational system, their personal housing decisions, and in their ability to navigate their everyday lives. In areas of high threat of deportation such as Maricopa and Cochise counties, the Latino community responds by increased levels of mobilization as well as more intensive mobilization such as preemptive organization, within which includes alert systems and internal security, as well as collective funds to combat deportation proceedings. Alert systems protect the community through warning where and when ICE raids occur, internal security serve as a literal shield to protect the community from ICE or government

enforcement, and collective funds are utilized to protect against deportation proceedings themselves. In other words, all of the Latino community's actions in response to threat are also forms of protection for the community as a whole.

The nature of protection is that it requires the presence of something to protect against. In the case of the Latino community, they are mobilizing to protect themselves and each other against the threat of deportation. Whether the protection that the community engages with is for advancing upward mobility through the provision of resources or whether the protection is for the physical safety of immigrants, protection against deportation is one of the strongest determining factors in the equation. In other words, the community's methods of self-protection are in direct response to the threat of deportation, which is an action exclusively available to the state. Additionally, although not all members of the community are immigrants and therefore not privy to deportation themselves, this study has revealed that Latinos as a whole have responded to threats of deportation through specific forms of mobilization to combat against those proceedings and protect the community. Therefore, the state's exclusive ability to threaten and incur deportation is a case of the state engaging in violence against the Latino community.

“Civil” Immigration Law as State Violence

Due to both the drastic ways that the threat of deportation affects mobilization to the point of alert systems and preemptive organization, as well as the levels of fear it instills, the threat of deportation is an act of state violence towards the Latino community. Despite popular rhetoric, immigration law falls under civil law, not criminal. However, given how levels of threat of deportation influence mobilization, this civil law operates more and more closely like criminal law in terms of fear and inspiring increased levels of response and legal protection through intermediaries and actors that serve as warning beacons.

The threat of deportation has become so pronounced and dangerous that the community itself has expressed consistent and harrowing accounts of fear towards law enforcement. Maribel from Yakima County states that

We've had very scary situations . . . [where] we're calling to get help or to get somebody to get out there [but nobody does] . . . We've had a burglary and it took hours for someone to come look at it. There was blood on the scene and samples were never sent in anywhere . . . We are an organization, you would expect better responses in those situations. So of course, that makes us think . . . if this is the response that we're receiving, what incentive is there for an individual to expect something different?

Guadalupe from Pima County, AZ also adds: "I'm afraid of the cops. I've been threatened by all kinds of crazies and the cops don't care. They haven't taken any threat against me seriously because they don't care." Additionally, Rosario describes the massive migration from immigrants away from Arizona as a direct response to the actions of Sheriff Joe Arpaio, a sheriff who was convicted for criminal contempt as a result of his actions that, added by Guadalupe, "terrorized the community" (Cassidy, 2017). Rosario claims that "the game changed" in regard to the ways that local police collude with immigration enforcement and acts towards immigrants in more recent years where now organizations are in fear of law enforcement.

In August of last year, [Trump] came to the convention center. We've had many demonstrations and rallies here in Arizona and we never got gassed, and that night we got gassed. we were peacefully demonstrating . . . They didn't even give us a warning, they just – they gave a warning after the first bottle of water [was thrown] but after that they didn't say they were going to start spraying pepper spray or anything like that, or the gas bombs . . . I couldn't believe it.

Additionally, Hector adds:

Here in Arizona a lot of immigrants and communities of color are still living in fear, they're traumatized because we've had significant laws that really curtail their ability to work, their ability to drive, their ability to be able to try and move up the social ladder and achieve what we know as the American dream . . . [The police and immigrations enforcement] have policies that are directly contributing to mass incarceration rates, that are contributing to deportation rates, and that are criminalizing communities of color.

These testimonies in particular reveal a fear of local law enforcement as a result of their practices around immigration. To reiterate, immigration law is a form of civil law, but the realities of the application of the law means that local, criminal law enforcement will cooperate with civil immigration law enforcement by utilizing criminal law means. In other words, although they are operating within the realm of civil law, the application of civil law has occurred in a way that not only has the whole community been affected by the amount of fear and anxiety caused by such actions as raids and attacks by federal and local enforcement, but even members of organizations who are additionally protected due to their close relationships with other activists and the way they operate within the legal confines of the law are strongly and personally affected by the fear of violence that the immigration system places on them.

This level of fear is so strong that it has even traumatized the community's own children. A large number of Latino families are "mixed status" household, meaning that some members of a family are natural born U.S. citizens whereas other members have some form of legal status or are undocumented. This produces scenarios where children who are natural-born U.S. citizens might have undocumented parents or one child may be a U.S. citizen while the other is not. Although a natural-born U.S. citizen may not be deported along with their family member, they can still suffer

great consequences as a result of that separation. As Guadalupe points out, one of those consequences is in direct relation to children's mental health. Previous research has found that Latino children display symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as a result of the fear that their families or friends will be taken away by ICE. (Cervantes, Mejía, & Mena, 2010; Lopez Levers & Hyatt-Burkhart, 2011). In other words, the fear of separation via deportation strikes Latino communities so strongly that the children living in these communities' experience symptoms equivalent to living in an active warzone.

The restrictions of immigration law are directly related to the border deaths of the community. Migrants who have been denied access to the United States through legal channels seeking out entry through increasingly dangerous means such as through travelling across the Arizona desert with the aid of smugglers, commonly referred to as *coyotes*, while also knowing that the CBP agents hold incredible amounts of discretion on how they can behave towards migrants while in the desert and away from prying eyes. This is particularly concerning given the amount of "militarization of the border" where CBP are receiving higher budgets to spend on tools like drones to control immigration. As a testament to the amount of migrant death, Guadalupe's organization in Pima County has:

. . . Painted 362 crosses representing the human remains and people found since 2000 in the Arizona-Sonora border alone. Just with our borders, since 2000, we have painted all of these crosses . . . [immigrants] are losing their life just three miles from here. People are dying. People are *dying* and people don't care because nobody's shooting them, it's just our policies. We're killing them by policies.

These border deaths have increased as a result of narrowed pathways towards lawful immigration. The demand for immigrant labor and the need to escape from terrible conditions means that the demand for immigration has remained constant for several decades. Although immigration levels by

Latinos, particularly immigration levels from Mexico, have remained consistent throughout the past several decades, the pathways towards legal migration have been increasingly narrowed in a rescinding of programs such as the Bracero Program despite the high labor demands of the U.S. and the utilization of fearmongering and criminalization campaigns (Chaves, 2008). This, combined with the fact that the demand for immigrants and immigrant labor has remained constant throughout the U.S., means that although immigration into the U.S. by Latinos has been consistent, the only change that has occurred is that immigration and therefore immigrants has been forced to take on the framework of undocumented or unauthorized (Chavez, 2008; De Genova, 2004). Latinos who are seeking entry into the United States are doing so to seek escape from conditions in their home countries such as devastating poverty, drug violence, and death squads, or are simply trying to be reunited with family members living in the U.S. Migrants who are facing these motivations and conditions will not be deterred by immigration laws that prohibit their entry. The consequence of this is that increasing numbers of migrants are dying in the desert. The families of these migrants are left to mourn, unable to bury the remains of their loved ones.

The threat of deportation's effects on the levels of mobilization and the action taken by activists, as well as the fear of law enforcement from the Latino community presents the case that this threat is a case of state violence. This study has revealed that Latino communities live in fear of law enforcement because of the possibility that they or their loved ones will be deported and even suffer through literal trauma and PTSD as a result. This fear has significant influences on mobilization of immigrant rights groups, several of which have set up their own forms of protection against law enforcement via legal observers and intermediaries. Several groups have also set up their own alert systems to warn the Latino community of ICE raids, and many of those have also submitted to the reality that their work is going to result in intervention by deportation proceedings, preemptively organizing in response to this. Two out of the eight interviewees have expressed that

their organizations work exclusively with immigrants in deportation proceedings. They have not only listed the ways that detention affects an immigrant's overall psyche to the point that they organize specifically on how to address those harms done in detention, but one of these groups has focused quite a significant amount of their efforts on directly combatting the abuse that immigration enforcement has done to migrants on the U.S.-Mexico border. Additionally, this abuse on the border and the severity of immigration law has also resulted in the reality that some organizations even go on to paint crosses for those who have died on the border seeking entry into a country where they can escape horrid conditions of poverty and violence, only to be met with violence in this one. The threat and practices of deportation have direct consequences on the actions of organizers of the Latino immigrant right movement, and deportation proceedings – along with the immigration system in general – has left a literal body count in its wake. In short, the threat of deportation is a practice state violence.

Framing the threat of deportation as a practice of state violence has been hinted at numerous times in previous scholarship. Robert Cover's argument on violence in the law primarily engages with analyzing the way that a judge can sentence and punish you for a crime which was committed (1986). In the case of civil immigration law, there are several cases where there is neither a "crime" or a "punishment" ever sentenced. According to current U.S. law, deportation is framed as simply a legal consequence of civil law violations, and is not considered a punishment. However, previous scholarship has described the ways that immigrant detention while in deportation proceedings have been similar to the conditions of a prison, which is utilized as punishment (Hernandez, 2014; Hernandez, 2017). These conditions have even caused some immigrants to "self-deport" and return to countries of origin that suffer conditions as extreme as widespread poverty and cartel violence simply because they could not stand the conditions within these immigrant prisons (Hernandez, 2014; Quinn, 2006). When local authorities can be and are acting in place of immigration

enforcement, the line between criminal law and civil law becomes ferociously blurred. Additional scholarship has found that the practice of ICE raids has left Latino children traumatized with PTSD as if they were living in an active warzone (Cervantes, Mejía, & Mena, 2010; Lopez Levers & Hyatt-Burkhart, 2011).

This very study has revealed the fact that in certain counties, the need to get protection from the police and immigration law via peacekeepers and lawyers and people posted at the door like one would in an active warzone takes precedent. This study has revealed that in multiple areas, Latino immigrant communities have had to set up networks to inform each other of ICE raids and establish plans for the case that they are torn away from their families. Additionally, attacks by police who control their engagement with civil law as well as conflicts with federal immigration agents can only be described as actions of abuse. Sending tear gas and gas bombs into a peaceful protest is an act of very clear and tangible violence, as is the brutalization of an immigrant at the hand of CBP as has occurred numerous times in Cochise County. Ergo, while violence is occurring under the law, this violence is not ever recognized as such due partially to our legal understanding and theoretical framework by which we engage with civil immigration law. Violence that is not recognized does not simply disappear. Instead, violence festers and leaves a trail of cruelty in its wake, among which lie the cries of help just beneath the desert's sand.

In short, previous scholarship, the present levels of cooperation between police and federal immigration enforcement, and the testimonies in this study are proof of the reality that civil law in this country does not behave civilly. The utilization of preemptive organization and the establishment of networks to warn people to due to their fear of law enforcement is testament to the amount of violence which is being utilized in opposition to the Latino community. For these reasons, despite falling under the category of “civil” law, the threat of deportation is a case of state violence against the community.

Implications & Future Extensions

The implications of this study are numerous for studies of Latino politics, immigration, and mobilization. This research provides additional evidence in contrast to some scholars' claims about low levels of Latino political engagement, and documents how Latinos and Latino immigrants are highly politically active. Additionally, the fact that most of the mobilization that took place in these counties was through methods other than voting expands the discipline's understanding of political participation beyond the constraints of characterizing voting as the academic "be all, end all" form of political participation. This research further contributes to existing literature on how Latinos respond to threat, confirming prior claims that Latinos respond to threat through increased and creative forms of political participation (Cronin, Levin, Branscombe, van Laar, & Tropp, 2011; Jones-Correa, 1998; Zepeda-Millan, 2017). Additionally, this thesis has shown that the threat of deportation is in itself an act of state violence because of the level of intensity that this threat affects mobilization of activists with the methods they employ as a response to that threat as well as the level of fear that the Latino community expresses towards deportation. While the claim that the state's threat and utilization of deportation is state violence has been previously circulating the discipline as discussions of "cimmigration," it has yet to be directly articulated as state violence. This argument may promote future scholarship that can delve further into the usage of civil immigration law as a tool of oppression in the United States.

Secondly, the recognition of deportation as an act of violence against Latino immigrants can serve as a tool of legitimacy for Latino immigrant rights activists to utilize in their quests for reform. Recognizing the threat and practice of deportation as state violence is a direct challenge to previous case law which has refused to recognize deportation as a form of punishment (*INS v Lopez-Mendoza*, 1984). The fact that this study itself can be expanded upon and further analyzed by additional scholarship is testament to the amount of legitimacy that such a claim can hold,

particularly for the purposes of drafting legislation to address these concerns. If the threat of deportation is recognized as a form of violence when drafting bills, there is the possibility for some groups to seek legislative reform through claiming Eighth Amendment constitutional protections against cruel and unusual punishment. I strongly encourage other scholars to expand upon this research and provide further tests to this claim.

Part of the explanation for the discrepancy in the kinds of mobilization instigated by the differing levels of threat of mobilization could be the urgency of the threat itself. The argument can be made high levels of threat of deportation carry with them a heightened sense of urgency, and ergo the utilization of preemptive organization is simply a response to that urgency. This logic therefore would claim that the primary response would be through mobilization that requires less time overall to conduct, which would lower the instances of longer and more local political campaigns such as those pursued in King County. Hector himself does admit that one of the limitations of his organization is the level of “reactiveness” that his organization finds in their pursuit of reform. However, this theory is complicated somewhat when considering how areas of high threat such as Maricopa County do still utilize longer mobilizing campaigns such running for local office positions or battling to recover aid for undocumented students to attain higher education. This does not mean that the temporality argument does not hold any merit at all. However, I would encourage further data collection and potentially include measurements of urgency when collecting data to further examine the issue of urgency in more detail.

Another potential reason for the kinds of political engagement in areas of comparatively low threat of deportation such as King and Pierce Counties is the fact that Latinos are still establishing communities in these regions and throughout Washington state more broadly. The Latino population in Washington is relatively low at only 11% of the state population, in contrast to Arizona, where Latinos make up over 30% (U.S. Census, 2010a; U.S. Census, 2010b). However,

Latino migration to Washington state has grown a significant amount in the past decade. This is of particular interest due to some literature which concludes that changes in demographics lead to higher tension and even backlash amongst whites to the minority group (Fraga & Segura, 2006; Hopkins, 2010). Also, such a claim is complicated by the inclusion of Yakima County in this study, which has not expressed severe backlash from the local community outside of law enforcement. I am interested in further analysis of this particular explanation, however cannot make a definitive evaluation on either side of the issue without first conducting additional research in the area. I encourage future scholars to contribute to this research.

This research does not imply that the claim of threat of deportation acting as state violence is exclusive to the Latino community. This paper focuses more narrowly on Latino immigrant rights activists and advocates, and the counties by which the activists are from are overall geared towards the Latino community, therefore the claim of state violence must be equally restricted to the Latino community. However, I would suggest that the threat of deportation impacts all immigrant groups to varying degrees. In the current moment, another notable group of immigrants who also face intensive threat of deportation are Middle Eastern and Muslim immigrants. This is particularly interesting given the current policy that has affected their community under the Trump administration and Executive Order 13769, commonly referred to as the Muslim Ban (2017). To that effect, I would encourage additional research to see if the methods that the specific ways that the threat of deportation of the Latino community is also revealed other communities with ties to immigration.

One possible and commonly offered explanation for the strong presence of resistance and the fear of police and deportation is the factor that Donald Trump is the current U.S. President. At first glance, this seems like a reasonable explanation to make. The Trump administration has implemented various anti-immigrant policies such as the attempted cancellation of the Deferred

Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which granted temporary reprieve and work permits for undocumented immigrants who had entered the U.S. as children (Shear & Davis, 2017; Wong et al., 2013). Additionally, the Trump administration has increased raids by Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE), vetoed bipartisan immigration bills proposed by Congress, and rescinded the Temporary Protected Status (TPS) program for nations such as El Salvador and Haiti (NBC News, 2017; Stolberg & Shear, 2018; Bennet & Mascaro, 2018; Schallhorn, 2017; Bacon, 2017; Lind & Lockhart, 2017). To add to this administration's actions, it must be recognized that Trump began and ran his campaign with very strong anti-Latino rhetoric, including the blatant characterization of Mexicans as "rapists" within the first ten minutes of the announcement of his presidential campaign (TIME, 2015). Although I do agree that the Trump administration has an effect on the community and many of the interviewees expressed some level of disgust, contempt, and fear of the administration, it is not enough to fully account for all of the reactions and political mobilization of the Latino community. To identify Trump as the sole explanation for the level of threat and state violence would be to erroneously erase the realities of the Obama administration that still holds the record for the largest number of immigrants deported under any administration in U.S. history. Additionally, identifying Trump as the primary factor would imply that the anti-Latino and anti-immigrant rhetoric in the current moment has not occurred before. This kind of violence due to the threat of deportation has been exhibited towards the Latino community significantly prior to Trump's election, as evidenced by the actions conducted by Sheriff Arpaio in Maricopa County, AZ that resulted in his conviction (Cassidy, 2017). To blame Trump as the sole causality for this level of fear and mobilization would be to trivialize the struggle of the community and the levels of resistance that they have expressed under increasing levels of violence and fear that the immigration system has caused.

Conclusion

This research engaged the utilization of interview data to analyze the ways in which increasing levels of threat of deportation affects the mobilization of the Latino immigrant rights movement. Through this research, I have demonstrated how this threat influences the ways that communities engage with local law enforcement, the allocation of resources towards particular programs, and have evoked a genuine and traumatizing fear from immigrant communities. In the face of such fear, Latinos have persevered and fought back through intense and oftentimes creative modes of mobilization, going directly against the claim that, as some scholars have argued, the Latino community simply lacks the collective resources to mobilize.

I have found through this research that not only does the threat of deportation incur heightened levels of mobilization, but has additionally influenced mobilization to the point that under lower levels of threat of deportation, the community primarily engages in collective mobility services and local campaigns, whereas under high threat, the community additionally utilizes preemptive organization, alert networks, and national campaigns. Additionally, I have made the claim that the impact of the threat and realities of deportation on the Latino community is enough to condemn the threat of deportation as state violence. I argue that it rises to the level of state violence because the actions are taken on by the state and the impact of this threat has resulted in distrust of government and lowering of political trust, fear and anxieties of violence by law enforcement, PTSD in Latino children, and the literal deaths of migrants who have attempted to cross the U.S-Mexico border.

While the work and the impacts of the Latino immigrant rights movement is yet to be completed, as scholars and as a society we have a moral obligation to critically analyze the ways that our civil immigration law engages with our communities. Through this critical lens, I believe that the errors of our current system can attain substantive systematic reform for the better.

Appendix I- Case Selection: Washington State and Arizona

To study threat and mobilization, I selected two states to focus on, Washington and Arizona. I chose cases that included variation in threat levels within the state (high and low) and contained variation in amounts and types of mobilization. Both states hold unique and varied perspectives on the issue of immigration, as evidenced by state history and state laws.

Arizona's history as part of the original land grants attained by the U.S. after the Mexican-American War offers a unique relationship with Latino immigration, marked by various historical cases of harsh treatment towards Mexicans in particular, such as the stealing of land from Mexican owners post the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. As the home of the infamous S.B. 1070, Arizona's relationship with immigrants is marked as a generally contentious one. Additionally, as a state along the U.S-Mexico border, Arizona has a particular state interest surrounding immigration shared only by a handful of other states. Latinos make up about 31% of Arizona's state population and have a legacy of Latino student activism in Phoenix and Arizona in the broader Chicano Movement of the 60's and 70's that completely overhauled Arizona's education system (U.S. Census, 2010b; Echeverria, 2014).

In contrast, Washington state has a less potent history with Latino immigration. The Latino population in Washington is relatively low at only 12.4% of the state population. (U.S. Census, 2010a). However, Latino migration to Washington state has grown a significant amount in the past decade. This is of particular interest due to some literature which concludes that changes in demographics lead to higher tension and even backlash amongst whites to the minority group (Fraga & Segura, 2006; Hopkins, 2010).

For these reasons, an analysis of Latino mobilization in these two states is critical for a more accurate and holistic picture of the current moment.

Appendix II – Interview Protocol

Appendix II includes the interview protocols I used while conducting phone interviews in Washington State and Arizona from March 2018 – April 2018. The protocol is a general guide that was adjusted to match the flow of conversation between researcher and interviewee. Interviews were available to be conducted in English and in Spanish according to the preference of the interviewee. Due to the fact that there are some locations where interactions between the organizations and local police are contentious if not outright hostile, I elected not to include the names of either the interviewee or their organizations. Instead, each interviewee is given a pseudonym and they are identified only by the county which they operate in to match more closely with the data collected to measure the levels of threat. I recognize that through this method may place limitations on the finished product of this thesis, however, maintaining the safety of interviewees and the ability for them to continue their work takes higher priority that I as a researcher am ethically bound not to contest.

Interviews in English

Date: _____

Time: _____ to _____

Interviewee: _____

Organization: _____

Contact Information: _____

Thank you for taking the time to talk to me. I know that you are very busy and I am grateful for your time.

As you know, I am a student at the University of Washington in Seattle and am conducting research for my thesis on immigrant rights activism. The purpose of this interview is to discuss your work with immigrant rights advocacy and mobilization. The interview will take around 45 minutes.

Before I begin, would it be alright with you that I record this interview? Anything you say is completely anonymous and the information I am collecting will only be used in my research.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

1. Work History
 - a. What is your role in this organization?
 - b. How long have you been with this organization?
 - c. How long have you been working in the field of immigrant rights activism?
2. Group Interests/Concerns
 - a. In your experience, what are the biggest concerns that the immigrant community expresses?
 - b. What does your organization do to address these concerns?
3. What are the kinds of activities that your organization focuses on and why?
 - a. Ex: Legal/Legislative advocacy or “Know Your Rights” Workshops?
 - b. (If there is a mix of the two): How do you divide resources?
4. Issues Mobilizing
 - a. What are some of the biggest obstacles towards mobilizing issues that your organization has faced in the past from the local community?
 - i. How did you address these obstacles?
 - ii. Have these issues changed since then and now?

1. If so, how?
 2. Why do you think this would be the case?
 - iii. Have these issues changed since January 2017?
 1. If so, how?
 2. Why do you think this would be the case?
- b. How do you reach out to immigrants who may be hesitant about disclosing their status?
 - i. Is this a common occurrence?
- c. What are some of the biggest obstacles towards mobilizing that your organization has faced in the past from the law or government enforcement?
 - i. How did you address these issues?
 - ii. Have these issues changed since then and now?
 1. If so, how?
 2. Why do you think this would be the case?
 - iii. Have these issues changed since January 2017?
 1. If so, how?
 2. Why do you think this would be the case?
- d. When planning or participating in an event, how often do you consider the possibility of law enforcement getting involved?
 - i. Is concern over this predominantly geared towards federal ICE agents or does it expand to local officers?
 - ii. Is there ever a conversation of what to do if someone goes through deportation proceedings or detention?

iii. Is there a protocol in place in the event that ICE or state law enforcement gets involved?

1. Do you think that this protocol is enough?

5. What have you observed to be the outlook of the immigrant community under the current administration?

a. Does this have an effect on the actions you take or the resources you divide?

b. If so, how?

6. Is there any last thought you'd like to express on everything we've talked about today?

Interviews in Spanish

Date: _____

Time: _____ to _____

Interviewee: _____

Organization: _____

Contact Information: _____

Gracias por tomar el tiempo para hablar conmigo. Se que usted es una persona muy ocupada y estoy agradecida por su tiempo.

Cómo usted ya sabe, yo soy una estudiante en la Universidad de Washington en Seattle y estoy conduciendo una investigación para mi tesis sobre movilización para los derechos de los inmigrantes. Esta entrevista durará alrededor de 45 minutos.

Antes de empezar, estaría bien con usted si yo grabó esta entrevista? Todo lo que usted diga es completamente anónimo y la información que estoy colectando nomás se usará en mi investigación.

Tiene usted alguna pregunta antes de empezar?

1. Historia de Trabajo
 - a. De que se encarga usted en su organización?
 - b. Por cuanto tiempo a usted trabajado con esta organización?
 - c. Por cuanto tiempo a usted trabajado en el _ de activism de los derechos de los inmigrantes?
2. Preocupaciones/Intereses del Grupo
 - a. En su experiencia, cuales son las preocupaciones mas grandes que espera la comunidad Latina?
 - b. Quales son las de la comunidad de los inmigrantes?
 - c. Que hace su organización para solucionar estas preocupaciones?
3. Quales son tipos de actividades que su organización se enfoca y porque?
 - a. Ex:
 - b. (If there's a mix of the two): Como dividen sus recursos?
4. Problemas con Mobilizar
 - a. Quales son los obstaculos mas grandes contra mobilizar que su organización a enfrentado en el pasado de la comunidad local?
 - i. Como enfrentaron estos obstaculos?
 - ii. Han cambiado estos obstaculos desde entonces y ahora?
 1. Como?
 2. Porque usted piensa que es así?

- iii. Han cambiado estos obstáculos desde Enero del 2017?
 - 1. Como?
 - 2. Por usted piensa que es así?
- b. Como usted puede ayudar a inmigrantes que son mas tímidos hablando sobre su status?
 - i. Esto ocurre con mucha frecuencia?
- c. Cuales son unos de los obstáculos mas grandes contra movilizar que su organización a enfrentado el el pasado de la ley o el gobierno?
 - i. Como enfrentaron estos obstáculos?
 - ii. Han cambiado estos obstáculos desde entonces y ahora?
 - 1. Como?
 - 2. Porque usted piensa que es así?
 - iii. Han cambiado estos obstáculos desde Enero del 2017?
 - 1. Como?
 - 2. Por usted piensa que es así?
- d. Cuando usted esta planiando o participando en un evento, con que frecuencia usted considera la posibilidad que se involucran el gobierno?
 - i. Esta preocupacion se enfoca solamente en los agentes de ICE o tambien se consideran la policia local?
 - ii. En su organización, hay una conversacion sobre que tienen que hacer si alguien esta en el procedimiento de deportacion or detencion de inmigrantes?
 - iii. Hay un protocolo en el evento que ICE o la policia del estado se involucran?
 - 1. Usted piensa que este protocolo es suficiente?

5. Que ha observado usted que es el perspectiva de la comunidad de inmigrantes bajo la administracion de Trump?
 - a. Esto afecta a las acciones que usted toma ó las recursas que usted divide?
 - i. Como?
6. Hay alguna otra cosa que usted quiere espressar sobre todo lo que hablamos hoy?

References

- ACLU. (2018). Customs and Border Protection's (CBP's) 100-Mile Rule. *American Civil Liberties Union*. Retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/other/aclu-factsheet-customs-and-border-protections-100-mile-zone?redirect=immigrants-rights/aclu-fact-sheet-customs-and-border-protections-100-mile-zone>
- American Immigration Council. (2016). Why don't they just get in line? There is no line for many unauthorized immigrants. *American Immigration Council*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/why-don%E2%80%99t-they-just-get-line>
- Arizona Department of Transportation. (2018). Proof of identification, age, and authorized presence. *Arizona Department of Transportation*. Retrieved from <https://www.azdot.gov/motor-vehicles/driver-services/driver-license-information/proof-of-identification-age-and-authorized-presence>
- Arizona Secretary of State. (2006). Proposition 300. *Arizona State Legislature*. Retrieved from <http://apps.azsos.gov/election/2006/info/PubPamphlet/english/prop300.htm>
- Avila, K., Bello, K., Graber, L., & Marquez, N. (2018). The rise of sanctuary: Getting local officers out of the business of deportations in the Trump era. *Immigrant Legal Resource Center*.
- Bacon, J. (2018). What is temporary protected status: nearly 200,000 Salvadorans may be forced to leave U.S. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2018/01/12/what-temporary-protected-status-nearly-200-000-salvadorans-may-forced-leave-u-s/1027487001/>
- Barreto, M. A., Manzano, S., Ramirez, R., Rim, K. (2009). Mobilization, participation, and solidaridad: Latino participation in the 2006 immigration protest rallies. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(5), 736-764.

- Basu, M. (2014). Waits for immigration status – the legal way – can be long and frustrating. *Cable News Network*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2014/09/08/us/immigration-visa-long-waits/index.html>
- Beck, P. A. & Jennings, M. K. (1975). Parents as “middlepersons” in political socialization. *The Journal of Politics*, 37(1), 83-107.
- Bennet, B. & Mascaró, L. (2018). Bipartisan Senate effort to protect Dreamers collapses after Trump threatens veto. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-immigration-trump-20180215-story.html>
- Berger, D. (2014). *Captive Nation: Black Prison Organizing in the Civil Rights Era*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of Northern Carolina Press.
- Bray, I. (2017). Deportation vs. inadmissibility after a DUI. Retrieved from <http://www.alllaw.com/articles/nolo/us-immigration/deportation-vs-inadmissibility-dui.html>
- Broder, T., Moussavian, A., & Blazer, J. (2015). Overview of Immigrant Eligibility for Federal Programs. *National Immigration Law Center*. Retrieved from <https://www.nilc.org/issues/economic-support/overview-immeligfedprograms/>
- Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. (2008). "The Myths of Coalition" from "Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America". *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts*, 1(2), 171-188. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25594984>
- Casellas, J. P. (2009). The institutional and demographic determinants of Latino representation in U.S. legislatures. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 34(3), 399-426.
- Cervantes, J. M., Mejía, O. L., & Guerrero Mena, A. (2010). Serial migration and the assessment of extreme and unusual psychological hardship with undocumented Latina/o families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 32(2), 275-291. Retrieved from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1031.4738&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Cassidy, M. (2017). Former Maricopa County sheriff Joe Arpaio guilty of criminal contempt. *The Republic*. Retrieved from

<https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/phoenix/2017/07/31/maricopa-county-sheriff-joe-arpaio-found-guilty-criminal-contempt-court/486278001/>

Chavez, L. (2008). *The Latino Threat*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chishti, M., Pierce, S., & Bolter, J. (2017). The Obama record on deportations: Deporter in chief or not? *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved from

<https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/obama-record-deportations-deporter-chief-or-not>

Cortes, L. (2017). Basis of detaining immigrants: Detention, length, bond and triggers to civil mandatory confinement. [Notes from Public Lecture].

Cover, R. (1986). Violence and the word. *Yale Law School*. Retrieved from

http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/2708/

Cronin, T. J., Levin, S., Branscombe, N. R., van Laar, C., & Tropp, L. R. (2011). Ethnic identification in response to perceived discrimination protects well-being and promotes activism: A longitudinal study of Latino college students. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15(3), 393-407.

De Genova, N. (2004). The legal production of Mexican/migrant “illegality”. *Latino Studies*, 2, 160-185.

Dickerson, C. (2017). Trump administration moves to expand deportation dragnet to jails. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/21/us/sheriffs-immigration-jails.html>

- Doty, R. L. & Wheatley, E. S. (2013). Private detention and the immigration industrial complex. *International Political Sociology*, 7(4), 426-443.
- Eagly, I., & Shafer, S. (2016). Access to counsel in immigration court. *American Immigration Council*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/access-counsel-immigration-court>
- Echeverria, D. V. (2014). *Aztlán Arizona: Mexican American Educational Empowerment, 1968-1978*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press. Print.
- Edwards, B. & McCarthy, J. D. (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Escobar, E. J. (1993). The dialects of repression: The Los Angeles police department and the chicano movement, 1968-1971. *The Journal of American History*, 79(4), 1483-1514. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2080213>
- Executive Order 13769. (2017). Executive Order Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States. *The White House*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states/>
- The Fair Labor Standards Act. (1938). *U.S. Department of Labor*. Retrieved from <https://dol.gov/whd/regs/statutes/FairLaborStandAct.pdf>
- Fraga, L. & Segura, G. (2006). Culture clash? Contesting notions of American identity and the effects of Latin American immigration. *Perspectives on Politics Symposium on Immigration* 4(2), 279-287.
- Garcia, S. R., Martinez-Ebers, V., Coronado, I., Navarro, S. A., & Jaramillo, P. A. (2008). *Politiclas: Latina Public Officials in Texas*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- GEO Group, Inc. (2018). Tacoma ICE Processing Center. *The GEO Group, Inc.* Retrieved from <https://www.geogroup.com/FacilityDetail/FacilityID/71>
- Gonzalez-Barrera, A., Lopez, M. H., Passel, J. S., & Taylor, P. (2013). The path not taken: Two thirds of legal Mexican immigrants are not U.S. citizens. *Pew Research Center: Hispanic Trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/02/04/the-path-not-taken/>
- Gosset, L., McDermott, J., Dembowski, R., Phillips, L., & Upthegrove, D. (2014). Ordinance 17886. *Metropolitan King County Council*.
- Han, H. (2017). Defending against deportation: The immigration court process, challenges to deportability and relief from removal. [Notes from Public Lecture].
- Hanson, F. H., Scheve, K. F., Slaughter, M. J., & Spilimbergo, A. (2001). Immigration and the U.S. economy: Labor-market impacts, illegal entry, and policy choices. Retrieved from http://www.frb.org/be/file/scheda/files/copy_0_paper2_23jun01.pdf
- Hernández, C. C. G. (2014). Immigration detention as punishment. *UCLA Law Review*, 61. Retrieved from <http://www.uclalawreview.org/pdf/61-5-5.pdf>
- Hernández, C. C. G. (2017). Abolishing immigrant prisons. *Boston University Law Review*, 97, 245-300.
- Hoffman Plastics Compounds, Inc. v. National Labor Relations Board. (2002). 535 U.S. 137.
- Hopkins, D. J. (2010). Politicized places: Explaining where and when immigrants provoke local opposition. *American Political Science Review*, 104(1), 40-60. DOI: 10.1017/S0003055409990360
- Huntington, S. P. (2005). *Who Are We?: Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster. Print.
- INS v. Lopez-Mendoza (1984). 468 U.S. 1032. Retrieved from <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/468/1032/case.html>
- Jackson, M. (2011). Priming the sleeping giant: The dynamics of Latino political identity and vote choice. *Political Psychology* 32(4), 691-716. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00823.x

- Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Latino Decisions. (2014). Center for American Progress Action Fund/Latino Decisions Immigration Poll. *Latino Decisions*.
- Lind, D. & Lockhart, P. R. (2017). Trump to 59,000 Haitians: You have 18 months to pack your bags. *Vox*. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2017/11/20/16682924/haiti-tps-temporary-protected-status>
- Lopez Levers, L. & Hyatt-Burkhart, D. (2011). Immigration reform and the potential for psychosocial trauma: The missing link of lived human experience. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 00(00), 1-10. Retrieved from https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/31196772/Immigration_Reform_ASI_PP.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1511267857&Signature=9uvctEvC36RKPRshZqtpRAuiZIQ%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DImmigration_Reform_and_the_Potential_for.pdf
- Mastman, M. (2008). Undocumented entrepreneurs: Are business owners “employees” under the immigration laws? *Legislation and Public Policy*, 12, 225-257.
- Meseck, D. (2016). Yakima County Profile. *Employment Security Department: Washington State*. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/esd/employmentdata/reports-publications/regional-reports/county-profiles/yakima-county-profile>
- Moore, J. (2017). Deportations and criminal convictions. [Notes from Public Lecture].
- Muñoz, C. (2013). *The Chicano Movement: Mexican American History and Struggle for Equality*. New York, NY: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung. Print.
- National Labor Relations Act. (1935). 29 U.S.C. §§ 151-169. Retrieved from <https://www.nlrb.gov/resources/national-labor-relations-act>

- National Lawyer's Guild (2018). About. <https://www.nlg.org/about/>
- Nowrasteh, A. (2016). Proposition 187 turned California blue. *The CATO Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.cato.org/blog/proposition-187-turned-california-blue>
- Oppenheimer, D. B. (1992). Martin Luther King, Walker v. City of Birmingham, and the letter from Birmingham jail. *U.C. Davis Law Review*, 26(4), 791-883. Retrieved from <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1601&context=facpubs>
- Osterling, J. P. (2010). Waking the sleeping giant: Engaging and capitalizing on the sociocultural strengths of the Latino community. *The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 25(1-2). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2001.10162785>
- Pardo, M. (1996). "Mexican American Women Grassroots Community Activists: "Mothers of East Los Angeles". In *Pursuing Power: Latinos and the Political System* F. Chris Garcia, editor. University of Notre Dame Press. South Bend: IN.
- Pew Research Center. (2016). On views of race and inequality, Blacks and Whites are worlds apart. *Social and Demographic Trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2016/06/27/1-demographic-trends-and-economic-well-being/>
- Rocha, R. R., Knoll, B. R., & Wrinkle, R. D. (2015). Immigration enforcement and the redistribution of political trust. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(4), 901-913.
- Robbins, T. (2013). The 'line' for legal immigration is already about 4 million people long. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/sections/itsallpolitics/2013/02/22/172622730/the-line-for-legal-immigration-is-already-about-4-million-people-long>
- Schallhorn, K. (2017). Trump administration ends TPS for El Salvador immigrants: What are these temporary protections? *Fox News*. Retrieved from

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2018/01/08/trump-administration-ends-tps-for-el-salvador-immigrants-what-are-these-temporary-protections.html>

Shear, M. D., & Davis, J. H. (2017). Trump moves to end DACA and calls on Congress to act. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/05/us/politics/trump-daca-dreamers-immigration.html>

State of Arizona House of Representatives. (2009). *Legal Arizona Workers Act*. (HB 2779). U.S.

Government. Retrieved from

<https://www.azleg.gov/search/oop/qfullhit.asp?CiWebHitsFile=/legtext/48leg/1r/bills/hb2779c.htm&CiRestriction=2779&CiBeginHilite=%3Cb%3E&CiEndHilite=%3C/b%3E&CiHiliteType=Full>

State of Washington House of Representatives. (2015). REAL hope act. (H.B. 1079). Olympia, WA: U.S. Government.

Stolberg, S. G. & Shear, M. D. (2018). Senators strike bipartisan deal on immigration despite veto threat. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/14/us/politics/trump-immigration-veto-threat.html>

SPLC. (2016). Shadow prisons: Immigrant detention in the south. *Southern Poverty Law Center*.

Retrieved from <https://www.splcenter.org/20161121/shadow-prisons-immigrant-detention-south>

Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley. Print.

TIME Magazine. (2015, June 16). Here's Donald Trump's presidential announcement speech. *Time*.

Retrieved from <http://time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>

Torodo, M. P. & Maruszko, L. (1987). Illegal migration and US immigration reform: A conceptual framework. *Population and Development Review*, 13(1), 101-114. Retrieved from

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1972122>

- U.S. Census. (2010a). QuickFacts: Washington. *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/WA>
- U.S. Census. (2010b). QuickFacts: Arizona. *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/AZ>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2015). Median weekly earnings by educational attainment in 2014. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2015/median-weekly-earnings-by-education-gender-race-and-ethnicity-in-2014.htm>
- Vaca, N. C. (2004). *The Presumed Alliance: The Unspoken Conflict Between Latinos and Blacks and What It Means for America*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers. Print.
- Verba, S., Scholzman, K. L., Brady, H., & Nie, N. H. (1993). Race, ethnicity and political resources: Participation in the United States. *British Journal of Political Science*, 23(4), 453-497. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400006694>
- Wallace, S. J., Zepeda-Millán, C., & Jones-Correa, M. (2014). Spatial and temporal proximity: Examining the effects of protests on political attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(2), 449-465.
- Washington Department of Licensing. (2018). Steps to getting your first driver license: Proof of identity. *Washington State Department of Licensing*. Retrieved from <http://www.dol.wa.gov/driverslicense/idproof.html>
- Washington State Legislature. (2018). How does my alien status impact my eligibility for state-funded benefits under the food assistance program? Washington Administrative Code 388-424-0030. Retrieved from <http://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=388-424-0030>
- White, A. (2015). When threat mobilizes: Immigration enforcement and Latino voter turnout. *Political Behavior*, 38, 355-382.

Wright, M. & Citrin, J. (2010). Saved by the stars and stripes? Images of protest, salience of threat, and immigration attitudes. *American Politics Research*, 39(2), 323-343. Retrieved from

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1532673X10388140>

Wong, T. K., García, A. S., Abrajano, M., FitzGerald, D., Ramakrishnan, K., and Le, S. (2013).

Undocumented no more: Nationwide analysis for deferred action for childhood arrivals, or DACA. *Center for American Progress*.

World Population Review. (2018). Population of cities in Arizona. *World Population Review*. Retrieved from <http://worldpopulationreview.com/states/arizona-population/cities/>

Zepeda-Millan, C. (2017). *Latino Mass Mobilization: Immigration, Racialization, and Activism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Print.