

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

---

Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Theses

Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality  
Studies

---

Spring 5-7-2013

## Mexican/migrant Mothers and 'Anchor Babies" in Anti-Immigration Discourses: Meanings of Citizenship and Illegality in the United States

Margaret E. Franz  
*Georgia State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/wsi\\_theses](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/wsi_theses)

---

### Recommended Citation

Franz, Margaret E., "Mexican/migrant Mothers and 'Anchor Babies" in Anti-Immigration Discourses: Meanings of Citizenship and Illegality in the United States." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2013. [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/wsi\\_theses/30](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/wsi_theses/30)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

MEXICAN/MIGRANT MOTHERS AND 'ANCHOR BABIES' IN ANTI-IMMIGRATION DISCOURSES: MEANINGS  
OF CITIZENSHIP AND ILLEGALITY IN THE UNITED STATES

by

MARGARET FRANZ

Under the Direction of Dr. Amira Jarmakani

ABSTRACT

The right wing anti-immigration movement's recent surge in racial panic and paranoia concerning the specter of the overly fertile Mexican migrant mother and her US-born child points to a discursive struggle over the meaning of citizenship and illegality. Starting from the assumption that both citizenship and illegality are highly contested and fluid political and moral categories, this project examines how white supremacist and heteronormative ideologies and political emotions like love and fear construct both Mexican migrants and their children as "illegal," while simultaneously shrinking the meaning and enactment of citizenship for everyone. I argue that citizens of Mexican descent are racialized and sexualized as "illegal," in order to warrant their exclusion, though not their expulsion, from the biopolitical fold of the nation-state.

INDEX WORDS: Migration, Sexual citizenship, Illegality, Political emotions, Biopolitics

MEXICAN/MIGRANT MOTHERS AND 'ANCHOR BABIES' IN ANTI-IMMIGRATION DISCOURSES: MEANINGS  
OF CITIZENSHIP AND ILLEGALITY IN THE UNITED STATES

by

MARGARET FRANZ

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2013

Copyright by  
Margaret Franz  
2013

MEXICAN/MIGRANT MOTHERS AND 'ANCHOR BABIES' IN ANTI-IMMIGRATION DISCOURSES: MEANINGS  
OF CITIZENSHIP AND ILLEGALITY IN THE UNITED STATES

by

MARGARET FRANZ

Committee Chair: Dr. Amira Jarmakani

Committee: Dr. Susan Talburt

Dr. Julie Kubala

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

May 2013

**DEDICATION**

*To Rogelio Cervantes Catalan and Lauren Altagracia Cervantes*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the emotional and intellectual support of everyone at the Institute for Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. I would especially like to thank my mentor, advisor, and thesis chair Dr. Amira Jarmakani, whose friendship and intellectual support made this project possible. I also sincerely thank my committee members and teachers Dr. Julie Kubala, Dr. Susan Talburt, and Dr. Megan Sinnott for their guidance. I am thankful to everyone who made the 10<sup>th</sup> floor of Urban Life the best place to be in Atlanta: Alex Venegas-Steele, Lucas Power, Nikki White, Sherah Faulkner, Scott Nesbitt, Ashleigh Riley, Taryn Jordan, Hannah Carswell, Lamont Loyd-Sims, Andrea Miller, Andy Reisinger, and Tahereh Aghdasifar. I thank Travis Giebler for his friendship and for endlessly listening to me anguish over my thesis. I would also like to thank my Blue Moon friends, especially Mary Betsill and Eduardo Martinez, for taking me in when I had no home. I also thank fellow Blue Moonies Sergio Guerrero and Rogelio Rico for informing me about the political climate in Georgia, which subsequently led me to my thesis. Lastly, though certainly not least, I would like to thank my family and friends in North Carolina, especially my sister Joanna, whose love, humor, and support made moving to Atlanta (and then several times within Atlanta) much easier.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Review of Literature .....	6
1.2 Methods .....	23
<b>2 SOCIETY MUST BE DEFENDED.....</b>	<b>29</b>
2.1 (Bio)Paranoia, Biopolitics, and Degeneracy in the “Anchor Baby” Discourse.....	31
2.2 Constructing Spectacles of Fear: The “Illegal Alien” and the “Anchor Baby” as Human Monsters .....	38
2.3 The Inheritance of Degeneracy .....	48
2.4 Conclusion: The Expansion of Illegality.....	52
<b>3 THE WILL TO LOVE: <i>JUS SOLI</i> AND LIBERAL CONSENT .....</b>	<b>55</b>
3.1 “Subject to Jurisdiction”: The Politics of Love, Monogamy, and Value .....	60
3.2 <i>Jus Soli</i> Citizenship and the Consent of Kinship .....	69
3.3 Conclusion: Love, Fear, and the Limits of Exception .....	73
<b>4 EPILOGUE .....</b>	<b>80</b>
REFERENCES .....	83
NOTES .....	89

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In December of 2011, the “anchor baby” discourse erupted when *The American Heritage Dictionary* added the term to its annual compilation of new colloquialisms. Through its deployment in anti-immigration discourses, the term “anchor baby” has come to connote the citizen-child of an “illegal” migrant mother who presumably uses her child’s citizenship status to stay in the country, sponsor family members, and take advantage of the state’s welfare system.<sup>1</sup> Architects of the “anchor baby” discourse like Samuel Huntington describe the allure of having a citizen-child as a ‘magnet’ that motivates Mexican women to migrate “not because they are attracted to America’s culture and Creed, but because they are attracted by government social welfare and affirmative action programs.”<sup>2</sup> Therefore, not surprisingly, the political and semantic weight of the term, as well as its addition to the dictionary as a non-pejorative noun, prompted an uproar from immigrants’ rights organizations like Immigration Impact who demanded that *The American Heritage Dictionary* label the term ‘pejorative’ or at least a product of right-wing fantasy.<sup>3</sup> However, once the dictionary finally did label the term offensive, rightwing commentators chastised the editors for ceding to ‘liberal media’ and not recognizing that the word describes a ‘real problem.’ For example, in response to the revision, Fox News Online writer and communications specialist for the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) Bob Dane wrote, “the offensive aspect of ‘anchor baby’ isn’t the term itself, but the practice of having children on U.S. soil for the sheer purpose of gaming the system.”<sup>4</sup> In other words, the central issue of its addition to the dictionary and its subsequent revision is whether the ‘problem’ that the word connotes is based in reality or fantasy. This project takes up this concern, examining not whether “anchor babies” are in fact real or not, nor whether ‘they’ constitute a problem, but instead examining how the “anchor baby” and his or her “illegal” Mexican/migrant mother are discursively constructed as both real and threatening to the US.

Due to the perceived reality and threat of the “anchor baby,” the rightwing pundits and politicians who use the word also advocate for the restriction of birthright citizenship by reinterpreting the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment in order to end the “anchor baby loophole” as Patrick Buchanan and John Tanton call it.<sup>5</sup> Advocates for reinterpreting the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment cite Yale Law professor Peter Schuck’s argument that the Amendment’s original drafters only intended to grant birthright citizenship to the children of freed slaves, not to every future baby born in the US.<sup>6</sup> Schuck and his followers also argue that undocumented migrants are not “under the jurisdiction” of the US government, and thus, their US-born children should be considered citizens of the parent’s native country like children born to diplomats.<sup>7</sup> Lastly, Schuck and his followers argue that granting citizenship to the children of undocumented migrants deprives the “American people” of consenting to the citizenry of the US, which results in “a loss of control over the nation’s future.”<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the “anchor baby” discourse can be easily conceptualized as a moral panic, since it constructs a largely phantasmagoric threat followed by the call to regulate the threat by reinterpreting the amendment.<sup>9</sup>

Though the moral panic concerning “anchor babies” is hardly new, the mainstreaming of both the term and its politics is a relatively recent development in the US’s long history of anti-immigrant politics. Although the term and its accompanying discursive construction of problematic Mexican migrant reproduction had been around for more than a decade prior to its addition to the *American Heritage Dictionary*, it was used primarily in relatively small rightwing media outlets (i.e., V-DARE) and had little circulation in mainstream public discourse.<sup>10</sup> However, the increasing popularity of conservative news websites and the contentious political rhetoric accompanying the passage of anti-immigration legislation in states such as Arizona, Georgia, and Alabama incited what media scholar Gabe Ignatow terms an “‘anchor baby’ boom” around the year 2010, which has remained fairly steady.<sup>11</sup> He defines the “‘anchor baby’ boom” as the exponential increase in the use of the phrase “anchor baby” by mainstream news sources, demonstrating that the ‘fringe’ has had considerable influence on at least the

vocabulary of the mainstream.<sup>12</sup> It seems, however, that the “‘anchor baby’ boom” has affected more than just the vocabulary of mainstream political discourse since the call to end birthright citizenship has grown louder alongside the proliferation of the term. That is, more than just Peter Schuck and his followers are advocating for limiting birthright citizenship; as of 2011, at least forty state representatives have publically indicated that they plan to introduce legislation limiting birthright citizenship on both the state and the federal level.<sup>13</sup> This indicates that the “anchor baby” discourse is a key site of contested meanings over citizenship that could have grave material implications, like the creation of a hereditary ethno-racial class of permanently “illegal” people.<sup>14</sup>

Legal scholar Priscilla Huang contends that panic and paranoia over “anchor babies” stems from two interconnected anti-immigration movements. The first is the Zero Population Growth (ZPG) movement, headed by Paul Ehrlich and his incendiary 1968 book, *The Population Bomb*.<sup>15</sup> This book was followed by numerous others advocating for government intervention to control birthrates. Population control advocates claim that supposedly out-of-control immigrant birthrates drain public resources and burden the environment.<sup>16</sup> The second anti-immigration movement is what Huang, Leo Chavez, and Nicholas De Genova call a white supremacist nativist movement headed by rightwing pundits like Samuel Huntington, Pat Buchanan, Michelle Malkin, and Peter Brimelow, as well as organizations like V-DARE, Numbers USA, FAIR, and the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS).<sup>17</sup> According to De Genova, the nativism prevalent in the US encompasses both an intense aversion and opposition to an internal minority that has been deemed ‘foreign’ and the prioritization of US citizens because of their supposed ‘nativeness.’<sup>18</sup> However, as the “anchor baby” discourse elucidates, mere birthright citizenship is often not enough to prove oneself as truly ‘native,’ which is why white supremacy, sexuality, and class become such important lenses for analyzing citizenship and illegality. This nativist strand of the anti-immigration movement laments “anchor babies” as bearers of the diminishment of specifically white nativeness, or what Brimelow proudly calls “white hegemony,” and it predicts a ‘clash of civilizations’

type of chaos and disorder resulting from the increasing heterogeneity of the nation.<sup>19</sup> These activists and writers also cite the racialized criminalization of “illegal” migrant mothers, declaring that they do not deserve to bear citizen-children who have access to state resources since they broke the law upon entering the nation.<sup>20</sup>

These two facets of the anti-immigration movement are closely intertwined and many proponents of population control also incite panic about the changing racial makeup of the nation. John Tanton, for example, is the founder of FAIR, which primarily focuses on population control, but he is also the creator of the nativist periodical *The Social Contract* as well as the nativist think-tank the CIS. Figures like Tanton show that the broader anti-immigration movement is concerned with both the perceived diminishment of ‘native’ white hegemony and the perceived out-of-control reproduction of women of color, which they believe contributes to the depletion of both white supremacy as well as natural and state resources.

Regarding whiteness and white supremacy, it is important to clarify that the political pundits and politicians whose work I study in this project have varying definitions of these concepts that even shift and change within their own writing. Journalist Peter Brimelow, political pundit Patrick Buchanan, and political science professor Samuel Huntington, for example, all conceptualize the US as having a distinct Anglo-Protestant ethnic core. However, only Brimelow and Buchanan consistently rely on scientific theories of race. Other authors, especially Huntington and the panelists in the House Committee assessing birthright citizenship that I focus on in chapter two, conceive of race and culture in a way that does not necessarily keep people of color and non-Protestants from embodying the racial project of whiteness.<sup>21</sup> For example, Huntington contends that “becoming white and ‘Anglo-conformity’ were the ways in which immigrants, blacks, and others made themselves Americans.”<sup>22</sup> As Jasbir Puar points out, whiteness in these contexts pertains to a privileged position within neoliberal capitalism, a “market virility,” and a racialized hetero/homo-normativity.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, this project theorizes

racialization and whiteness as fluid and ever shifting, sometimes reliant on heredity and sometimes reliant on positions within capitalism and other criteria. However, this project does find two instances of consensus in regards to whiteness and racialization in the texts it analyzes. First, coinciding with Howard Winant's claim that whiteness in the post-civil rights era emerges in New Right discourses as disenfranchised and disadvantaged, all of these texts position whiteness—whichever theorization of whiteness they employ—as in need of protection.<sup>24</sup> Second, racialization in these discourses is ultimately about assigning value to populations, specifically assigning value to whiteness or 'legality' or citizenship over all else, which according to Lisa Marie Cacho violently devalues repudiated populations of people of color, "illegals," or non-citizens.<sup>25</sup> This is most evident in the paranoid discourses that uphold American exceptionalism as reliant on the Anglo-Protestant core and the American Creed.<sup>26</sup>

The rightwing anti-immigrant movement's panic and paranoia concerning the citizenship status of the children of Mexican/migrant women point to a struggle over the meaning of citizenship in the United States. What is more, the movement's attempt to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to make citizenship even more exclusionary is worrisome for those concerned about social justice, since excluding the children of Mexican/migrant women from citizenship would effectively place even more people under the political category "illegal."<sup>27</sup> It is important to note that my concern over the expansion of illegality does not solely attend to how illegality is *legally* assigned to people, but rather how illegality is constructed legally, discursively, and affectively. Therefore, I am not arguing that the children of undocumented migrants remain as citizens because that is the best interpretation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, but rather that we interrogate how *all* people who have been labeled "illegal" are assigned such a label. The "anchor baby" discourse is a key site of such interrogation since it constructs a new group of citizens as "illegal" in order to make a case for legal illegality. Interrogating their arguments allows us to peer into what discourses and political emotions drive the production of illegality and citizenship so that we might subvert it. Therefore, this project asks, what are the ideological and

affective logics driving the “anchor baby” discourse? How are illegality and citizenship constructed in this discourse? How is the nation imagined? After reviewing the existing literature on panic, citizenship, and illegality, my research will grapple with these questions by enacting a discursive and affective analysis of the texts and contexts in which the “anchor baby” and his or her “illegal” mother emerge. This project shows how racialized and sexualized bodies are constructed as valuable and non-valuable populations, legitimate and illegitimate national subjects both through paranoid discourses and through the attribution of feelings to individual and national bodies. Ultimately I show how Mexican/migrants and citizens of Mexican descent are discursively and affectively racialized and sexualized as “illegal” in order to warrant their exclusion, though not their expulsion, from the biopolitical fold of the nation-state.

### **1.1 Review of Literature**

This literature review pulls apart the underlying assumptions about young female migrant sexuality, citizenship, and illegality that the “anchor baby” discourse perpetuates. First, I give an overview of theories of moral panic and paranoia, situating talk about “anchor babies” and Mexican/migrant reproduction in a constant flux between an ongoing state of imperial paranoia and bursts of racial panic. Then, I outline scholarship on eugenicist and nativist discourses as they relate to moral panics and paranoia about immigration to the United States. Finally, I look at scholarship concerning gender, race, sexuality, and neoliberalism as they relate to citizenship and the production of migrant illegality.

#### *“Anchor Babies” in Discourses of Racial Panic and Paranoia*

Stanley Cohen introduced the concept of moral panic to characterize the disproportionately panicked reactions of the media, the public, and the state to the threat of counter-culture youth. The

cycle of moral panic involves: the definition of a threat, the stereotyping of the threat in the media as monstrous, the escalation of the threat, leading to some sort of repressive social action against the threat, followed by an alleviation of public anxiety after the source of the threat has been restrained by the state.<sup>28</sup> As mentioned above, the “anchor baby” discourse constitutes a moral panic since it constructs a threat and then outlines a mode of repressing the threat. As the delineation of the “anchor baby” subject position demonstrates, moral panics are significant to social life because they demarcate social and moral boundaries as they discursively construct new social categories.<sup>29</sup> They also tend to precede policies and laws that increase social control and further societal surveillance, showing that moral panics have material effects both on the targets of the panic and on society as a whole.<sup>30</sup>

The “anchor baby” discourse, however, does more than just label a group of people morally threatening to the social body. It racializes Mexican/migrants and their citizen children as threatening to white hegemony and as “illegal,” as it also sexualizes Mexican/migrant mothers as deviant to the heteronormative nuclear family. Scholars like Junaid Rana, Gayle Rubin, and Lisa Duggan posit that race panics and sex panics are variations of moral panics that similarly motivate moral reform and regulation, but do so in a way that specifically delineates deviant sexual and racial boundaries, subject positions, and social categories.<sup>31</sup> Though none of these scholars overtly combine race and sex panics, I find that it is theoretically useful to think of both types of panics as intricately related since race and sex are inherently imbricated in one another. According to Rana, the role of racial panics is to “intensify the categories of racialization within the racial formation,” that is, to reinforce the boundaries that produce distinct racial groups.<sup>32</sup> He describes the process of racial panic, claiming:

Violence and persecution often follow these moments, as demonization and scapegoating become part of an exclusionary logic of purging problems and threats. Deviance then becomes the measure by which to reiterate the dominance of heteronormative social structure and upward mobility through dispossessing others of their resources and rights.<sup>33</sup>

Race panics still involve the process of assigning deviance to a population, but they do so in a way that racializes and sexualizes the target population as well. In a similar vein, in discussing the “casting out” of Muslims and Arabs from Western law and politics, Sherene Razack claims that the discursive melding of deviance and degeneracy to a racialized population secures the continuous ideological reproduction of the correct citizenry of the nation and naturalizes the need for the state to regulate the deviant population.<sup>34</sup>

Public discourse about migrants is a key site for the production of racial and sexual Others via race panics since historically many groups of migrants have been imagined as deviant and connected to criminal activity.<sup>35</sup> For example, Peter Schrag argues that in the United States a constant national ambivalence arises between the demand for more immigrants to do the nation’s low-wage work and the backlash against them.<sup>36</sup> This backlash can quickly evolve into a racial panic about the fear of racial extinction, the coming change in the complexion of the nation, or the integral modification of ‘American values.’<sup>37</sup> According to Schrag, these panics have almost always targeted whichever new immigrant group is beginning to emerge and increase in population, and they are often molded by whether the economy is producing enough jobs for both migrants and ‘natives.’<sup>38</sup>

Conversely, De Genova disputes both claims that all immigrant groups are subjected to the same type of panic and that panic about immigrants arises from actual competition over jobs or actual economic hardships. He argues that panic about “illegal” immigrants specifically refers to Mexicans, or migrants who are racialized as Mexican.<sup>39</sup> He claims that illegality is racialized as Mexican in the United States because of nativist discourses that situate the threat of “illegal” migrants as coming from the US-Mexican border, as well as immigration laws that criminalize otherwise welcome migrant labor from Mexico.<sup>40</sup> In addition, illegality is explicitly related to deviance as racial panics about “illegal” immigrants construct a binary between ‘good’ immigrants and ‘bad’ immigrants. Mexican migrants are frequently regarded as the iconic ‘bad immigrants,’ as those who undermine ‘national sovereignty’ by forsaking the

'rule of law,' and as those who are unable to assimilate to the dominant (white) American culture.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, specific discourses construct Mexican migrants as distinctly "illegal" and as distinctly bad compared to other groups of immigrants. Moreover, racial panics about "illegal" migrants have nothing to do with whether the economy is producing enough jobs for US citizens. Instead, Mexican undocumented labor is legislated against in criminal laws and discriminated against in immigration laws, yet not entirely discouraged, producing what De Genova calls the "revolving door policy."<sup>42</sup> This ensures that migrants live in a perpetual state of deportability, or a state of anxiety about the potential threat of deportation so that the US can maintain a tractable class of labor.<sup>43</sup> Similarly, Mike Davis claims that the spectacle of the "terror machine of the border [...] has been cynically calibrated to criminalize labor migrants but never wholly discourage their entry into an American economy capitalized on their labor."<sup>44</sup> Therefore, racial panics about "illegal" migration have less to do with actual economic competition with native workers and more to do with the fear of diminished white supremacy and the maintenance of a racialized class of exploitable laborers. The combination of fear and capitalist determination to maintain an exploitable labor class highlights Linda Kintz's argument that rightwing moral panics often combine 'rational' convictions and apocalyptic social fantasies.<sup>45</sup> This illustrates that the circulation of discourses of moral panic is often inseparable from the production and circulation of public emotions.

Scholars have long ago established that racism and eugenics are inseparable from immigration control and the panicked language used to justify immigration control.<sup>46</sup> Historically, federal immigration control developed as a response to the perceived threat of the nation being infiltrated by racially and sexually unfit immigrants, meaning non-Anglos, convicts, and people charged as capable of becoming public charges like prostitutes and other single women.<sup>47</sup> Though the United States never was and never will be a racially homogenous nation, in rightwing anti-immigration discourses, the nation is constructed as white.<sup>48</sup> De Genova, for example, contends that nativist discourses construct the United

States as inherently and eternally white, rendering it an exceptional nation in the minds of nativists who believe that free-market capitalism, democracy, and freedom are all created and sustained by whites.<sup>49</sup> This racialized nativism interacts with discourses of nationalism by giving the nation a unique identity that is incompatible with anything 'alien.'<sup>50</sup> Likewise, Aimee Carrillo Rowe argues that anti-immigrant discourses that call for further immigration control construct white victimhood, which thrives through the cultural production of white anxiety at the perceived destruction of a historically constructed white heteropatriarchal national identity.<sup>51</sup>

This contrast between the exceptional whiteness of the nation and the perceived threat of 'alien' contamination is where racial panics about migration intersect with sustained paranoia. While panics can be conceived as erupting and dissolving, paranoia tends to linger as a continuous feeling and a sustained framework of interpretation and action. For example, we can characterize the year 2010 as having a burst of racial panics with the passage of Arizona's draconian immigration law and the heightened use of polemical anti-immigrant rhetoric as demonstrated by the year's "'anchor baby' boom."<sup>52</sup> Yet, while much of the hyper-visibility of the immigration debates has subsided, there remains an underlying consistent paranoia regarding "illegal aliens" and their citizen children. Feminist scholar Anne McClintock defines paranoia in the United States as "an inherent contradiction with respect to power: a double-sided phantasm that oscillates precariously between deliriums of grandeur and nightmares of perpetual threat."<sup>53</sup> Paranoia is a "hinge phenomenon," a dialectical relationship between the ordinary individual and society whereby contradictory cultural narratives, mythologies, practices, and identities "oscillate between delusions of inherent superiority and omnipotence, and phantasms of threat and engulfment."<sup>54</sup> Although McClintock is referring to the paranoia that perpetuates the War on Terror, the same paranoia about shadowy "barbarians" and cultural "others" promulgates the anti-immigrant movement, which scholars like Rana and De Genova claim is an integral aspect of the War on Terror. Anti-immigration discourses exhibit a paranoid dialectic where the US is

upheld as exceptional since it is not only impenetrable and sovereign, but also, as Siobhan Somerville notes, as an object of love and desire that immigrants have constantly sought after for its “freedom” and “opportunity.”<sup>55</sup> Meanwhile, the exceptionality of the beloved nation necessitates the militarization of the border and draconian immigration laws in order to protect it from the ‘hordes’ that want to ‘flood’ the nation. This theorization of paranoia is an integral aspect of my project as it provides a fruitful lens for examining the discursive and affective swings between the fear of Mexican/migrant invasion and the fantasy of national omnipotence, both of which provide the rationale for violence in the name of self-defense. Therefore, while I employ moral panic scholarship to discuss how “anchor babies” are constituted as a threat in need of suppression, the lens of paranoia enables me to examine the “anchor baby” discourse’s ruptures and contradictions, as well as how it constructs the national body in relation to the “anchor baby” and the “illegal alien.”

As mentioned above, racial panics are intertwined with sex panics since the processes of racialization and the construction of deviant sexuality are imbricated. Paranoia about supposed out-of-control migrant sexuality and fertility often propels racial panics and paranoia about migrants. Eithne Luibhéid charts the history of the US government’s immigration policies as a series of interventions intended to control migrant sexuality and assuage public concerns over perceived out-of-control migrant fertility.<sup>56</sup> Social panics over migrant fertility have historically led to immigration policies that fully excluded procreative Asian couples as well as policies that barred prostitutes and other single women of childbearing age from entering the country.<sup>57</sup>

Contemporarily, Chavez and De Genova claim that the news media and academic writing on overpopulation construct Mexican/migrant reproduction and mothering as a threat to the white nation. Both Chavez and De Genova cite rightwing writers like Peter Brimelow and Samuel Huntington whose books express paranoia about the demise of the white nation because of high levels of migration and migrant fertility.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, Chavez notes that popular imagery in the media portrays Mexican women

and Latinas as having a dangerously high fertility rate that is contributing to unsustainable population growth.<sup>59</sup> Similarly, Laura Briggs shows that Puerto Rican women have been demonized for overpopulating the island, causing “hunger, homelessness, lack of education opportunity, unemployment, disease (especially syphilis), [and] poor housing.”<sup>60</sup> Chavez claims that popular stereotyping of Latinas as both overly sexual and overly submissive reinforces the claims that Mexican women are dangerously fertile.<sup>61</sup> Likewise, Briggs claims that Puerto Rican women have been popularly and academically constructed as at once dangerously promiscuous and victimized by Puerto Rican male machismo, contributing to the popular stereotype that they are dangerously fertile.<sup>62</sup> Briggs shows the material effects of these discourses on the lives of Puerto Rican women as they were subjected to oppressive anti-prostitution laws and coercive sterilization.<sup>63</sup>

Mexican/migrant mothers’ perceived overuse, or illegitimate use, of public assistance corresponds with paranoia and panic about “welfare queens.” Critical legal theorist Dorothy Roberts claims that the “welfare queen –the lazy mother on public assistance who deliberately breeds children at the expenses of taxpayers to fatten her monthly check,” is one of the most readily accepted stereotypes about Black women’s fertility.<sup>64</sup> Briggs, Luibhéid, and Chavez all show that the “welfare queen” myth extends to both Black women and Latinas, casting them as not only unfit mothers, but also burdens to the state and manipulators of taxpayer dollars.<sup>65</sup> This cultural myth has not only been continuously reproduced throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century with the aid of Ronald Reagan, rightwing talk-show hosts, and the media, but it has also been written into social science and public policy.<sup>66</sup> For example, The Moynihan Report, written in 1965 by Senator Moynihan, blamed systemic poverty in the African American community on slavery and the irreparable structure of the Black family, namely the Black matriarch.<sup>67</sup> Briggs claims that Moynihan’s report was part of a social-science constructed discourse on the “culture of poverty,” heralded by sociologists like Oscar Lewis, who argued that poverty was inherited generationally because of dysfunctional families consisting of promiscuous mothers,

absent fathers, and illegitimate children.<sup>68</sup> Therefore, instead of locating structural causes of inequality and poverty, the blame was put solely on the bad parenting and laziness of the mother and the pathology of communities of color.

In the 1990s, the discourse of the “welfare queen” explicitly began to coincide with the demonization of Mexican migrant mothers’ supposed overuse of state resources, as the welfare state was constructed as a “magnet,” attracting migrant women to the US for the “wrong reasons.”<sup>69</sup> Luibhéid, De Genova and Chavez note that starting in the 1990s, rightwing politicians began campaigning for numerous anti-immigration and anti-welfare bills aimed at suppressing female migrants’ perceived overuse of state resources for reproductive purposes. The authors cite the language supporting California’s Proposition 187, the “Save our State” movement, as an integral discursive event in terms of the way it constructed Latina reproduction as threatening to the state.<sup>70</sup> The remnants of the “Save our State” panic still remain even after the nation-wide welfare reform act passed in 1996, prohibiting immigrants from using social welfare services, as rightwing politicians and figureheads continue campaigning for the reinterpretation of the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment in a further attempt to keep “illegal” migrants from using state resources.<sup>71</sup> Once again, this elucidates the connections between paranoia and panic, as even though the heightened rhetoric of the “Save our State” campaign has passed, its remnants remain as Mexican/migrant mothers’ reproductive capabilities are still constructed in political discourse as threatening to the nation-state.

### *The Affective Dimensions of Panic and Paranoia*

In order to map the discursive construction of the “anchor baby” and his or her Mexican migrant mother as targets of racial panic and paranoia, I follow social panic scholars Janice Irvine, Ann Burlein, and Linda Kintz who trace the language of panics by analyzing their discourses as well as their production and circulation of emotions. Irvine, for example, chastises past theories of panics for

overlooking their emotional components and dismissing them as inherently irrational representations of fear or bigotry. She claims that the amplification of public emotion during a panic has generally been theorized as irrational, and the result of mob mentality or the contagion of chaos.<sup>72</sup> Combining affect theory and moral panic theory, she argues that the “seemingly irrational expression of feeling during [moral] panics is deeply social” and transmitted discursively through anxious rhetoric and social scripts that guide the production of emotion.<sup>73</sup> Kintz and Burlein precede Irvine in linking the affective circulation of public emotion to moral panics.<sup>74</sup> Linda Kintz argues that the paranoid and anxious rhetorics of the rightwing are mainly characterized by the fusion of rational convictions and social fantasy, showing that panic and paranoia are more extra-rational than rational or irrational in that they operate outside of this culturally constructed binary. She notes how social anxieties and fear are sustained by apocalyptic and millennial narratives about the demise or invasion of the nation and the family. Similarly, Ann Burlein claims that the New Right employs anxious rhetorics that evoke a gendered nostalgia for the ‘traditional’ family by employing the nation, crises in masculinity, children, and the need to control female sexuality as “affective magnets” for a series of moral panics that transgress the public/private divide.<sup>75</sup>

I use Irvine’s blend of affect theory and moral panic theory since I am concerned with mapping the discourses of panic and paranoia in order to examine how “anchor babies” and their “illegal” mothers are discursively constructed as “illegal,” and how this in turn constructs citizenship. In other words, following Sara Ahmed, I am interested in analyzing how figures like the “anchor baby” and the “illegal alien” come to be seen as the sources of the feelings that are attributed to panic and paranoia and how these emotions work to discursively expand illegality and barricade citizenship.<sup>76</sup> That is, this project analyzes how the attribution of feelings to racialized and sexualized bodies aids in the assignment of value and legitimacy, as well as disposability and illegitimacy, to populations of citizens and migrants.

*Citizenship, Gender, and Sexuality in the Nation-State*

Since “anchor baby” connotes a child who is somehow undeserving of United States citizenship because of his or her mother’s immigration status, certain notions about gender, sexuality, and citizenship “stick” to the term.<sup>77</sup> Those who complain about “anchor babies” and their mothers often construct young migrant mothers as unproductive, not valuable, and nothing more than a threat to the state’s safety and economy.<sup>78</sup> Panic and paranoia about “anchor babies” and the call to end birthright citizenship is telling of what anti-immigration advocates imagine as the real or ideal citizenry of the United States. What do these texts tell us about who is considered a ‘worthy’ citizen of the nation-state?

Though there is no universally agreed upon theory of citizenship, it is loosely conceived as membership in a community, the relationship between individuals and the state, and between individual citizens within a community.<sup>79</sup> Currently, citizenship in the US is granted either by naturalization, by lineage (*jus sanguine*), or by birthright (*jus soli*). Although citizenship is often thought of as membership in civic life or in the so-called public-sphere, Lauren Berlant contends that citizenship in the United States is becoming increasingly privatized. Instead of a mode to exercise one’s membership in the state, citizenship is becoming a “mode of volunteerism and privacy” that is only available to “good people with good money.”<sup>80</sup> Jonathan Inda concurs with Berlant, claiming that in the current neoliberal state, ideal citizenship is constructed as an exercise in prudentialism, or the ability to take care of oneself and one’s family without the help of the state or a community of citizens.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, though ideally citizenship is an abstract concept that should grant equal status to everyone, citizenship is actually experienced through prisms of race, gender, class, and sexuality.<sup>82</sup> Elizabeth Povinelli elucidates the contradiction between the ideal of liberal citizenship and its embodied experience, claiming that “the very conceptual form of state citizenship [...] is based on birth from a human body or a territorial body and thus is inflected by the governing metaphors of the flesh—race,

gender, and sexuality.<sup>83</sup> That is, citizenship is intimately related to racialized, sexualized, and classed bodies in how it is reproduced both sexually and socially.

How citizenship is experienced by individuals is not only embedded in their connection to racialized and classed communities, but also in the context of the nation-state. Although the concept of citizenship has been discussed in Western political thought since the time of the classical Greeks, its modern connotation as a status of various rights and obligations in relation to the state emerged from the liberal democratic revolutions of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the United States and France.<sup>84</sup> This coincides with the creation of the modern nation-state, highlighting that citizenship, nationalism, and the state are all intertwined. Sociologist Jyoti Puri defines the state as a “contradictory and fraught set of institutions, structure of governance, and social relations that are neither stable nor uncontested.”<sup>85</sup> The state involves both material aspects like territory, and the continuous reproduction of the idea of the state as a normal and permanent figure.<sup>86</sup> It is characterized by the claiming of territorial sovereignty through legitimizing only state violence, as well as the biopolitical management of life through the surveying and collecting of demographic information about the population and the generation of resources to ensure the well-being of the targeted population.<sup>87</sup> Though the state is often conceptualized as an abstract institution of governance, feminist theorist Siobhan Somerville identifies the state as a “site of affective power” and as both “sexualized and sexualizing.”<sup>88</sup> The production and regulation of sexuality are some of the biopolitical modes that the state utilizes both to reproduce itself sexually and ideologically as well as to regulate insiders and outsiders.

The nation is often equated with the state, but Puri stresses that the two very rarely ever coincide as neatly as the term “nation-state” implies, since normally there are many nations within one state. The nation is often defined as an “imagined political community,” which is imagined as inherently bounded and sovereign.<sup>89</sup> However, the nation also connotes a sense of kinship, familial relationship, or primordial belonging, which Somerville claims foregrounds its affective power.<sup>90</sup> That is, the nation is

not just imagined into being, but also ‘felt’ into being. How the nation is imagined (or felt), that is whether it is imagined as white or English speaking or Christian, is a function of nationalism, which engenders the nation and “the principles of nationalism give form to a particular nation, its defining characteristics, its past and its common destiny.”<sup>91</sup> Ann Laura Stoler argues alongside Michel Foucault that the emergence of nationalist discourse “drew on and gave force to a wider politics of exclusion” by delineating boundaries based on the visual markers of race and class, which were believed to reveal inner essences of sexualized abnormality and degeneracy.<sup>92</sup> Stoler claims that nationalist discourses contain gendered and sexualized “prescriptions for conduct and bourgeois civilities that [keep] a racial politics of exclusion at its core.”<sup>93</sup> She adds that nationalist discourses also prescribe “affective states” in order to forge a national and racial affiliation.<sup>94</sup> The exclusionary logic of nationalism, which delineates “citizens” as those who are worthy of the protection and life-maximizing force of the state biopolitics and those “others” who are unworthy, demonstrates how citizenship, race, sexuality, and nation are all intertwined.<sup>95</sup> The “citizen,” meaning the person whose race, class, and sexual morality distinguish him or her as included into the fold of the state, often emerges in the cultural or political ideal that is articulated in the exclusionary discourses of nationalism. As mentioned earlier, nationalism and nativism work together in that nationalism outlines the idea of (and feeling attached to) the nation-state and nativism assigns value to ‘natives,’ rendering them the rightful originators and heirs of the national project.<sup>96</sup>

Panic and paranoia over “anchor babies” as well as the subsequent call to redefine *jus soli* citizenship emphasize the intersections of gender, race, sexuality, citizenship, and nationalism since women and their roles as mothers are often deployed as symbols of inclusion and exclusion in nationalist discourses. Many feminist scholars like Anne McClintock, Nira Yuval-Davis, and Rhoda Ann Kanaaneh have contributed to a vast body of research that theorizes how women’s bodies and behavior are used in nationalist discourses as representative of the nation since they are deemed both the

biological and cultural reproducers of their respective races.<sup>97</sup> Eugenicist reproduction policies, rape as a weapon of war, and invasive monitoring of women's bodies and behaviors are all examples of how nationalist discourses influence women's experiences of citizenship or belonging in a nation.<sup>98</sup> Patricia Hill Collins maintains that the sexual politics of race organize women's access to citizenship rights and benefits in the United States. She claims, for example, that women in the United States who embody the hegemonic ideal of white middle-class motherhood are encouraged to reproduce and are granted citizenship benefits like access to health care, labor practices that support the white middle class family, and other benefits that will further enable these mothers to pass on the dominant national culture.<sup>99</sup> In contrast, women who do not fit the national ideal, women of color and working class white women, are subjected to second-class citizen status and ostracized from the ideal family structure through institutional practices that favor middle class motherhood. Furthermore, feminist scholars like Angela Davis and Dorothy Roberts have also shown how racially and economically marginalized women have been subjected to forced sterilization and coercive contraception policies.<sup>100</sup> By being stripped of agency over their reproductive capabilities, these women are denied the rights of citizenship and power within the state.

Hill Collins's argument about citizenship and family politics complements Berlant's notion that "the nationalist ideology of marriage and the couple is now a central vehicle for the privatization of citizenship: first via moralized issues around privacy, sex, and reproduction that serve as alibis for white racism and patriarchal power."<sup>101</sup> White heterosexual marriage represents suburban privacy and self-sufficiency, non-promiscuous heterosexual sex, and the 'right' kind of reproduction (meaning 2.1 white children). The privatized citizen, which can collapse into the white citizen and the white married mother citizen, has come to be understood as "the moral foundation of national life."<sup>102</sup> To demand more of the state by requiring public services is to harm the state, to behave unpatriotically, and to not fulfill the duty of the 'productive' neoliberal citizen.

Though denied access to the rights of citizenship and thus, the welfare state, Mexican/migrant women are still vilified as unproductive members of society since they are constructed as harming the state with their deviant fertility and corresponding overuse of state resources. Hill Collins argues that non-citizen or stateless women in the United States are subjected to eugenicist discourses concerning their 'rampant' reproductive abilities, while they are simultaneously exploited as employable mothers for the children of middleclass white women.<sup>103</sup> While racialized concepts of Third World migrant women's ability to mother and nurture contribute to their exploitability as domestic workers, their own practices of motherhood and uses of public assistance programs are judged as either dangerous to the existing welfare state, or I add, as proof that the social state is inherently flawed.<sup>104</sup> In other words, the myth of the Mexican/migrant mother's overuse of state resources is not rhetorically deployed as merely a 'danger' to the state, but as precisely what the neoliberal state needs in order to justify and necessitate the dismantling of the welfare state. Moreover, Hill Collins asserts that panic over non-citizen mothers' supposedly illegitimate use of state benefits delineates the boundaries between who belongs to the nation and who must remain on the margins.<sup>105</sup> The fact that Mexican migrant women's mothering capabilities are exploited by white middle-class citizens for the benefit of the white family yet Mexican migrant mothering of their own children is deemed dangerous, reinforces De Genova's argument that the illegalization of Mexican bodies is integral to the maintenance of an exploitable class of labor.<sup>106</sup> Mexican/migrant women are the epitome of what Berlant refers to as those who "have been American enough to provide labor but not American enough to be sustained by the fullest resources of democratic national privilege."<sup>107</sup>

### *Mexican/Migrant Illegality*

The denigration of non-citizen mothers, and especially "illegal" mothers, is a crucial component of the "anchor baby" discourse since the discourse relies on the illegalization of the mother in order to

sustain panic and paranoia. People who are called “illegal aliens” are the epitome of subjects who have been “barred from citizenship” and thus live without the rights that citizenship in a nation-state entails.<sup>108</sup> In the globalized neoliberal economy, many women and men have had to migrate to search for work or because their lands have been invaded or destroyed. Moreover, because of the increasingly discriminatory regulations of immigration and citizenship-attainment, many women and men are left out, discarded as stateless or non-citizens. Following Giorgio Agamben, Judith Butler and Gayatri Spivak point out that many people live in a stateless condition of “bare life” in which they are no longer citizens because they have been physically or ideologically cast out of the nation, occupied by another state, incarcerated, or in other ways deprived of moral and political legitimacy.<sup>109</sup> Though these people reside in a state of exception, in spaces where the rule of law has been suspended so that it can uphold itself, they are subject to the full force of the state’s power yet they do not possess the legitimized platform to contest state power.<sup>110</sup> I emphasize that citizenship is a ‘legitimized’ platform for contesting state power because undocumented migrants and non-citizens have continuously contested state power and abuse despite the risk that they will be deported or incarcerated.<sup>111</sup>

This question of agency and law is why De Genova regrets that many scholars take for granted the illegality of certain groups of people, thus reproducing a tautological understanding of illegality that continuously allows people to inhabit the category “illegal.”<sup>112</sup> He argues that scholars should interrogate the discursive and legislative production of migrant illegality, instead of viewing criminalized populations as such. For example, the “revolving door policy” mentioned earlier illustrates how illegality is a strategic discourse as it conveys how anti-immigration laws are ultimately not intended to physically remove all Mexican migrants from the nation, nor bar all of them from entering; they are merely intended to keep them in a state of deportability so that their bodies can fuel the economy without having to be taken care of in the form of access to social services, affordable health care, and education. This is precisely what links illegality to value in that the active devaluation of a group of

people via illegalization produces value for the global economy. Feminist scholar Melissa Wright has shown how the state and transnational corporations purposefully perpetuate the myth that Mexican women are constantly devolving into worthlessness through their labor, which simultaneously produces value for the global economy.<sup>113</sup> Therefore, “illegal” people are not just cast out of the nation-state, but instead strategically included only in order to foster a racialized class of tractable labor. For these reasons, De Genova claims that scholars should go beyond the study of illegality as a legal condition and study illegality as a sociopolitical condition, “inseparable from a distinct ‘problem’ or ‘crisis’ of governance and sovereignty.”<sup>114</sup> In other words, De Genova asks how migrants are illegalized in everyday life. What ideologies, practices, social structures, and laws include Mexican migrants into the economic body of the state, yet illegalize their social and political presence?

Apart from a legal status, illegality is also a moral status where “illegal” migrants are constructed as criminal and deviant.<sup>115</sup> As mentioned above, illegality is racialized as distinctly Mexican, contributing to the criminalization of Mexican-ness whereby Mexican migrants are deemed to already be criminals who have violated the national sovereignty of the US.<sup>116</sup> Chavez claims that Mexican migrants are further criminalized through media discourses that produce Mexican men as involved in crime, especially in drug-trafficking and violent gangs, and Mexican women as “welfare queen”-type reproductive threats to the nation.<sup>117</sup> Junaid Rana adds to this, arguing that terror events like 9/11, the bombings in London, as well as the (incorrect) claim that the 9/11 hijackers entered the US through Mexico have been deployed in racial panics that construct migrants from the Global South as “illegal” and racially degenerate.<sup>118</sup> Southeast Asian and Middle Eastern migrants are strategically constructed as terrorists and Mexican migrants are often constructed as complicit in terror because of these groups’ association with underground economies and other ‘illegal’ activities.<sup>119</sup> This contributes to the racialization of migrants as ‘illegal’ and deviant as it also provides justification for relegating an ever-growing number of people into the spaces of “social death,” which is what Lisa Marie Cacho refers to as

the disavowal and repudiation of a population because they are “self-evidently undeserving” and/or “politically illegible.”<sup>120</sup> In other words, migrants *and* citizens are not just constructed as “illegal” through immigration and citizenship laws, but through degeneracy discourses that become naturalized to the point where one’s status as a legitimate or valuable citizen can be ascertained from one’s membership in a racialized and/or sexualized population.

### *Conclusion*

Scholarship on racial panics and paranoia about migrants has mainly focused on how panics produce draconian laws and policies or on how these panics reveal the white nativism prevalent in the United States. Scholarship has also attempted to compare panicked language and the resulting restrictive policies, glossing over the particularities of how racialized and criminalized migrant groups are talked about and treated legislatively.<sup>121</sup> However, as De Genova points out, few studies interrogate the discursive and legislative production of illegality and how in the United States “illegality” is particularly imagined as Mexican.<sup>122</sup> However, while De Genova offers a nuanced analysis of illegality in the United States, he makes gender and sexuality invisible and does not consider how they can both affect the production of “illegal” bodies. Luibhéid points out that, much like “illegality,” sexuality is often analyzed in a tautological manner, suppressing any interrogation into how immigration control reproduces and privileges certain sexualities, subsequently repressing and denigrating others.<sup>123</sup> Furthermore, even fewer studies have analyzed the interrelationship between citizenship and illegality, and especially how Mexican/migrant women *and* their citizen-children are often *both* the targets of rightwing panic and paranoia. What could it mean that both Mexican/migrant women and their citizen-children are criminalized and regarded as unworthy of citizenship, yet implicitly worthy of sustaining the economy of the U.S. through their labor? I attend to these gaps by tracing how both Mexican/migrant women and

their citizen children are specifically constructed as “illegal” and subsequently how this constructs citizenship.

## 1.2 Methods

A cultural studies approach to discourse analysis is the optimal method to attend to my research questions concerning the construction of the “anchor baby” in rightwing anti-immigrant discourses. This approach employs a Foucauldian/poststructuralist reading of discourse, which will not uncover a finite truth or the origin of the “anchor baby” discourse, but instead will examine the ideological commitments that both emerge from it and perpetuate it. Ideological commitments, does not refer to the traditional Marxian reading of ideology where ideology acts as a veil concealing an actual reality, but instead what Terry Eagleton calls a “particular set of effects within discourses.”<sup>124</sup> In other words, in this project ‘ideology’ takes on its more mundane connotation as a set of ideas or ideals. For example, discourse theorist Norman Fairclough maintains that ideologies are discursively constructed notions of “common sense,” not veils that must be removed in order to liberate autonomous subjects.<sup>125</sup> Therefore, this project examines how discursively constructed ideologies and worldviews *produce* subject positions like the “anchor baby,” and the “illegal alien,” not how they exert power over already-existing subjects.

For Michel Foucault, discourse is a highly regulated grouping of utterances or statements with specific internal rules. Foucauldian discourse theory is poststructuralist; it sees language as not only the site where “actual and possible forms of social organization [...] are defined and contested,” but also where they are constructed.<sup>126</sup> Language exists in historically and socially specific discourses that “inhere in social institutions and practices and can be organized analytically in discursive fields,” or competing processes of meaning making and structuring.<sup>127</sup> Discourses are sites where power is produced and transmitted, but they are also sites where dominant meanings are contested, undermined, and exposed.<sup>128</sup> For example, I consider the “anchor baby” discourse as a site of struggle

over the meaning of citizenship and illegality in the United States. A Foucauldian/poststructuralist discourse analysis enables an examination of the rules and relations that perpetuate the “anchor baby” discourse, the power structures that allow the discourse to emerge, and the struggle over the meaning of the discourse.

As suggested earlier, I employ discourse analysis in order to analyze how ideologies, politics, power structures, and *emotions* work to construct the “anchor baby” and his or her “illegal” mother as both real and threatening to the nation-state, and thus needing to be barred from citizenship. I agree with Lauren Berlant’s claim that there is increased anxiety and turmoil over the meaning of citizenship in the US, where a “certain cluster of demonic and idealized images and narratives about sex and citizenship has come to obsess the official national public sphere.”<sup>129</sup> This struggle involves apocalyptic imaginings, paranoia, and anxiety that cannot be adequately expressed by only attending to discourse. Moreover, Berlant refers to political rhetoric in general as an “amalgam of reflexive opinion and visceral or ‘gut’ feeling.”<sup>130</sup> Thoughts are not separate from feelings as both are “an embodied rhetorical register associated with specific practices, times, and spaces of appropriateness.”<sup>131</sup>

Therefore, as a component of the discourse analysis, I examine how what Sara Ahmed calls “the emotionality of texts” constructs, moves, and animates the “anchor baby” discourse.<sup>132</sup> Importantly, I examine how racialized and sexualized bodies like the “anchor baby” and the Mexican/migrant mother are constructed as both causing emotions like fear and disgust, as well as having (or not having) emotions like love. In other words, I examine how emotions form the skin of fantasy bodies like “the nation,” the “illegal alien,” and the “anchor baby,” in that through the attribution of *feelings* and histories of contact, these bodies take shape as real, solid, and most of all delimited. I highlight that feelings and emotions are discursively attributed to objects since Ahmed claims that emotions do not originate from within objects despite how we colloquially assign emotions to ourselves and to other people.<sup>133</sup> Instead, emotions and affects are produced as an effect of their circulation, which is in turn

aided by their relation to other discourses as well as their historicity.<sup>134</sup> This explains why discourse analysis is so intertwined with affective analysis. Emotions like love, disgust, or fear “work to materialize the very ‘surface’ of collective bodies.”<sup>135</sup> For example, when writers and politicians express anxiety about the “flooding” of migrant mothers and their “anchor babies” on the public school and public health systems, the historicity and intertextuality of their utterances shape the objects as productive of fear, constructing them as real threats. In sum, I intend for this discourse analysis to unravel and examine the emotions, genealogies, and ideologies that construct the “anchor baby” and his or her Mexican migrant mother as permanently “illegal.”

My analysis of the “anchor baby” discourse will involve a close reading of the intersecting anti-immigrant discourses that produce the “anchor baby” and “illegal” migrant mother subjects. The materials that comprise my discourse analysis are the product of an effort to trace the “anchor baby” discourse from mainstream news articles about politicians who want to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment to the scholars and political pundits that produce—though are not necessarily the origins of—the discursive and affective basis for this type of anti-immigrant argument. The analysis maps the “anchor baby” discourse onto intersecting anti-immigrant discourses about out-of-control migrant reproduction, the criminality of Mexican migrants and their citizen-born children, the incompatibility of Mexican culture with the U.S. Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture, and the pathology of the Mexican migrant family, as well as broader discourses about bodily immunity, scientific and cultural racism, and heteronormativity.

I started tracing the “anchor baby” discourse when I began encountering the term in short news articles published in major news outlets like Foxnews.com, FinancialTimes.com, and *The Washington Post*. The conservative politicians quoted as wanting to “solve” the “anchor baby problem” led me to question what the term “anchor baby” referred to and why it was constructed as already constituting a problem. This led me to the websites of national anti-immigration organizations Federation for

American Immigration Reform (FAIR), V-Dare, Numbers USA, and Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) whose presidents and communications specialists were being interviewed as legitimate authorities on immigration in news articles that reported on the “anchor baby problem” and in the on-going immigration debates. The published content on these websites led me to six main pundits in the broader anti-immigrant movement in the United States and a series of conservative politicians who repeatedly attempt to pass House of Representatives Bills to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment by revising the Immigration and Nationality Act. Looking at the pundits’ oeuvre of books and articles as well as the proposed legislation and transcripts from House Committees debating such legislation in lieu of limiting my analysis to just those articles that mention “anchor babies” allows me to delve deeper into the “anchor baby” discourse’s genealogies, points of intertextuality, and contradictions.

The first author whose content I analyze is John Tanton, the previously mentioned founder of FAIR and the anti-immigrant periodical *The Social Contract*, who the Southern Poverty Law Center names as the main architect of the modern anti-immigration movement.<sup>136</sup> I specifically analyze a 1996 issue of *The Social Contract* titled “Anchor babies’—the citizen-child loophole” since it is the earliest mention of the term that I can locate. I also read Peter Brimelow’s best-selling book *Alien Nation*, which is often proudly cited by anti-immigrant advocates as “this year’s *Bell Curve*,” referring to Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray’s controversial 1994 book.<sup>137</sup> Peter Brimelow founded the anti-immigration organization V-Dare in honor of Virginia Dare, the first European baby born to the pilgrim occupiers in the colonial United States.<sup>138</sup> He is also a financial reporter and has been editor of *Forbes*, *The Financial Post*, and *The National Review*. Next, I read Patrick Buchanan’s best-selling books, *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America* and *Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Third World Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization*.<sup>139</sup> Buchanan is a prolific author of white supremacist populist books as well as a former advisor for presidents Nixon, Ford, and Reagan, a syndicated columnist, and a broadcaster for various news outlets like CNN and MSNBC. He

was also a presidential nominee in 2000 for the Reform Party. In addition, I read Heather Mac Donald's *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan than Today's*, which she co-authors with Victor Davis Hansen and Steven Malanga.<sup>140</sup> She is a scholar for the right-wing think-tank The Manhattan Institute as well as a prolific journalist for rightwing and mainstream news outlets. I also read Michelle Malkin's *Invasion*. She is a prolific anti-immigration writer for news outlets like Fox News, Newsmax.com, and *The National Review*.<sup>141</sup> Last, I read Samuel Huntington's *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*.<sup>142</sup> Samuel Huntington was Professor of International and Area Studies at Harvard University until his death in 2008. These are all texts that are widely circulated in mainstream public discourse. The texts also overlap with each other since the authors heavily cite one another as well as each other's anti-immigration organizations. For the second chapter, I also analyze the transcript for the House of Representative's Committee Hearing titled *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*. This hearing features three 'expert' panelists and politicians like Nathan Deal and John Hostettler who are attempting to pass H.R. 698.

### *Conclusion*

In the "anchor baby" texts, the bodies of young Mexican/Latina women are deemed overly fertile, dangerously reproductive, and a hindrance to the health of the nation-state. Their citizen-children are signaled as surplus and a nuisance to the public school system, the public health system, and the cultural/racial future of America. However, the term is more than an offensive descriptor used to denigrate migrant mothers and their children; it also forms part of a discourse on migrant illegality and sexuality that pervades how we conceptualize and imagine the citizenry of the United States and its Others. This project grapples with the texts and contexts that perpetuate the "anchor baby" discourse in order to examine how citizenship and illegality are co-constructed along lines of race, class, and sexuality.

Using Anne McClintock's theory of imperial paranoia, both chapters situate the production and circulation of the "anchor baby" discourse in eruptions of racial and sexual panic as well as within an ongoing paranoia that vacillates between American exceptionalism and the need to defend the nation's borders. Importantly, emotions like unconditional love for the nation-state and fear of invasion and demise embolden the dialectic, constructing the skin of fantasy bodies like the "anchor baby" and "the nation." The chapters are divided according to these two affective poles of paranoia. The first chapter analyzes how fear constructs both mother and child as human monsters and "spectacles of fear," and thus equally "illegal." Fear of the nation's invasion by racially and sexually unfit migrants and citizens delineates and naturalizes the boundaries of the nation, enacting a biopolitical war of races where the removal of birthright citizenship is constructed as a means to 'inoculate' the nation from demise. This chapter ends by arguing that the paranoid construction of the "anchor baby" as a monstrous internal enemy expands the political category of illegality and solidifies the borders around citizenship. The second chapter takes up American exceptionalism and love, analyzing the anti-immigrant activists' and politicians' campaign to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment. I particularly examine the House Committee's transcript on dual citizenship and birthright citizenship, focusing on the two main tenets of the reinterpretation argument, that the children of undocumented migrants are not "subject to jurisdiction" to the nation-state and that birthright citizenship violates the premise of liberal consent upon which the nation-state was supposedly founded. I find that the argument to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment is premised on producing and regulating the correct affective orientation towards the nation-state, mainly unconditional love.<sup>143</sup> This stems from and contributes to a will to love the exceptional nation-state and the "gift of freedom" that it proffers.<sup>144</sup> In the end, this project remains open ended and unfinished as I consider the future of social activism concerning birthright citizenship and illegality, pondering how to negotiate both the tangible benefits of birthright citizenship with the violence of illegalization and social exclusion inherent to the biopolitics of nation-states. How are we to craft a radical politics that does not

ignore the strategic value of citizenship while not contributing to the violent devaluing of non-citizens and stateless people?

My proposed research examines how the “anchor baby” discourse functions to reproduce nativist paranoia about citizenship and illegality in the United States. An attention to the affective dimensions of paranoia will enable me to consider how emotions like fear and love animate and solidify the “anchor baby” and the “illegal alien.” This project will contribute to a vast body of research on migration, illegality, citizenship, race, and sexuality that has not yet adequately addressed how illegality is discursively and affectively inscribed to an increasing number of bodies while “citizen” is both increasingly inaccessible and increasingly elusive.

## 2 SOCIETY MUST BE DEFENDED

Patrick Buchanan opens his paranoid treatise *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America* with a quotation about the fall of the Roman Empire. He quotes conservative historian Thomas Cahill saying, “Why was the border guard so thin? Did the Romans not notice...that their way of life was changing forever?”<sup>145</sup> In that chapter, titled “How Civilizations Perish,” Buchanan, referring to the “bleeding” US-Mexico border, argues that America is on a similar road to death because “the frontiers of civilization are no longer defended.”<sup>146</sup> Influenced by Jean Raspail’s foreboding dystopia *Camp of Saints*, a novel about the invasion of France by a million formerly colonized peoples, Buchanan and his contemporaries John Tanton, Peter Brimelow, and Heather Mac Donald fear that the United States is experiencing a similar invasion or *reconquista* from Mexico.<sup>147</sup> Collectively they urge citizens to realize that we are in a “state of emergency” and thus, we must defend our borders, both the state’s territorial borders and the nation’s membership borders by limiting birthright citizenship, in order to save the nation-state. However, why does migration from Mexico constitute a state of emergency for which a state of exception must be deployed to save us? Why must we build walls around the state and walls around citizenship? What is to fear?

This chapter takes up these questions by focusing on how both the “anchor baby” and his or her migrant mother become illegalized in rightwing anti-immigration discourses, thus necessitating their exclusion from the nation-state. Therefore, this chapter specifically analyzes how the affective dimensions of paranoia construct and naturalize the “anchor baby” specter as threatening, legitimizing the violence of the “anchor baby” discourse. That is, this chapter examines how the children of undocumented migrants are constructed as what Jonathan Xavier Inda terms “anti-citizens,” and second, how the emotions associated with paranoia naturalize the “anchor baby” construct and legitimize the need to defend society from it.<sup>148</sup>

The first section sketches the biopolitical landscape of the “anchor baby” discourse, embedded in the broader nativist anti-immigration discourse, showing that the affective and bodily dimensions of paranoia are integral to the naturalization of the nation’s defense against both internal enemies (citizen children) and infiltrating enemies (migrant mothers). Then, I employ a close reading of my sample of nativist anti-immigration books and articles, arguing that they construct both the “anchor baby” and his or her Mexican/migrant mother as national enemies, specifically human monsters, according to a paranoid biopolitical logic. Both mother and child are constructed as monstrous because of their transgression of juridical and natural/biological norms. Notably, the monstrosity of the “anchor baby” is constructed according to theories of the heredity of degeneracy and cultural racism, thus creating a permanent Other within the nation’s borders. Drawing from society’s embedded belief in what Ed Cohen calls “immunity as exception” and “immunity-as-defense,” the “anchor baby” discourse advocates for inoculating or defending the nation by removing citizenship for the children of Mexican/migrant women.<sup>149</sup> In conclusion, I ponder the purpose of the “anchor baby” discourse’s mobilization of fear, taking into account Chela Sandoval’s claim that white representations of racial and cultural otherness are not only manufactured for capital, but also imagined into being in order to sustain white superiority.<sup>150</sup> In other words, according to Sherene Razack, racialized otherness is mobilized to “enable the West to feel its own civilizational superiority and to make the case that exceptional violence is required to keep in line those whose uncivilized natures are so much in evidence.”<sup>151</sup> Taking this into account moves us beyond looking at the construction of illegality only in terms of strategic capitalism, while not discounting it either. Therefore, leading into the next chapter, I argue that the purpose of the “anchor baby” spectacle of fear is to expand the political category of illegality, thus solidifying the borders of citizenship along neoliberal, white supremacist, and heteronormative lines.

## **2.1 (Bio)Paranoia, Biopolitics, and Degeneracy in the “Anchor Baby” Discourse**

The civilization that we as whites created in Europe and America could not have

developed apart from the genetic endowments of the creating people, nor is there any reason to believe that the civilization can be successfully transmitted by a different people.<sup>152</sup>

But pulling up the ladder may be necessary—if the lifeboat is about to capsize.<sup>153</sup>

But in order to curb immigration, it is necessary first to assert the existence, integrity, and legitimacy of the Western and American way of life—to assert, in other words, the legitimacy of a ‘we’ against the demands of a ‘they.’<sup>154</sup>

Still knowing what I already knew from my twelve years in Los Angeles, I did see him as a domestic terrorist playing his part in the take-over agenda.<sup>155</sup>

The “anchor baby” discourse exhibits a dual-sided paranoia that relies on the fantasy of (Anglo)-American exceptionalism coupled with the constant fear of demise. According to Anne McClintock, paranoia is a deeply unstable and contradictory organization of power that oscillates between “deliriums of grandeur and nightmares of perpetual threat.”<sup>156</sup> Joined through the anxiety of loss and impossibility, fear of impending demise and love of the exceptional nation-state are two of the primary affective components of paranoia, and they work together to constantly delineate boundaries between “we” the exceptional nation and “them,” those whose invasion we fear.<sup>157</sup> This chapter will mainly address the fear aspect of paranoia—in that it analyzes how the “anchor baby” and his or her mother emerge in discourse as something to be feared, but just as exceptionalism and demise are in a constant dialectic, so are fear and love.<sup>158</sup>

The paranoia deployed in the “anchor baby” discourse, as well as the broader nativist anti-immigration movement, also conveys a bodily or biological dimension of paranoia, produced through histories of the bourgeois quest for hygiene, self-control, sexual regulation, and purity. For instance, bodily dimensions of the nation like its health, its face, and its blood are referenced as needing to be healed, controlled, and protected from threat.<sup>159</sup> Additionally, since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, societal paranoia about foreigners has consistently been metaphorically and literally portrayed in terms of germs, parasites, and contagions, all of which are medical-biological concepts that bind themselves to intimate bodies, both individual and national.<sup>160</sup> Critical Art Ensemble (CAE) terms the biological

motivations of paranoia “bioparanoia,” which is derived from “spectacles of fear” produced by fantasy bodies like the disinfected body (the germ-free, pure body), the aestheticized screenal body (the perfectly controlled body), and the abused body (the apocalyptic body in meltdown).<sup>161</sup> “Spectacle” is a useful theoretical frame for analyzing the discursive and affective construction of both “anchor baby” and his or her “illegal” mother since it attends to how fantasy bodies become ‘real’ fleshy bodies through circulation in the media.<sup>162</sup> Most importantly, spectacles naturalize the meanings and feelings that they construct, securing what Stuart Hall calls the discursive or ideological ‘closure’ of meaning.<sup>163</sup> The mobilization of paranoia and fear is an apt way to secure the meaning of a spectacle since, according to Sara Ahmed, emotions constitute the very surfaces and boundaries of objects;<sup>164</sup> they are part of what constructs a spectacle as ‘real.’

The abused body, the apocalyptic body in meltdown, or the unbounded, uncontained body is often evoked by politicians and capitalist centers of power to legitimize the war on terror and especially the war on biological terrorism.<sup>165</sup> According to CAE, epidemic-causing germs have been deemed an official weapon of terrorism, allowing neoconservative politicians and manufacturers of anti-biological-terrorism tools to profit tremendously from harnessing societal fear.<sup>166</sup> This is yet another rhetorical instance where the War on Terror and the war of immigration collide; the fear that makes the most improbable mode of attack seem highly probable and the fear that names Mexican migrants as “domestic terrorists” and invaders of Anglo spaces are derived from the same spectacle of fear of an abused national body.<sup>167</sup> In the case of the “anchor baby” discourse, both the “illegal” mother and the “anchor baby” are produced as spectacles of fear that signify threat to individual bodies through infectious crime and the national body through reproductive “inundation” and “demographic warfare.”<sup>168</sup> In sum, bioparanoia is perpetuated through the continuous fear of invasion and disintegration of borders, the contamination of pristine surfaces, and the fear of contagion that the

subject could not only be gaining in power, but also proliferating and infecting, all of which call for a reading of paranoia through Michel Foucault's notion of biopolitics.

Paranoia about the nation's impending doom and the subsequent call to defend it illustrated in the quotations at the beginning of the chapter advocate for the use of biopower to "defend society against all the biological dangers of that other race, of that sub-race, of that counter-race that despite ourselves we are constituting," by removing birthright citizenship for the children of undocumented migrants.<sup>169</sup> In other words, paranoia delineates the perceived threat of the "anchor baby" and his or her mother, naturalizing the violence of the biopolitical defense advocated by the nativist pundits. Emerging out of the Enlightenment in Western Europe, biopolitics is a form of governing that seeks to facilitate the proliferation of life by making live and letting die instead of more ancient forms of power that make die and let live.<sup>170</sup>

Immunity is a central node of biopolitics. Feminist theorist Ed Cohen claims that the migration of "immunity-as-exception" in Western legal and political discourses to "immunity-as-defense" in biomedical and political discourses during the 19<sup>th</sup> century was an essential mode of naturalizing the biopolitical project of the modern individual(ized) body and the national body.<sup>171</sup> Originally imagined as a political exception to the law in order to uphold the law, the more contemporary notion of immunity refers to the modern body-as-organism's 'natural' mode of defense against hostile exterior germs and bacteria.<sup>172</sup> Cohen maintains that biomedicine uses "this lawful conundrum (i.e., that exceptions prove the rule) to incorporate defense as properly natural and thereby anoint it as a natural property."<sup>173</sup> Through the migration of immunity-as-exception to immunity-as-defense, the law becomes ingrained in our bodies. In other words, the migration of the uses of immunity enables us to understand self-defense of bodies and property as natural law.<sup>174</sup> Therefore, the fusing of the law of man and the law of nature, coupled with our pervasive fear of germs, naturalizes the political endeavor to build up the body's immunity, defending it from harm.<sup>175</sup> Importantly, this contributed to the conceptual merging of

the individual's body with the national body, thus naturalizing the imperative to defend both the national and the individual body.

As mentioned above, in nativist anti-immigration discourse, the nation is often described as a body, but more specifically as a woman's body that is raped, raided, or otherwise invaded by foreignness, whether foreign bodies, foreign germs, and sometimes foreign plants and food. Following the immunity-as-defense metaphor in biopolitics, this bodily invasion serves as the justification for making the nation immune to attack by erecting bigger and less permeable barriers. It also legitimizes making the interior of the nation inhospitable to undocumented migrants by passing legislation criminalizing migration and barring access to 'magnets' like healthcare and welfare. Specifically, in the "anchor baby" discourse, the "anchor baby" and his or her "illegal" mother are discursively constructed as spectacles of fear that *should* be fought with the removal of citizenship in order to save the nation. Therefore, the denial of citizenship to citizen-children becomes the means to 'inoculate' the national body, defending it from further invasion.

The bodily metaphor in biopolitics is not only important for visualizing how we see ourselves as in need of defense and as defensible, but also for envisioning how biopower works on sexual and racial bodies. In biopolitics, the regulation of sexuality, the family, and the family as a sexual unit is the "means of access both to the life of the body and the life of the species" since these clusters encompass both the discipline of the body and the regulation of the population.<sup>176</sup> Along with sexuality, race is a central tenet for the organization of biopower since the regulation of sexuality is always racially and ethnically inflected.<sup>177</sup> Moreover, highlighting the interconnectedness of racialization and the assignment of value, the emergence of biopower as a form of governance has structured the ascendancy of whiteness through creating a hierarchy of races determining which population's life should be optimized and the populations that should be left to die.<sup>178</sup> Thus, the "anchor baby" discourse can be theorized as biopolitical since it enacts the necessity of making US/Anglo life thrive by

quarantining and letting die Mexican/migrants. This imperative to quarantine the proliferation of Mexican migrants is why Mexican and Latina sexuality becomes, to use Foucault's words, "a particularly dense transfer point of power" in the form of the reproduction of citizens, and thus why it is seen as such a threat to the nation.<sup>179</sup>

The theoretical construction of abnormality and degeneracy is central to the ascendancy of whiteness and the resulting hierarchization of races, as well as paranoia. Foucault describes the historical development of a taxonomy and regulation of abnormality that began to emerge in Western European medical and legal discourses in the seventeenth century, contributing to the "construction of a general theory of degeneracy" by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>180</sup> The first abnormal to emerge, the human monster, violates both juridical and natural norms, as well as norms of modernity and civilization.<sup>181</sup> Puar and Rai contend that "the category of monstrosity is also an implicit index of civilization development and cultural adaptability," which is how the monster becomes intertwined with "the individual to be corrected."<sup>182</sup> For unlike "the individual to be corrected," the monster is deemed unable to adapt to "civilization" and thus, it must be quarantined from the public. This is precisely what makes the monster so productive of fear, for the monster is a "dangerous individual" that has no cure.<sup>183</sup> Along with modernity, both race and sexuality figure directly into the construction of monstrosity. Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the "human monster" and "the individual to be corrected" have become intertwined with each other and with the "onanist," or the masturbating child of the white European bourgeois family, and familial sexuality has become the most resonant theory for degeneracy.<sup>184</sup> Therefore, as will be illustrated in the "anchor baby" discourse, monstrosity is co-constructed along lines of race, modernity, and sexuality.

As mentioned above, the notion of protection and defense is central to the theorization of biopolitical discourses since biopolitics enacts a discourse of racial warfare where the white bourgeois population must defend itself from the races deemed inferior so that it can thrive. According to

Foucault, racism creates a biological relationship to the degenerate or the inferior race; “the more inferior species die out, the more abnormal individuals are eliminated, the fewer degenerates there will be in the species as a whole, and the more I—as a species [...]—can live, [...] the more vigorous I will be. I will be able to proliferate.”<sup>185</sup> Thus, this racism is not necessarily militaristic because the expulsion, rejection, or political death of the abnormal, degenerate, and/or inferior races is not based on victory over political foes, but rather, it is a purifying discourse, alleging that inoculating the species from the unwanted will improve, maximize, and save the superior group.<sup>186</sup> Therefore, the abnormal is not made to die, but cast out of the biopolitical fold of the nation in order to preserve life for the target population. The removal of citizenship is one way of accomplishing this, since by inhabiting a state in the stateless condition of illegality, one is not removed from the nation, but merely removed from the state’s project of life maximization. This is precisely what proponents of the “anchor baby” discourse envision since they do not advocate for mass deportations, but instead for barred access to citizenship rights and especially state welfare resources that would facilitate health, education, and parenting. For this reason, Puar and Rai’s use of the word “quarantine” when describing societal reactions to human monsters is important.<sup>187</sup> For it seems as though modern forms of power do not rely so much on removing life (though it would be utterly false to claim that this does not happen), but rather on quarantining, containing, and warehousing racial and sexual others who are considered to be endangering the national body. In other words, the use of the removal of citizenship as a method of quarantine, does not remove Mexicans from the nation, but rather inoculates the nation from Mexican/migrants’ ability to exercise any political power and access any resources that could endanger the white hegemony of the US.

This section has outlined the elements of paranoia and biopolitics that undergird the “anchor baby” discourse. In the next section, I illustrate how the construction of the “anchor baby” is constructed as a spectacle of fear in terms of monstrosity, which enacts the necessity of a biopolitical

war to save the future. Thus, revoking the citizenship of the children of Mexican/migrant women is produced as a means to achieve “a sort of homeostasis [...] by achieving an overall equilibrium that protects the security of the whole from internal dangers.”<sup>188</sup> The exclusion, though not the expulsion, of the citizen-children of Mexican/migrant women is constructed as way to preserve the essential Anglo-Protestant core of the US from disintegrating in the future. In the end, I argue that the mobilization of the “anchor baby’s” monstrosity does not just advocate for its exclusion from society; it sets off a normalizing discourse that barricades an already narrow discourse of sexual, racial, and classed citizenship.

## **2.2 Constructing Spectacles of Fear: The “Illegal Alien” and the “Anchor Baby” as Human Monsters**

Both citizen-child and “illegal alien” are discursively constructed as “invaders” who have infected the nation and must be quarantined as “illegal” subjects to keep them from proliferating as citizens with full access to the state. This section outlines how the monstrosity of the “illegal” mother is constructed in terms of bioparanoia, thus naturalizing the necessity of defense. Later, I show how the characteristics of the mother are inscribed onto the “anchor baby” and how discourses of heredity and cultural racism render the children of undocumented migrants permanent ‘others.’

Nativist pundits often describe undocumented migrants as inhuman, which conveys monstrosity since human monsters are often depicted as hybrid creatures such as the half-human/half-animal or the hermaphrodite.<sup>189</sup> For example, Buchanan regularly refers to undocumented immigration as “the specter haunting the United States,” and undocumented immigrants as “specters” and “ghost-like.”<sup>190</sup> He also calls them inhabitants of an “underworld of undocumented immigration.”<sup>191</sup> Brimelow, referencing his trip to the US-Mexico border in Arizona, reiterates the invocation of migrant inhumanity by claiming to witness “flurries of phantom illegals” crossing the U.S.-Mexico border at night.<sup>192</sup> The fantastic imagery produces “illegal aliens” as figures of paranoia in the form of fear of the openness of the border and of their subsequent merging with the body politic of the Anglicized US.

Undocumented immigrants are also constructed as animals or animal-like. For instance, Buchanan references Rudyard Kipling, calling migrants from the Global South “lesser breeds without the law.”<sup>193</sup> Brimelow, again referencing his trip, recalls seeing Mexicans “like raccoons,” digging under the fence at the border.<sup>194</sup> Michelle Malkin’s declaration, “It is time to turn off the magnets that attract the hordes of illegal aliens” demonstrates elements of bioparanoia in the construction of monstrosity as the body of the nation is turned into a magnet, whose coveted citizenship pulls unwanted people towards it.<sup>195</sup> This reinscribes the US as an object of desire to which migrants are magnetically attracted, but the need to turn it off conveys that the pull of the magnet is turning the national body into an “abused body,” a crisis narrative that references Jean Raspail’s France after invasion in *Camp of Saints*.<sup>196</sup> At the same time, the migrants are dehumanized and turned into animals, as the phrase “turn off the magnets” refers to the common act of “turning off the lights” at night to deter the attraction of “hordes” or “swarms” of mosquitos and flies.

In addition to dehumanization, these anti-immigration texts also construct the “illegal alien” as breaking juridical boundaries. Oft-repeated crime statistics and incarceration rates of Latino and Mexican documented and undocumented migrants found in all of the books and journals in my sample construct Mexicans and Latinos as either committing more crimes or being incarcerated more often than the white “norm.”<sup>197</sup> The discussion of crime rates in these texts naturalizes and obscures the fact that Mexicans and Latinos may have higher crime rates because, as mentioned earlier, they are already constructed as criminals in US society; embodying the racial and political category of illegality opens one up to state harassment and policing.<sup>198</sup> By erasing the historic criminalization of Mexican and Latino immigrants, the crime statistics contribute to constructing the “illegal alien” as a spectacle of fear, constructing the “illegal” migrant as a material reality. Moreover, the spectacle of fear perpetuated by the constant reminder of crime statistics contributes to the affective production of a feeling of danger while it also simultaneously assuages fear. The statistics remind the reader that the danger has been

controlled; the criminals have been quantified and disciplined so that they cannot harm the nation yet.<sup>199</sup> This relates to CAE's claim that "individuals under the influence of artificially created bioparanoia will typically attempt to find ways to [...] restore equilibrium" by deferring to power, purchasing a product proven to mitigate the threat, or acquiring more information about the threat.<sup>200</sup> Through indicating that the threat has been quantified by authorities and providing vast bodies of information about the threat, these anti-immigration texts assuage fear while simultaneously reproducing it.

The dangerous "illegal alien" is not only constructed as avidly participating in everything from rape, to robbery, to drug and sex trafficking, but he or she is also often equated with other historical human monsters, intensifying the feelings of fear and danger associated with the "illegal alien."<sup>201</sup> For example, Michelle Malkin's entire book, *Invasion*, is dedicated to melding the "illegal alien" with other spectacles of fear like "the terrorist" and "the pedophile." She first merges the "illegal alien" and the 9/11 hijackers by claiming, "[the media] ignore the fact that illegal alien day laborers hanging out in front of convenient stores and government offices helped at least seven of the hijackers."<sup>202</sup> This again links the "illegal alien" and the "Muslim/Arab terrorist" as spectacles of fear that threaten to abuse the national body by violently transgressing its boundaries. Malkin also dedicates several chapters to relating the tales of certain infamous "alien lawbreakers" like the "railway killer," "foreign cop-killers on the loose," "the torturers next door," and "the infant killer."<sup>203</sup> These names sound like late-night science fiction monster movies, showing how the spectacle of the "illegal alien" gains shape (or skin) through its contact with other renditions of our society's feared human monsters.

In addition, the illegality of the "dangerous individual" is constructed as an intrinsic state of being, fixing the "illegal alien" as permanently and irredeemably criminal, which fortifies his or her incorrigibility.<sup>204</sup> Buchanan illustrates this, claiming that undocumented migrants are perpetually breaking the law; "millions of Mexicans are here illegally. They broke the law to get into the United States, and they break the law by being here."<sup>205</sup> Another author states that undocumented migrants'

“original crime of illegal entry breeds more crime and disorder, so that longtime residents [of majority-Mexican neighborhoods] increasingly find their property vandalized or burgled.”<sup>206</sup> That the “illegal” act of undocumented entry is constructed as “breeding” more crime conveys that the criminality associated with illegality is contagious or infectious, contributing to the need to “turn off the magnets,” to put a stop to it. Additionally, the texts cement the inevitable criminality of the “illegal alien” by conveying that their presence on the US-Mexico border, in neighborhoods, and in prisons contaminates the areas, “breeding” more crime and degeneracy. Mac Donald claims, “After a neighborhood became more than 60 percent Latino, physical decay—including graffiti, trash-filled vacant lots, and abandoned cars—jumped disproportionately.”<sup>207</sup> According to her logic, just their presence contaminates and endangers spaces.

These references convey the affective dimensions of bioparanoia in that the “illegal alien” is portrayed as producing disgust and fear; the “illegal alien” endangers and contaminates the nation through the spread of crime and trash. In noting the connection between the abject and the disgusting, Sara Ahmed claims that both threaten and invoke fear, and that this threat is intensified when it comes from within.<sup>208</sup> Disgust works alongside fear in paranoia since the bodily recoil that often results from seeing something as disgusting points out what should be feared, what could possibly do harm. The abject and the disgusting invade space, skin, or the internal body, and the feeling of invasion is precisely what generates the hierarchical border between “us,” the non-disgusting, and “them,” the threatening disgusting things.<sup>209</sup> Fear and disgust’s boundary making also reinscribe the immunity-as-defense tenet of biopolitics, as for the modern body “living entails a ceaseless problem of boundary maintenance.”<sup>210</sup> In order for the national body to maintain its health and vigor, it must constantly fortify its boundaries.

The monstrosity of the “illegal alien” is racialized as distinctly Mexican and gendered as Mexican/migrant women are constructed as violating natural laws through abnormal fecundity and Mexican/migrant men are constructed as violating juridical laws because of violent “machismo.”<sup>211</sup> As

with general crime rates, the birthrate of Latina women, and especially Mexican/migrant women is quantified, charted, and compared to Anglo women and Black women.<sup>212</sup> Just as the quantification of the criminal population converts it into manageable units for disciplinary techniques, the quantification of populations and their regeneration rates “reduce people to manageable entities that can allegedly be controlled for the ‘common good.’”<sup>213</sup> Moreover, the population that is seen as surplus is always intertwined with race, class, and sexuality, as “Third World” women are frequently characterized as having uncontrollable reproduction that requires intervention in order to save the planet from the assumed consequences of overpopulation.<sup>214</sup> In these texts especially, Mexican/migrant reproduction is categorized as uncivilized and ‘Third World,’ as well as ‘illegitimate,’ which has clear racial, classed, and sexual implications. Mac Donald illustrates this when she says, “Hispanic immigrants bring near Third World levels of fertility to America [...] coupled with illegitimacy.”<sup>215</sup> This coincides with Puar and Rai’s claim that monstrosity is intertwined with regulatory regimes of “civilization,” in that human monsters are seen as inadaptable to and counter to modern civilization.

Mexican/migrant women’s reproduction is also constructed in the texts as perpetually uncontainable due to the elusiveness of the “illegal alien;” the ghost-like condition of her existence renders her uncountable, unable to be disciplined. This perpetuates the cycle of paranoia, mobilizing fear of harm to the nation that may never be known. For example, the authors sometimes ask, just how many “anchor babies” are there? The number is constructed as ever increasing and unquantifiable. For example, Tanton muses how the population would look if parents of “anchor babies” had the ‘normal’ two children, but then claims, “Given the large-family-size characteristic of the home countries of many illegals, what multiplier should be applied to the number of citizen-children to predict potential population growth - five, perhaps? That would account only for two parents and two siblings, small by Third World standards.”<sup>216</sup> Then he goes on to envision an ever-greater number of children born to undocumented parents, writing:

How many citizen-children/anchor babies have been born in the U.S. over the past twenty years [...]? Not surprisingly, no one knows, [...] there may be as many as 2 million. If the multiplier is five, that is 10 million additional people.<sup>217</sup>

Instead of alleviating fear like the charting of Mexican crime rates, the inability to quantify the number of “anchor babies” intensifies fear since Mexican/migrant women’s reproductive practices *could* be even greater than ever imagined. This intensifies the population-growth-panic discourse that so many of these nativist anti-immigration texts draw on, as it conjures images of the national body out-of-control and abused of its resources.<sup>218</sup> Here, the Mexican/migrant woman is made into a monstrous spectacle of fear that evades the disciplinary gaze of demography and is endlessly able to proliferate and overpopulate the planet, abusing the national body.<sup>219</sup>

The fact that Mexican/migrant women’s ‘abnormal’ birthrate is continuously framed in terms of welfare use, public cost, and illegitimacy further intensifies the paranoia associated with the “illegal alien” who produces unquantifiable “anchor babies.”<sup>220</sup> The paranoia produced by the “danger” of Mexican/migrant women’s fertility facilitates a slide with the “welfare queen” discourse, while simultaneously magnifying the threat, suggesting that the Mexican/migrant mother is perhaps *more* dangerous than the “welfare queen” since the birth rates of Black women are frequently compared to those of Mexican women. Mac Donald, for example, states that though Black families still use more welfare and commit more crimes, “the black population is not growing.”<sup>221</sup> This comparison is meant to incite nativist and white supremacist fear of Mexican/migrant mothers, for they are even “worse” than the contained stock character of the Black “welfare queen.” It is also meant to convey that Mexican/migrant women only desire the nation because of the “magnet” of the welfare state, which is meant to portray them as illegitimately or greedily using state resources. Mac Donald exemplifies this sentiment claiming, “It is the Yanqui dollar, not untasted freedom, that brings the vast majority of illegals here.”<sup>222</sup>

Mexican/migrant women's fertility also mobilizes paranoia for the future by framing it in terms of "demographic warfare" and "the browning of America."<sup>223</sup> This is evidenced by the repeated sentiment that the white population is less of a majority because of Mexican/migrant women's higher fertility rates, which in 2050 will finally kill white hegemony in the US. Buchanan frequently reiterates, "By 2050 Americans of European descent will be a minority in the nation their ancestors created and built."<sup>224</sup> He claims that "white death" is occurring all throughout the West because white women are not reproducing "enough" and "Third World" women are reproducing at a much higher rate.<sup>225</sup> Referring to changing demographics in Europe, which Buchanan envisions as portending the demise of whiteness in the US, he cites an apocalyptic passage from Jean Raspail's *Camp of Saints*:

Dismissed by some as mere fantasy, Raspail's nightmare vision of the Third World invasion of the Western world has become today's reality [...] Comes now the closing chapter: the colonization of the mother countries by the children of the subject peoples that Europe once ruled.<sup>226</sup>

This nostalgic statement, mourning the loss of whiteness and colonial empire, is also tinged with an intersecting fear of miscegenation, or the merging of bodies. For example, referencing *Camp of Saints*, *The Social Contract* contributor Katharine Betts claims, "we are indeed 'all from the Ganges now.'"<sup>227</sup> In a similar, though less apocalyptic tone, Huntington mourns the end of "American identity," saying "We Americans were not what we were, and are uncertain of who we were becoming."<sup>228</sup> "We" do not even know who we are anymore because our bodies have already become impure from the invasion of the "Others." Such statements mix fear and nostalgia for the idealized past while constructing what Foucault would call a purifying discourse by referencing the narrative of contaminating the disinfected body, making the boundary between "we" Americans and "those" others even more tangible and real.<sup>229</sup>

Since the "anchor baby" has no gender, the gendered discourses of migrant degeneracies converge upon it, intensifying its threat to the future since it could be both a criminal, threatening juridical norms, and a reproductive danger, threatening natural/biological norms. Thus, the "anchor

baby” perpetuates so much paranoia through its potential danger precisely because it slides into ‘the criminal,’ ‘the violent ‘macho,’ the ‘Third World hyper-fertile woman,’ and the ‘worse-than-the-welfare queen.’ The not knowing intensifies the paranoia about the future of the white nation. Mac Donald sustains this paranoia by recounting tales of Hispanic and Mexican youth’s delinquency; “Hispanic youths, whether recent arrivals or birthright American citizens, are developing an underclass culture.”<sup>230</sup> As examples of “underclass culture,” she claims that Latino boys join gangs and commit crimes at a “higher-than-average” rate, while Latina adolescents are described as perpetuating their mothers’ supposed hyper-fertility and out-of-wedlock child-bearing.<sup>231</sup> In one statement that encompasses the convergence of both degeneracy discourses, as well as the forward-looking paranoia, she claims, “the Hispanic baby boom is certain to produce more juvenile delinquents, more school failure, more welfare use, and more teen pregnancy in the future.”<sup>232</sup> These discourses of raced and gendered degeneracy, as well as their accompanying emotions of fear of male violence and reproductive harm to the nation, converge upon the “anchor baby,” producing it as a replica of its parents and thus, a danger to the nation.

That the “anchor baby” is both young *and* a citizen further cements the futurity of the paranoid fantasies about the coming national dystopia, since like all youth, it is the future of the nation. During the construction of bourgeois adolescence at the turn of the eighteenth century, adolescence in the West emerged as a space for reformers to express their fears about the future racialized and classed citizenry of the nation.<sup>233</sup> Thus, the ‘youth’ is a constant source of paranoia and moral panic in political and social science writing.<sup>234</sup> In fact, most of the anti-immigration texts point to the U.S.-born *children* of undocumented immigrants, the “anchor babies,” as the real source of threat. For instance, one author claims that Americans only became adamant about militarizing the US-Mexico border after witnessing “the problems with first-generation native-born children of illegal aliens,” which are described as teen pregnancy, illegitimacy, and criminal activity.<sup>235</sup> Agreeing that the children of

undocumented immigrants produce “problems,” Mac Donald asserts that Mexicans’ “problems [...] worsen dramatically from the first to the second generation of Mexicans, who not only are legal but are American citizens.”<sup>236</sup> The fact that these “problems” cannot be legally removed or excluded from the nation is conceived as the real source of threat. These citations produce the “anchor baby” as a sort of infection or virus that has been “anchored” to the nation, and thus, whose belonging must be prevented in order to save the nation from the unknown future.

In addition to portraying the children of Mexican/migrants as violating the same juridical and sexual norms as their parents, the “anchor baby” discourse constructs the child as a complicit agent in the mother’s ‘crime.’ For example, “anchor babies,” like the welfare state, are also described as “magnets” that pull their “illegal alien” parents and families into the US.<sup>237</sup> Buchanan reiterates this, quoting a doctor as saying:

Illegal alien women come to the hospital in labor and drop their little anchors, each of whom pulls its illegal alien mother, father, and siblings, into permanent residency simply by being born within our borders. Anchor babies are citizens, and instantly qualify for public welfare aid.<sup>238</sup>

In this statement, the baby performs an active role by “pulling” its “illegal” family members into permanent residency and allowing them to receive welfare. This makes it seem as though the baby is complicit in the mother’s supposed “abuse” or “theft” of the welfare state. Buchanan also employs language that renders the children of migrants ‘responsible’ for the feared population growth. He says, “In the 1990s immigrants and their children are responsible for 100 % of the population growth in California, New York [...].”<sup>239</sup> Lastly, the “anchor baby” discourse perpetuates fear for the future of the white nation by conveying that the children of Mexican migrants will eventually bring over more and more of their mothers’ family members. Buchanan states:

Pregnant women who sneak in or overstay their visas automatically entitle their babies to a lifetime of benefits at the expense of U.S. taxpayers, including twelve years of free schooling. The parents stay to collect the benefits. When the child reaches eighteen, he or she can sponsor relatives coming in.”<sup>240</sup>

This statement reiterates a repeated anti-immigration trope that incites fear of chain-migration because of the implied future population increase. It also perpetuates the notion that the “anchor baby”/monster is endlessly able to proliferate, in that it can reproduce both naturally and by sponsoring more family members. Not only is the “anchor baby” bound to slide into other figures of paranoia and hatred like the hyper-reproductive ‘teen mother’ and the ‘welfare queen,’ she or he can also proliferate without biological reproduction. This further reinscribes the inhumanity of the “anchor baby”/monster, as it morphs into the fantastical spectacle of fear that reproduces degenerate bodies both naturally and unnaturally. It also references the conflation of public health discourse and anti-immigration discourse.<sup>241</sup> Like the germs that migrants from the Global South are presumed to spread, Mexicans and Latinos are themselves contagions that can spread uncontrollably through multiple forms of reproduction.

The threat of contagion is intensified since the citizen-children of undocumented migrants are constructed as the exception to the hegemonic discourse that immigrants and their children will eventually assimilate to the (Anglo) nation. Instead, the children of Mexican/migrant women are described as “in America but not of it.”<sup>242</sup> This heightens the imagined threat to the nation, and at the same time upholds the assimilationist discourse that produces whiteness/American-ness as exceptional, loved, and desired. Huntington, the author who talks most about the tragedy of the non-assimilation of the citizen-children of both undocumented and documented Mexican immigrants, claims that “Mexican immigrants and their progeny have not assimilated into American society as other immigrants did in the past and as many other immigrants are doing now.”<sup>243</sup> Non-assimilation is pathologized and constructed as a contributing factor to what Huntington calls “generational poverty.”<sup>244</sup> He claims, “In the southwest, the overwhelming bulk of Mexican immigrants have been poor, unskilled, and not well educated, and it appears that many of their offspring are likely to be similar.”<sup>245</sup> Therefore, it is not the

structural inequality of the global economy that produces poverty, it is non-assimilation, non-“Anglo-conformity.”<sup>246</sup>

### **2.3 The Inheritance of Degeneracy**

In the “anchor baby” discourse as well as the broader nativist anti-immigration discourse, the citizen children of Mexican/migrants are portrayed as threatening to the future of the nation because they replicate the monstrosities of their parents through non-assimilation. Moreover, the citizen children are constructed as even more threatening than their parents because they are citizens and thus, cannot be deported. It is important to examine the reasons the texts give for Mexican and Latino children’s non-assimilation since they not only uphold the assimilationist discourse and thus, American exceptionalism, but also contribute to the paranoid construction of a war of biological races, where the well-being of the white race and American-ness is seen as in danger of contamination and demise. Below, I will outline how the “anchor baby” discourse constructs the children of Mexican/migrant women as biologically and culturally determined to threaten the livelihood of white hegemony by inheriting the racial and sexual degeneracies of their parents.

First, the texts produce the Mexican or Latino family as the abnormality that renders “anchor babies” permanently threatening to the functionality of the nation. This is accomplished by constructing Mexican/migrant women’s children as doomed victims of degenerate familial structures, intersecting with discourses that deem degeneracy and monstrosity to be inherited from generation to generation.<sup>247</sup> This is evident above all in Mac Donald’s continuous reiteration that the “social problems” evident in Hispanic families, such as illegitimacy, teen pregnancy, and criminal activity, not only continue but also worsen into the second, third, and fourth generations.<sup>248</sup> Intersecting with discourses that demonize and pathologize the Black family, these “social problems” are deemed to be inherited via parenting and “family values.” For example, according to Mac Donald, Mexican-American youth’s supposed poor school performance derives from “parents who don’t demand rigorous academic

application and don't stand up to corrosive popular influences."<sup>249</sup> Like the pathologization of the Black family, this caricature is written into academic writing. For example, law professor Lino Graglia, who also writes about the unconstitutionality of birthright citizenship, recently came under fire for voicing his long held opinion that single working Latina and Black mothers are to blame for their children's low school performance.<sup>250</sup>

In addition to the supposed non-interference of the Mexican/Hispanic family, the texts also construct the family as productive of illicit sexuality and non-heteronormativity. One of the main ways that the Mexican/Hispanic family is produced as abnormal and threatening is the continuous reiteration that "Hispanic illegitimacy is epidemic."<sup>251</sup> The term "epidemic" relates back to the fear produced in discussing the endless and unquantifiable proliferation of Mexican/migrant women. An epidemic is largely invisible though it is invasive, contaminating everyone exposed to it. If illegitimacy is epidemic, then it could spread to the rest of society, contaminating the exceptionality of the heteronormative nuclear family, the supposed bedrock of civilization. Once again, this relentless focus on illegitimacy and fatherless children as a social problem intersects with the rightwing demonization of Black mothers for not marrying their way out of poverty, which is a well-documented discourse that perpetuates heteronormative marriage as the gateway to prosperity, "happiness," and civic order.<sup>252</sup> In an overt example of this intersection of discourses, Mac Donald notes the high rate of intergenerational "illegitimacy" and teenage pregnancy, claiming, "The vaunted Latino family is coming to resemble the Black family."<sup>253</sup> Along with reinforcing the "worse-than-welfare queen" discourse, this reveals an overt white supremacist logic that commends the mythical white bourgeois family as the organizing principle of an "exceptional" civilization.<sup>254</sup> Also, like the comparison of Mexican migrants to 'terrorists,' the discursive contact between 'welfare queens' and 'illegal aliens' furthers the racialization of both figures as not valuable, and thus disposable to the nation-state.

In explaining why illegitimacy and teenage pregnancy endure through generations, Mac Donald continues to blame the ‘abnormal’ Hispanic familial structure, claiming, “The most powerful Hispanic family value—the tightknit extended family—facilitates unwed child-rearing.”<sup>255</sup> She also blames the sexuality of the Hispanic family (or what she is calling the sexuality of the Hispanic family), illustrating its inferior sexuality to what she deems as normative “family values.” She claims:

Social workers report that the impregnators of younger Hispanic women are with some regularity their uncles, not necessarily seen as a bad thing by the mother’s family. Alternatively, the father may be the boyfriend of the girl’s mother, who then continues to stay with the grandmother. Older men seek out young girls in the belief that a virgin cannot get pregnant during her first intercourse, and to avoid sexually transmitted diseases.<sup>256</sup>

The discursive construction of the Hispanic family’s degeneracy not only demonstrates how the normalization of familial sexuality works to produce monstrous sexual degenerates. It also echoes Ann Laura Stoler’s retelling of *The History of Sexuality* to account for how the European bourgeois self was constructed partly through discourses that put the self-contained, correctly sexually repressed, self-disciplined Western European family in contradistinction to the production of colonial subjects as savage, unrestrained, and threatening to the whiteness of Europeans in colonies.<sup>257</sup> The discourses that prescribe the “correct” bourgeois family emerge from the power and control exercised on and through “the abnormal,” especially the onanist, who exemplifies unrestrained adolescent sexuality and the need for the parental unit to regulate sexuality.<sup>258</sup> In these anti-immigration texts Mexican migrant mothers do not properly train their children to restrict their fertility to the desired 2.1 children per woman, they do not interfere in their children’s lives to instill self-discipline and restraint, and they allow perverse older men (another Foucauldian object of knowledge and target of control) to sexually abuse their daughters, reproducing more abnormal. These texts echo Stoler’s examples of the colonial texts that warned European families how to live in the tropics without becoming contaminated by the natives. Similar to how the European bourgeois subject was simultaneously produced as superior to both the inferior colonized peoples *and* the Europeans living in the colonies who had somehow been “tainted” by

degenerate sexuality, the anti-immigration texts produce the white heteronormative family as possessing the “correct” sexuality, leaving especially Mexican/migrants and their children but also all non-heteronormative people as contributing to the demise of the nation.

The discourse of the sexualized abnormality of the Hispanic family is also steeped in a discourse of biological/cultural racism that pervades a broad array of anti-immigration texts, producing the “anchor baby” as a monster that not only is doomed to degeneracy because of its family, but also is utterly irredeemable because of its biology/culture. Biological racism is a central thread of anti-immigration discourse, as the inferiority of people of color—both immigrants and citizens—is constantly justified by tired white supremacist tropes like lower IQ and school test scores as well as “propensity” for violence.<sup>259</sup> Race, however, is not the only category that is deemed to have fixed, biological traits that are transmitted through reproduction, culture is deemed to also “function like nature.”<sup>260</sup> In this discourse, biological determinism folds into cultural determinism, making both nature and nurture determinative of degeneracy. For example, using the *Clash of Civilizations* paradigm, Buchanan and Brimelow conflate race, nationality, and culture, rendering all of them biologically determined and essentially unable to coexist peacefully with whiteness. In explaining why the U.S. should be wary of too many non-white foreigners, Brimelow states, “cultural patterns are pervasive, powerful, and remarkably persistent.”<sup>261</sup> Buchanan explains the incompatibility of Mexican/migrants and their children by saying that, “Mexicans not only come from another culture, but millions are of another race.”<sup>262</sup> Huntington, the creator of the *Clash of Civilizations* paradigm, claims that there is bound to be future turmoil because “profound differences exist between Mexican and American values and culture.”<sup>263</sup> Biological racism and the biological transmission of cultures are key discourses that advocate for the rigid regulation of citizenship since anti-immigration proponents believe that “political ideologies are inevitably transmitted through biological reproduction,” and that the co-existence of too many different racialized and cultured political ideologies will create national havoc.<sup>264</sup>

These reiterations of biological and cultural racism, coupled with the discourse on the Hispanic family, echoes both Ann Laura Stoler's and Nancy Lesko's notion that the rearing of children is regulated by discourses about the maintenance of the purity of the race and the nation, as well as the production of proper citizens.<sup>265</sup> These statements also exemplify that only white bourgeois families—or those who assimilate to this construct—are deemed capable of producing such an ideal child and thus, an ideal future for the nation. As demonstrated by the authors' paranoia over the children of Mexican/migrants' potential harm to the nation, the “anchor babies” monstrosity is deemed permanent, irredeemable, and incompatible with white ‘civilization.’ The discursive permanence and incompatibility of the “anchor baby’s” monstrosity conveys that the children of Mexican migrants cannot be a part of the nation that they have already infected by being born citizens; they must be kept on the outside of citizenship to preserve its exceptionality. Once again merging immunity-as-exception with immunity-as-defense, the “anchor baby” discourse positions the citizen children of undocumented migrants as needing to be relegated to the spaces of exception as a mode of inoculating the national body from the harm that they could inflict on it.

#### **2.4 Conclusion: The Expansion of Illegality**

This chapter has argued that the “anchor baby” discourse enacts a biopolitical war of the races where Mexican/migrants and their citizen children are constructed as infringing on the Anglo-Protestant population, which is imagined as the rightful core of the nation. The “anchor baby” discourse criminalizes and illegalizes the children of Mexican/migrant women, constructing them as irredeemable and a permanent threat to the US since their monstrosity is deemed to be inherited both biologically through their race and culture and generationally through the ‘abnormal’ familial structure of the Hispanic family. Moreover, the ideological construction of an internal enemy to the nation is co-constructed along the lines of paranoia, which materializes a clear boundary between “Us,” exceptional heteronormative Anglo-Protestant Americans, and “Them,” those inferior/degenerate/monstrous

peoples who interfere with their well-being and proliferation. In addition, the portrayal of monstrosity in terms of contagion and epidemic necessitates the need to defend the nation through inoculation by using the law to limit birthright citizenship. The fact that the “anchor baby” has already penetrated the borders of the nation and become permanent recalls the body’s use of immunity to defend itself against threats to its health that have already taken residence in the body. Therefore, the pundits and politicians in my sample claim that the solution for “solving the ‘anchor baby’ racket,” as Buchanan terms it, is to revoke citizenship for the children of undocumented migrants.<sup>266</sup> Coinciding with the ‘letting die’ side of biopower, this would place a growing population of people in the position of illegality, thrusting them into “bare life” where they would be “cast into a state of indeterminacy that is simultaneously inside and outside the law.”<sup>267</sup> In other words, the citizen-children of Mexican/migrant women are cast into spaces of exception in order to reinforce the power of the rule of law. This effectively expands the political category of illegality, but what does this expansion entail? What rule of law of citizenship is upheld through excepting the “anchor baby”?

To conclude, I argue that the “anchor baby” discourse’s expansion of illegality does not just exercise power *on* “anchor babies” by attempting to quarantine them from the white population in order to save the future from “the browning of America.”<sup>268</sup> Its intersections with broader anti-immigration and rightwing discourses on the proper sexuality of the family simultaneously produce the “anchor baby” as a disciplinary technique for society as a whole, solidifying an exclusionary logic of citizenship in the United States and erecting solid walls around citizenship. As Puar and Rai state in regards to the production of the Muslim/terrorist/monster as a tool for the construction of a heteronormative hyper-patriotism, “discourses that would mobilize monstrosity as a screen for otherness are always involved in circuits of normalizing power as well.”<sup>269</sup> Lauren Berlant makes a similar claim, arguing that the demonization of abject populations is used in public discourse as a way to

mobilize the privatization of citizenship, where the heteronormative family is the main vehicle for the enactment of citizenship.<sup>270</sup>

The anti-immigration texts that I analyze for this essay deploy the idealized heteronormative family as the core of the United States, which must defend itself from the abject and monstrous Mexican/migrant women and their “anchor babies” to avoid the impending turmoil of 2050. This discursive construction of citizenship does not just exclude a population from citizenship; it simultaneously disciplines all members of society into internalizing the power structures of “privatized” or “intimate citizenship,” as Berlant calls it. More than just privatizing citizenship, however, this discourse builds a wall around it, regulating and categorizing people into ‘worthy’ and ‘unworthy,’ ‘safe’ and ‘threatening.’ If we accept that we must remove citizenship as an access point to the social state for those who do not ‘deserve’ it, then we are accepting that citizenship to the state is only reserved for those who can afford it. Given that citizenship discourses and practices work to both quarantine and discipline society’s leftovers *and* the targets of the biopolitical state, we must not ignore it as an organizing principle of society. It is imperative that we interrogate the logic of citizenship that is driving the “anchor baby” discourse.

### 3 THE WILL TO LOVE: *JUS SOLI* AND LIBERAL CONSENT

“We, the people, recognize that we have responsibilities as well as rights; that our destinies are bound together; that a freedom which only asks what’s in it for me, a freedom without commitment to others, a freedom without love or charity or duty or patriotism, is unworthy of our founding ideals, and those who died in their defense.”

--Barack Obama

“Citizenship without emotional attachment is the civic equivalent of a one-night stand.”

--Stanley Renshon

“Who, being loved, is poor?”

--Oscar Wilde

The last chapter left off by asking, how do the discourses that produce the “anchor baby” as “illegal” and produce citizenship as in need of more solid enclosures construct proper citizenship? In other words, if the “anchor baby” is thrust to the outside of citizenship, then what is the inside? This chapter takes up these questions by examining how citizenship and thus, implicitly illegality, are constructed in the argument to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment.

Though I am still pulling from my archive of right-wing anti-immigration punditry, I also examine Congress’ 2005 committee hearing assessing Georgia Representative Nathan Deal’s proposed HR 698— “to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deny citizenship at birth to those children born in the United States to parents who are not citizens or permanent resident aliens.”<sup>271</sup> The committee panelists are voices of authority who constitute and reproduce the “anchor baby” discourse as they publish academic articles, testify for official committees, and contribute to key sites of discursive circulation like The Center for Immigration Studies (CIS). Though the panelists do not overtly cite the rightwing pundits on whom the last chapter was focused, the rightwing pundits like Patrick Buchanan, Peter Brimelow, and Michelle Malkin cite the panelists as legitimate sources of knowledge, highlighting the interdependent relationship between ‘mainstream’ political discourse and media that tends to get classified as ‘far-right’ or ‘extreme.’ In the committee, the panelists discuss the constitutionality of birthright citizenship as well as whether the current War on Terror and increase in undocumented

migration—and subsequent reproduction—necessitate a reinterpretation. These two inciters of panic and paranoia, the War on Terror and the constant calculation of increasing undocumented migration, help to propel the paranoid dialectic between love of country and fear of invasion into bursts of panic, demanding that the force of law be deployed to protect the nation-state from what Peter Schuck calls “citizen terrorists.”<sup>272</sup>

Even though the call to deploy the force of law to limit birthright citizenship is not new, many legal scholars credit law and political science professors Peter Schuck and Rogers Smith’s 1985 book, *Citizenship without Consent: Illegal Aliens in the American Polity*, as integral in reigniting the argument to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, especially within the last two decades.<sup>273</sup> Schuck and Smith’s arguments have subsequently been taken up and recirculated by other restrictionist legal scholars like Lino Graglia and John Eastman as well as right-wing pundits like Patrick Buchanan, Peter Brimelow and his V-DARE, John Tanton and his Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), Numbers USA, CIS, and The Social Contract Press, Michelle Malkin, Anne Coulter, and many more. First, Schuck and Smith argue that the “massive increase in illegal immigration to the United States and the equally dramatic rise of the welfare state” have rendered the inclusiveness of the birthright citizenship clause detrimental to the nation-state.<sup>274</sup> Second, they argue that the citizenship clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment was never intended to grant birthright citizenship to every child born in the US since its only intent was to impede states from denying former slaves and their children full citizenship.<sup>275</sup> Nevertheless, they argue that *jus soli* citizenship for the children of undocumented migrants contradicts the US’s liberal tradition of “consensual citizenship” as well as the “subject to jurisdiction” clause of the amendment, which in their opinion mandates allegiance, or a “genuine connection” to the state—one that is deemed nonexistent or deficient in the children of undocumented migrants.<sup>276</sup>

This chapter argues that love, which comprises one of the affective poles of the paranoid dialectic between American exceptionalism and fear of invasion, is often premised as the litmus test for

a “genuine connection” to the nation-state. According to Elizabeth Povinelli, love, especially its liberal reiteration as choice-based, transcendent, monogamous, and romantic, is an intimate and a political event; it is a “liberal mode of self-abstraction and social unity.”<sup>277</sup> Love is positioned as social glue, or as what sticks people together, most of all motivating what Povinelli terms “a higher civilizational form.”<sup>278</sup> The reinterpretation argument positions national love as cohering heterogeneous bodies together into one national body through the ideal of American exceptionalism and patriotism. For example, “patriotic assimilation,” or becoming an exceptional American who believes in and enacts all of the country’s ideals, is constantly upheld as proof that one loves the US, therefore possessing a “genuine connection.”<sup>279</sup> The panel also positions love as intricately related to fear and exclusion, illustrating Sara Ahmed’s claim that anxiety, as an effect of love’s impossibility, gets displaced onto objects of fear “which seems to present themselves from the outside as dangers that should be avoided, and as obstacles to the fulfillment of love itself.”<sup>280</sup> For example, patriotic love is positioned as driving the movement to reinterpret the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, highlighting how in the “anchor baby” discourse love of country is expressed by fearing and excluding Others.<sup>281</sup>

This chapter will also discuss desire in relation to love, even though more attention will be given to love. Desire, though often categorized as fleeting or frivolous, is an integral part of the formation of love. It adds a bodily component, signaling which objects are lovable or not lovable. This is why Eithne Luibhéid and Siobhan Somerville both claim that immigration and citizenship laws shape desirable and undesirable migrants according to racist and heteronormative logics that will ultimately reproduce the exclusionary and disciplinary technologies of the state.<sup>282</sup> Desire also connotes want, and when used in a sexual context, it could signal wanting to merge with another body. Patrick Buchanan illustrates the interconnectedness of love, desire, and exceptionalism in these texts. In explaining why the US is doomed to demise because of non-assimilation, Patrick Buchanan laments that “many [new migrants] bring with them no love of America or any desire to be one of us.”<sup>283</sup> In the context of the quotation,

love is conceived of as an emotional alignment with American exceptionalism, while desire is the movement towards 'us' or the merging of the foreign body with the national body so that after a while it is no longer foreign.

The imbrication of love, desire, and exceptionalism is why value is so integral to the theorization of love and desire, as well as to racialization and criminalization. Following Brian Massumi, Felicity Amaya Schaeffer characterizes desire as "an act of becoming, of movement, of enacting oneself in the world through the image of how one is valued on a global stage."<sup>284</sup> Desiring entails enacting and demonstrating value; I desire you because I value you. Regarding love, Sara Ahmed argues that the delineation of an object of love sticks a collective together, valorizing both the collective and the object.<sup>285</sup> Love outlines the ideal, simultaneously approximating the beloved to that ideal, validating the beloved. Therefore, both love and desire are tied into value-making as well as devaluing. Moreover, the interconnectedness of love, desire, and value also illuminates the panel's and pundit's description of citizenship in the US as "precious" and as a "gift."<sup>286</sup> Citizenship is constructed as something valuable that should not just be given away to anyone, but only to those who are truly worthy of it, those who have patriotically assimilated, demonstrating their value through their love. This is partly accomplished by the construction of citizenship as the mode of receiving what Mimi Thi Nguyen calls the "gift of freedom."<sup>287</sup> Nguyen conceptualizes the gift of freedom as "an assemblage of liberal political philosophies, regimes of representation, and structures of enforcement that measure and manufacture freedom and its others."<sup>288</sup> Importantly, the benevolent empire's gift of freedom positions the recipient in a perpetual state of debt to the giver.<sup>289</sup> As I will show below, citizenship as a point of access to the gift of freedom erects a 'will to love' the nation-state as a condition of the indebtedness that it orchestrates.<sup>290</sup>

However, the fact that one can be born into the gift of citizenship despite one's status as the child of an undocumented Mexican/migrant complicates its exceptionality and its status as a gift.

Moreover, as opponents of birthright citizenship claim, the conferral of the gift of citizenship to anyone “cheapens” it.<sup>291</sup> Is it a gift if just anyone can receive it? This effort to continuously construct citizenship as exceptional and only for exceptional subjects, I argue, is how the will to love the nation-state and its gifts functions as a disciplinary mechanism for society as a whole, categorizing both migrants and citizens into valuable or disposable subjectivities: “freedom lovers,” using Nguyen’s terminology, and freedom haters/freedom exploiters.<sup>292</sup> In other words, the “anchor baby” discourse’s mobilization of the will to love the nation-state is a central mode of organizing racialized and sexualized bodies as valuable, productive members of society or as disposable and most of all threatening Others.

Following both Sara Ahmed and Elizabeth Povinelli’s theorizations of political love, this chapter shows that the ‘will to love’ evident in the “anchor baby” discourse, which Povinelli argues is an integral part of liberal governance, furthers the privatization and securing of citizenship as well as the assignment of illegality to racialized collectives.<sup>293</sup> First, I trace the two main tenets of the reinterpretation argument, that the children of undocumented migrants are not “subject to jurisdiction” and that *jus soli* deprives the nation-state of consent, arguing that both construct proper citizenship not as membership to a state where one possesses a combination of rights, duties, and privileges, but as an affective bond that both the citizen feels for the state and the state feels for the citizen. The “subject to jurisdiction” argument constructs both the migrant and her child as loving or not loving the state dependent on racialized and sexualized notions of what Jonathan Inda calls “the new prudentialism,” or idealized citizenship in the post-social state where the state makes individuals and communities accountable for their well-being.<sup>294</sup> This logic relies on the discursive construction of money as devaluing love and intimacy, as well as a culturalist racism that devalues Mexican/migrant women and their children’s membership to the state in order to extract value from their labor. The “consent” argument constructs the nation-state as a desiring and loving body that must consent to a migrant mother’s presence in order to render her child worthy of citizenship. As I will show, the argument for

consent reinforces liberal notions of a love and choice-based nation-state as it masks the violence of illegality. I conclude by juxtaposing “the Hamdi case,” which the panelists and pundits cite as an emergency reason why citizenship law must merge with national security, and Mimi Thi Nguyen’s examination of “the refugee patriot” Viet D. Dinh. These two cases show how ‘the will to love’ and the ‘will to fear’ operate in tandem as the poles of imperial paranoia, mobilizing the need to defend against the unlovable and discipline the loveable. In other words, this chapter ends by bringing together the two poles of paranoia, further explicating how they work together in the “anchor baby” discourse.

Ultimately this chapter follows contemporary scholars of affect like Ann Laura Stoler, showing that political sentiments and emotions are “not metaphors for something else but instrumental as ‘dense transfer points of power’ in themselves (a term Michel Foucault uses to describe, not ‘structures of feeling,’ but the power inherent in discourses of sexuality).”<sup>295</sup> In other words, political emotions are like skin that “work to shape the ‘surfaces’ of individual and collective bodies.”<sup>296</sup> Emotions like national love fuel the biopolitics of the nation-state, shaping ‘we’ the nation and ‘them’ as Others along white supremacist and heteronormative lines.

### **3.1 “Subject to Jurisdiction”: The Politics of Love, Monogamy, and Value**

As mentioned above, the panelists in the House Committee on Dual Citizenship and Birthright Citizenship define the “subject to jurisdiction” clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment as a condition of “total and exclusive allegiance” to the US.<sup>297</sup> Allegiance is primarily defined by emotional attachment and identification with American values, beliefs, and opportunities, components that I argue comprise the ideological thrust of the gift of freedom. Allegiance is imagined as an unwavering belief in and love for the excellence and infallibility of what Samuel Huntington calls the “American Creed,” or the core American principles of liberty, equality, individualism, representative government, and private property.<sup>298</sup> For example, panelist Stanley Renshon, a political psychology professor at CUNY and a contributor to the CIS, claims that “emotional attachment to the American national community is the

foundation of U.S. citizenship, this country's institutions, its way of life."<sup>299</sup> Renshon and the other panelists who argue in favor of the legislation, John Eastman and John Fonte—both of whom are law professors—conflate this emotional attachment with patriotism, or love of country, which Renshon defines as “a warmth and affection for, an appreciation of, a justifiable but not excessive pride in, and a commitment and responsibility to the United States, its institutions, its way of life and aspirations, and its citizens.”<sup>300</sup> These statements coincide with Patrick Buchanan and other anti-immigration pundits' contentions that patriotism is the foundation of citizenship. Buchanan claims, “patriotism is the soul of a nation [...] It is a passionate attachment to one's own country—its land, its people, its past, its heroes, literature, language, traditions, culture, and customs.”<sup>301</sup> In other words, citizens of the US emerge as a distinct unified group through a shared affective orientation towards the nation-state, which Sara Ahmed characterizes as “national love.”<sup>302</sup> Like most emotions, national love is often erased from analyses of political rhetoric and discourse because emotions are thought to be intimate and private. However, Elizabeth Povinelli characterizes love as a central technology of governance in liberal societies like the US.<sup>303</sup> She posits, “love, as an intimate event, secures the self-evident good of social institutions, social distributions of life and death, and social responsibilities for these institutions and distributions.”<sup>304</sup> Love delineates boundaries between groups of people as lovers, beloved, and Others (those who neither love nor are loved), while it also creates proper subjectivities in relation to the state.

Moreover, the love that the potential citizen is willed to cultivate for the nation-state and its gifts is not a pluralist “agape” love for all things, but a more romantic, exclusive kind of love. I argue that it is even a romantically jealous love since the citizen must direct all of its love towards the US and disavow all other former objects of national love. This is evident in the committee's conflation of the “problem” of birthright citizenship with the “problem” of dual citizenship; the panelists and proponents of the bill contend that the citizenship clause's emphasis on allegiance necessitates that the American citizen relinquish all former allegiances. For example, Eastman claims that the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment's

original exemption of Native Americans proves that American citizens must only have one allegiance, saying “the children of Indians who still ‘belong[ed] to a tribal relation’ and hence owed allegiance to another sovereign (however dependent the sovereign was) would not qualify for citizenship under the clause.”<sup>305</sup> This is why the legislators want to establish the Oath of Allegiance as the “law of the land,” to “remind all Americans—recent immigrants and life-long citizens alike—that pursuing the American dream requires a full-time commitment to citizenship.”<sup>306</sup> Siobhan Somerville likens the language of the Oath of Allegiance used during naturalization procedures to traditional marriage vows since both mandate fidelity and obligation, establishing “an exclusive—one might even say ‘monogamous’—relationship to the other party.”<sup>307</sup> Here, the national love constructed by the committee mirrors our culture’s idealization of heteronormative love and romance where the beloved and the lover are monogamous and exclusive, consummating their love in the formal and state-sanctioned act of marriage (or the Oath of Allegiance).

The mandate of monogamous national love enables Eastman to blame the state’s exclusion and violence towards historically oppressed groups of people on the groups themselves; Native Americans were not denied citizenship because of the genocidal campaign to eradicate them from their historic homeland, but because they were not monogamous with the nation-state. This not only dangerously whitewashes US colonialist history, but it also provides a rationale for the current attempt to exclude the US-born children of undocumented Mexican migrants. If the state requires absolute monogamy, then any sort of infraction, any glance or feeling of affection towards another nation or ethnic group can result in exclusion from citizenship. Love becomes integral to the infinite waiting required upon receipt of “the gift of freedom” that Nguyen theorizes so well.<sup>308</sup> As mentioned above, the gift of freedom positions the receiver (the citizen, the refugee, or the legalized migrant) in an indebted relationship to the giver (the nation-state) where the giver gains “both *power over* and *power over time*,” troubling “the recipient far into the foreseeable future.”<sup>309</sup> Professing adequate love for the nation-state is a part of

(never) reciprocating the gift of freedom, since loving the nation-state is an infinite process of gratitude where the lover is in a continual emotional debt to the beloved and only the beloved. The lover must continue to prove his or her monogamous love lest the lover be categorized as not loving, which could result in the erasure of subjectivity and the perception of “asking to be given something sacred in return for nothing at all.”<sup>310</sup>

The monogamy mandate also racializes proper citizenship as white even as the committee attempts to eradicate race and ethnicity from the discussion of citizenship. Even though the migrants and citizens that the House committee problematizes are decidedly racialized and sexualized “types” of people, the panelists and legislators are careful to explain that national love is not related to blood-ties, race, or ethnicity. Instead, the speakers reiterate that the US is a nation of ideas and affiliations, not shared ethnicity, exemplifying that love, not blood, holds us together. For example, Renshon cites anti-immigration author Tamar Jacoby, stating “we are a unique nation not by blood or ancestry, but by a shared set of ideas.”<sup>311</sup> Law professor John Fonte claims, “We are a civic Nation, a Nation that is held together by civic bonds, not by ethnic bonds.”<sup>312</sup> However, the committee’s mandate that allegiance necessarily involves a disavowal of all other national ties—that one be monogamous to the nation-state—explicitly frames their discursive construction of citizenship in racial and ethnic terms. The American citizen must “turn away” from any meaningful engagement with other nation-states or non-hegemonic ethnic groups within the nation-state.<sup>313</sup> Ahmed suggests that “turning away,” or affectively orienting oneself away from an object of fear is often constructed as an act of love, as an act of “turning towards home” and thus, creating a “fellow feeling.”<sup>314</sup> As “home” is constructed as centrally Anglo for pundits like Huntington, Brimelow, and Buchanan, and centrally ‘non-racialized’ for the panelists, turning towards home and away from others is conceived of as turning towards whiteness or towards a post-racial fantasy. Sherene Razack illuminates this, claiming that according to the logic of liberalism, “the ideal citizen is an individual without any sort of group-based identity,” and that the ideal that the

nation should be comprised of unified, homogenous, and nonracial bodies is “highly compatible with a white-supremacist agenda.”<sup>315</sup>

In fact, adhering to racial and ethnic identities, *not* turning exclusively towards an Anglicized America as home, produces fear and suspicion that one does not exclusively love the nation-state. This is evident in the attempt to regulate monogamy to the US in broader conservative politics through the mandate to eradicate and illegalize ethnic studies for fear that such fields breed ethnic solidarity over American solidarity and hatred for the state and its canonized history.<sup>316</sup> In fact, both Renshon *and* the committee’s dissenting voice, Democratic Representative Sheila Jackson Lee, agree that students should be taught more exclusively “American” history in order to foster the correct emotional ties to the state.<sup>317</sup> Therefore, even though biological conceptions of race and culture are still tacitly present, whiteness in these contexts is not constructed as a static biological entity that only manifests itself in pigmentation and genetic transmission, but instead as an achieved status, that can be accomplished by affectively orienting oneself towards the “American Creed” and turning away from one’s multifarious ethnic and cultural ties. The panelists calls this “patriotic assimilation,” while pundits that are more candid like Samuel Huntington and Patrick Buchanan call it “becoming white.”<sup>318</sup>

Sara Ahmed conceives of national love as an act of becoming like the object of love.<sup>319</sup> The object of love is idealized in a way that conflates lover with beloved so that the lover can approximate the ideal through his or her beloved.<sup>320</sup> Thus, this logic of love does not exclude from citizenship the children of Mexican migrants based on their race or ethnicity, but it instead constructs a will to love and thus, become white, and a will to turn away from all other ethnic, racial, and political ties that *could* cause one to turn away from the US. However, the imperative to “become white” through national love is not necessarily an aesthetic homogenization or even a will to completely turn away from one’s ethnicity or race. In fact, a certain amount of divergence from hegemonic whiteness is not only tolerated, but is also brought into being through discourses of diversity and what Nguyen calls

“transnational multiculturalism.”<sup>321</sup> The catch is that these exhibitions of multiculturalism and diversity must ultimately serve and reproduce the nation-state as beloved granter of freedom and liberal democracy. Instead, becoming like the object of love is a more deep-seated political erasure of histories of imperialism and colonialism that have marked bodies and psyches in ways that may not be conducive to love. For example, the panelists and pundits oppose ethnic studies not because it diverts our attention from whiteness, but instead because it exposes histories of colonialism and injustice; it reveals that the “gift of freedom” is tied to war-making and genocide. Therefore, becoming like the beloved nation-state is less about identifying oneself as “white,” and more about lovingly orienting oneself towards whiteness and the US. It is about affectively orienting oneself towards American exceptionalism and thus, American mythologies of benevolent pilgrims and virgin land. To do otherwise would be to expose the nation-state as not exceptional, as an unworthy object of love.

The committee’s rationale for excluding the children of undocumented mothers from citizenship based on allegiance also shows how national love proves the worth of the lover, while it simultaneously makes the nation-state worthy of love. According to Ahmed, “love creates the ideality of the object,” which in turn creates value for the subject.<sup>322</sup> National love constructs the ideal nation-state, which then valorizes the citizen-subject, making him or her worthy of membership to the nation-state. As mentioned above, value is an important analytic for conceptualizing national love since it enables us to see how certain racialized and sexualized subjects, like Mexican migrant women and their children, are rendered valueless partly because of their perceived non-love for the nation-state. Following Lindon Barrett, Lisa Marie Cacho explains that value is intelligible relationally, where something must be devalued in order to assign value to an object.<sup>323</sup> In order for citizenship and the nation-state to be intelligible as valuable, there must be “an ‘other’ of value because ‘for value, negativity is a *resource*,’ an essential resource.”<sup>324</sup>

In the “anchor baby” discourse, Mexican migrant women and their children are deployed as value’s other, as well as active devaluers of citizenship; “[the] policy of giving the children of illegal aliens citizenship cheapens one of the most basic building blocks of our Republic.”<sup>325</sup> Through the will to love, those who love the nation-state are rendered valuable, while those who are constructed as unloving are rendered disposable not only because they do not love, but also because they are always and already constructed as waste. Melissa Wright characterizes “the myth of the disposable Third World woman” (which for the panel and the pundits is racialized as Mexican) as “a dialectic image built on both waste and value.”<sup>326</sup> She generates value through her labor, yet she is always becoming worthless; she is perpetually wasting away as she produces valuable products for global capital. Yet, recalling Nicholas De Genova’s theorization of the enforcement of immigration law as creating a “revolving door,” her disposability is tied explicitly to her value as a laborer.<sup>327</sup> This is precisely why De Genova links deportability, the everyday condition of being labeled as “illegal,” with disposability.<sup>328</sup> Therefore, just as non-monogamy becomes the rationale for exclusion, masking the racialization of proper citizenship, disposability masks the violence of illegality, constructing as disposable Mexican migrants who have already been made disposable through the logic of capitalism.

Not only jealous and valorizing, national love is also paranoid love since it shapes the nation-state as exceptional and utterly deserving of the citizen’s unconditional love (it is a gift), while it also relies on a fear of interlopers and citizens/migrants who do not love the US.<sup>329</sup> For example, Patrick Buchanan describes 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century European immigrants as “carrying a burning desire to be part of the American people.”<sup>330</sup> However, he claims that “today’s immigrants, mostly illegal and mostly from Mexico,” are anti-assimilationist and anti-American values.<sup>331</sup> Michelle Malkin contrasts “the salt of the Earth” towards which the US has “historically shown generosity” and “the scum of the Earth,” who have “exploited ruthlessly” American benevolence.<sup>332</sup> By “the scum of the Earth,” she means criminalized working-class migrants from Mexico, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia; in other words,

those who have been constructed as potential terrorist threats through post-9/11 racial panics in order to control, regulate, and discipline racialized labor.<sup>333</sup> The panel shows that both migrants and citizens can be characterized as not displaying the correct affect for the nation-state since it specifically problematizes the children of undocumented migrants and dual citizens like Yaser Esam Hamdi as archetypal racialized “alien citizens,” or what Mae Ngai calls an American citizen by virtue of birth whose citizenship is suspect or denied because of the racialized identity of his or her immigrant ancestry.<sup>334</sup> The committee, as well as the anti-immigration discourses from which it stems, question these citizens’ ability to adequately love the nation-state because of their position within the welfare state as well as their racialized status as children of migrants from the Global South, both of which construct them as not generating value for the state.

First, Mexican migrant women and their children are deemed incapable of true patriotic love because of their supposed overuse of state resources. The House committee repeats and reinforces the thrust of the “anchor baby” discourse, counting the number of births to undocumented Mexican women and reading statistics about the supposed cost to tax-paying-citizens for state resources like Medicaid, public school, and welfare.<sup>335</sup> Moreover, the committee also reiterates that undocumented women migrate in order to reap the benefits of the welfare state.<sup>336</sup> For example, one congressman laments the harm to citizenship caused by “anchor babies,” lamenting “the offense to common morality and common sense of conferring citizenship on children whose only connection to the United States is that their mothers crossed the border in time to give birth here.”<sup>337</sup> As Mexican migrant and citizen labor produces value for the US economy, their spatial presence and use of state resources is deemed to perpetuate waste, devaluing both citizenship and the state.

The discursive construction of non-love through the use of state resources also emerges from the mainstream US’s cultural contention that monetary gain and economic exploitation are inherently incompatible, even hostile, to sentimental values like love and sexual intimacy.<sup>338</sup> Viviana Zelizer argues

that the notion that love and money reside in separate spheres and even contaminate each other when they come into contact is written into marriage law, social science writing, and popular culture.<sup>339</sup>

Renshon most echoes this sentiment as he explains that true allegiance entails loving the country no matter what it gives in return. He says,

A national identification allows people to weather the storms that they go through; it allows support for the country during the hard times. It's in a sense like an emotional bank account which isn't related to a *quid pro quo* of what can you do for me lately. No government and especially no democratic government can survive on what it gives with regard to goodies.<sup>340</sup>

This denunciation of *quid pro quo* reiterates marriage laws that regulate the exchange of money between spouses, mandating that any monetary exchange must be considered a gift.<sup>341</sup> This further elucidates the ties between “the gift of freedom” and the love-debt that it necessitates.<sup>342</sup> Citizens and migrants who wish to be citizens should unconditionally love the nation-state for the gifts of freedom and democracy that it has freely bestowed upon them, never expecting anything from the giver of freedom.

Renshon's testimony, coupled with the larger “anchor baby” discourse and widespread demonization of “welfare queens” that casts Black and Latina women who use state resources as the cause of recessions and financial crises and inadequate contributors to society, constructs citizenship as a selfless love for the nation that needs no reciprocation. For this reason, Ahmed characterizes national love as “a form of waiting,” where the failure of the nation to return its promise of the good life only increases one's investment in the nation.<sup>343</sup> Like the Christian who waits piously for the return of Christ, the ideal citizen must wait lovingly for the American dream. Most importantly, one must wait prudently, embodying the liberal ideal of self-reliance and ‘rugged individualism,’ which mandates personal responsibility for societal problems like unemployment, crime, poverty, and so on.<sup>344</sup> The longer one waits, the more invested one becomes, and the extension of investment “through the failure of return works to maintain the ideal through its deferral into the future.” Nguyen notes, “the gift is freighted

further with asymmetry and nonequivalence, with the dispensation of power *over time*, because the gift cannot be returned straightaway lest its significance be undone.”<sup>345</sup> Upon receipt of the gift of citizenship and thus freedom, the recipient must wait, “without forgetting” and without recompensing for the gift.<sup>346</sup> As I will elucidate in the last section, this waiting without the promise of return is what contributes to the anxiety that links love and fear, perpetuating the imperial paranoia that drives the “anchor baby” discourse.

### 3.2 *Jus Soli* Citizenship and the Consent of Kinship

While the first part of the reinterpretation argument constructs illegalized migrants and alien citizens as not “subject to jurisdiction” of the nation-state due to their supposed lack of allegiance and love, the second part of the argument constructs both the nation and the state as not loving those who it legislates and constructs as outsiders. In this case, the nation-state is the lover and the migrant/citizen is the beloved. Somerville explains that queer and feminist theorists often overlook “the state’s construction of certain immigrants and citizens as lovable and others as inappropriate objects for the nation’s love.”<sup>347</sup> In this section, I take up Somerville’s challenge, arguing that the notion of consent in the reinterpretation argument constructs the nation-state as a desiring and sexual body whose supposed denial of consent to criminalized migrants shapes the ideal citizen according to white supremacist and heteronormative logics. In addition, since the consent portion of the reinterpretation argument is the only time when the citizen-children are actually mentioned by both the committee panelists and the pundits, I examine how mother, child, and marriage are intertwined in this debate, arguing that the reinterpretation discourse upholds white heteronormativity, furthering the privatization of citizenship.

Schuck and Smith and their followers argue that the “founding fathers,” followers of John Locke, sought to break with English Common Law traditions of *jus soli* citizenship because of its tyrannical uses and its incompatibility with the liberal ideals of democracy and consensual membership in a republic.<sup>348</sup>

That is, they argue that people should not be born as citizen-subjects to a state because this deprives them of the rational choice to consent to be governed. However, though the pundits and panelists proclaim the merits of consensual membership to a nation-state and disavow the tyrannical and colonial uses of *jus soli* citizenship, they only actually problematize the nation-state's non-consent of criminalized migrants. In other words, the individual's consent to be governed matters either less than the state's consent to receive or, as Nguyen posits, the individual's consent is assumed because of the logic that everyone desires American citizenship and thus, freedom.<sup>349</sup> For example, during the committee deliberations Eastman claims, "What you are talking about is an entire class of people that have not been involved in that consent relationship, but have nevertheless through their parents come here and claimed something that we have not agreed to."<sup>350</sup> Here, Eastman delineates two classes of people: "we" the nation, members of the state who consent, and "they," those who have violated "our" consent. Law professor Lino Graglia claims, "no one can become a citizen of a nation without its consent."<sup>351</sup>

According to the panelists, a nation-state expresses consent by recognizing that the citizen/migrant is "subject to jurisdiction," or in Eastman's words, by expressing "a total and exclusive allegiance" to the nation-state.<sup>352</sup> In other words, the state consents to the citizen when the citizen professes allegiance towards the state. Significantly, criminalized migration signals the state's non-consent and the migrant's non-allegiance. For example, Graglia argues, "There cannot be a more forceful denial of consent to a person's citizenship than to make the source of that person's presence in the nation illegal."<sup>353</sup> Therefore, the panelists and pundits indicate that the legislation of migrant illegality is the nation-state's indication of non-consent. In other words, the state's consent is indicated when there is mutual love between the nation-state and the citizen. It is important to examine how desire also figures into the argument about consent. As mentioned above, scholars of queer theory have shown that citizenship and immigration laws shape migrants into desirable and undesirable

subjects.<sup>354</sup> I am arguing that this desire delineates the subjects that the nation-state wishes to incorporate and the subjects that it wants to keep on the outside—though as shown in the last chapter, not completely outside. The state’s imagined love and desire for certain subjects over others elucidates the interconnectedness between love, desire, value and criminalization, showing who the state values as a full member and who it criminalizes into the spaces of social death. Moreover, the devaluation of Mexican and undocumented migrants and citizens as undesirable and unlovable masks the calculated violence of illegality, naturalizing capital’s exploitation of undocumented labor. It also, however, reconstructs the tautology of illegality: undocumented migrants do not love or desire the state because they break its laws and the state does not desire or love undocumented migrants because it has made their presence illegal.

The consent argument also illuminates the welfare state’s shift to a ‘post-social’ state based on love and choice, mirroring the redefinition of marriage along the lines of love and choice in lieu of financial partnership and familial obligation. Amaya Schaeffer claims, “Love encapsulates the ideal Western sentiment to express an obligation that is freely chosen and unconstrained by social obligation (family or oligarchy) or economic restraints.”<sup>355</sup> Proponents of reinterpretation often claim that consensual citizenship is what makes citizenship in the United States so free and so wonderful, truly a ‘gift.’ For example, panelist John Eastman claims that consent is “at the heart” of any strong modern political community, and as mentioned above, Schuck and Smith base their consent argument on “the founding fathers” will for government based on freedom and choice in lieu of past forms of governance.<sup>356</sup> Many of the panelists and pundits argue that birthright citizenship is “primitive,” “feudal,” “medieval,” and a “bastard concept” from the past.<sup>357</sup> In other words, consent and choice valorize citizenship just as they valorize love and romance according to liberal ideologies of love and marriage that espouse “primitive” concepts like arranged marriages or marriages based on familial obligation.

The panelists abandon the liberal ideals of choice and freedom, however, when they turn their argument towards the citizen children of Mexican migrant women. Though the panelists seldom mention the actual citizen-child, spending more time on the non-citizen parent, they make it clear that the US-born child inherits the nation-state's non-consent towards the mother. Even though Schuck and Smith begin their adaptation of their 1985 book for Tanton's journal *The Social Contract* by giving a brief sketch of Locke's view of the relative autonomy and rationality of children, they go on to claim that children cannot consent to citizenship, echoing state laws that regulate children's capacity for consenting to sex. Therefore, Schuck and Smith claim that consent is logically derived from societal consent towards the parents. They state,

The parents of such children are, by definition, individuals whose presence within the jurisdiction of the United States is prohibited by law and to whom society has explicitly and self-consciously decided to deny membership. And if the society has refused to consent to their membership, it can hardly be said to have consented to that of their children who happen to be born while their parents are in violation of the American law.<sup>358</sup>

This sentiment is reiterated by the committee panelists as well as rightwing anti-immigration pundits like Buchanan, Brimelow, and Tanton in their own citations of Schuck and Smith's argument.<sup>359</sup> The logic that illegality is transferred extends the "anchor baby" discourse's construction of the undocumented mother's criminality as contagious that I outlined in the last chapter. Moreover, the reinterpretation argument furthers this logic by constructing dispositions, feelings, and attachments as transmitted both through the family and to the family. The child is constructed as both not feeling the love-based allegiance towards the state that forms the foundation of consent, while it is also constructed as the state's rejected object through the logic of sexual consent laws; the state cannot desire the child nor the child the state because children cannot desire.

Miraculously, however, according to Nathan Deal's proposed legislation, the child inherits consent and allegiance only if his or her undocumented mother is married (and not common law married) to a citizen or a documented migrant.<sup>360</sup> This privileging of heteronormativity parallels

historical transformations in immigration law that privilege not only heterosexuality, but ‘respectability’ and the heteronormative family.<sup>361</sup> The marriage requirement seems to convey that through marriage to a citizen, an undocumented woman can gain the respectability lost through her criminalized status. Lisa Marie Cacho writes that the respectability attached to the white heteronormative family “operates as a mode of discipline,” and an unattainable “prerequisite for the conferral of rights and dignity that functions to align paid and unpaid workers with the regulating institutions and ideologies that keep them economically exploitable and legally vulnerable.”<sup>362</sup> That is, in order to gain access to citizenship for oneself and one’s US-born child, undocumented women should submit to a regulatory institution that makes them ineligible for the majority of social welfare programs. Povinelli would cite this as another example of how the ideology of romantic love functions as a disciplinary mechanism in liberal states that measures and calculates the worth of certain lives over others.<sup>363</sup> For this reason, Lauren Berlant claims that the increasing emphasis on the love-based white heteronormative family as the vehicle for citizenship is really all about the privatization of citizenship and everyday life.<sup>364</sup> It is no coincidence that citizenship is increasingly associated with the respectability of one’s private familial life and especially how one feels about the nation-state as the state places more and more emphasis on the self-reliance of the heteronormative family unit in order to justify the shrinking social state.

### **3.3 Conclusion: Love, Fear, and the Limits of Exception**

As a whole, this project has shown how both the discursive and affective components of the “anchor baby” discourse contribute to the production of citizenship as an increasingly elusive construct and the production of illegality as an increasingly proliferous construct. This chapter has argued that the will to love functions as a disciplinary technique, shaping some migrants and citizens as loving and beloved, and thus worthy of citizenship, and others as not loving and not beloved, thus worthy of exclusion and social death. In the argument to repeal birthright citizenship, embedded in the broader

“anchor baby” discourse, citizenship is constructed as a gateway to the liberal gift of freedom, which enacts a will to love the nation-state, proving one’s allegiance and thus the nation-state’s consent to one’s inclusion into the category of citizen. According to opponents of birthright citizenship, Mexican migrant women and their citizen children must remain on the outside of the gift because of their criminalized and devalued statuses; because they have not proven that they love the nation-state monogamously and without material condition.

Love’s ability to delineate worthiness and goodness, versus disposability and badness, relates to its dialectical relationship with fear. Love, which Ahmed claims involves a turning towards home, such as the nation-state, can invoke anxiety due to love’s inability to fulfill its promises, which then gets displaced onto objects of fear like migrants.<sup>365</sup> The object of fear is then seen as the reason why the object of love is not making good on its promise of the good life. This is one of the reasons why the people in our society with the least amount of power, like people on welfare or non-citizens, are often blamed for wreaking havoc on the nation-state. Moreover, Ahmed claims that the turning away from the object of fear towards the object of love “could even be understood as compulsory” to avoid being implicated as lacking fellowship or as lacking the value that loving the nation-state will create.<sup>366</sup> Since I am arguing that citizenship—as a mode of receiving the gift of freedom—imposes a love-debt to the nation-state that alien citizens are deemed unable to fulfill, I also argue that it imposes a will to fear freedom’s Others and preemptively protect the nation-state from imagined harm. In other words, conforming to the logic of paranoia, the will to love the nation-state also provokes the will to fear the nation’s Others so that they do not tarnish its exceptionality.

Concluding this chapter, I examine how love and fear work together through comprising the affective poles of paranoia, contributing to the illegalization of Mexican bodies (as well as Middle Eastern and Southeast Asian bodies) as well as the privatization and securitizing of citizenship. Two recent cases that emerge as part of the post 9/11 racial panic exemplify the paranoid dialectical

exchange between love and fear and their use as modes of governance. First, Viet Dinh, who Nguyen outlines in her chapter “Race Wars, Patriot Acts” as the exemplar refugee patriot, proves his love and eternal gratitude for the nation-state that grants his freedom from communist Vietnam by authoring and continuously defending the PATRIOT ACT. Second, Yaser Esam Hamdi, who the panel and various conservative pundits characterize as the “citizen terrorist,” exemplifies why both immigration law and citizenship law must undergird our national security apparatus and why birthright citizenship must be repealed for the children of undocumented and temporary migrants in order to defend against freedom’s enemies from without and from within. These two cases, along with the ghosts of the Mexican undocumented migrants whose criminality and monstrosity emerge in the discourse as facilitating terrorism and insecurity, demonstrate how the affective dimensions of imperial paranoia operate as one of the gift of freedom’s abilities to “produce and police distinctions between racial bodies, disciplining some for freedom and disavowing others as monstrous.”<sup>367</sup>

Though Dinh and Hamdi were born in very different circumstances and live very different lives, both of their births are characterized as “accidents.” Viet Dinh was born in South Vietnam during the Viet Nam war. He escaped the war’s violence by boat and eventually made his way to the West Coast of the US where he would go on to excel in school, becoming assistant Attorney General and authoring the PATRIOT ACT, a bill designed to protect the nation-state and its freedom through heightened security and passed via the exceptional powers bestowed upon the state during the ongoing War on Terror.<sup>368</sup> His birth in war-torn South Viet Nam is characterized as an accident, as a product of chance or fate, imposed by a cruel world on an innocent subject. Escaping violence and communism, he becomes a refugee patriot “whose love of country transcends the accidents of birth to revere a universal liberalism as a politics of life.”<sup>369</sup> According to Nguyen, Dinh is characterized as “the perfect guest, the subject of freedom who not only consents to be governed but who understands his consent to be also his obligation—a debt—to those who accorded him hospitality.”<sup>370</sup> He infinitely repays his debt through

loving and protecting the nation-state and its promise of freedom. His presence as an exceptional refugee and as an exceptional patriot keep the “delusion of grandeur” alive that Anne McClintock claims comprises the first pole of imperial paranoia.<sup>371</sup> Moreover, the fact that he is *not* a birthright citizen facilitates the liberal illusion of love as a choice. He stands as a regulatory example to all citizens who are constructed as taking their citizenship for granted. As Lauren Berlant claims, immigration discourse is “a central technology for the reproduction of patriotic nationalism” not just because the immigrant (and I add especially the refugee) are portrayed as without the individual and market freedoms that America proffers and thus worthy of pity, but because he or she is seen as “*someone who desires America.*”<sup>372</sup> As shown above, this desire for America valorizes both the nation-state and the desiring subject.

Hamdi, on the other hand, is constructed as desiring to harm America because of his spatial and visual proximity to terror. Born in Louisiana to Saudi parents who were working as engineers with a temporary work visa, he returned to Saudi Arabia with his family at the age of three.<sup>373</sup> According to the panel, shortly after the onset of the US invasion of Afghanistan, Hamdi was “captured, engaged in armed conflict against the forces of the United States because he never had any allegiance to the United States as we expect of our citizens.”<sup>374</sup> For the panel, (alleged) terrorism comes easy to Hamdi because of his lack of love (he hates us for our freedom) and his lack of desire (he left the country, never merging with the body politic.) His status as a US citizen was not clear at the time of his capture and he was held as an “enemy-combatant” in indefinite detention and without formal charge per the exceptional powers bestowed upon the state during the War on Terror until his father sued on his behalf.<sup>375</sup> Once it became known that he was a citizen and would have to be treated according to the law, a racial panic ensued, disseminating a myriad of opinion editorials, blog posts, and the eventual 2005 and 2009 committee hearings that merged old arguments about the constitutionality and abuse of *jus soli* citizenship with

newer arguments about national security and what sort of connection American citizens should have with the state.<sup>376</sup>

Perhaps most notably, Hamdi was called “an accidental” American citizen by pundits like Michelle Malkin and law professors like John Eastman and John Fonte, as well as “a presumed citizen” by the dissenting supreme court judges Justice Stevens and Justice Scalia in *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*.<sup>377</sup> The “accident” of his birth on US soil and the subsequent terror that Hamdi *could have* wreaked on the nation-state incites fear because of the precariousness of accidents, necessitating the preemptive strike against future accidental citizens. As Peter Schuck claims in his article addressing the Hamdi case and the prospect of “citizen terrorists,” “American citizenship greases the wheels of domestic terror,” necessitating the conflation of national security, immigration law, and citizenship law.<sup>378</sup> Whereas Dinh overcomes his accidental foreignness through his love for the nation-state and its gift of freedom, valorizing himself and reiterating its value, Hamdi’s American-ness is erased through his construction as an object of fear and he is racialized as alien.

Since this project begins by deconstructing the “anchor baby” discourse and showing how it constructs Mexican migrant women and their children as unworthy and unfit for citizenship and inclusion, it may seem strange that I end by juxtaposing the cases of two men who are neither Mexican migrant mothers nor their citizen children. This is because I wish to end by arguing that Viet Dinh and Yaser Hamdi represent limit figures that are deployed through the affective modulation of paranoia to construct and regulate racialized bodies as lovable/loving and thus fit for inclusion or unloved/unloving *and* feared and thus needing to be excluded. Nguyen posits that the refugee patriot “is a limit figure of the condition of exteriority and yet enters signification (the realm of human contact and intercourse) into an existing interior of liberal empire [...] as a useful remainder of a racial, colonial other, and a haunted future.”<sup>379</sup> Dinh not only represents the exceptional citizen that all must aspire to become, but his status as a refugee embodies America’s exceptionalism; he fled violence and terror (the outside of

freedom), finally becoming free in the US. Meanwhile, Hamdi represents the abject and the monstrous, the birthright citizen that necessitates the state of exception against citizens and migrants in order to protect Dinh's freedom. Junaid Rana claims, for example, that the post 9/11 crescendo in the securitization and criminalization of migration has deployed the Muslim body "as a concrete, objective entity to control and regulate, a logic that is central to an expansive racialized terror formation that broadly disciplines migrants into imperial systems of control."<sup>380</sup> The fact that Mexican/migrants are increasingly constructed as facilitative of and complicit to terrorism, especially within the criminalized space of the borderlands, binds these figures together. The discursive circulation of these mythical figures police and produce the racialized boundaries of acceptable citizenship, reinforcing the need to exclude from citizenship the children of racialized, undocumented, and "temporary" migrants.<sup>381</sup>

Importantly, McClintock reminds us that she uses the lens of imperial paranoia as a way of examining "contradictions within power."<sup>382</sup> I am arguing that an attention to the affective dimensions of paranoia in the "anchor baby" discourse allows us to see how love and fear are harnessed by ordinary people, political pundits, and state legislators in order to uphold the biopolitics of the nation-state. In other words, the affective dimensions of paranoia bring into being the "illegal alien," the "citizen terrorist," and the "anchor baby," delineating them as Others, as those who are not us because they do not love us, and most of all as those who should be feared because they *could* harm our object of love. The affective dimensions of paranoia also bring into being ideal citizens and refugee patriots who love the nation-state and fear its others. It is, however, the politics and rationale of these emotions that delineate worthiness and unworthiness, ultimately expanding the political category of illegality, sticking it to an ever-expanding number of bodies. In other words, the racialization and sexualization of national love and fear work to shape the biopolitical nation and its others. The devaluing of Mexican migrants and their citizen children as well as migrants who are racialized as Arab and Muslim in order to value

freedom lovers and “prudent” citizens enacts violence on not only the devalued through the imposition of social death, but on everyone who is not perceived as waiting patiently for the gift of freedom.

#### 4 EPILOGUE

As I finish this project, Congress is working to pass an immigration reform legislation that would further militarize the border, implement a guest worker program, and provide a ‘pathway to citizenship’ for a portion of the millions of undocumented migrants currently living and working in the US. Though many immigration rights activists cite this possibility as an improvement upon the DREAM ACT for proffering the possibility of citizenship to a larger segment of the undocumented migrant population, still more writers and activists indicate that the steep financial penalties and well-documented paper trail required to even embark on the pathway to citizenship will end up excluding millions of migrants.<sup>383</sup> Moreover, *Colorlines* writer Steve Freed Wessler claims that if the reform passes, it will likely increase the detention of undocumented migrants and increase police surveillance of Mexicans and Latinos who “appear” undocumented since the bi-partisan reform necessitates increasing the militarization of the US-Mexico border.<sup>384</sup> Not to mention, the same Republicans who are part of the bi-partisan panel drafting the reform are the same Republicans who are continuously trying to redefine birthright citizenship by passing what is currently being called H.R. 140.<sup>385</sup> Nicholas De Genova would characterize the current immigration reform debate as a piecemeal approach to citizenship and immigration that does not address the underlying issue: that is, we have a legal and political system that produces “illegal” migrants and a punitive system that deports some so that most can stay and fuel the economy.<sup>386</sup>

What are social justice activists to do about the political constructs of citizenship and illegality? Given the tangible benefits of accruing citizenship status, should we fight for inclusion into citizenship and the maintenance of our current interpretation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment? According to immigration historian Mae Ngai, both birthright citizenship and the conferral of citizenship to formerly ineligible subjects of citizenship have been utilized by the state as a tool for conquest, like the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and The Indian Citizenship Act of 1924, while they have also been used by

marginalized ethnic groups as a means of combating racial inequality and subordination.<sup>387</sup> She claims, “birthright citizenship is a first-line defense of individual rights before the arbitrary exercise of state authority.”<sup>388</sup> Her analysis poignantly illumines that if birthright citizenship is redefined to exclude the children of undocumented migrants, a substantial group of people will be excluded permanently from an essential platform in protesting inequality and marginalization. What is more, such a redefinition will unfairly and disproportionately target Mexicans and Central Americans, which “would create a hereditary caste of illegal aliens in our society [and] an extreme form of racial marginalization.”<sup>389</sup> Eithne Luibhéid points out that in the Irish Republic, where birthright citizenship has been redefined to exclude the children of undocumented migrants, citizenship law has “significantly expanded migrants’ routes into illegal status.”<sup>390</sup> Given the fact that there is no clear distinction between “legal” and “illegal” migrants and many migrants slide back and forth between statuses, Ireland’s new citizenship law made many more children “illegal” than was originally intended even by the most conservative politicians.<sup>391</sup>

However, keeping in mind that birthright citizenship is strategically indispensable for securing basic rights and freedoms for the children of undocumented migrants, merely maintaining the status quo does nothing to address the political condition of illegality nor does it address the ongoing privatization of citizenship and the discursive illegalization of an ever-increasing number of people. In fact, using Lisa Marie Cacho’s logic of the violence of value, rhetorically distancing the social and political status of the children of undocumented migrants from their parents may guarantee that birthright citizenship remains intact, but at the cost of further marginalizing “illegal” migrants and securing their criminalization and ineligibility for personhood.<sup>392</sup> In other words, the attempt to delineate and legitimize the citizenship status of people like Yasser Hamdi and “anchor babies” who have been constructed as alien citizens further cements the denigrated and devalued status of illegality; by valuing citizen-children one could be violently devaluing their “illegal” parents. Cacho explains that “the act of

ascribing legible, intelligible, and normative value is inherently violent and relationally devaluing.”<sup>393</sup>

This is why inclusion campaigns like the DREAM ACT are often critiqued as further marginalizing ‘unexceptional’ migrants, or migrants who ‘chose’ to migrate without documentation. Moreover, keeping the status of illegality intact and untroubled guarantees that the Patrick Buchanans and Nathan Deals of the future will continuously attempt to categorize more and more undesirable and devalued citizens as not citizens at all. For example, to a chorus of rightwing cheers, the musician-turned-rightwing pundit Ted Nugent has already asserted that welfare recipients should not be allowed to exercise their right as a citizen to vote.<sup>394</sup>

So, what could we imagine as a solution to the violences of citizenship and illegality? Global citizenship? Would that then necessitate a global nation, and if so who would govern it? No citizenship? Would that dismantle the nation-state construct? That seems attractive to many leftists, but there are also many collectives who desire and need sovereignty. Etienne Balibar offers a promising framework for thinking about belonging and political action without eliding the importance of sovereignty. Advocating for a “politics of civility,” or a politics that constantly seeks to make participatory action possible without upholding harmony, pacifism, or emancipatory violence, he envisions a transnational democratic citizenship.<sup>395</sup> Though he does not see this as a utopian project that would create a global village, he envisions political borders as zones of contact and constant negotiation, deconstruction, and activity. However, would this construct address the problem of illegality? Would his emphasis on the role of ‘intellectuals’ sustain the global racial and national hierarchy as is? Obviously, I do not know the answers to these questions, nor do I suggest that there is a simple solution to this problem. I propose, however, that we must start by continuously interrogating and denaturalizing illegality and citizenship, making visible how these constructs are assigned to people and the violence that they effect.

## REFERENCES

- Admin. "Closing Anchor Baby Loophole Restores the 14th Amendment." *Human Events: Powerful Conservative Voices*, February 21, 2011. <http://www.humanevents.com/2011/02/21/closing-anchor-baby-loophole-restores-the-14th-amendment/>.
- Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Amaya Schaeffer, Felicity. *Love and Empire: Cybermarriage and Citizenship Across the Americas*. New York: New York University Press, 2013.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 2006.
- Associated Press. "'Anchor Baby' Constitutional Amendment to Face Scrutiny in Congress." *Associated Press*, December 26, 2010. <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/12/26/anchor-baby-constitutional-amendment-face-scrutiny-congress/>.
- Balibar, Étienne. *We, the People of Europe?: Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Beilenson, Anthony. "Case for Correction by Constitutional Amendment." *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1 (1996): 7–9.
- Berlant, Lauren. "The Epistemology of State Emotion." In *Dissent in Dangerous Times*, 46–78. edited by Sarat Austin. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2005.
- . *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 1997.
- Betts, Katharine. "An Interview with Jean Raspail." In *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, edited by John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith. London: Avebury, 1996.
- Briggs, Laura. *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.
- Brimelow, Peter. *Alien Nation: Common Sense About America's Immigration Disaster*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1996.
- . "RICO Lawyer Howard Foster On Anchor Baby Loophole." *VDARE.com*, September 8, 2010. <http://www.vdare.com/node/8815>.
- Buchanan, Patrick J. "Is This Our America Anymore?" *Pat's Columns*, December 10, 2010. <http://buchanan.org/blog/is-this-our-america-anymore-4582>.
- . *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2006.
- . *The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2002.
- . "Who Killed California?" *World Net Daily*, July 30, 2003. <http://www.wnd.com/2003/07/20030/>.
- Burghart, Devin. "Birthright Citizenship Again Under Attack in Congress." *Institute for Research and Education on Human Rights*, January 13, 2013. <http://www.irehr.org/issue-areas/nation-state-and-citizenship/item/456-birthright-citizenship-again-under-attack-in-congress>.
- Burlein, Ann. *Lift High the Cross: Where White Supremacy and the Christian Right Converge*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Cabezas, Amalia L. *Economies of Desire: Sex and Tourism in Cuba and the Dominican Republic*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2009.
- Cacho, Lisa Marie. *Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.
- Chavez, Leo R. *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation*. 1st ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001.

- . *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008.
- Chip, William F. "Not a Birthright: No Citizenship for the Children of Non-Citizens." *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1. "Anchor Babies" - The Citizen-Child Loophole (1996): 17–18.
- Chow, Rey. *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Cohen, Ed. *A Body Worth Defending: Immunity, Biopolitics, and the Apotheosis of the Modern Body*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Cohen, Stanley. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics the Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1987.
- Critical Art Ensemble. "Bioparanoia and the Culture of Control." In *Tactical Biopolitics: Art, Activism, and Technoscience*, 413–427. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008.
- Dane, Bob. "Dictionary's 'Anchor Baby' Decision Is Definition of Foolish." *FoxNews.com*, December 9, 2011. <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/12/09/dictionaries-anchor-baby-decision-is-definition-foolish/>.
- Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race, & Class*. New York: Vintage, 1983.
- Davis, Mike. "The Great Wall of Capital." In *Against the Wall: Israel's Barrier to Peace*, 88–99. edited by Michael Sorkin. New York: The New Press, 2005.
- Deal, Nathan. *Citizenship Reform Act of 2005*, 2005.
- Debord, Guy. "The Society of the Spectacle." In *The Visual Culture Reader*, 142–144. edited by Mirzoeff Nicholas. 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Duggan, Lisa, and Nan D. Hunter. *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Erler, Edward J. "Birthright Citizenship and Dual Citizenship: Harbingers of Administrative Tyranny." *Imprimis* 37, no. 7 (2008): 1–5.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. 2nd ed. New York: Pearson Education, 2001.
- Fallon, Joseph. "The Racial and Ethnic Transformation of the U.S." In *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, 179–181. edited by John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith. London: Avebury, 1996.
- Foucault, Michel. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. New Press, The, 1998.
- . "Society Must Be Defended": *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. Translated by David Macey. New York: Picador, 2003.
- . *The Foucault Reader*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- Francis, Samuel. "Funding 'Demographic Warfare'." In *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, edited by John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith. London: Avebury, 1996.
- De Genova, Nicholas. "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (2002): 419–447.
- . "The Production of Culprits: From Deportability to Detainability in the Aftermath of 'Homeland Security'." *Citizenship Studies* 11, no. 5 (2007): 421–448.
- . *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and "Illegality" in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2005.
- Gilman, Sander. *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.

- Giovagnoli, Mary. "Anchor Baby Added to New American Heritage Dictionary." *Immigration Impact*, December 2, 2011. <http://immigrationimpact.com/2011/12/02/%E2%80%9Canchor-baby%E2%80%9D-added-to-new-american-heritage-dictionary/>.
- Goode, Erich, and Nachman Ben-Yehuda. *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1994.
- Goode, Virgil. "End Birthright Citizenship." *Human Events: Powerful Conservative Voices*, July 22, 2010. <http://www.humanevents.com/2010/07/22/end-birthright-citizenship/>.
- Gowan Sr., David, Steve Montenegro, Carl Seel, and David Stevens. *House Bill 2281*, 2010.
- Graglia, Lino. "Birthright Citizenship for the Children of Illegal Aliens: An Irrational Public Policy." *Texas Review of Law and Politics* 14, no. 1 (2010): 1–14.
- Hall, Stuart. "The Spectacle of the 'Other'." In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, edited by Stuart Hall. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 1997.
- Hill Collins, Patricia. "Producing Mothers of the Nation: Race, Class and Contemporary U.S. Population Politics." In *Women, Citizenship, and Difference*, 118–129. edited by Pnina Werbner and Nina Yuval-Davis. New York: Zed Books, 2004.
- Holt, Mytheos. "Arizona to Ban Ethnic Studies College Courses?" *The Blaze*, April 2, 2012. <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2012/04/02/arizona-to-ban-ethnic-studies-college-courses/>.
- Hostettler, John, Sheila Jackson Lee, Lamar Smith, Stanley Renshon, John Fonte, John C Eastman, and Peter Spiro. *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*. Washington, DC, 2005.
- Huang, Priscilla. "Anchor Babies, Over-Breeders, and the Population Bomb: The Reemergence of Nativism and Population Control in Anti-Immigration Policies." *Harvard Law & Policy Review* 2 (2008): 385–406.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *Who Are We: The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004.
- Ignatow, Gabe, and Alexander T. Williams. "New Media and the 'Anchor Baby' Boom." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 17, no. 1 (2011): 60–76.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier. "Biopower, Reproduction, and the Migrant Woman's Body." In *Decolonial Voices: Chicana and Chicano Cultural Studies in the 21st Century*, edited by Arturo J. Aldama and Naomi H. Quiñonez. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- . "Foreign Bodies: Migrants, Parasites, and the Pathological Body Politic." *Discourse* 22, no. 3 (2000): 46–62.
- . *Targeting Immigrants: Government, Technology, and Ethics*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005.
- . "The Value of Immigrant Life." In *Women and Migration in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands*, edited by Denise A. Segura and Patricia Zavella. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Irvine, Janice M. "Transient Feelings: Sex Panics and the Politics of Emotions." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 14, no. 1 (2008): 1–40.
- Kanaaneh, Rhoda Ann. *Birthing the Nation: Strategies of Palestinian Women in Israel*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.
- "King Introduces Bill Closing 'Anchor Baby' Loophole." *Congressman Steve King*. Accessed February 10, 2013. [http://steveking.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=4077:king-introduces-bill-closing-anchor-baby-loophole&catid=71:press-releases&Itemid=300164](http://steveking.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=4077:king-introduces-bill-closing-anchor-baby-loophole&catid=71:press-releases&Itemid=300164).
- Kintz, Linda. *Between Jesus and the Market: The Emotions That Matter in Right-Wing America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Lee, Hatty, and Seth Freed Wessler. "How Millions Could Get Cut Out of Immigration Reform [Infographic] - COLORLINES." *COLORLINES*, February 5, 2013. [http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/how\\_millions\\_could\\_get\\_cut\\_out\\_of\\_immigration\\_reform\\_infographic.html](http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/how_millions_could_get_cut_out_of_immigration_reform_infographic.html).

- Lesko, Nancy. *Act Your Age!: A Cultural Construction of Adolescence*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Lister, Ruth. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives, Second Edition*. 2nd ed. New York: NYU Press, 2003.
- Luibhéid, Eithne. *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality At The Border*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- . “Nationalist Heterosexuality, Migrant (Il)legality, and Irish Citizenship Law: Queering the Connections.” *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 110, no. 1 (2011): 179–204.
- . “Sexuality, Migration, and the Shifting Line Between Legal and Illegal Status.” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 14, no. 2–3 (2008): 289–315.
- Luibhéid, Eithne, and Lionel Cantu, eds. *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, U.S. Citizenship, and Border Crossings*. 1st ed. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Mac Donald, Heather. “Hispanic Family Values?” *City Journal*. Autumn 2006.
- . “Hispanic Family Values?” In *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, 116–130. edited by Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007.
- . “Seeing Today’s Immigrants Straight.” In *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, 52–74. edited by Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007.
- . “The Illegal-Alien Crime Wave.” In *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, 75–94. edited by Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007.
- . “The Immigrant Gang Plague.” In *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, 95–115. edited by Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007.
- Mac Donald, Heather, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga, eds. *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007.
- Magnet, Myron. “Introduction.” In *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, 3–10. edited by Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007.
- Malanga, Steven. “The Right Immigration Policy.” In *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, 170–184. edited by Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007.
- Malkin, Michelle. *Invasion: How America Still Welcomes Terrorists, Criminals, And Other Foreign Menaces To Our Shores*. New York: Regnery Publishing, 2004.
- . “What Makes an American?” *Townhall.com*, July 4, 2003.  
[http://townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/2003/07/04/what\\_makes\\_an\\_american](http://townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/2003/07/04/what_makes_an_american).
- Markel, Howard, and Alexandra Minna Stern. “The Foreignness of Germs: The Persistent Association of Immigrants and Disease in American Society.” *The Milbank Quarterly* 80, no. 4 (2002): 757–788.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . “Paranoid Empire: Specters from Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib.” *Small Axe* 13, no. 1 (2009): 50–74.
- McDevitt, Caitlin. “Ted Nugent: Welfare Recipients Shouldn’t Vote.” *POLITICO*, December 4, 2012.  
<http://www.politico.com/blogs/click/2012/12/ted-nugent-welfare-recipients-shouldnt-vote-151063.html>.
- Mendoza, Ashley E. “Anchors Aweigh: Redefining Birthright Citizenship in the 21st Century.” *Journal of Law & Family Studies* 13 (2011): 203.
- Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

- Murphy, Tara. "We Shall Overwhelm." In *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, edited by John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith. London: Avebury, 1996.
- Nakano Glenn, Evelyn. "Constructing Citizenship: Exclusion, Subordination, and Resistance." *American Sociological Review* 76, no. 1 (2011): 2–25.
- Ngai, Mae. "Birthright Citizenship and the Alien Citizen." *Fordham Law Review* 75, no. 5 (2007): 2521–2530.
- . *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Nguyen, Mimi Thi. *The Gift of Freedom: War, Debt, and Other Refugee Passages*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012.
- Nyers, Peter. "The Accidental Citizen: Acts of Sovereignty and (Un)making Citizenship." *Economy and Society* 35, no. 1 (2006): 22–41.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth A. *The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Puar, Jasbir. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2007.
- Puar, Jasbir K., and Amit Rai. "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots." *Social Text* 20, no. 3 (2002): 117–148.
- Puri, Jyoti. *Encountering Nationalism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003.
- Rana, Junaid. *Terrifying Muslims: Race and Labor in the South Asian Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.
- Razack, Sherene.  *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Reasoner, W.D. "Birthright Citizenship for the Children of Visitors: A National Security Problem in the Making?" Center for Immigration Studies. *Center for Immigration Studies Backgrounder Report*, March 2011.
- Renshon, Stanley. "Becoming American: The Hidden Core of the Immigration Debate." *Center for Immigration Studies*, January 2007. <http://cis.org/BecomingAmerican-ImmigrationDebate>.
- Roberts, Dorothy. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. New York: Vintage, 1998.
- Rosenbloom, Rachel E. "Policing the Borders of Birthright Citizenship: Some Thoughts on the New (and Old) Restrictionism." *Washburn Law Journal* 51 (2012): 311–330.
- Rowe, Aimee Marie Carrillo. "Whose 'America'? The Politics of Rhetoric and Space in the Formation of U.S. Nationalism." *Radical History Review* 89, no. 1 (2004): 115–134.
- Rubin, Gayle. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality." In *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, 267–293. edited by Carole S Vance. London: Pandora, 1992.
- Sandoval, Chela. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Schlafly, Phyllis. "American Citizenship Is Precious." *The Phyllis Schlafly Report* 39, no. 4 (November 2005). <http://www.eagleforum.org/psr/2005/nov05/psrnov05.html>.
- Schott, Ben. "Anchor-Baby Loophole." *Schott's Vocab Blog*, June 10, 2010. <http://schott.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/06/10/anchor-baby-loophole/>.
- Schrag, Peter. *Not Fit for Our Society: Immigration and Nativism in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011.
- Schuck, Peter H. "Citizen Terrorist." *Hoover Institution's Policy Review* 164 (December 2010). <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/58011>.
- Schuck, Peter H., and Rogers M. Smith. *Citizenship Without Consent: Illegal Aliens in the American Policy*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1985.

- Schuck, Peter, and Rogers M. Smith. "Citizenship Without Consent." *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1 (1996): 19–25.
- Somerville, Siobhan B. "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization." *American Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2005): 659–675.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, and Judith Butler. *Who Sings the Nation-State?: Language, Politics, Belonging*. New York: Seagull Books, 2011.
- Stein, Dan. "Citizenship and the Babies of Non-Citizens." *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1 (1996): 11–15.
- Stern, Alexandra Minna. *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. "Affective States." In *A Companion to Anthropology of Politics*, 4–20. edited by David Nugent and Joan Vincent. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2007.
- . *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 1995.
- Tancredo, Tom. "The Barbarians Are Past the Gate." *Human Events: Powerful Conservative Voices*, October 18, 2006. <http://www.humanevents.com/2006/10/18/the-barbarians-are-past-the-gate/>.
- Tanton, John. "Jumping the Queue." *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1. "Anchor Babies" - The Citizen-Child Loophole (1996): 1.
- Tanton, John, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith, eds. *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*. London: Avebury, 1996.
- Vedantam, Shankar. "Several States Want Court Ruling on Birthright Citizenship." *The Washington Post*, January 6, 2011, sec. Print Edition. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/05/AR2011010506372.html>.
- Wall, Allan. "Rep. Steve King Introduces House Bill to Close Up Anchor Baby Loophole." *VDARE.com*, January 7, 2013. <http://www.vdare.com/node/27609>.
- Weedon, Chris. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1996.
- Welch, Michael. *Detained: Immigration Laws and the Expanding I.N.S. Jail Complex*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.
- Wessler, Seth Freed. "CEO of Largest Private Prison Company: No Worries About Immigration Reform - COLORLINES." *COLORLINES*, February 14, 2013. [http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/ceo\\_of\\_largest\\_private\\_prison\\_company\\_in\\_us\\_says\\_hes\\_not\\_worried\\_about\\_immigration\\_reform.html](http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/ceo_of_largest_private_prison_company_in_us_says_hes_not_worried_about_immigration_reform.html).
- Winant, Howard. *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
- Wood, Charles. "Losing Control of the Nation's Future--Part Two--Birthright Citizenship and Illegal Aliens." *The Social Contract Press* 16, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 103–108.
- Wright, Melissa W. *Disposable Women and Other Myths of Global Capitalism*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Young, Gary. "BBC Radio 4 - Positively Flawed? Affirmative Action and the Future of America, Gary Younge Talks to Professor Lino Graglia." *BBC*, December 6, 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p0127k6n>.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender and Nation*. New York: SAGE Publications, 1997.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. "Money, Power, and Sex." *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 18, no. 303 (2006): 1–17.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> I employ the odious term “illegal” to convey that people who have been named ‘illegal’ by news outlets and politicians are those migrants who have been racialized as Mexican or Central American and criminalized as having committed a serious crime against the nation. I follow Ngai (2004) and De Genova (2005) in using the term in a way that denaturalizes the category of an ‘illegal’ person. I also use De Genova’s (2005) terminology and employ the term “Mexican/migrant” to refer to undocumented Mexican migrants.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We: The Challenges to America’s National Identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004), 219; Also Jonathan Xavier Inda describes how prenatal care for pregnant undocumented women was often referred to as a “magnet” during the Proposition 187 debates in the 1990s. See his, “Biopower, Reproduction, and the Migrant Woman’s Body,” in *Decolonial Voices: Chicana and Chicano Cultural Studies in the 21st Century*, ed. Arturo J. Aldama and Naomi H. Quiñonez (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2002), 105.

<sup>3</sup> Mary Giovagnoli, “Anchor Baby Added to New American Heritage Dictionary,” *Immigration Impact*, December 2, 2011, <http://immigrationimpact.com/2011/12/02/%E2%80%9Canchor-baby%E2%80%9D-added-to-new-american-heritage-dictionary/>.

<sup>4</sup> Bob Dane, “Dictionary’s ‘Anchor Baby’ Decision Is Definition of Foolish,” *FoxNews.com*, December 9, 2011, <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/12/09/dictionaries-anchor-baby-decision-is-definition-foolish/>. Bob Dane is also communications director of Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR).

<sup>5</sup> Patrick J. Buchanan, *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2006), 258; John Tanton, “Jumping the Queue,” *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1, “Anchor Babies” - The Citizen-Child Loophole (1996): 1.

<sup>6</sup> Schuck and Smith outline their argument in: Peter H. Schuck and Rogers M. Smith, *Citizenship Without Consent: Illegal Aliens in the American Policy* (New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1985); Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 259; Dan Stein, “Citizenship and the Babies of Non-Citizens,” *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1 (1996): 11–15; Tanton, “Jumping the Queue,” 1; Anthony Beilenson, “Case for Correction by Constitutional Amendment,” *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1 (1996): 7; William F. Chip, “Not a Birthright: No Citizenship for the Children of Non-Citizens,” *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1, “Anchor Babies” - The Citizen-Child Loophole (1996): 17; Steven Malanga, “The Right Immigration Policy,” in *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, ed. Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007), 170–184; Peter Schuck and Rogers M. Smith, “Citizenship Without Consent,” *The Social Contract Press* 7, no. 1 (1996): 19–25.

<sup>7</sup> Schuck and Smith, *Citizenship Without Consent*, 1985; Schuck and Smith, “Citizenship Without Consent,” 1996.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Wood, “Losing Control of the Nation’s Future--Part Two--Birthright Citizenship and Illegal Aliens,” *The Social Contract Press* 16, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 103.

<sup>9</sup> Stanley Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics the Creation of the Mods and Rockers*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1987).

<sup>10</sup> Gabe Ignatow and Alexander T. Williams, “New Media and the ‘Anchor Baby’ Boom,” *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 17, no. 1 (2011): 60–76.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Shankar Vedantam, “Several States Want Court Ruling on Birthright Citizenship,” *The Washington Post*, January 6, 2011, sec. Print Edition, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/05/AR2011010506372.html>.

<sup>14</sup> See Mae Ngai, “Birthright Citizenship and the Alien Citizen,” (2007).

<sup>15</sup> Huang, “Anchor Babies, Over-Breeders, and the Population Bomb: The Reemergence of Nativism and Population Control in Anti-Immigration Policies,” 393.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 396.

<sup>17</sup> Huang, “Anchor Babies, Over-Breeders, and the Population Bomb: The Reemergence of Nativism and Population Control in Anti-Immigration Policies”; Leo R. Chavez, *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008); Nicholas De Genova, *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and “Illegality” in Mexican Chicago* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2005).

<sup>18</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 60.

- <sup>19</sup> Peter Brimelow, *Alien Nation: Common Sense About America's Immigration Disaster* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1996).
- <sup>20</sup> See D.A. King's online column for the *Marietta Daily Journal Online* titled, "Mr. Foley: Please Take the Road to Reality? – In which We Are Once Again Reminded that Words Have Meaning and Illegal Aliens Are Illegal Aliens, Published on 16 April, 2012. This column represents the epitome of a teleological understanding of migrant illegality
- <sup>21</sup> I specify race *and* culture because contemporarily race is often expressed in terms of culture and vice versa. "Racial project" is referring to Howard Winant's conceptualization of the term, meaning: "To interpret the meaning of race in a particular way at a given time [...] to propose or defend a certain social policy, a particular racialized social structure, a racial order" (2004, 53).
- <sup>22</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We*, 145.
- <sup>23</sup> Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2007), 26–27.
- <sup>24</sup> Howard Winant, *The New Politics of Race: Globalism, Difference, Justice* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 56–57.
- <sup>25</sup> Lisa Marie Cacho, *Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected* (New York: New York University Press, 2012), 16–17.
- <sup>26</sup> See: Huntington, *Who Are We*; Buchanan, *State of Emergency*; Patrick J. Buchanan, *The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2002); Brimelow, *Alien Nation*.
- <sup>27</sup> In fact, Eithne Luibheid (2011) shows that when Ireland revised birthright citizenship to exclude the children of undocumented migrants, the law ended up creating more "illegal" people than even the most conservative politicians envisioned.
- <sup>28</sup> Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics the Creation of the Mods and Rockers*, 45.
- <sup>29</sup> Erich Goode and Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1994), 29.
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 76–77.
- <sup>31</sup> Junaid Rana, *Terrifying Muslims: Race and Labor in the South Asian Diaspora* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Gayle Rubin, "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," in *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, ed. Carole S Vance (London: Pandora, 1992), 267–293; Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter, *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2006).
- <sup>32</sup> Rana, *Terrifying Muslims*, 53.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.
- <sup>34</sup> Sherene Razack, *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 38.
- <sup>35</sup> Rana, *Terrifying Muslims*, 53.
- <sup>36</sup> Peter Schrag, *Not Fit for Our Society: Immigration and Nativism in America* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011), 7.
- <sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>38</sup> Michael Welch, *Detained: Immigration Laws and the Expanding I.N.S. Jail Complex* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002), 6–7; Schrag, *Not Fit for Our Society*, 7.
- <sup>39</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 8.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 91–94.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>44</sup> Mike Davis, "The Great Wall of Capital," in *Against the Wall: Israel's Barrier to Peace*, ed. Michael Sorkin (New York: The New Press, 2005), 91.
- <sup>45</sup> Linda Kintz, *Between Jesus and the Market: The Emotions That Matter in Right-Wing America* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).

- <sup>46</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*; Chavez, *The Latino Threat*; Leo R. Chavez, *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation*, 1st ed. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001); Eithne Luibhéid, *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality At The Border* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002); Mae Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005); Eithne Luibhéid, "Sexuality, Migration, and the Shifting Line Between Legal and Illegal Status," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 14, no. 2–3 (2008): 289–315.
- <sup>47</sup> Luibhéid, *Entry Denied*, 2.
- <sup>48</sup> Aimee Marie Carrillo. Rowe, "Whose 'America'? The Politics of Rhetoric and Space in the Formation of U.S. Nationalism," *Radical History Review* 89, no. 1 (2004): 115–134; De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*; Chavez, *The Latino Threat*.
- <sup>49</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 61.
- <sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.
- <sup>51</sup> Rowe, "Whose 'America'?"
- <sup>52</sup> Ignatow and Williams, "New Media and the 'Anchor Baby' Boom."
- <sup>53</sup> Anne McClintock, "Paranoid Empire: Specters from Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib," *Small Axe* 13, no. 1 (2009): 53.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 54, 53.
- <sup>55</sup> Siobhan B. Somerville, "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization," *American Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2005): 659–675.
- <sup>56</sup> Luibhéid, *Entry Denied*.
- <sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 66–67.
- <sup>58</sup> Chavez, *The Latino Threat*, 71; De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 90.
- <sup>59</sup> Chavez, *The Latino Threat*, 90.
- <sup>60</sup> Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), 77.
- <sup>61</sup> Chavez, *The Latino Threat*, 90.
- <sup>62</sup> Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*, 19.
- <sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 16–20.
- <sup>64</sup> Dorothy Roberts, *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty* (New York: Vintage, 1998), 17.
- <sup>65</sup> Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*; Luibhéid, *Entry Denied*; Chavez, *The Latino Threat*.
- <sup>66</sup> Roberts, *Killing the Black Body*, 8, 17; Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*, 180–181.
- <sup>67</sup> Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*, 164.
- <sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 168–70.
- <sup>69</sup> "Wrong reasons" is referring to Lindsey Graham's comment cited at the beginning of the essay.
- <sup>70</sup> Luibhéid, *Entry Denied*, 137; De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 93; Chavez, *The Latino Threat*, 72; Huang, "Anchor Babies, Over-Breeders, and the Population Bomb: The Reemergence of Nativism and Population Control in Anti-Immigration Policies," 388.
- <sup>71</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 93; Chavez, *The Latino Threat*, 72; Huang, "Anchor Babies, Over-Breeders, and the Population Bomb: The Reemergence of Nativism and Population Control in Anti-Immigration Policies," 386; Ashley E. Mendoza, "Anchors Aweigh: Redefining Birthright Citizenship in the 21st Century," *Journal of Law & Family Studies* 13 (2011): 204.
- <sup>72</sup> Janice M. Irvine, "Transient Feelings: Sex Panics and the Politics of Emotions," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 14, no. 1 (2008): 3.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 11, 30.
- <sup>74</sup> Kintz, *Between Jesus and the Market*; Ann Burlein, *Lift High the Cross: Where White Supremacy and the Christian Right Converge* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002).
- <sup>75</sup> Burlein, *Lift High the Cross*, 150.
- <sup>76</sup> Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 1.
- <sup>77</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*.

- <sup>78</sup> Huang, "Anchor Babies, Over-Breeders, and the Population Bomb: The Reemergence of Nativism and Population Control in Anti-Immigration Policies," 388. Though the validity of these assumptions is not directly important to my research, due to a different set of epistemological concerns, these claims about the unproductiveness of Mexican migrant women are for the most part incorrect. See Chavez (2002) for a further discussion on the invalidity of these claims
- <sup>79</sup> Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation* (New York: SAGE Publications, 1997), 4.
- <sup>80</sup> Lauren Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 1997), 5, 7.
- <sup>81</sup> Jonathan Xavier Inda, *Targeting Immigrants: Government, Technology, and Ethics* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2005).
- <sup>82</sup> Jyoti Puri, *Encountering Nationalism* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003); Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation*.
- <sup>83</sup> Elizabeth A. Povinelli, *The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 197.
- <sup>84</sup> Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation*, 2.
- <sup>85</sup> Puri, *Encountering Nationalism*, 26.
- <sup>86</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>87</sup> Ibid., 27.
- <sup>88</sup> Somerville, "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization," 660, 661.
- <sup>89</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2006), 7.
- <sup>90</sup> Somerville, "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization," 660.
- <sup>91</sup> Puri, *Encountering Nationalism*, 34.
- <sup>92</sup> Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 1995), 8.
- <sup>93</sup> Ibid., 93.
- <sup>94</sup> Ann Laura Stoler, "Affective States," in *A Companion to Anthropology of Politics*, ed. David Nugent and Joan Vincent (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2007), 9.
- <sup>95</sup> Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*, 8.
- <sup>96</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*.
- <sup>97</sup> Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation*; Rhoda Ann Kanaaneh, *Birthing the Nation: Strategies of Palestinian Women in Israel* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002); Ruth Lister, *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives, Second Edition*, 2nd ed. (New York: NYU Press, 2003); Puri, *Encountering Nationalism*; Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
- <sup>98</sup> Puri, *Encountering Nationalism*, 114–117.
- <sup>99</sup> Patricia Hill Collins, "Producing Mothers of the Nation: Race, Class and Contemporary U.S. Population Politics," in *Women, Citizenship, and Difference*, ed. Pnina Werbner and Nina Yuval-Davis (New York: Zed Books, 2004), 120–121.
- <sup>100</sup> Angela Y. Davis, *Women, Race, & Class* (New York: Vintage, 1983); Hill Collins, "Producing Mothers of the Nation: Race, Class and Contemporary U.S. Population Politics," 126; Roberts, *Killing the Black Body*.
- <sup>101</sup> Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*, 209.
- <sup>102</sup> Ibid., 21.
- <sup>103</sup> Hill Collins, "Producing Mothers of the Nation: Race, Class and Contemporary U.S. Population Politics," 127.
- <sup>104</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>105</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>106</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*.
- <sup>107</sup> Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*, 19.
- <sup>108</sup> Chavez, *The Latino Threat*, 23.
- <sup>109</sup> Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Judith Butler, *Who Sings the Nation-State?: Language, Politics, Belonging* (New York: Seagull Books, 2011); Razack, *Casting Out*.
- <sup>110</sup> Povinelli, *The Empire of Love*, 202 ; Spivak and Butler, *Who Sings the Nation-State?*.
- <sup>111</sup> Evelyn Nakano Glenn, "Constructing Citizenship: Exclusion, Subordination, and Resistance," *American Sociological Review* 76, no. 1 (2011): 2–25.

- <sup>112</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*; Nicholas De Genova, "The Production of Culprits: From Deportability to Detainability in the Aftermath of 'Homeland Security'," *Citizenship Studies* 11, no. 5 (2007): 421–448.
- <sup>113</sup> Melissa W. Wright, *Disposable Women and Other Myths of Global Capitalism* (New York: Routledge, 2006).
- <sup>114</sup> Nicholas De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31 (2002): 433.
- <sup>115</sup> De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life."
- <sup>116</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 91.
- <sup>117</sup> Chavez, *Covering Immigration*, 193, 229.
- <sup>118</sup> Rana, *Terrifying Muslims*.
- <sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>120</sup> Cacho, *Social Death*, 8.
- <sup>121</sup> Both Welch's (2002) and Schrag's (2010) books compare nativist panics about various groups of immigrants since the 1800s.
- <sup>122</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*, 2–5.
- <sup>123</sup> Luibhéid, *Entry Denied*, xviii.
- <sup>124</sup> Eagleton cited in Sara Mills, *Discourse* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 46.
- <sup>125</sup> Norman Fairclough, *Language and Power*, 2nd ed. (New York: Pearson Education, 2001).
- <sup>126</sup> Chris Weedon, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1996), 21.
- <sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.
- <sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.
- <sup>129</sup> Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*, 5.
- <sup>130</sup> Lauren Berlant, "The Epistemology of State Emotion," in *Dissent in Dangerous Times*, ed. Sarat Austin (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2005), 47.
- <sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>132</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 13.
- <sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.
- <sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 92, 45.
- <sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.
- <sup>136</sup> See Southern Poverty Law Center. 2002. "John Tanton Is the Mastermind behind the Organized Anti-Immigration Movement," *Intelligence Report* 106
- <sup>137</sup> Brimelow, *Alien Nation*.
- <sup>138</sup> As Amira Jarmakani points out, this makes Virginia Dare the first 'anchor baby.'
- <sup>139</sup> Buchanan, *The Death of the West*; Buchanan, *State of Emergency*.
- <sup>140</sup> Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga, eds., *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today's* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007).
- <sup>141</sup> Michelle Malkin, *Invasion: How America Still Welcomes Terrorists, Criminals, And Other Foreign Menaces To Our Shores* (New York: Regnery Publishing, 2004).
- <sup>142</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We*.
- <sup>143</sup> Allan Wall, "Rep. Steve King Introduces House Bill to Close Up Anchor Baby Loophole," *VDARE.com*, January 7, 2013, <http://www.vdare.com/node/27609>; Ben Schott, "Anchor-Baby Loophole," *Schott's Vocab Blog*, June 10, 2010, <http://schott.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/06/10/anchor-baby-loophole/>; Admin, "Closing Anchor Baby Loophole Restores the 14th Amendment," *Human Events: Powerful Conservative Voices*, February 21, 2011, <http://www.humanevents.com/2011/02/21/closing-anchor-baby-loophole-restores-the-14th-amendment/>; Associated Press, "'Anchor Baby' Constitutional Amendment to Face Scrutiny in Congress," *Associated Press*, December 26, 2010, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/12/26/anchor-baby-constitutional-amendment-face-scrutiny-congress/>; "King Introduces Bill Closing 'Anchor Baby' Loophole," *Congressman Steve King*, accessed February 10, 2013, [http://steveking.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=4077:king-introduces-bill-closing-anchor-baby-loophole&catid=71:press-releases&Itemid=300164](http://steveking.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=4077:king-introduces-bill-closing-anchor-baby-loophole&catid=71:press-releases&Itemid=300164).
- <sup>144</sup> Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1990). The phrase, 'will to love,' references Michel Foucault's theorization of the discourse of sexuality as a "will to knowledge" that both supports and constructs sexuality as a central tenet of identity and a science of the self.

- <sup>145</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 1.
- <sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.
- <sup>147</sup> Katharine Betts, "An Interview with Jean Raspail," in *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, ed. John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith (London: Avebury, 1996).
- <sup>148</sup> Inda, *Targeting Immigrants*. According to Inda, 'anti-citizens' are subjects who, according to a neoliberal logic of citizenry, are deemed imprudent and unable to become productive members of society. Some examples include the "illegal alien" and the "welfare queen" both of which are figures who are widely constructed as using state resources, yet not contributing to the state.
- <sup>149</sup> Ed Cohen, *A Body Worth Defending: Immunity, Biopolitics, and the Apotheosis of the Modern Body* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009), 11–26.
- <sup>150</sup> Chela Sandoval, *Methodology of the Oppressed* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 86.
- <sup>151</sup> Razack, *Casting Out*, 47.
- <sup>152</sup> Samuel Francis cited in Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 165.
- <sup>153</sup> Brimelow, *Alien Nation*, 211.
- <sup>154</sup> Samuel Francis, "Funding 'Demographic Warfare'," in *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, ed. John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith (London: Avebury, 1996), 200.
- <sup>155</sup> Tara Murphy, "We Shall Overwhelm," in *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, ed. John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith (London: Avebury, 1996), 202.
- <sup>156</sup> McClintock, "Paranoid Empire," 53.
- <sup>157</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 74.
- <sup>158</sup> The next chapter will explore the tension between fear and love more clearly.
- <sup>159</sup> Some examples of this include: Buchanan has a chapter in *State of Emergency* titled "The Face of America: 2050" (36-50). He also passionately declares, "a nation is organic, a nation is alive; a nation has a beating heart," and later on claims that nations are "embryonic" (141). Brimelow specifies the linkages of blood implied in the word "nation," claiming that it is meant to suggest familial and blood relations (203). He also talks about receiving nations need to "digest" a large influx of migrants before taking in more (212).
- <sup>160</sup> Howard Markel and Alexandra Minna Stern, "The Foreignness of Germs: The Persistent Association of Immigrants and Disease in American Society," *The Milbank Quarterly* 80, no. 4 (2002): 757; Jonathan Xavier Inda, "Foreign Bodies: Migrants, Parasites, and the Pathological Body Politic," *Discourse* 22, no. 3 (2000): 46–62.
- <sup>161</sup> Critical Art Ensemble, "Bioparanoia and the Culture of Control," in *Tactical Biopolitics: Art, Activism, and Technoscience* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008), 414–421.
- <sup>162</sup> Stuart Hall, "The Spectacle of the 'Other'," in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, ed. Stuart Hall (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 1997); Guy Debord, "The Society of the Spectacle," in *The Visual Culture Reader*, ed. Mirzoeff Nicholas, 2nd Edition (New York: Routledge, 2002), 142.
- <sup>163</sup> Hall, "Spectacle," 245.
- <sup>164</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 10.
- <sup>165</sup> Critical Art Ensemble, "Bioparanoia and the Culture of Control," 422.
- <sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>167</sup> Murphy, "We Shall Overwhelm," 202.
- <sup>168</sup> Samuel Francis, "Funding 'Demographic Warfare'," in *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, ed. John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith (London: Avebury, 1996), 200.
- <sup>169</sup> Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*, 67.
- <sup>170</sup> Michel Foucault, "Society Must Be Defended": *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), 247.
- <sup>171</sup> Cohen, *A Body Worth Defending*.
- <sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.
- <sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.
- <sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 14–15.
- <sup>176</sup> Michel Foucault, *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 267.
- <sup>177</sup> Rey Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 7.

- <sup>178</sup> Ibid., 3.
- <sup>179</sup> Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, 1.
- <sup>180</sup> Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*, 139; Michel Foucault, *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New Press, The, 1998), 55.
- <sup>181</sup> Foucault, *Ethics*, 51.
- <sup>182</sup> Jasbir K. Puar and Amit Rai, "Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots," *Social Text* 20, no. 3 (2002): 119.
- <sup>183</sup> Foucault, *Ethics*.
- <sup>184</sup> Foucault, *Ethics*, 53. Foucault does not explicitly say that the onanist is the part of the white familial unit. Along with Foucault's theories of degeneracy and biopolitics, I am employing Stoler's (1995) and Puar and Rai's (2002) revisions and theorizations of how race and sexuality are integral to the production of both degeneracy and the bourgeoisie.
- <sup>185</sup> Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 255.
- <sup>186</sup> Ibid., 258.
- <sup>187</sup> Puar and Rai, "Monster, Terrorist, Fag."
- <sup>188</sup> Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 249.
- <sup>189</sup> Foucault, *Ethics*, 51.
- <sup>190</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*; Buchanan, *The Death of the West*.
- <sup>191</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 11.
- <sup>192</sup> Brimelow, *Alien Nation*, 238.
- <sup>193</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 83.
- <sup>194</sup> Brimelow, *Alien Nation*, 238.
- <sup>195</sup> Malkin, *Invasion*, 234.
- <sup>196</sup> Critical Art Ensemble, "Bioparanoia and the Culture of Control," 421.
- <sup>197</sup> John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith, eds., *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies* (London: Avebury, 1996); Buchanan, *State of Emergency*; Buchanan, *The Death of the West*; Mac Donald, Hanson, and Malanga, *The Immigration Solution*; Malkin, *Invasion*; Brimelow, *Alien Nation*.
- <sup>198</sup> See Leo Chavez (2002; 2008)
- <sup>199</sup> In "The Abnormals" Foucault claims that the human monster is constructed as an especially dangerous individual, which contributes to their incurability (*Ethics*, 52).
- <sup>200</sup> Critical Art Ensemble, "Bioparanoia and the Culture of Control," 414.
- <sup>201</sup> All of the books and articles in my sample reference crime statistics and indicate the types of crimes perpetuated by undocumented immigrants. Some examples include: Brimelow, *Alien Nation*, 7; Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 142-143; Heather Mac Donald, "The Illegal-Alien Crime Wave," in *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today's*, ed. Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007), 75-94; Heather Mac Donald, "The Immigrant Gang Plague," in *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today's*, ed. Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007), 95-115.; Mac Donald, *Straight*, 77; Malkin, *Invasion*
- <sup>202</sup> Malkin, *Invasion*, 29.
- <sup>203</sup> Ibid., 13, 87, 113, 124, 217.
- <sup>204</sup> Luibhéid, "Sexuality, Migration, and the Shifting Line Between Legal and Illegal Status," 291.
- <sup>205</sup> Buchanan, *The Death of the West*, 125.
- <sup>206</sup> Myron Magnet, "Introduction," in *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today's*, ed. Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007), 7.
- <sup>207</sup> Mac Donald, "The Immigrant Gang Plague," 112.
- <sup>208</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 86.
- <sup>209</sup> Ibid., 86-87.
- <sup>210</sup> Cohen, *A Body Worth Defending*, 8.
- <sup>211</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*. De Genova finds that in the United States migrant illegality consistently refers to Mexicans as the exemplar "illegal" immigrant so that public discourse about "illegal" immigration is public

discourse about Mexican immigration. Importantly, “Mexican” is a racialized category that includes all Latinos that are read in the media as Mexican.

<sup>212</sup> Joseph Fallon, “The Racial and Ethnic Transformation of the U.S.,” in *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*, ed. John Tanton, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith (London: Avebury, 1996), 179–181.

<sup>213</sup> Kanaaneh, *Birthing the Nation*, 26.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>215</sup> Heather Mac Donald, “Hispanic Family Values?,” in *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, ed. Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007), 116.

<sup>216</sup> Tanton, “Jumping the Queue,” 1.

<sup>217</sup> Tanton, “Jumping the Queue.”

<sup>218</sup> The only author in my sample who does not draw on the overpopulation panic, of which John Tanton is a major contributor, is Patrick Buchanan.

<sup>219</sup> “Killing” is referencing Buchanan’s argument that Mexican migration to California has killed it (I guess he doesn’t know that migrant labor from Mexico and Asia built California after it was annexed from Mexico). See: Patrick J. Buchanan, “Who Killed California?,” *World Net Daily*, July 30, 2003, <http://www.wnd.com/2003/07/20030/>.

<sup>220</sup> Mac Donald, Hanson, and Malanga, *The Immigration Solution*; Huntington, *Who Are We*, 224; Tanton, “Jumping the Queue,” 1; Schuck and Smith, “Citizenship Without Consent,” 1996, 22.

<sup>221</sup> Mac Donald, “The Immigrant Gang Plague,” 104.

<sup>222</sup> Heather Mac Donald, “Seeing Today’s Immigrants Straight,” in *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s*, ed. Heather Mac Donald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007), 70.

<sup>223</sup> Samuel Francis, “Funding ‘Demographic Warfare,’” in *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*. Edited by John Tanton, Denis McCormack, & Joseph Wayne Smith (London: Avebury, 1996), 196. He uses this term “to denote the concept of instigating and exploiting mass population movements” (196). Second quote is from Brimelow, *Alien Nation*, 75.

<sup>224</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 12.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*, 200.

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, 191–200.

<sup>227</sup> Betts, “An Interview with Jean Raspail,” 208.

<sup>228</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We*, 11.

<sup>229</sup> Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*.

<sup>230</sup> Mac Donald, “The Immigrant Gang Plague,” 96.

<sup>231</sup> Heather Mac Donald, “Hispanic Family Values?,” in *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today’s* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007), 116

<sup>232</sup> Mac Donald, “Hispanic Family Values?,” 2007, 117.

<sup>233</sup> Nancy Lesko, *Act Your Age!: A Cultural Construction of Adolescence* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 21–22.

<sup>234</sup> Lesko, *Act Your Age!*.

<sup>235</sup> Mac Donald, Hanson, and Malanga, *The Immigration Solution*, 164, 166.

<sup>236</sup> Mac Donald, “Seeing Today’s Immigrants Straight,” 53.

<sup>237</sup> Peter Brimelow, “RICO Lawyer Howard Foster On Anchor Baby Loophole,” *VDARE.com*, September 8, 2010, <http://www.vdare.com/node/8815>; Patrick J. Buchanan, “Is This Our America Anymore?,” *Pat’s Columns*, December 10, 2010, <http://buchanan.org/blog/is-this-our-america-anymore-4582>; Beilenson, “Case for Correction by Constitutional Amendment”; Stein, “Citizenship and the Babies of Non-Citizens”; Wood, “Losing Control of the Nation’s Future--Part Two--Birthright Citizenship and Illegal Aliens.”

<sup>238</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 31.

<sup>239</sup> Buchanan, *The Death of the West*, 141.

<sup>240</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 259.

<sup>241</sup> Ina, “Foreign Bodies”; Markel and Stern, “The Foreignness of Germs: The Persistent Association of Immigrants and Disease in American Society”; Alexandra Minna Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America*, 1st ed. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005).

- <sup>242</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We*, 256.
- <sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*, 222.
- <sup>244</sup> *Ibid.*, 238.
- <sup>245</sup> *Ibid.*, 252.
- <sup>246</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.
- <sup>247</sup> Sander Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 89. Also, according to Foucault degeneracy is deemed to be inherited; “anyone who has been sexually debauched is assumed to have a heredity. Their descendants will be affected for generations, [...]” (2003, 252).
- <sup>248</sup> Mac Donald, Hanson, and Malanga, *The Immigration Solution*; Heather Mac Donald, “Hispanic Family Values?,” *City Journal*, Autumn 2006.
- <sup>249</sup> Mac Donald, “Seeing Today’s Immigrants Straight,” 66.
- <sup>250</sup> Gary Young, “BBC Radio 4 - Positively Flawed? Affirmative Action and the Future of America, Gary Young Talks to Professor Lino Graglia,” *BBC*, December 6, 2012, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p0127k6n>.
- <sup>251</sup> Mac Donald, “Seeing Today’s Immigrants Straight,” 64.
- <sup>252</sup> Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*; Roberts, *Killing the Black Body*.
- <sup>253</sup> Mac Donald, “Hispanic Family Values?,” Autumn 2006.
- <sup>254</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>255</sup> Mac Donald, “Hispanic Family Values?,” 2007, 120.
- <sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.
- <sup>257</sup> Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*.
- <sup>258</sup> Foucault, *Ethics*.
- <sup>259</sup> Both Buchanan (2002, 2006) and Brimelow (1995) cite Charles Murray’s books and articles on IQ and race. Mac Donald takes a cultural deterministic approach, arguing that the social degeneracies she describes continue in generations of Hispanic families (2007).
- <sup>260</sup> Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 14.
- <sup>261</sup> Brimelow, *Alien Nation*, 178.
- <sup>262</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 125.
- <sup>263</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We*, 253.
- <sup>264</sup> Siobhan B. Somerville, “Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization,” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2005): 670.
- <sup>265</sup> Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*; Lesko, *Act Your Age!*.
- <sup>266</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 62.
- <sup>267</sup> Razack, *Casting Out*, 175.
- <sup>268</sup> Brimelow, *Alien Nation*, 75.
- <sup>269</sup> Puar and Rai, “Monster, Terrorist, Fag,” 119.
- <sup>270</sup> Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*, 7.
- <sup>271</sup> Nathan Deal, *Citizenship Reform Act of 2005*, 2005; John Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty* (Washington, DC, 2005).
- <sup>272</sup> Peter H. Schuck, “Citizen Terrorist,” *Hoover Institution’s Policy Review* 164 (December 2010), <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/58011>.
- <sup>273</sup> Rachel E. Rosenbloom, “Policing the Borders of Birthright Citizenship: Some Thoughts on the New (and Old) Restrictionism,” *Washburn Law Journal* 51 (2012): 311–330; Mae Ngai, “Birthright Citizenship and the Alien Citizen,” *Fordham Law Review* 75, no. 5 (2007): 2521–2530; Mendoza, “Anchors Aweigh.”
- <sup>274</sup> Schuck and Smith, “Citizenship Without Consent,” 1996, 21.
- <sup>275</sup> Though the logical implications of this argument are beyond the scope of this project, it is worth noting that if we solely accepted the drafters’ of the Constitution and its amendments *intent*, “man” and “people” would still just apply to white men.
- <sup>276</sup> Schuck and Smith, “Citizenship Without Consent,” 1996. See Mae Ngai’s “Alien Citizen,” for a good interrogation into how the argument about consent conveniently only applies to birthright citizenship, not citizenship based on lineage, yet whom one is born to is no more of a choice than where one is born.

- <sup>277</sup> Povinelli, *The Empire of Love*, 177.
- <sup>278</sup> Ibid., 178.
- <sup>279</sup> Phyllis Schlafly, "American Citizenship Is Precious," *The Phyllis Schlafly Report* 39, no. 4 (November 2005), <http://www.eagleforum.org/psr/2005/nov05/psrnov05.html>; Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*.
- <sup>280</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 67.
- <sup>281</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 18.
- <sup>282</sup> Somerville, "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization"; Eithne Luibhéid, *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality At The Border*, 1st ed. (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
- <sup>283</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 222.
- <sup>284</sup> Felicity Amaya Schaeffer, *Love and Empire: Cybermarriage and Citizenship Across the Americas* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 14.
- <sup>285</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 124–125.
- <sup>286</sup> Schlafly, "American Citizenship Is Precious"; Michelle Malkin, "What Makes an American?," *Townhall.com*, July 4, 2003, [http://townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/2003/07/04/what\\_makes\\_an\\_american](http://townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/2003/07/04/what_makes_an_american); Malkin, *Invasion*.
- <sup>287</sup> Mimi Thi Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom: War, Debt, and Other Refugee Passages* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012).
- <sup>288</sup> Ibid., 12.
- <sup>289</sup> Though Nguyen describes the gift of freedom as "a world-shaping concept describing struggles aimed at freeing peoples from unenlightened forms of social organization through fields of power and violence" mainly through the figure of the refugee, I suggest that the gift of freedom is simultaneously directed inward as it functions as a central technology of American imperialism and war-making abroad.
- <sup>290</sup> Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*. The phrase, 'will to love,' references Michel Foucault's theorization of the discourse of sexuality as a "will to knowledge" that both supports and constructs sexuality as a central tenet of identity and a science of the self.
- <sup>291</sup> Admin, "Closing Anchor Baby Loophole Restores the 14th Amendment"; Virgil Goode, "End Birthright Citizenship," *Human Events: Powerful Conservative Voices*, July 22, 2010, <http://www.humanevents.com/2010/07/22/end-birthright-citizenship/>; Schlafly, "American Citizenship Is Precious"; Malkin, "What Makes an American?"
- <sup>292</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*.
- <sup>293</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*; Povinelli, *The Empire of Love*.
- <sup>294</sup> Inda, *Targeting Immigrants*, 16–17.
- <sup>295</sup> Stoler, "Affective States," 7.
- <sup>296</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 1.
- <sup>297</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 15.
- <sup>298</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We*.
- <sup>299</sup> Stanley Renshon, "Becoming American: The Hidden Core of the Immigration Debate," *Center for Immigration Studies*, January 2007, 9, <http://cis.org/BecomingAmerican-ImmigrationDebate>.
- <sup>300</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*.
- <sup>301</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 139.
- <sup>302</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 129.
- <sup>303</sup> Povinelli, *The Empire of Love*.
- <sup>304</sup> Ibid., 17.
- <sup>305</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*.
- <sup>306</sup> Ibid., 82.
- <sup>307</sup> Siobhan B. Somerville, "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization," *American Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2005): 662.
- <sup>308</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*.
- <sup>309</sup> Ibid., 19.
- <sup>310</sup> Cacho, *Social Death*, 7.

- 
- <sup>311</sup> Renshon, "Becoming American."
- <sup>312</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 71.
- <sup>313</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 74.
- <sup>314</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>315</sup> Razack, *Casting Out*, 166.
- <sup>316</sup> David Gowan Sr. et al., *House Bill 2281*, 2010; Mytheos Holt, "Arizona to Ban Ethnic Studies College Courses?," *The Blaze*, April 2, 2012, <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2012/04/02/arizona-to-ban-ethnic-studies-college-courses/>.
- <sup>317</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*.
- <sup>318</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We*, 164; Buchanan, *State of Emergency*; Buchanan, *The Death of the West*; Buchanan, "Is This Our America Anymore?"
- <sup>319</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 128.
- <sup>320</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>321</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*.
- <sup>322</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 127.
- <sup>323</sup> Cacho, *Social Death*, 13.
- <sup>324</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>325</sup> Goode, "End Birthright Citizenship."
- <sup>326</sup> Wright, *Disposable Women*, 78.
- <sup>327</sup> De Genova, *Working the Boundaries*; Wright, *Disposable Women*, 86.
- <sup>328</sup> De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life."
- <sup>329</sup> McClintock, "Paranoid Empire."
- <sup>330</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*, 133.
- <sup>331</sup> Ibid., 133–134.
- <sup>332</sup> Malkin, *Invasion*, x.
- <sup>333</sup> Rana, *Terrifying Muslims*, 136–137.
- <sup>334</sup> Ngai, "Alien Citizen," 2521.
- <sup>335</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 8–11, 83.
- <sup>336</sup> Ibid., 16, 32.
- <sup>337</sup> Ibid., 11.
- <sup>338</sup> Viviana A. Zelizer, "Money, Power, and Sex," *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 18, no. 303 (2006): 3; Amalia L. Cabezas, *Economies of Desire: Sex and Tourism in Cuba and the Dominican Republic* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2009), 9–10.
- <sup>339</sup> Zelizer, "Money, Power, and Sex."
- <sup>340</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 55.
- <sup>341</sup> Zelizer, "Money, Power, and Sex," 5–6.
- <sup>342</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*.
- <sup>343</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 131.
- <sup>344</sup> Inda, *Targeting Immigrants*.
- <sup>345</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*, 8.
- <sup>346</sup> Ibid., 8–9.
- <sup>347</sup> Somerville, "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization," 661.
- <sup>348</sup> Schuck and Smith, "Citizenship Without Consent," 1996; Schuck and Smith, *Citizenship Without Consent*, 1985.
- <sup>349</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*.
- <sup>350</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 73.
- <sup>351</sup> Lino Graglia, "Birthright Citizenship for the Children of Illegal Aliens: An Irrational Public Policy," *Texas Review of Law and Politics* 14, no. 1 (2010): 9.
- <sup>352</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 16.
- <sup>353</sup> Graglia, "Birthright Citizenship for the Children of Illegal Aliens," 9.
- <sup>354</sup> Luibhéid, *Entry Denied*; Somerville, "Notes Toward a Queer History of Naturalization."
- <sup>355</sup> Amaya Schaeffer, *Love and Empire*, 18.

- <sup>356</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 61; Schuck and Smith, "Citizenship Without Consent," 1996.
- <sup>357</sup> Graglia, "Birthright Citizenship for the Children of Illegal Aliens," 9–10; Schuck and Smith, "Citizenship Without Consent," 1996, 3.
- <sup>358</sup> Schuck and Smith, "Citizenship Without Consent," 1996, 22.
- <sup>359</sup> Buchanan, *State of Emergency*; Brimelow, *Alien Nation*; Tanton, "Jumping the Queue"; Wood, "Losing Control of the Nation's Future--Part Two--Birthright Citizenship and Illegal Aliens."
- <sup>360</sup> Deal, *Citizenship Reform Act of 2005*.
- <sup>361</sup> Eithne Luibhéid and Lionel Cantu, eds., *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, U.S. Citizenship, and Border Crossings*, 1st ed. (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
- <sup>362</sup> Cacho, *Social Death*, 128.
- <sup>363</sup> Povinelli, *The Empire of Love*, 183.
- <sup>364</sup> Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*, 16–21.
- <sup>365</sup> Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 74.
- <sup>366</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>367</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*, 149–150.
- <sup>368</sup> Ibid., 134–135.
- <sup>369</sup> Ibid., 164.
- <sup>370</sup> Ibid., 166.
- <sup>371</sup> McClintock, "Paranoid Empire."
- <sup>372</sup> Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*, 195.
- <sup>373</sup> Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 30.
- <sup>374</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>375</sup> Peter Nyers, "The Accidental Citizen: Acts of Sovereignty and (Un)making Citizenship," *Economy and Society* 35, no. 1 (2006): 22–41.
- <sup>376</sup> Michelle Malkin, *Invasion: How America Still Welcomes Terrorists, Criminals, And Other Foreign Menaces to Our Shores* (New York: Regnery Publishing, 2004); Michelle Malkin, "What Makes an American?," *Townhall.com*, July 4, 2003, [http://townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/2003/07/04/what\\_makes\\_an\\_american](http://townhall.com/columnists/michellemalkin/2003/07/04/what_makes_an_american); W.D. Reasoner, "Birthright Citizenship for the Children of Visitors: A National Security Problem in the Making?" Center for Immigration Studies, *Center for Immigration Studies Background Report*, March 2011; Tom Tancredo, "The Barbarians Are Past the Gate," *Human Events: Powerful Conservative Voices*, October 18, 2006, <http://www.humanevents.com/2006/10/18/the-barbarians-are-past-the-gate/>; Edward J. Erlar, "Birthright Citizenship and Dual Citizenship: Harbingers of Administrative Tyranny," *Imprimis* 37, no. 7 (2008): 1–5; John Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty* (Washington, DC, 2005); Stanley Renshon, "Becoming American: The Hidden Core of the Immigration Debate," *Center for Immigration Studies*, January 2007, <http://cis.org/BecomingAmerican-ImmigrationDebate>.
- <sup>377</sup> Malkin, "What Makes an American?"; Malkin, *Invasion*; Hostettler et al., *Dual Citizenship, Birthright Citizenship, and the Meaning of Sovereignty*, 4.
- <sup>378</sup> Schuck, "Citizen Terrorist," 7.
- <sup>379</sup> Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*, 178.
- <sup>380</sup> Rana, *Terrifying Muslims*, 155.
- <sup>381</sup> "Temporary" is in quotation marks because what documented migrant is not technically using a temporary form of documentation? Visas expire and people must reapply.
- <sup>382</sup> McClintock, "Paranoid Empire," 53.
- <sup>383</sup> See for example: Hatty Lee and Seth Freed Wessler, "How Millions Could Get Cut Out of Immigration Reform [Infographic]" *COLORLINES*, February 5, 2013, [http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/how\\_millions\\_could\\_get\\_cut\\_out\\_of\\_immigration\\_reform\\_infographic.html](http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/how_millions_could_get_cut_out_of_immigration_reform_infographic.html).
- <sup>384</sup> Seth Freed Wessler, "CEO of Largest Private Prison Company: No Worries About Immigration Reform - COLORLINES," *COLORLINES*, February 14, 2013,

---

[http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/ceo\\_of\\_largest\\_private\\_prison\\_company\\_in\\_us\\_says\\_hes\\_not\\_worried\\_about\\_immigration\\_reform.html](http://colorlines.com/archives/2013/02/ceo_of_largest_private_prison_company_in_us_says_hes_not_worried_about_immigration_reform.html).

<sup>385</sup> Devin Burghart, "Birthright Citizenship Again Under Attack in Congress," *Institute for Research and Education on Human Rights*, January 13, 2013, <http://www.irehr.org/issue-areas/nation-state-and-citizenship/item/456-birthright-citizenship-again-under-attack-in-congress>.

<sup>386</sup> De Genova, "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life."

<sup>387</sup> Ngai, "Alien Citizen," 2528.

<sup>388</sup> *Ibid.*, 2529.

<sup>389</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>390</sup> Eithne Luibhéid, "Nationalist Heterosexuality, Migrant (Il)legality, and Irish Citizenship Law: Queering the Connections," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 110, no. 1 (2011): 180.

<sup>391</sup> *Ibid.*, 189.

<sup>392</sup> Cacho, *Social Death*.

<sup>393</sup> *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>394</sup> Caitlin McDevitt, "Ted Nugent: Welfare Recipients Shouldn't Vote," *POLITICO*, December 4, 2012, <http://www.politico.com/blogs/click/2012/12/ted-nugent-welfare-recipients-shouldnt-vote-151063.html>.

<sup>395</sup> Étienne Balibar, *We, the People of Europe?: Reflections on Transnational Citizenship* (Princeton University Press, 2009), 15.