

HC 231: Social Science Inquiry (CRN: 17818)

Deportation from the United States – *University of Oregon* – Fall 2020

Instructor: Dr. Tobin Hansen

Email: thansen2@uoregon.edu

Office Hours: MonThu 0830-1000 hrs

Class Meeting Schedule: MonWed 1615-1745 hrs

Class Location: Zoom Meeting ID: 997 8012 2171

Office Hours Meeting Slot: <https://tinyurl.com/y6rs2z3k>

Course Description

Who belongs in the United States? How is belonging understood and policed? And what are the consequences of expulsion? These questions illuminate this course's concern with the U.S. government's robust deportation machinery and its effects on communities and individuals.

This course explores deportation from the United States in historical and contemporary social and political context. Our examination of the logics of and mechanisms for expelling "undesirable" populations will provide an entrée into certain people's relative social devaluation and perceived non-membership, which underpin the U.S. government's contemporary deportation regime. By considering how social identities such as race, gender, class, and nationality shape social and legal belonging, we will bring into focus the rationalization of population management through technologies of identification, apprehension, and expulsion that leave people on the outside looking in. We will also elucidate how U.S. government deportation shapes people's lived experiences. The course takes an anthropological approach to belonging and removal and also engages ideas from geography, history, philosophy, political science, and sociology.

Course Objectives

After successful completion of this course, you will be able to:

- Outline scholarly conceptions of social, cultural, and political-legal membership in local and national communities.
- Trace broadly de jure and de facto right to presence since the late 19th century.
- Explain relationships between membership and the social identities of race, gender, social class, language, and nationality.
- Sketch the logics of and mechanisms for expulsion from the United States and its social effects.
- Develop academic writing and oral presentation skills that demonstrate critical thinking and well-developed argumentation about social difference and belonging.
- Engage in both academic and public debates regarding noncitizen belonging.
- Write reflexively about the implications of your positioning within globalized social, economic, and political systems.

Required Texts

Goodman, Adam. 2020. *The Deportation Machine*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Heidbrink, Lauren. 2019. *Migranthood: Youth in a New Era of Deportation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Other required texts are available on Canvas.

Course Logistics

Course Format: This is a synchronous course, meaning that we have live audio/video class meetings on Zoom. Course readings, explanations of activities and expectations, and deadlines are available on the online course platform—called Canvas—and in this syllabus. You will submit assignments on Canvas. In this course you are expected to take an active role in your learning. Completing course activities on time and in a high-quality manner requires motivation, organization, and responsibility. *Be resolute your attentiveness to course content, activities, and due dates.* Anticipate the course calendar and be in touch well before a due date with a situation regarding completing assignments on time. To maximize your learning experience and keep the whole group on pace, you are expected to actively engage the course material and complete activities *before* deadlines.

Communication: Regular, edifying, and genial communication is important to a learning community. We will have regular contact during semiweekly class meetings via Zoom. I am happy to schedule additional Zoom meetings with you during office hours to talk more about what we are learning, give additional feedback on coursework, or offer support and guidance as you navigate your University of Oregon career and beyond. For general questions, e.g. regarding due dates, please consult the syllabus and Module tabs on Canvas first. Feel free to email me for any support that I can provide. When emailing, keep the following points in mind:

- Please put “HC 231” and the topic in the subject line of your email.
- My preference is that you begin your message with “Dear Tobin” or “Hi Tobin,” instead of “Hey” or simply no salutation at all. If you would rather call me “Dr. Hansen” or “Instructor Hansen,” that’s fine. I identify with “he” or “they” pronouns. Feel free to let me know if you have a preferred way to be addressed.
- Between Monday and Friday, generally expect a response to emails within 24 hours.
- Please check your email and Canvas announcements regularly.

Course Requirements

❖ Attendance, Preparation, and Participation Self-Evaluation (15%):

You are expected to take an active role in your learning and to engage course content thoughtfully as you make connections to life experiences and previous learning and enrich the way you understand deportation. I expect you to make meaningful contributions in class: offering comments, questions, and critiques; listening attentively to others and responding to their ideas when appropriate; and doing your part to get the group started on time and working efficiently. You will reflect on and assess your participation, using the Participation Guidelines and Rubric, in order to assign yourself a score and make comments on your engagement and opportunities for improvement.

❖ Current Event Presentation (5%):

You will make an individual presentation (4-6 minutes long) on a relevant current event (broadly conceived), such as contemporary congressional debates or executive orders related to an aspect of immigration enforcement, a public figure’s portrayals of noncitizens in the United States, or the U.S. Department of Homeland Security’s release or withholding of data. Presentations should rely on multiple, credible sources and these should be mentioned in the presentation. In your explanation of the event, you should provide a clear

summary and offer an analysis in light of the topics and concepts that we are examining in the course. A visual component is recommended, but not required.

❖ **Discussion Facilitation (15%):**

In a group of three, you will facilitate discussion for approximately 30-35 minutes once during the course. The goal of our engagement with course texts is not to summarize them. Instead, the objective is to critically engage texts such that we draw out central themes and generate new ways of considering course topics.

You and your partners should incorporate the following three activities into your Discussion Facilitation session:

- 1) *A brief introduction to the topic using an artifact that stimulates our thinking. Artifacts might be a video clip, news article, song, social media post, or similar object that encourage us to connect with an aspect of the day's topic and texts that we've read.*
- 2) *A sophisticated contextualization of the readings: their central argument, premises, methods used, evidence, and implications (i.e. what's at stake).*
- 3) *A deeper analysis of the two or three most crucial ideas of the text(s). You may lead us in an analysis by offering stimulating questions or by pinpointing especially rich passages from our reading to revisit. This process is an opportunity to make clear connections between how we understand the text(s) of the day and previous texts and to seek, collectively, to pinpoint tensions between them or areas of agreement and new perspectives on course topics. We may find aspects of the argumentation, logic, tone, or evidence to critique, but we will keep an eye on substance of the claims and the way they reconfigure our perspectives.*

Remember that the objective is to explore ideas by facilitating a discussion with and between your classmates. Endeavor to elicit active participation from others—the group in aggregate should do as much of the talking as you as facilitators.

You are being asked to accomplish a lot in 30-35 minutes. Manage your time effectively. I suggest that after briefly introducing your topic with an artifact, you—as a group—take about 15 minutes to contextualize and analyze, and then use a series of prompts to lead the class in a discussion that examines crucial aspects of the readings in more depth.

You will be assessed for organizing the presentation in a clear and conscientious manner (40%), leading an incisive and creative analysis (50%), and following directions (10%).

❖ **Short Position Papers (5% x2 = 10% total):**

Short Position Papers are reflective essays (each two-pages, double-spaced) that encourage you to consider the political and moral implications of human movement and the right to presence and to develop your own stance regarding these issues. In writing Short Position Papers, you will contemplate broad philosophical arguments for and

against unfettered immigration and immigration restrictionism. You will not directly rely on, cite, or list sources.

For the first Short Position Paper, you will take a firm stand for one of two extremes: either for unlimited movement over national borders or for robust immigration restrictionism. In your paper you may consider arguments for both sides, but you will not argue for the middle ground. The first Short Position Paper is an opportunity to identify the political and moral values that underpin immigration regulation and begin to take stock of your own beliefs.

The second Short Position Paper provides the opportunity for you to consolidate and clarify your political and moral values regarding movement and presence after our exploration of deportation from the United States during the term. In this paper, you will stake out a nuanced position within the range of political and moral possibilities.

Short Position Papers will be assessed based on three criteria: a well-defined thesis (15%), clarity and organization (35%), a robust and logical discussion (40%), and conforming to guidelines (10%).

❖ **Letter to General Audience or Government Official (10%):**

Letters will be written with the intention of influencing public debate or shaping public policy. Letters are an opportunity for you to consider a message regarding the political or moral implications of deportation—given its historical, social, political, and economic context—and disseminate it to a wider public or to an elected official. You will then select a target audience, craft a letter that persuasively makes your case, and upload or send the letter to the media platform or public office that you've identified.

Letters will be assessed based on three criteria: a well-defined thesis (15%), clarity and organization (35%), robust and logical discussion (40%), and following guidelines (10%).

❖ **Research Paper Topic and Sources (5%):**

For the Research Paper Topic and Sources assignment, you will develop and submit a topic, research question, and list of seven to ten academic sources—a first step toward producing your Final Research Paper. You will outline your proposed topic and research question in a paragraph that describes the directions you want your exploration to take and the specific question you want to answer. Your list of seven to ten academic articles and books should provide bibliographic information as well as a two- or three-sentence synopsis of each source.

❖ **Research Paper Outline (5%):**

For the Research Paper Outline, you will resubmit your revised Research Paper Topic and Sources as well as a section-by-section outline of your paper that provides summaries of your introduction, background, evidence, and discussion. The outline should reflect your vision for the structure of your argument and evidence you are providing.

❖ **Final Research Paper (30%):**

The Final Research Paper (4-6 pages, double-spaced) is the culmination of your inquiry into an aspect of deportation. It will reflect the manner in which you have engaged with and critically examined a central course topic.

Research Papers will be assessed using four Writing Evaluation Rubric criteria: Content Development and Analysis (30%), Sources and Evidence (30%), Organization and Clarity (30%), and Context and Purpose (10%).

❖ **Miscellaneous (5%):**

Getting to Know You Survey, Final Reflection, etc.

Accessibility

The University of Oregon is working to create inclusive learning environments. Please notify me if there are aspects of this course that result in disability related barriers to your participation. For more information or assistance, you are also encouraged to contact the Accessible Education Center, 164 Oregon Hall, 346-1155; website: <http://aec.uoregon.edu/> If you are not a student with a documented disability through Disability Services, but you would like for me to know about class issues that will impact your ability to learn, I encourage you to contact me so that we can strategize how you can get the most out of this course.

Equity and Inclusion

The University of Oregon is a place where people from different cultures and experiences learn together; understanding and respecting these differences are critical for the University to be a place of open-minded inquiry where, in challenging the boundaries of knowledge, we include and value all members of our community. The university values our diversity and seeks to foster equity and inclusion in a welcoming, safe, and respectful community. For more information or assistance, you are also encouraged to contact the following campus services:

- Division of Equity and Inclusion, 1 Johnson Hall, 346-3175; website: <http://inclusion.uoregon.edu/>
- Center for Multicultural Academic Excellence (CMAE), 164 Oregon Hall, 346-3479; website: <https://inclusion.uoregon.edu/content/center-multicultural-academic-excellence-cmae>
- Center on Diversity and Community, 54 Susan Campbell Hall, 346-3212; website: <http://codac.uoregon.edu/>

Statement of Support for DACA/Undocumented Students

I support all students regardless of immigration status or country of origin. I support DACAmented and undocumented students and promote your sense of belonging and safety in the United States, the local community, and at UO. I commit to not sharing your status with anyone if you reveal it to me, but also want to remind you that when interacting with faculty, staff, and offices around campus you are never required to reveal your immigration status.

Reporting

As a UO employee, I have certain reporting obligations as explained on the [Employee Reporting Obligations](#) webpage. If you experience any form of prohibited discrimination or harassment,

including sex- or gender-based violence, you will find information at safe.uoregon.edu, respect.uoregon.edu, or investigations.uoregon.edu. Moreover, for help you may contact the non-confidential Title IX office (541-346-8136), Office of Civil Rights Compliance (541-346-3123), or Dean of Students offices (541-346-3216), or call the 24-7 hotline 541-346-SAFE. I am also a mandatory reporter of child abuse. Additional information is available at [Mandatory Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect](#).

Academic Integrity

The University Student Conduct Code (available at conduct.uoregon.edu) defines academic misconduct. Students are prohibited from committing or attempting to commit any act that constitutes academic misconduct. By way of example, students should not give or receive (or attempt to give or receive) unauthorized help on assignments or examinations without my express permission. Students should properly acknowledge and document all sources of information (e.g. quotations, paraphrases, ideas) and use only the sources and resources that I authorize. If there is any question about whether an act constitutes academic misconduct, it is your obligation to clarify the question with me before committing or attempting to commit the act. Please contact me with any questions you have about academic conduct.

Instructor Statement on Acceptable Communication

Interactions within our remote, digital classroom should promote a supportive, collaborative, and non-threatening environment. This includes during Zoom meetings, on Discussions threads, via email, or on any other communicative medium. Learning is not a linear process; it is chaotic, occurs in fits and starts, and depends on our interacting with one another about nuanced ideas. I take a constructivist approach to teaching and learning, meaning that I seek to help you make connections between your existing ideas, experiences, and values and new ones you'll be exposed to. Respectful collaboration with me and your classmates is key to this process.

Community learning is challenging. It requires attention, effort, and consistency. It isn't always easy to listen closely to others, humbly question our own ideas, and respond in ways that stimulate our learning and that of others. And it takes time to develop the trust needed to risk sharing our ideas and ourselves. In building trust, we can make some assumptions about each other (e.g. we all value learning?) but should also keep in mind that there is a lot that we don't know about each other's beliefs and lives. Being surprised, confounded, and prompted by what others say, write, and do, requires focus, energy, and goodwill; but productive challenges to our knowledge and points of view are what force us to muddle through to new ways of thinking and enriched lives. Openness to an approach which values the experiences of others will certainly provide a way for us to communicate respectfully and to appreciate one another's humanity above all else.

The University of Oregon's free speech policy reads, in part: "As a public institution, the University will sustain a higher and more open standard for freedom of inquiry and free speech than may be expected or preferred in private settings... Free inquiry and free speech are the cornerstones of an academic institution committed to the creation and transfer of knowledge." It goes on to say, "It is the responsibility of speakers, listeners and all members of our community to respect others and to promote a culture of mutual inquiry." In other words, we enjoy the freedom to speak, but share the obligation to do so in a way that is thoughtful, responsible, and considerate.

The following are some guidelines for our communication:

- Be constructive. Share ideas, thoughts, and analyses that are thought provoking, yet sensitive to others. When responding to others, express appreciation of their insights; and add to, complement, and extend their ideas.
- Be considerate. Discussions are for analyzing concepts, not the character of the people who express them. Take responsibility for supporting others' learning and for making them feel heard and accepted.
- Be respectful. Take note of your participation and that of others to help the group develop a balanced discussion. For some of us, it's difficult to speak up and for others, it takes effort to be quiet. Be attuned to the interpersonal dynamics of the moment and work hard—by speaking up or laying back, when needed—to improve your group collaboration and communication skills.

Access UO free speech policy and further information at:
<https://policies.uoregon.edu/policy/by/1/01-administration-and-governance/freedom-inquiry-and-free-speech>

Grading					
A+	=97-100%	A	=93-96.9%	A-	=90-92.9%
B+	=87-89.9%	B	=83-86.9%	B-	=80-82.9%
C+	=77-79.9%	C	=73-76.9%	C-	=70-72.9%
D+	=67-69.9%	D	=63-66.9%	D-	=60-62.9%
F=	<59.9%				

Levels of performance:

- (A) Outstanding performance relative to course requirements. Demonstrates mastery of course content at the highest level.
- (B) Performance that is significantly above course requirements. Demonstrates mastery of course content at a high level.
- (C) Performance that meets course requirements in every respect. Demonstrates adequate understanding of course content.
- (D) Performance that is at a minimum level to pass, but does not fully meet requirements in all aspects; demonstrates a marginal understanding of course content.
- (F) Performance that does not meet requirements, for whatever reason. Demonstrates an inadequate understanding of course content.

Course Topics and Readings

Module One: Belonging: Late-19th Century to 1965

In the first module we will trace membership in and exclusion in the United States from the late 19th century. Who has been granted citizenship at different historical moments? How have the twin forces of nativism and racial oppression shaped immigration law and deportation practices? What has the relationship been between citizenship and the right to presence? How have the judiciary, legislature, and executive contributed to the creation of a deportation apparatus? How many deportations have been effectuated historically?

Monday, September 28 – No Class: Yom Kippur

[1] Wednesday, September 30 – Introductions, Course Overview

[2] Monday, October 5 – Early Deportations I

Goodman, Adam. 2020. *The Deportation Machine*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Introduction-Ch 2, pp. 1-72

Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2015. “Deportation Studies: Origins, Themes, and Directions.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(4): 671-681.

Due: Short Position Paper #1

Due: Getting to Know You Survey

Optional:

Hester, Torrie. 2017. *Deportation: The Origins of U.S. Policy*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. Ch 1-3, pp. 7-81.

Moloney, Deirdre M. 2012. *National Insecurities: Immigrants and U.S. Deportation Policy Since 1882*. Ch 3-4, pp. 79-133.

[3] Wednesday, October 7 – Early Deportations II

Goodman, Adam. 2020. *The Deportation Machine*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Ch 3-4, pp. 73-133.

Optional:

Kettner, James H. 1978. *The Development of American Citizenship 1608-1870*. Durham, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press. Prologue, pp. 3-10; Ch 5, pp. 106-128; Ch 10, pp. 287-333.

[4] Monday, October 12 – Guest: Prof. Adam Goodman

Goodman, Adam. 2020. *The Deportation Machine*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Ch 5-Epilogue, pp. 134-205.

Optional:

De Genova, Nicholas. 2002. “Migrant ‘Illegality’ and Deportability in Everyday Life.” *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31: 419-447.

Klebaner, Benjamin J. 1958. "State and Local Immigration Regulation in the United States Before 1882." *International Review of Social History*, 3(2): 269-295.

[5] Wednesday, October 14 – Creating “Illegality” – Guest: Senior Librarian Miriam Rigby

Ngai, Mae M. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Ch. 2, pp. 56-90.

Optional:

Hernández, Kelly Lytle. 2010. *Migra!: A History of the U.S. Border Patrol*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press. Ch. 8-9, pp. 171-217.

Jacobson, Robin Dale, Daniel Tichenor, and T. Elizabeth Durden. 2018. "The Southwest's Uneven Welcome: Immigrant Inclusion and Exclusion in Arizona and New Mexico." *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 37(3): 5-36.

Kang, S. Deborah. 2017. *The INS on the Line: Making Immigration Law on the U.S.-Mexico Border, 1917-1954*. New York: Oxford University Press. Ch. 3, pp. 1-46.

Module Two: Belonging in Local and National Communities

The second module provides a broad theoretical framework for belonging in and banishment from social and political communities. How have scholars conceptualized membership in social and political communities? What is the relationship between social identities and claims to participation in social and political communities?

[6] Monday, October 19 – Moral and Political Dimensions I

Mendoza, José Jorge. 2017. *The Moral and Political Philosophy of Immigration: Liberty, Security, and Equality*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. Ch 5, pp. 95-119.

Due (before class): Research Paper Topic and Sources

[7] Wednesday, October 21 – Moral and Political Dimensions II

Carens, Joseph H. 2013. *The Ethics of Immigration*. New York: Oxford University Press. Ch 1, pp. 1-16; Ch 8 pp. 158-169; Ch 11, pp. 225-254; Ch 12, pp. 255-287.

Optional:

Mendoza, José Jorge. 2015. "Does Cosmopolitan Justice Ever Require Restrictions on Immigration?" *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 29(2): 175-186.

Miller, David. 2015. "Justice in Immigration." *European Journal of Political Theory*, 14(4): 391-408.

Walzer, Michael. 1983. *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books. Ch 2, pp. 31-63.

Module Three: Crime, Race, and Deportation from 1965 to Today

The third module engages the reconfigured relationship—from 1965 to today—between crime, race, and deportation. What have been the effects of the federal legislation (especially in 1965, 1986, 1996, and 2001) that linked crime and immigration regulation? How has mass incarceration influenced the deportation regime? In what ways have policing and immigration enforcement

become entangled? And how has the focus on exclusions shifted from the southwest border to include the U.S. territorial interior?

[8] Monday, October 26 – Mass Deportation

Martínez, Daniel J., Jeremy Slack, and Ricardo Martínez-Schuldt. 2018. “The Rise of Mass Deportation in the United States.” In *The Handbook of Race, Ethnicity, Crime, and Justice, 1st ed.*, edited by Ramiro Martínez, Jr., Meghan E. Hollis, and Jacob I. Stowell, pp. 173-201.

[9] Wednesday, October 28 – Crime and Security

Stumpf, Juliet. 2013. “The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, and Sovereign Power.” In *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, edited by Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda, pp. 59-76. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Optional:

Chacón, Jennifer M. 2013. “The Security Myth: Punishing Immigrants in the Name of National Security.” In *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, edited by Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda, pp.77-93. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

[10] Monday, November 2 – Labor, Capital, and Human Movement

Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2015. *Deported: Immigrant Policing, Disposable Labor, and Global Capitalism*. New York: New York University Press. Introduction, Conclusion, pp. pp. 1-25, 256-265.

Optional:

Inda, Jonathan Xavier. 2013. “Subject to Deportation: IRCA, ‘Criminal Aliens,’ and the policing of immigration.” *Migration Studies*, 1(3): 292-310.

King, Ryan D., Michael Massoglia, and Christopher Uggen. 2012. “Employment and Exile: U.S. Criminal Deportations, 1908-2005.” *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(6): 1786-1825.

[11] Wednesday, November 4 – The Prison-Policing-Deportation Nexus

Heyman, McC. Josiah. 2013. “Constructing a Virtual Wall: Race and Citizenship in U.S.-Mexico Border Policing.” In *Governing Immigration Through Crime: A Reader*, edited by Julie A. Dowling and Jonathan Xavier Inda, pp. 99-113.

Due (before class): Research Paper Outline

Optional:

Macías-Rojas, Patrisia. 2016. *From Deportation to Prison: The Politics of Immigration Enforcement in Post-Civil Rights America*. New York: New York University Press. Ch 3-4, pp. 77-131

[12] Monday, November 9 – Belonging and Deservingness I

Gerkin, Christina. 2013. *Model Immigrants and Undesirable Aliens: The Cost of Immigration Reform in the 1990s*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Introduction-Ch. 1, pp. 1-71.

[13] Wednesday, November 11 – Belonging and Deservingness II

Cacho, Linda M. 2012. *Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected*. New York: New York University Press. Conclusion, pp. 147-168.

Optional:

Coleman, Mathew. 2007. "Immigration Geopolitics Beyond the Mexico-U.S. Border." *Antipode*, 39(1): 54-76.

Ewing, Walter A., Daniel E. Martínez, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2015. *The Criminalization of Immigration in the United States*. Washington D.C.: American Immigration Council.

Module Four: The Aftermath of Deportation

In the fourth module, we will explore the aftermath of deportation. How is deportation experienced? What are the effects of deportation on communities, families, and the nation? What vulnerabilities do deported people face? How do deported people seek to remake their lives?

[14] Monday, November 16 – Conceptualizing Removal and Experiencing Expulsion

Dingeman-Cerda, M. Kathleen and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2015. "Unwelcome Returns: The Alienation of the New American Diaspora in Salvadoran Society." In *The New Deportation Delirium: Interdisciplinary Responses*, edited by Daniel Kanstroom and M. Brinton Lykes, pp. 227-250. New York: New York University Press.

Due (submitted to Canvas): Op-Ed, Letter to the Editor, or Letter to Elected Official

Optional:

Caldwell, Beth C. 2019. *Deported Americans: Life After Deportation to Mexico*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press. Ch 2-3, pp. 49-101.

Hagan, Jaqueline Maria, Nestor Rodriguez, and Brianna Castro. 2011. "Social Effects of Mass Deportations by the United States Government, 2000-10." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(8): 1374-1391.

Peutz, Nathalie. "'Criminal Alien' Deportees in Somaliland: An Ethnography of Removal." In *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*, edited by Nicholas de Genova and Nathalie Peutz, pp. 371-409.

Zilberg, Elana. 2011. *Space of Detention: The Making of a Transnational Gang Crisis Between Los Angeles and San Salvador*. Durham: Duke University Press. Ch. 4, pp. 129-150.

[15] Wednesday, November 18 – Making Life I

Heidbrink, Lauren. 2020. *Migranhood: Youth in a New Era of Deportation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Introduction-Ch 3, pp. 1-100.

Optional:

Coutin, Susan Bibler. 2016. *Exiled Home: Salvadoran Transnational Youth in the Aftermath of Violence*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. Conclusion, pp. 205-225.

[16] Monday, November 23 – Making Life II – Guest: Lauren Heidbrink

Heidbrink, Lauren. 2020. *Migranhood: Youth in a New Era of Deportation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Ch 4-7, pp. 101-181.

Optional:

Golash-Boza, Tanya Maria. 2016. “‘Negative Credentials,’ ‘Foreign-Earned’ Capital, and Call Centers: Guatemalan Deportees’ Precarious Reintegration.” *Citizenship Studies*, 20(3-4): 326-341.

Hagan, Jacqueline, Maria Eschback, and Nestor Rodriguez. 2008. “U.S. Deportation Policy, Family Separation, and Circular Migration.” *International Migration Review*, (42)1: 64-88.

[17] Wednesday, November 25 – Getting By After Deportation

Hansen, Tobin. n.d. “Coming Together: Gendered Care between Men After U.S. Prison and Deportation to Mexico.”

Due (before class): Short Position Paper #2

Optional:

Hansen, Tobin. n.d. “Relief from Deportation?: Gang and Drug Injector Identities, the Risk of Violence, and ‘Particular Social Group’ Membership.”

Film: Grabias, David and Nicole Newnham. 2006. *Sentenced Home: The Deportation of Cambodian-Americans*. United States: Sentenced Home Productions.

[18] Monday, November 30 – Whose Freedom, Whose Security?

Carens, Joseph H. 2013. *The Ethics of Immigration*. New York: Oxford University Press. Ch 11, pp. 225-254.

De Genova, Nicholas. “The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement.” In *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*, edited by Nicholas De Genova and Nathalie Peutz, pp. 33-65. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

[19] Wednesday, December 2 - Conclusion

Wrap up

Due (after class): Final Research Paper

Due (after class): Participation Worksheet