

2009-01-01

A Critical Analysis of Immigration and Terrorism in the USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001 through Political Rhetoric.

Cesar Hugo Rodriguez, Jr,
University of Texas at El Paso, czrjr78@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd



Part of the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rodriguez, Jr., Cesar Hugo, "A Critical Analysis of Immigration and Terrorism in the USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001 through Political Rhetoric." (2009). *Open Access Theses & Dissertations*. 2765.
https://digitalcommons.utep.edu/open_etd/2765

This is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UTEP. For more information, please contact lweber@utep.edu.

A Critical Analysis of Immigration and Terrorism in the USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001 through
Political Rhetoric.

Cesar H. Rodríguez, Jr.

Department of Communication

APPROVED:

Frank G. Pérez, Ph.D. Chair

Richard D. Pineda, Ph.D.

Dennis Bixler-Márquez, Ph.D.

Patricia D. Witherspoon, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

A Critical Analysis of Immigration and Terrorism in
the USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001
through Political Rhetoric.

by

Cesar H. Rodríguez, Jr., B.A.

THESIS

Presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at El Paso
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

December 2009

Acknowledgements

In doing this thesis paper, patience and persistence played a major role in accomplishing this major task. One does not know what they are taking on when trying to obtain a Masters Degree. It shows just what exactly a person is made of in terms of their ability to take on a study that at times seemed out of reach and unattainable. I wish to thank my family, because without their backing and words of encouragement, this thesis would have never been completed. Furthermore, without the aid and resolution of Dr. Frank G. Pérez, Dr. Dennis Bixler-Márquez, and Dr. Richard D. Pineda, this study would have never been completed. I want to thank them all for their persistence in seeing me finish this academic study that was long in the making.

Abstract

The PATRIOT ACT is legislation that was enacted shortly after the terrorist attacks of 9-11. This current thesis is a qualitative study using critical discourse analysis of the PATRIOT ACT, displaying the negative ramifications that it has had on immigrant aliens. A critical analysis of the PATRIOT ACT will be done by utilizing political rhetoric to answer the research questions. Findings suggest the PATRIOT ACT envelopes immigrant aliens as terrorists through the use of specific rhetoric. Attention is given to the rhetoric that is used by government to manipulate the outcome that it desires. Limitations are addressed and ideas for further study are provided.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Chapter	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Literature Review.....	8
3. Methodology.....	13
3.1 Framework.....	22
4. Analysis.....	24
5. Discussion.....	31
5.1 Limitations.....	35
5.2 Future Research.....	36
5.3 Conclusion.....	42
List of References.....	45
Curriculum Vitae.....	51

Chapter 1: Introduction

The PATRIOT ACT is a piece of federal legislation written in response to the 9-11 terrorist attacks against the United States. It dictates new measures that must be followed and executed in a post-September 11 United States. This study examines the impact that the PATRIOT ACT had on immigration during the Presidency of George W. Bush 2001-2008.

As a result of the 2001 terrorist attacks the Congressional Bill HR 3162, Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001, the USA PATRIOT ACT of 2001, became law on October 26, 2001 (Dow, 2004). Elected representatives also reworked the United States' immigration law via the PATRIOT ACT (Boyle & Busse, 2006) and multiple resolutions were included to potentially thwart terrorist attack(s) against the United States by foreign nationals. One resolution is to fortify the northern and southern borders of the nation. In addition, the bill seeks to increase law enforcement personnel and to amplify surveillance and detentions when dealing with "suspected" terrorists. These elements and other measures expanded the definition of "terrorist activities" (Dow, 2004). The end result of the PATRIOT ACT's legal reforms was to cluster immigrant aliens into the potential "terrorist" category. In consequence, it has made it difficult to draw a distinction between a terrorist and a non-terrorist, or in this case an immigrant alien or illegal alien (Boyle & Busse, 2006).

While the United States has never used the PATRIOT ACT against immigrant aliens, the sentiment that the PATRIOT ACT is available for use is comforting. The United States government communicates the misleading rhetoric of the PATRIOT ACT with the title itself. The word *patriot* conjures an image of Americana, magnifying the sacrifices of its citizens during times of hardship since the Revolutionary War. It is rhetoric that delivers a perceived

notion to the receiver and it is part of the fabric of what makes the United States. Therefore, people may perceive it as truth and do not question its authenticity, especially after the horrendous events of 9-11. The PATRIOT ACT also signifies how government can manipulate rhetoric to make it appear that it is out for the best interests of its citizens.

When in reality, it is a manner in which to suppress the rhetorical truth by deflecting its true meaning and converting the truth surreptitiously into an alternative designation. There is an absence of individual interpretation of what the PATRIOT ACT legislation is. Therefore, it is a way for government to communicate without having its objectives questioned. This is significant due to it showcasing the influence and authority that government, as the sender, has on the populace, the receiver.

For purposes of this study, immigrant alien and illegal alien will be used to describe immigrants without proper credentials residing in the United States. *Immigrant alien* is used in the PATRIOT ACT to label immigrants who are residing in the United States. *Illegal aliens* is the term used in scientific literature, more progressive literature uses the term undocumented immigrants. In terms of defining an illegal alien, *Illegal* is an unauthorized border crosser. *Immigrant* is categorized as a person who comes from a permanent settlement (Ngai, 2004). The PATRIOT ACT addressed the immigration issue by increasing the government's ability to detain and deport suspected terrorists (Hines, 2006). In addition, it increased the budget for immigration enforcement and tripled in size the United States Border Patrol along the U.S. national borders in North America (Hines, 2006).

Section 411 of the PATRIOT ACT expands the rank of immigrants that can be legally charged with *terrorists activities, engaging in terrorist activities, and terrorist's association* (Howard, Forest, & Moore, 2006). Under Sec. 802 Definition of Domestic Terrorism of

PATRIOT ACT, the definition of terrorist activities is: assassination, kidnapping, mass destruction, involving acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the laws of the United States (<http://fl1:findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/cnn.docs/terrorism/hr3162.pdf>). An immigrant alien who yields or uses a weapon such as a knife in an altercation, may be charged with engaging in a terrorist activity (Howard, Forest, & Moore, 2006). The PATRIOT ACT has also given the federal government the right to detain anybody suspected of being a terrorist for seven days. However, it is difficult to measure the accuracy of whether those detained are in fact terrorists, or if perceptions play a role in stigmatizing immigrant aliens as such.

Perceptions within themselves produce a mismanaged standpoint towards a certain entity that may have positive or negative connotations. I will argue that the PATRIOT ACT advances perceptions that immigrant aliens are hazardous to the United States. Thus, causing an aperture in how they are perceived in terms of the threat-level immigrant aliens pose. A boundary is drawn to separate immigrant aliens and American citizens. It acknowledges one while simultaneously dismissing the other. The group with which one affiliates becomes that group members identity (Aviram, 2007). A creation of positive self-regard is a motivational factor that develops positive in-group individuality in relation to the out-group (Aviram, 2007). Hence, primary identification is created and can be utilized when social conditions highlight collective identity (Aviram, 2007). When one ethnicity attacks another ethnicity, identification with one's group is enacted. This makes prejudicial actions against an out-group easily attainable. In this context, for example, an outside source (out-group) attacked the United States (in-group).

The mistrust of foreigners emanates from the secrecy that the Bush administration had over the detention of those individuals arrested in the United States or captured abroad in places such as Afghanistan (Tumlin, 2005). The Secret Evidence Repeal Act was annulled after 9- 11,

to give the federal government the authorization to keep individuals in custody without evidence (Saito, 2005). In addition, the federal government does not have to give explanations for a person's detention to any outside sources, not even immigration lawyers (Saito, 2005).

Before the PATRIOT ACT was enacted, proof that a non-citizen was associated with a terrorist organization had to be presented by the government before any allegations or charges could be filed (Hines, 2006). A "known should have known" clause had to be brought forth by the government as evidence in order to make a connection (Hines, 2006). In essence, the United States government had to have suspicion or probable cause to make a terrorist connection to an individual. After the PATRIOT ACT, this clause was nullified and the government acquired open restraining power to detain whomever they felt was of interest.

In 2003, the United States Supreme Court upheld this view by declaring that the detention of immigrants without due process was not a constitutional violation (Hines, 2006). It may be in part because language contained in this clause, "known or should have known," is vague and therefore innocent individuals could be deported from guiltless association with humanitarian or political groups (Feingold, 2006). These groups could be labeled as terrorist organizations by the United States and at the government's discretion (Feingold, 2006).

When individuals are sectioned off into clichéd labels on political grounds, they are then presented in a "good" or "evil" scenario (Edelman, 2001). The PATRIOT ACT legislation does not make a distinction between a terrorist and an immigrant alien, making it difficult to distinguish one from the other. Therefore, the PATRIOT ACT and the ensuing "War on Terror" gave the federal government unlimited power to target those deemed as viable threats to the United States. Among the victims of this action are immigrant aliens without proper documentation that are seen as individuals unknown to American society; as such, they are

viewed with cynicism (Tumlin, 2004). The 9-11 assailants broke immigration law by remaining in the United States after their student visas expired. Once residing in the United States, they financed and orchestrated an attack from within the nation's borders. As a result of the September 11 attacks, immigration control came under scrutiny.

The possible threats from immigrants who come into the United States as terrorists are the primary reasons the PATRIOT ACT was thought necessary. Immigrant's intentions are essentially unknown in terms of what they want to accomplish in the United States. Since 9-11, the course of action taken towards immigration policies are framed around the idea that to combat illegal immigration is to fight terrorism (Tumlin, 2004). As a direct reaction to this terrorism policy, the militarization of the border by means of the United States Army National Guard and civilian groups has taken place along the southern United States border (Gallegos, 2004). The possibility of a person being a terrorist has become a key concern to U.S. immigration officials. Due to the high influx of immigrants through the United States-Mexican border, the United States Army National Guard has been placed to reinforce the United States Border Patrol at certain locations.

Consequently, the United States government view of immigrant aliens being honest and hard working has fallen by the wayside (Ngai, 2004). Immigrant aliens are viewed as the "other," or the out-group of American society. This perspective is due to perceptions that immigrant aliens without proper documentation apparently have no foundational roots in the country. Therefore, they are frowned upon as not-American or un-American (Saito, 2005). These immigrants have thus been categorized as individual(s) with no legal status, an apparition unknown to the society at large (Ngai, 2004). Consequently, immigrant aliens detained under the PATRIOT ACT are denied their due process, and their right to consul with immigration lawyers

(Saito, 2005). Former Attorney General John Ashcroft stated, that “all post 9-11 detainees are terrorists” (Dow, 2004, p25). Thus, any immigrant alien is automatically connected with terrorism, a symbolic interaction between both parties. The Bush-Ashcroft anti-terrorism policy never clarified the distinction between an “illegal alien” or a “terrorist” (Dow, 2004).

According to Saito (2005), the federal government has based their accusations of possible terrorists on stereotypes and/or racial profiling. A precedent has been set in accordance with how an American is expected to appear. Consequently, it has made anyone not matching this image a “non-American” in the eyes of the status quo. These people do not possess the stereotypical appearance of what an American is “supposed” to look like.

Security factors in an era of *asymmetric warfare* is the assumption that United States citizens and the federal government must combat terrorism by casting out illegal immigrants and shutting down the borders (Barry, 2005). Part of the theory behind asymmetric warfare is that illegal immigrant aliens cannot be trusted in a time of war. Again, the United States government has also called out the National Guard to protect its southern borders from possible terrorist penetration (Gallegos, 2004). Opponents of this measure call it excessive and view it as the militarization of the United States (Gallegos, 2004).

The current immigration sentiment brings forth conflict between segments of the White American population and segments of racial and ethnic minority groups (Lee & Ottati, 2002). However, throughout the history of the United States, there has been an association between immigrants (legal or illegal) and the United States government’s enemies. They are intertwined in order to make it manageable to critique and expel them from United States soil. Any foreign influence can be seen as dangerous and untrustworthy. This phenomenon was seen and experienced with great occurrence during World War II by those of German, Japanese, and

Italian descent. They were the United States' enemies that that time and were seen as potential threats to the sovereignty of the United States (Daniels, 2006).

Therefore, the following study will address how undocumented immigrants are portrayed by political rhetoric via the PATRIOT ACT as possible terrorists on American soil. The current thesis will answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How does the political rhetoric contained in the PATRIOT ACT frame undocumented immigrants in the United States?

RQ2: What are the rhetorical implications of uniting terrorism and immigration?

This chapter introduced and framed the thesis's topic of study. It offered insight into the sociopolitical setting that surrounds the topic of immigration to the U.S. after the 9-11 attacks. Chapter 2 will analyze the academic literature on the topic of study in terms of how critical discourse analysis can be used to analyze the rhetoric surrounding the issue. Chapter 3 will demonstrate the methods used for the study. Chapter 4 will describe the final results of the study. Chapter 5 will summarize the present study, address its limitations, and provide ideas for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Political rhetoric is comprised of many attributes that lends itself to public perception, in-group/out-group, and the other. It has its roots in history by showing how political rhetoric can influence an entire nation to conform to a government belief system. Depending on how political rhetoric will be used, stereotypes play a role in laying the foundation for promoting an agenda against a specific ethnic, religious or political faction. Immigration policies in the United States mirror past political rhetoric, not as extreme as before, but still contain the same undertones of what was used before.

Historically, political rhetoric has had a presence that extends to the late 19th Century. However, it was not until the 1930's which was the beginning of political rhetoric being transmitted to a mass audience in the form of propaganda (Nicotra, 2009). It was transmitted to a mass audience through an assortment of media outlets such as radio and propaganda speeches. Propaganda was the popular term for political rhetoric in the 1930's (Nicotra, 2009).

The 1930's was an era in which the function and influence of both language and communication were being understood in America (Nicotra, 2009). In order to understand and educate the American population on language and communication, there were two schools that were formed. These schools were The Institute of Propaganda Analysis (1937) and the Institute for General Semantics (1938) by Count Alfred Korzybski. Both took an academic and influential look at the power and prestige that language and communication had on people.

However, during the 1930's in Europe, there were other governmental entities at work using political rhetoric for their virulent schemes. While the United States was trying to learn the basics of how rhetoric and communication worked, the Nazis were trying to perfect the use of political rhetoric and communication. During World War II, political rhetoric was used to great

effect to serve both the Allies and Axis powers alike. It had a profound effect on the sections of society that it was meant to persuade. This form of political rhetoric displayed venomous effects in terms that it could rally to assemble a nation to do the will of a government. Part of what made up the rhetoric at that time was stereotypes transformed into “truths” about ethnic members of society. The term stereotype can be thought of as having a belief that all people within a specific ethnic or religious group have attributes and characteristics that warrant definite behavior from that ethnicity or religion (Baron, Byrne, & Johnson, 1998). In doing so, it created a lasting effect on those considered the other of those nations.

This government was responsible for taking political rhetoric to new heights. The Nazis communicated their political rhetoric through radio, parades, literature, and cinema (Koonz, 2003). According to Simpson (2008), propaganda filmmaker Remi Reifentahl created one of the most influential propaganda films in existence, *Triumph of the Will* (1934). This propaganda film promoted the superiority of the in-group, while at the same time disgraced the other. They tried to accomplish this feat by adopting propaganda to communicate their political rhetoric to a mass audience. According to Nicotra (2009), propaganda draws on the imagery of “hygiene” in the realm of a social, racial, and personal context. A quote from Aranson (1935) states :

Propaganda, once released, is like a contagion because fear is contagious.

Its phrases are taken up and repeated without any effort to smell out their tainted sources. Why? Because propaganda appeals to the violent emotions of fear and hatred-passions not difficult to mobilize.

The propaganda the Nazis implemented created agents of dissent among the population in order to create a sense of dread and anger towards a particular ethnic or political entity. Stereotyping was commonplace, in order to spawn alarm and revulsion towards those

deemed outside of the societal norms. Joseph Goebbels headed the Ministry of Enlightenment and Propaganda, and he manipulated political rhetoric to control the thoughts that the German population had on the Jewish community, Communists, Catholics, and others deemed as the other. One of his proclamations about propaganda was:

The best propaganda is that which as it were, works invincibly, penetrates the whole of life without the public having any knowledge of the propagandist initiative (Koonz, 2003).

Therefore, when one looks at political rhetoric through a historical perspective, one can see that it has major influence over segments of the population. Today, the application of rhetorical rhetoric to control and belittle members of other ethnicities still exists. Though, they may not be as extreme as that which came out of WWII, but the fact remains that political rhetoric still communicates to society during times of peril. One of the underlying manifestations is the manner that the out-group has been viewed by the in-group through political rhetoric.

According to Lee & Ottatai (2002), the out-group and in-group standpoint is that the out-group (ethnic) is looked at as being unworthy or looked down negatively by the in-group. This is formed through prejudicial or a social hierarchy in order to preserve the social identification or group belongingness of the in-group. A collective identity that reinforces the in-groups preference to be at the top of societal structure is also part of the in-group and out-group stance (Lee & Ottatai, 2002).

In the United States, political rhetoric has played a part in persuading members of the American population to consider immigrant aliens in a certain train of thought. Prior to WWII, there were other anti-immigrant laws that were put in place in the United States. Much like the PATRIOT ACT, these laws attacked immigrants for the possible threats they posed either to

national security or the fabric of the United States. In 1790, the United States Congress passed the first immigration legislation that restricted naturalized citizenship to only *free white men* (Saito, 2005). All others were recognized as the *other*, and therefore were not legitimate contenders to become United States citizens. This was done to keep immigrants who were considered *non-white* from outpopulating the white establishment who held power in the United States.

Chinese immigrants along with immigrants of other ethnicities were used as scapegoats to endorse an anti-immigrant agenda in Congress (LoBreglio, 2004). Anti-immigrant legislation only pertained to those immigrants who were no longer desired in the United States. It consequently made room for the next arrival of immigrants that were needed for cheap labor. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 halted the migration of Chinese immigrants to the United States. Employers then focused their attention to employing Mexican workers to fill the positions needed (LoBreglio, 2004). During the late 1800s to early 1900s, Mexican immigrants came to the United States without any legislative restrictions (LoBreglio, 2004). However, during the 1920's the economy's supply and demand structure in the United States changed. It changed to the extent that Mexican immigrants were not needed for employment in great numbers as they once were.

The 1924 Act was passed to oust and to stop unchecked immigration from coming into the United States (LoBreglio, 2004). This act stipulated that visas be required for all immigrants who came into the United States. Though, many immigrants, primarily Mexican, neglected to follow this law and crossed into the United States without proper documentation. Due to the large numbers of Mexicans crossings, the Border Patrol was created to enforce this legislation

along the borders of the Southwest (LoBreglio, 2004). Immigrants were subjugated in the Southwestern region of the United States, being rounded up and sent back to Mexico by force.

In addition, every three months the migrant had to confirm his or her address in writing to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) (Daniels, 2006). John Ashcroft called for the same action after 9-11 for Middle Easterners and South Asian people living in the United States (Daniels, 2006). Though instead of deportation there would be arrest followed by interrogation. More anti-immigrant legislation soon followed such as the Wetback Act of 1952 and Congressional Bill: HR4437 Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Act of 2005. Both legislative bills targeted Mexican immigrants whose presence in the United States caused a sense of economic, criminal and racial turmoil. The Wetback Act of 1952 was passed, while HR4437 was held off due to its radical call of action against immigrant aliens without proper documentation such as mass deportation.

Perceptions of these ethnicities were increased by the way the media communicated its message about these ethnicities to the American public. As was discussed in the study, rhetoric has the ability to manipulate a train of thought. Chapter 3 will discuss the methodology that is incorporated in the study. It will outline the use intercultural communication, critical discourse analysis, and how qualitative research is used in the study. In addition, it will focus on the use of political rhetoric through speeches and the use of rhetoric during times of war and peril.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Qualitative research will be utilized because it is appropriate for addressing questions about culture, interpretation, and power (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The purpose for using qualitative research in this study is that it conserves for examination the situated form, content, and understanding of societal acts rather than applying it to mathematical or other strict transformations (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). It gives the study the capability to be modifiable and yielding in terms of the qualitative inquiry that will be assembled (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). This study will also include the use of intercultural communication (ICC), an area of study that is concerned with the relational connection between the members of diverse cultural factions (Martin & Nakayama, 1999). Within intercultural communication, sociolinguistics has played a vital role in social constructions of cultural knowledge and identities (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Lofland (1991) characterizes qualitative studies in the types of questions asked:

What kinds of things are going on here? What are the forms of this phenomena? What variations do we find in this phenomenon? That is qualitative analysis is addressed to the task of delineating forms, kinds and types of social phenomena, and of documenting in loving detail the things that exist. (p.13)

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) define qualitative research as researchers who accumulate constructive and imperative forms from obtainable, disconnected assets in order to assemble the situational requirements. In short, it is left to the qualitative researcher to construct a study from the information they have collected in order to reveal relations of power that are illuminated through this method.

ICC is a subfield of communication that has been influenced by postmodern and critical standpoints in terms of Western culture's imposing position regarding homogeneity, assimilation, rationality, and consensus (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Cultures may compose of diverse communities, which comprise of nation states, regional entities, and political systems. Unequal power relations, diversity, and preconceptions of ethnicity, class, and gender identities play a major role in terms of what intercultural communication examines (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

Using this method of sending a message to the general public, a rhetorical conflation between what a terrorist is and how the terrorist is perceived is molded through critical discourse analysis (CDA). According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA is methodologically approaching primary philosophical assumptions, principles, and inherent knowledge-power dynamics. It attempts to capture the affiliation between discourse and society, and the micro-macropolitical structures of power relations. It does so by drawing from an assortment of theoretical backdrops and methodological tools (Luke, 2002).

CDA will be aided by the use of critical theory to further develop the philosophical underlying of this study. According to van Dijk (2001), critical discourse analysis is a form of analysis that demonstrates the exploitation of dominance, inequality, and social power abuses. It originated from discourse analysis, which can be traced to the study of language, speech, and literature extending to approximately 2,000 years ago. Furthermore, it also illustrates how these three entities are then resisted by text and oral communication in a social and political context (van Dijk, 2001).

Political communication, much like critical theory, is active and continually developing to the differing forms of political applications (Esser & Pfetsch, 2004). Political communication

was introduced by Blumler and Gurevitch as a direct result of the study of political cultural study in the 1960s (Pfetsch, 2004). When rhetorical communication is introduced to the political aspect of communication, it delivers a message to adhere to what the audience wants to hear. It influences the political culture and orients itself to opinion building, hence its relevance to the study of the application of the term *terrorist* to a specific individual or person.

During times of war, the political rhetoric that is utilized by the powers that be is persuasive and undeviating. War rhetoric concentrates on the: (a) audience's sense of territoriality; (b) ethnocentricity; (c) optimism; and (d) its relevance to war aims (McPhail, 1994). This has been evident since the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. New terminology has been introduced into American speech which illustrates the nature of the "War on Terror." It is rhetoric that is militaristic in nature, using phrases such as "sleeper cells," "dirty bomb," "border infiltration," and "asymmetrical warfare" (Collins & Glover, 2002).

An example of this was the speech presented by former president George W. Bush who told the American public after the 9-11 attacks

A great people has been moved to defend a great nation. Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.

America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that from shining. Today our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America-with daring our rescue workers,

with the caring for strangers and neighbors who came to give blood and help in any way they could. This is a day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for justice and peace. America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time. None of us will ever forget this day. Yet, we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world (Silberstein, 2002).

The grammatical selection of language is formed in a passive-aggressive tone, so as to sound sympathetic, but vigorous at the same time. This was one of many rhetorical statements made by the Bush administration to tap into the nationalistic sentiments that the nation had at that time. This was prior to the United States entering into Afghanistan, but using such rhetoric has consequences due to it creating a world of understanding that is enveloped by the rhetoric that is outputted (Silberstein, 2002). After the attacks 9-11, the media used titles such as “America Under Attack,” “Attack on America,” and this generation’s “Pearl Harbor.”

The label given to those that caused the attacks of 9-11 was evildoers (Collins & Glover, 2002). In a sense, terrorists are segmented into the label of “good” versus “evil.” It is a simple yet effective manifestation which the American public can understand (Collins & Glover, 2002). The terrorist attacks of 9-11, the mind-set in the political establishment in Washington D.C. was transformed from passive to defensive (Wolfe, 2008). In a sense, an image had to be constructed of what a terrorist looked like and for what Americans should watch.

This rhetoric invokes a distress that may or may not be intended by the audience that is the recipient of such terminology (Collins & Glover, 2002). Complexities evolve as to what the meaning of the message is, because the audience draws their conclusions from past experiences or typecasts. A network of communication is fashioned between the rhetoric that is sent to the

receiver, and how the message is established. When a sender transmits a message to the receiver, senders do not ascertain the power to determine what the definition of the message is.

What occurs is the receiver obtains the message that is sent by the sender. Once the message is grasped by the receiver, then the true definition of the message is divulged. However, pessimistic undertones and fraudulent claims will always be injected into rhetoric that is implied to the general populace (Feldman & Landtsheer, 1998). The first studies of political rhetoric were from The French Revolution (Frey, 1925; Ranft, 1908). All language that is put into a certain context can become political rhetoric.

The use of the name terrorist to any group or nation is used to advocate trepidation to the society at large. The term terrorist or terrorism is marginalized to define a group or groups that use shock tactics via militarized or economic power to create upheaval (Lilleker, 2006). These tactics are used in an attempt to set new principles and set forth their message over all other political organizations in society. Among many of the tools that terrorists have at their disposal, communication is an imperative instrument for which to deliver their point. Terrorist or terrorism comes from the Latin word *terrer*, which means to frighten (O'Ballana, 1979).

According to Schmid (1982), terrorism and mass communication are associated with each other. A communication structure is constructed to set forth an order for which to present the message that a terrorist wants. The sender is the terrorist, a message generator is the victim, and a receiver, the enemy (Schmid, 1982). Modern technology has enabled a terrorist to communicate a message on a mass scale to the audience via the media or other sources. Evidence of this was seen after the 9-11 attacks when Al Qaeda videotaped their messages and released the video to media outlets such as Al Jazeera television. Al Qaeda has since adopted this protocol to communicate to a mass audience by using such tactics. Former diplomat David Long remarked:

The medias mission to cover the news and the terrorists ability to 'create' news have led to a symbiotic relationship between the two, one in which the media not only convey the news, but help the terrorist create it. (Silberstein, 2002)

Political rhetoric has been used in the context of influencing or informing the public at large. The vocabulary and importance of rhetoric is dependent on the framework and the projected audience to which the statement is made (MacDonell, 1986). Bosmajian (1983) stated that the application of names and classification towards a distinct segment of the populace may have positive or negative effects. Rhetoric has progressed into an academic discipline which is utilized by using specific vocabulary to deliver a message to a specific audience (McPhail, 1994; Said, 1978). This form of communication may take advantage of the emotions that the receiving audience is experiencing at that time (Edelman, 2001).

Critical theory is a form of social critique that addresses concepts of resistance, social parity, and autonomy against oppression and dominance within societal constructs (Kellner, 1995). Critical theory showcases the adverse effects of how terrorists and immigrants are merged into the same field by the introduction of political rhetorical communication. It will be used as in conjunction with CDA for this analysis.

A CDA of the USA PATRIOT ACT showcases the unification of immigrant aliens and terrorists. It demonstrates a defensive posture toward those deemed a threat to the United States. It necessitates an interpretation between culture and society in terms of associating powers, dominance, and struggle. The use of nationalism, nativism, and an authoritarian posture are demonstrated in the language that composes the PATRIOT ACT. It is an intellectual point of view that employs scholarly inquiry with matters of pressing and imperative unease in the non-

scholarly world (Widdowson, 2004). Critical discourse analysis makes relevant discourse analysis by introducing it to an ethical foundation and ideological principle (Widdowson, 2004).

The stances in critical discourse analysis vary in terms of its positions, and techniques (Luke, 2002; cited in Widdowson, 2004). It showcases how language is used for the exercise of socio-political control (Widdowson, 2004). Textual composition determines the interpersonal significance for the reader. The terminology used, as well as the meanings of the words, depends on where and against what the statement is made (Macdonell, 1986). In this way critical discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis connects properties of texts and social processes and relations (e.g. power relations, ideologies), which are generally not known to the people who produce and interpret the text in question (Fairclough, 1995). In addition it also rectifies the integration of ‘micro analysis’ (of discourse) and the ‘macro’ analysis, which includes the language policy and planning.

Fairclough (1995) designated the manner in which the receiving audience interprets what is projected to them. It is done so by (a) description (text analysis); (b) interpretation (processing analysis); and (c) explanation (social analysis) of the discourse related to the topic. This is done by constructing the social identification and social relationships for the reader. Language that may be fragmented will cause a dual meaning for the reader, potentially causing the receiver’s audience to misunderstand and take at face value what is being said (Widdowson, 2004).

van Dijk (1996) used an example of how a message directed at a particular audience may be misconstrued. He took an excerpt written by John Kay and Alison Bowyer from the *London Sun* newspaper (2 February 1989) about illegal immigrants. This shows the manner in which rhetoric may be utilized to alter the reality of the situation. van Dijk deciphered this passage by stating that it was written for a largely White British audience. The rhetoric used such terms as,

“invaded,” “overwhelmed,” and “tens of thousands” to bring about the representation of a military invasion led by immigrants coming to find jobs in the United Kingdom. Critical attention is given to such terminology on the basis that it gives a false representation of the individuals that it is mentioning. Hence, the usage of language is fragmented and does not give an accurate portrayal of the event.

During times of war, the political rhetoric that is utilized by the powers that be is persuasive and undeviating. War rhetoric concentrates on the: (a) audience’s sense of territoriality; (b) ethnocentricity; (c) optimism; (d) and its relevance to war aims (McPhail, 1994). This has been evident since the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 9-11. New terminology has been introduced into American speech which illustrates the nature of the “War on Terror.” It is rhetoric that is militaristic in nature, using phrases such as “sleeper cells,” “dirty bomb,” “border infiltration,” and “asymmetrical warfare” (Collins & Glover, 2002). It is a simple yet effective manifestation for which the American people can understand (Collins & Glover, 2002).

This rhetoric invokes a distress that may or may not be intended by the audience that is the recipient of such terminology (Collins & Glover, 2002). Such vocabulary showcases the fact that this type of warfare is against an unseen enemy which can attack at will (Howard, Forest & Moore, 2006). In direct consequence of such actions, a misapplication of who is a terrorist has evolved. The application of such a title has overlapped the societal distinction between an immigrant alien and a terrorist. Therefore, immigrant aliens have been subjugated by the status quo into a category of being a national security threat. This situation plays into the field of critical theory in terms of how immigrant aliens are being subjugated into the terrorist grouping.

The PATRIOT ACT singled out specific groups, among them immigrant aliens, as being a danger to the national sovereignty. The merger of terrorism and immigration gives the notion that “all” immigrants are “suspects first” and “immigrants second” (Tumlin, 2004). Immigrant aliens are therefore thrust into the spectrum of being terrorist threats, even if they are not directly associated with this type of activity or a terrorist entity. Therefore, it is difficult to ascertain a solid determination of who is a terrorist without stereotyping. Immigrant aliens are thus placed in the spectrum of threatening the way of life in the United States. Immigrants have been the main object of ridicule because they are not recognized as Americans.

Due to this, a racial dynamic has produced a communicative aspect to the populace as to what a stereotypical terrorist looks like. Timothy McVeigh took part in the Oklahoma City bombing of 1995, one of the deadliest terrorist attacks on American soil prior to the attacks of 9-11. Yet, he did not fit the stereotypical likeness of what a terrorist is supposed to look like to the American population. The mold of a terrorist is that of a foreigner, with the distinctiveness of a person from the Middle East and not of European descent. American law enforcement was looking for an individual who more than likely is of Middle Eastern ethnicity. This event clearly showed that a terrorist attack is automatically connected to a certain ethnicity that has predominantly been involved in terrorist attacks

In conclusion, this passage divulged the multitude of different aspects that are involved in political rhetoric, and how it is delivered to a mass audience. It gives credence to the application of such rhetoric by government, by showing how the PATRIOT ACT enacts such a persuasive significance. Complexity and timing are essential to molding the CDA and the networking communication of the PATRIOT ACT. Cultural pluralism is shown by having the ethnicity with higher influence dictate what the status quo is. Chapter 3 explains the methodology and

analytical framework used to deconstruct the PATRIOT ACT. It will do so by looking at the qualitative aspect, as well as intercultural communication characteristics.

Framework

Attention will be given to the language which will be used to divulge the delineation of the rhetoric of study. The language expressed reflects the nature of what the PATRIOT ACT uses to categorize immigrant aliens. Immigrant alien is in itself a term that places an individual that is not a United States citizen, although it juxtaposes the immigrant alien as an outsider or other. Such vocabulary showcases the act that this type of warfare is against an unseen enemy which can attack at will (Howard, Forest & Moore, 2006). Such was the case when the terrorists unexpectedly skyjacked civilian aircraft, and used the aircraft as missiles to attack symbols of American prominence.

In direct consequence of such actions, a misapplication of who is a terrorist has evolved. The application of such a title has overlapped the societal distinction between an immigrant alien and a terrorist. It alienates individuals, placing them in a sphere of excommunication from the status quo. Therefore, a direct connection will be made between the rhetoric that is contained in the PATRIOT ACT and the presumed threat that immigrant aliens create.

The following terms are selected in descending order as can be found in the PATRIOT ACT. The terms of analysis are: (a) presidential authority; (b) associations with a terrorist organization; (c) mandatory detention of suspected terrorists; (d) participation of office of Homeland Security on entry-exit task force; and (e) foreign student monitoring program.

The terms selected will help answer the research questions by examining how the PATRIOT ACT personifies immigrant aliens in relation to terrorism. The subsections within each term are what hold the structure and rhetoric of the personification that arises towards

immigrant aliens via the PATRIOT ACT. One has to analyze what is contained within each term in order for an enhanced understanding of the term to be interpreted.

In summary, the narrative account of this chapter disclosed an alternate meaning by divulging what they mean from a critical perspective. It shows the dangerous terrain that the PATRIOT ACT traverses in terms of the rhetoric that encompasses its legislation. Each term centers on the meaning behind the rhetoric of each term's analysis. Therefore, examining the terms will assist in answering the research questions. It does so by examining the categorical application of a narrative construction of immigrant aliens. Chapter 4 will provide the study's findings between the relationship of critical discourse analysis and the message content of the PATRIOT ACT. The chapter will answer the two research questions, and do so by framing governmental political rhetoric and how it is applied to immigrant aliens.

Chapter 4: Analysis

This chapter will address the study and its results by explaining what the adverse effects of combining terrorism and immigration through political rhetoric, and the importance of government power in delivering such rhetoric. It presents the results to each of the research questions. Attention will be paid to factors such as illusory correlation, ideological perception, stereotypes, and misconceptions.

The first research question asks if political rhetoric contained in the PATRIOT ACT frames a certain perception in relation to immigrant aliens. In turn, it has rooted an overall negative stigma against immigrant aliens due to the high level of attention and importance that it gives toward immigrant aliens. It has done so by joining undocumented immigrant aliens with terrorism and moves the previous issues that are coincided with immigration such as poverty, race, and social order, into a realm of violent disorder (De Ming Fan, 2007). A sentiment that immigrant aliens are going to menace the American way of life through various factors, most importantly terrorism permeates into the political spectrum (Paxton & Mughan, 2006). A sense of the “us versus them” mentality has set in with certain sections of people living in the United States when it comes to immigration (Gallegos, 2006).

The terrorist threat has added a new dimension to the threat scale through which immigrant aliens are viewed (Paxton & Mughan, 2006). The immigrant alien has become the unknown figure that casts a shadow of doubt, fear and deceitfulness. As a result, an illusory correlation between immigrants and terrorists has been construed (De Ming Fan, 2007). An illusory correlation is a false perception of association between two entities or it is an overestimation between real correlations (De Ming Fan, 2007). Thus, it causes a vague judgment in relation to correlations that do and do not exist between the two entities, thereby, giving

credence to the notion that United States immigration law has always been tied along with political and economic policies (Hines, 2006).

The ideological perception given by the title of the PATRIOT ACT is misleading, its rhetorical connotations frame immigrant aliens as terrorists. This rhetoric turns immigrant aliens into military insurgent figureheads or into insurgents molding themselves into society without revealing their true identity. The social interaction process demonstrates that immigrant aliens and terrorism are viewed through the lens of stereotypes or racial profiling. The language used via symbolic meaning to describe immigrant aliens now directly relates to that of depicting terrorists (Howard, 2000).

Because immigrants have militaristic rhetoric applied to them in the PATRIOT ACT, they are seen as the “other” and may be subject to governmental dominance and scrutiny. Global terrorism has presented a new type of risk that cannot disconnect “external” from an “internal” security threat (Dow, 2004). In the PATRIOT ACT, the law is structured by heading and then followed by a subheading containing a subsection. Under each subsection, there are decrees which form the PATRIOT ACT.

For example, *Subtitle B-Enhanced Immigration Provisions* of the PATRIOT ACT, constitutes an imperative foundation through which immigrant aliens and terrorism are coupled. Subheadings that are listed under this subtitle are: (a). *SEC. 411 DEFINITIONS RELATING TO TERRORISM*; (b). *SEC. 412 MANDATORY DETENTION OF SUSPECTED TERRORISTS, HABEUS CORPUS, JUDICIAL REVIEW*; (c). *SEC. 413 MULTILATERAL COOPERATION AGAINST TERRORISTS*; (d). *SEC. 414 VISA INTEGRITY AND SECURITY*.

This section of the PATRIOT ACT redefines the definition of a terrorist organization, placing tighter restrictions on immigrants, creating a broader definition of terrorist activity, and

empowering the United States government to exercise any authority deemed necessary to detain or arrest terrorists. However, the rhetoric uses complex connotations to describe and define the law. Within these connotations are emotional connections tied to terrorism. An excerpt from one of the sections illustrates this point:

(F) ASSOCIATION WITH TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS-Any alien who the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Attorney General, after consultation with the Secretary of State, determines has been associated with a terrorist organization and intends while in the United States to engage solely, principally, or incidentally in activities that could endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States is inadmissible.

These emotional connections maybe positive, negative or a mixture of both, depending on the political view that the individual wants to project. This is whether you are a United States citizen seeking protection, or an immigrant alien on the receiving end of the PATRIOT ACT. A correlation is then crafted into the connotation that produces rhetoric that specifically schemes and molds itself into an immigrant-terrorist illusory correlation (De Ming Fan, 2007). A distorted perception occurs, which inevitably includes seeing correlations that over determine actual correlations (De Ming Fan, 2007). In this case, the United States government can deliberately conceal the nature of what each subsection entails. It may be redefined as something else, in order for the receiving audience to be deceived into accepting as truth what the PATRIOT ACT states (Edelman, 2001).

Metaphorically, it hides its true meaning by forecasting itself as something that is self-explanatory, when in reality it is something that is much different. Language used to justify actions and conditions have little bearing on the actual consequences of actions and conclusions

other than to justify support (Edelman, 2001). Since the PATRIOT ACT does not make a distinction between a terrorist and an immigrant alien, rhetorically they are not sectioned off into a “good” and “evil” framework (Edelman, 2001). Textual structure determines the interpretational meaning for the reader, causing fragmented language to have dual meaning to the reader (Widdowson, 2004). Americans can be united by sharing a hatred for an enemy that has caused the United States harm. The good-evil scenario is broken down by rhetoric that draws the line as to who is good and who is evil. According to Silberstein (2002), rhetoric such as “despicable acts” and “mass murder” are used to describe the enemies of the United States. This is in direct contrast to “the brightest beacon of freedom,” which is used to symbolize and represent the United States as wholesome and the savior of freedom.

For example, *SEC. 412, SEC 236 (a) DETENTION OF TERRORIST ALIENS: (B)* is engaged in any other activity that endangers the national security of the United States. The interpretational power that is given to this section is open-ended and subject to the individual interpretation of the Attorney General. It is not easily distinguishable as to what “activity” might endanger the United States.

In summary, the PATRIOT ACT has planted a sense of untrustworthiness and uneasiness amongst the immigrant aliens that are currently living in the United States. An assortment of convoluted prejudicial stigmas on immigrant aliens has developed whether they are true or not. Reinforcing these stigmas was the fact that prior to 9-11, 80% of United States citizens were against the usage of racial profiling to capture and or interrogate suspected criminals (Tumlin, 2004). After 9-11, 70% of the United States population believed that racial profiling was an essential tool to maintain security. Foreign terrorists exploited United States immigration laws to

infiltrate the nation and launch a terrorist attack that inevitably affiliates immigration and security prevention (Rudolph, 2006).

Therefore, application of negative rhetoric to immigrant aliens has caused their representation to society at large to be called into question. Whether the claim is legitimate or not, rhetoric has caused a trickledown effect in which the application of the word terrorist has shown the influence rhetoric has. From a historical perspective, previous immigrant legislation, such as the Wetback Act of 1952, alienates the receiver of the legislation by the rhetoric utilized.

The second research question addresses the rhetorical implications of combining terrorism and immigration. Rhetoric affects political action by manifesting itself into a form of repetitive claims (Tumlin, 2004). One can look at the stereotypes that are applied to different ethnicities. These representations can create worlds and versions of worlds that are false in nature. According to Tumlin (2004), stereotypes can support a false claim that a certain group is inferior or dangerous (e.g. Jews control the media and banks, homosexuals exploit children, and African Americans are mentally substandard). When it comes to terrorists, a racial element is communicated by applying the notion that terrorists are meant to have a particular appearance, that appearance being that terrorists are meant to have a Middle Eastern look.

Therefore, in the PATRIOT ACT, the rhetoric that is utilized in placing immigrant aliens involves a sense of insecurity and threat by the immigrant aliens against the United States (Tumlin, 2004). It places immigrant aliens in a sphere as a possible enemy that must be under constant surveillance, scrutiny, and vigilance. It plays on the fact that rhetoric nourishes itself by enveloping on the strong sentiments and viewpoints that are at times substandard when substance and structure augment each other. Sentiments and viewpoints eventually leads to the political

socialization of the populace by having thought and behavior being influenced by political rhetoric (Tumlin, 2004).

Therefore, it is seen as unpatriotic to make a critical analysis of the United States government's actions and beliefs after 9-11 in targeting immigrant aliens (Tumlin, 2004). On the contrary, politicians do not want to be the ones to question the validity of what certain sections of the PATRIOT ACT entail, because they do not want to be "with the terrorists."

In its own right, the implication of looking sentimental towards immigrant aliens might render that politician as being a dissenter towards the fabric of America. Images dominate language, writing, and thinking and produce a key influence in terms of influencing social change and more than likely a conservative force. Therefore, immigrants are subject to being intertwined with political initiatives (e.g. affirmative action, immigration) and subsequently become ideological prospects for individuals to discriminate and not be accused of bigotry (Stuart & Magana, 2002). Ideologies that are driven by negative rhetoric evoke typecasts based on false assumptions and beliefs which are then proclaimed as fact.

The rhetoric used is formed from the nature of the environment from the surroundings from which they originated. Though it does not consider the opinions or the root from which the rhetoric was derived (Edelman, 2001). An individual's ideology may be pronounced even greater using his or her personal linguistics, and no independent thought being used to originate an end result. It is used to justify support of the rhetoric used by justifying the actions and own personal thought.

Media interpretations of events that affect the United States and its citizens may generate anger, happiness, or the like. Thus, when the PATRIOT ACT is interpreted through one entity, such as a politician, that politician may generate the rhetoric in the PATRIOT ACT as something

of a necessity to combat terrorism. When it is transmitted to the receiver, the individual may not assume any ill intentions. It solely relies on the fact that the rhetoric used from the PATRIOT ACT, through the politician, and subsequently to the receiving audience is for the best.

Building on the rhetoric, and adding negative connotations to it has left a permanent stigma on immigrant aliens. One's concept about terroristic occurrences, 9- 11 being the focal point, is molded by public and political oratory. The general public bases their opinions of an ethnicity or religion by messages that are given to them by various sources. What is given to them is taken to heart without questioning the validity of its source.

Chapter 4 divulged the complexities of trying to interpret competing representations of immigrant aliens, and the political rhetoric that encompasses the PATRIOT ACT. Research questions examined sections of the PATRIOT ACT to reach a conclusion to the questions asked. The research questions concluded that the PATRIOT ACT has had ill effects towards immigrant aliens. It has done so by placing a racial element in the rhetoric and creating an atmosphere of fear and doubt in the American population. Authentic perceptions of immigrant aliens are difficult to ascertain when the message sent to the receiver is misconstrued by misinformation. The authenticity that is given to the general public by the PATRIOT ACT might not be questioned due to it coming from a governmental figurehead.

Chapter 5 will discuss the study's impact, limitations, and ideas for future research. In addition, it will also cover the "War on Terror" and its effects on immigrant aliens. Historical events will be utilized to exemplify how the United States has acted in previous events such as 9- 11. Limitations and future research will discuss what restrictions were presented in this study, and what future research will present in this field of study.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The critical discourse analysis showed the use of rhetoric and its implementation in the PATRIOT ACT. Rhetoric is more than vocabulary or language comprised to deliver a message. Its use in the PATRIOT ACT showcases the nature of language to place immigrant aliens into a category of fear, deviousness, and dangerousness. The CDA conducted here suggests that the PATRIOT ACT symbolizes authoritarianism and fear mongering against immigrant aliens. The following chapter will recapitulate what was covered in this study.

The two research questions asked led to the conclusions that emphasize the irrationality of the PATRIOT ACT, as well as the strain it poses on immigrant aliens through the use of specific rhetoric. The reason these specific questions were posed is due to their adequacy in covering the concerns that arose after the institution of the PATRIOT ACT. Not just concentrating on the effects this rhetoric would have on the “War on Terror,” but also on those that would be targeted by this legislation. Attention was placed on the rhetoric due to its authority and power in society.

The PATRIOT ACT is subject to a critical analysis in order to analyze the rhetoric brought forth by the PATRIOT ACT. A translation of the rhetoric was done in order to better understand what the law states. What the PATRIOT ACT states cannot be taken at face value. On the contrary, a categorization of the rhetoric must be done in order for the interpretation of the stated rhetoric in the PATRIOT ACT to be understood better.

The first research question elaborates on the pessimistic framing of immigrant aliens vis-à-vis the PATRIOT ACT. Negativity that is applied on a consistent basis, will eventually appear to be reality to many. The PATRIOT ACT does not distinguish between immigrant aliens and terrorists. It combines both and when the law is read, it does not state that it applies to terrorists

and not to immigrant aliens. The question was selected by looking at the how immigrant aliens were viewed during times of crisis in the United States throughout its history. Building on that notion, it appears that nothing has changed in the contemporary United States. When the United States was attacked in Pearl Harbor, it was an automatic reaction to demean those Japanese Americans with racist propaganda and to view them as if they had a hand in the planning and bombing of Pearl Harbor (Daniels, 2006). Anti-Japanese rhetoric inundated the United States, so much so that what was being said was considered to be true. After 9-11, the same reaction was adopted against Arab-Americans and all things Middle Eastern.

The second research questions address the implications of using negative and accusatory rhetoric against immigrant aliens. The questions tried to inquire if negative rhetoric will potentially lead to a bigoted mindset against immigrant aliens. As was previously stated, an illusory correlation might occur in having both immigrant aliens and terrorists be connected via the PATRIOT ACT.

The United States has a long history of racist actions against immigrant aliens. When the United States is involved in wars, the racist factor is elevated to an entirely new level that overwhelms any state of mind. A cause and effect scenario is that anger and resentment against those that are enemies of the United States are projected through rhetoric. The rhetoric might be in the form of propaganda or laws that are set into place to classify a certain segment of society as enemies or possible enemies. Therefore, the rhetoric that is used has the initiative in terms of who is the “good guy”. That is, that those that are fighting against the United States are to be vilified.

A war on terror has encompassed many factors, including immigration, civil liberties, and the subject of torture. Immigrant aliens are at times considered “the other” because they do

not fit the mold of the status quo. *The other* is defined as having the characteristics of attachment and preference for one's own group (in-group), while eliminating the other group (out-group) (Aviram, 2007). Groups of individuals who do not show evidence of having the same characteristics as the prevailing group or ethnicity are subject to distortion and false impression of their true nature (Smith, 1991).

These acts of placing minority groups as the Other reinforces the fact that minority groups are placed in the lower spectrum of the status quo (Smith, 2006). Once this is constructed, the majority's ethnic characteristics become indistinguishable due to the characteristics being seen as the norm (Smith, 2006). This perception leads them to be labeled as the out-group through complex strategies of Otherness (Smith, 1991). Even though everyone has an ethnic identity, minority groups are the main focus group to be treated as outsiders (Smith, 2006).

A formation of "us vs. they" is constructed by society to put individuals into a weakened position. Thus "they" (the minority) live in "our" land and therefore they need to adopt to our culture, learn our language and adopt our social norms (Smith, 2006). Consequently, they are an easy target for negative stereotyping because they are not known to the society at large. Stereotypes emerge in society when immigrant aliens speak because they speak with an accent, or the style of dress does not conform to that of what is "American."

The term stereotype first emerged in 1922 with author Walter Lippman, a New York newspaper columnist and public relations expert (Klopf, 2001). According to Baron, Byrne and Johnson (1998), a stereotype is a dogma in which individuals in a certain social group embody specific characteristics and or behaviors. These individuals are then branded and categorized negatively, which in turn could lead to prejudicial actions taken against them. What is presented

then is a belief structure that contains perceptions and expectations about certain human social groups. This mental perception can lead to other possible negative effects such as nativism.

According to Barkan (2003), this is a frame of mind in which an outside source has come to threaten the way of life in an individual's native country and must be directly countered. Nativism considers that those that are considered status quo are those who are not seen as a threat to the United States either through the spectrum of immigration, economic, or militaristically. They are essentially the "mainstream." Hence those that are thrust into that spectrum as being possible threats are seen through the lens of *nativism*. Nativism has given rise during times of war, political strife, or during influx of immigrants. Nationalistic in nature, there is no room for foreign influence such as customs, language, and ethnicities

Using a title such as "War on Terror" encompasses a feeling of dread and fear due to the saying conjuring images of war. The word *war* brings forth many repulsive images that have been seen through media outlets through different eras of American history. When rhetoric such as "War on Terror" is merged together with legislation such as the PATRIOT ACT, society will come to see those who critique this action as being against the United States. Due to the perceived notion that immigrant aliens are "enemies" of the United States, they must be dealt with accordingly.

Since the PATRIOT ACT OF 2001, there has been the PATRIOT ACT II, which continues in the same avenue of approach as the first PATRIOT ACT. It is apparent once again that the United States government can exercise power through rhetoric to obtain what it deems necessary. Using rhetoric that places alarm, the government influenced politicians to pass this legislation. As mentioned earlier in the study, there is certain terminology used by the government that causes the populace to undergo a metamorphosis of being passive to being self-

defensive. The government understands and exercises a type of rhetoric that touches base with the American population. A narrative construction of rhetoric is the underlying base for which the government operates its rhetorical output. People will have greater reaction with rhetoric that espouses trepidation than that which is tranquil.

Rhetoric that is told to society by the powers that be is taken as being legitimate. Questioning the effects of this effort may be seen as a lack of social conformity, for example, when former President Bush makes a rhetorical proclamation such as, “You are either with us, or against us.” However, the former presidential administration took a negligent approach to almost every dilemma that the country faced. However, according to Rudolph (2006), since there were no terrorists attacks on United States soil since 9-11 from foreigners, the anti-terrorist policies initiated by the former Bush Administration have worked.

Limitations

Immigration is constantly changing landscape in the United States. It is hard to measure what the political atmosphere and world events brings forth to immigration in the United States. The PATRIOT ACT of 2001 has given way to the present economic turmoil that started in 2008. Individuals in the United States are not focusing their attention on the problems that generates alertness of just a few years ago. The United States is in the midst of a recession in the years of 2008 and 2009, which has seen the loss of jobs, foreclosures, and bankruptcies. Immigration reform that commenced in 2005 has yet to be passed, politicians weighing their political careers and American frustration from the lack of jobs.

Coupled with the fact that at the time of this study, Mexico is living one of the most violent chapters in its history since the Mexican Revolution with the ongoing drug war that has enveloped all of the country. Therefore, for one event to predict what immigration is going to

look like from one year to the next is challenging at best. In addition, underlying stereotypes that permeates United States culture hampers the immigration cause. A study of immigration in the United States has to be broken down in accordance to a particular time period. Summing up the differing immigration periods into one study will do the immigration study a disservice.

Another limitation for this study is that it only creates awareness and does not create a force of interaction. In that it does not intercede in a governmental or supporting role to create an opposing force to the entities that created this dilemma. It produces only a communicative rhetorical identity towards the situation at hand. The PATRIOT ACT is a manifestation of authoritarianism, class, nativism, and race. Some of these entities such as race and class are themes that are sensitive in United States society. However, when these practices of inadvertently objectifying those that are considered “the other.” Then the society at large may find consolation in the fact that there are forces that are helping to prevent future unjust actions.

Future Research

It is hoped that this study will provide awareness for those who want to pursue a communicative awareness in this arena of critical theory and discourse. At the time of this writing, a new presidential administration is set to alter the previous administrations’ cause in the “War on Terror.” President Barack Obama potentially has an alternate view and method of confronting the issues of terrorism. A spectacular orator, President Obama is set to bring forth a new mindset towards not only immigration, but to fighting terrorism as well.

A dilemma that has encompassed the present Obama Administration is the presence of the PATRIOT ACT that has not been discredited or ousted from the American landscape. Nor does the administration want to do away with the legislation, since the date that it has been enacted was there has been no large scale terrorist attack. Fearing that if the PATRIOT ACT

were to be nullified, and there were to be a terrorist attack, the President might be labeled as one of the causes of the attack. The federal government might also see the PATRIOT ACT as a sense of security to be used when needed. It is a representation of legislation that was drafted and endorsed during one of the United State's deadliest days. The PATRIOT ACT is symbolic of rhetorical might that the United States is willing to use in times of need if nothing more.

Immigration, much like terrorism, has its roots in people wanting to make change for themselves by whatever means they see possible. Political upheaval, frustration, and conflict are some of the many roots that give rise to immigration influx, or give birth to terrorism. Therefore, it will take more than legislation or military might to try and resolve both subject matters. The root of the problem must be a starting point to try and see what causes both. Immigrants and terrorists may at times come from poverty stricken countries and see no other alternative than to create change by taking matters into their own hands. The individuals may either better their livelihoods by moving from their native country, or strike a figure of prominence as a show of dissatisfaction through violent means. Though immigration and terrorism are in constant flux and never settled.

The entrance of immigrant aliens into the United States, primarily through the southern border, has been overwhelming. Apprehensions by the Border Patrol alone in 2004 along the south-west border are approximately 1,159,802 (Cornelius, 2005). As a result, American citizens have taken the issue of immigrant aliens entry into the United States into their own hands. The immigration issue is not just a Mexican issue, but Mexican immigrants have taken the forefront on the issue. In 1996 to the present day, more than the 2.7 million immigrants have come from Mexico (LoBreglio, 2004). By March of 2002, an estimated 9.3 million illegal immigrants were living in the United States (Cornelius, 2005). Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Migracion has

proclaimed there are about 100 large scale smuggling rings helping immigrants cross into the United States (Cornelius, 2005).

The primary reasons for immigrants wanting to come into the United States are to find a better socioeconomic life. Immigrants look at the United States as the land of opportunity, something that can never be achieved in their native land (Reese, 2001). Many immigrants come from third world countries where the economy is pitiable, and the governments are corrupt. So they have to make the decision of either staying in their native land or come to the United States by any means possible.

The United States has transformed from an industrial based economy into a technologically oriented economy (Canales, 2003). It then leaves a void for manufacturing positions that are left open due the fact that they are low paying and without great economic reward (Canales, 2003). However, more of those jobs are leaving the United States to third world countries across the globe. Certain people living in the United States have the mindset that this country cannot have jobs leaving and immigrants coming in. Americans have conflicting opinions when it comes to the issue of immigration. On one side the feeling is that immigrants that the United States wants cheap labor, but in the same token it does not want high levels of immigration (Cornelius, 2005).

It seems that the immigrant alien will face more racial discrimination and in a worse case scenario, assault or murder. Whether the rise in white supremacist groups and the rise of illegal immigration can be correlated has not been looked at in great depth. Municipalities across the United States are taking an anti-immigrant stance, blaming immigrants from terrorism, crime and the draining of medical facilities. Critical theory can thus be applied to the hatred that illegal immigrants receive to the extent that they are looked at as “slave labor.” If history has taught the

United States anything, is that racism will always be the underlying factor in most circumstances when dealing with issues such as immigration.

This study established that immigration and terrorism is complex, with many other factors being involved, turning this issue into a volatile one. Immigration will not subside any time, not as long as the United States presents itself as an economically prosperous nation. Therefore, the threat of terrorism will not subside as long as immigration presents itself. The past has clearly shown that the United States has always had a strong relationship with immigration. Though, that relationship has time and again been filled with misdeeds, maltreatment, and racism to the immigrant.

At the time of the writing of this study, immigration and the PATRIOT ACT have been put to the wayside in Washington D.C. The momentum from the 9-11 attacks and the justified causes of why the PATRIOT ACT was put in place has for the most part vanished in the United States. The Democrat controlled House and Senate have presently not paid as much attention to terrorism and immigration. In the place of immigration and terrorism, concentration on another dilemma to American national security has presented itself along the border has given rise.

Along the United States-Mexico border, a new phase of terrorism has emerged, called narco-terrorism. *Narcoterrorists* is the name given to modern day drug traffickers, since the war on terrorism has also been justified as a war on drugs. Drug-trafficking has caused the border to become more violent, and has therefore has been intertwined with immigration and terrorism. According to the PATRIOT ACT, individuals who associate with individuals in drug trafficking can be labeled as being involved with “possible terrorist activities.” Therefore, they present a clear and present danger to the sovereignty of the United States.

Multiple drug trafficking organizations such as “Los Zetas” and “La Familia Michiocana” are in the midst of a brutal drug war and are armed as well if not better than the Mexican military. They have taken over border cities such as Nuevo Laredo, Mexico and are presently fighting for control of Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico. They have done so by shootouts and grenade attacks on law enforcement and Mexican military.

Members of these drug trafficking organizations use hyper-violence to gain control of cities and states in Mexico. In addition, they have also assassinated judges and lawyers who prosecuted or were in the process of prosecuting drug traffickers who belonged to these organizations. United States law enforcement has gradually been taking drastic measures to protect United States citizens and themselves from this new era of terrorism. They have already murdered in the United States, in Texas cities such as El Paso and Laredo and Atlanta, Georgia. Their signature is beheading or burning people alive with diesel in a torture called “el guiso or “the stew.” As a result, immigration and terrorism has resulted in becoming a much more complex issue on a micro and macro level.

During an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raid in Laredo, Texas on July 2005, ICE agents discovered approximately: 33 Improvised Explosive Devices (IED's), five hand grenade shells, 26 grenade triggers, 40 grenade pins, 31 grenade spoons, semiautomatic weapons of diverse calibers, 700 pounds of marijuana, 300 pounds of cocaine, and \$1.14 million in cash (<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2006/feb/03/20060203-111444-9836r/>). Reports have also risen on possible paramilitary camps that have taken hold along the Mexican side of the southern border.

Gunfire has been exchanged between some of the populace and law enforcement of Cochise County with Mexican drug traffickers. These attacks have manifested themselves into a

sort of “border war” between the populace and law enforcement of Cochise County. This has caused an increase of law enforcement, armed with heavier weapons and technology. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has equipped the Border Patrol with fixed-wing aircrafts, helicopters, night vision goggles, night vision scopes, and sensor units (Gallegos, 2004). The fact that some of the people who have engaged in gunfire are drug traffickers, Attorney General John Ashcroft has allowed warrantless searches within 100 miles of the border (LoBreglio, 2004).

The influx of illegal immigrants has caused vigilante groups or border watch groups to rise up. Some of the border watch groups have at times a xenophobic and radical viewpoint on immigration. Ranch Rescue founder, Jack Foote, commented his feelings on how he felt about illegal immigrants from Mexico. He stated, “You and the vast majority of your fellow dog turds are ignorant, uneducated, and desperate for a life in a decent nation because the one you live in is nothing but a pile of dog shit made up of millions of worthless dog turds like you” (Walker, 2007).

In the year 2009, El Paso has seen violence from Mexico cross into the United States. Sergio Cuevas was kidnapped from his home in Horizon City, Texas (El Paso County) in front of his wife in broad daylight. His body turned up in Juarez a few days after, with both of his forearms amputated off. It is suspected that he was a member of the Juarez Drug Cartel. Another murder took place when the individual was gunned down in front of his home. It was later revealed that he was not only an Immigration and Customs informant, but a member of the Juarez Drug Cartel.

Conclusion

At the time of this writing, it has been approximately eight years since the 9-11 attacks. America's memories of the events are still in the limelight, since there are still a war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Both wars find their pedigree from the 9-11 attacks, with thousands of American dead and wounded in both conflicts combined. This study tried to cover the subject of terrorism and immigration, a combination that were intertwined and inevitably were partially blamed for 9-11.

A common theme that was found in this study was throughout the history of the United States, the adverse effects that perceptions incorporated with rhetoric can be devastating. Considering the history of the United States when it is faced with adversity, it is very simple to react with anger and not contemplation. When rhetoric is incorporated to this formula, the end result is what happened to the Japanese, Germans, and Italians during WWII. During World War II, Congress passes the Alien Registration Act of 1940 (Daniels, 2006). Title II of this legislation, consisted of any type of "radical" actions deemed dangerous by the government could cause the deportation of the individual or individuals in question (Daniels, 2006). Title III called for migrants fourteen years of age and older to be fingerprinted and registered with the government.

Both are very litigious subjects that have touched United States society as a whole on different wave lengths. Critical theory scholars have shown that need for critical analytics has not ceased. On the contrary, critical theory has continued to be on the front lines of analyzing modern day politics from different avenues of approach. Politicians understand the power of rhetoric and its ability to deliver to the populace what they deem important. It is apparent that

neither terrorism nor immigration will cease to encounter resistance and controversy in the United States.

The concern of immigrant aliens coming into the United States is multifaceted and not easily analyzed without complications arising. There has always been the economic issue of immigration. A common concept is that immigrant aliens are arriving in the United States to take away jobs from United States citizens. Another is that immigrant aliens are going to cause a crime wave or lead to a welfare state. Therefore immigration policy has been a controversial topic in the United States, especially since many immigrants come from Mexico. The United States has a booming Mexican-American population with strong ties to Mexico. However 9/11 has added one more dilemma, that of international terrorism coming into the United States.

The entrance of immigrant aliens into the United States, primarily through the southern border, has been overwhelming. Apprehensions by the Border Patrol alone in 2004 along the south-west border are approximately 1,159,802 (Cornelius, 2005). As a result, American citizens have taken the issue of immigration aliens entry into the United States into their own hands. The illegal immigration issue is not just a Mexican issue, but Mexican immigrants have taken the forefront on the issue. In 1996 to the present day, more than the 2.7 million immigrants have come from Mexico (LoBreglio, 2004). By March of 2002, an estimated 9.3 million illegal immigrants were living in the United States (Cornelius, 2005). Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Migracion has proclaimed there are about 100 large scale smuggling rings helping immigrants cross into the United States (Cornelius, 2005). Therefore, when political rhetoric mentioning immigrant aliens is used in an assortment of political messages, it gives rise to hostile responses.

Credence is given that when the application of militaristic rhetoric used by the PATRIOT ACT, it enhances the public perception that immigrant aliens are not to be trusted. A cultural

pluralism is then set and is shown by having the ethnicity with higher influence dictate what the status quo is, and how it should be followed. Therefore, immigrant aliens have been subjugated by the status quo into a category of being a national security threat. However, tomorrow will hold yet another chapter in the ongoing and laborious segments of immigration and terrorism.

References

- Aviram, R.B. (2006). Object relations and prejudice: From in-group favoritism to out-group hatred. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 4, 4-14.
- Baitz-Rivera, F. (2000). Underground on American soil: Undocumented workers and United States immigration policy. *International Affairs*, 53, 485-500.
- O'Ballan, E.O. (1979). *Language of violence: The blood politics of terrorism*. San Rafael, California: Presidio Press.
- Barkan, E.R. (2003). Return of the natavists? *Social Science History*, 27, 229-283.
- Barry, T. (2005). Anti-immigrant backlash on the "home front." *NACLA report of the Americas*, 38, 28-41.
- Booth, D. (2006). Federalism on ice: State and local enforcement of federal immigration law. *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 29, 1063-1083.
- Border task force seizes weapons cache in Texas. (2006, February 6). *The Washington Post*.
- Bosmjian, H. (1983). *The language of oppression*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Canales, A. I. (2003). Mexican labor migration to the United States in the age of globalization. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29, 741-761.
- Cole, D. (2000/2001). Secrecy, guilt by association, and the terrorists profile. *Journal of Law and Religion*, 15, 267-288.
- Collins, J. & Glover, R. (2002). (Eds). *Collateral language: A user's guide to Americas new war*. New York: New York University Press.

- Cornelius, W.A. (2005). Controlling “unwanted immigration: Lessons from the United States. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31, 775-794.
- Daniels, R. (2006). Immigration policy in a time of war: The United States, 1939-1945. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 25, 107-116.
- De Ming Fan, M. (2007). *The immigration-terrorism illusory correlation and heuristic mistake*. *Harvard Latino Law Review*, 10, 33-52.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (3rd ed.). (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dow, M. (2004). *American gulag: Inside U.S. immigration prisons*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dovido, J.F., & Gaertner, S.L. (1996). Affirmative action, unintentional racial biases, and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52, 51-76.
- Edelman, M. (2001). *The politics of misinformation*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Eberstadt, N. (2006). The changing demographics of the United States southern security perimeter: A first look at numbers. *Comparative Study*, 25, 81-108.
- Esser, F. & Pfetsch, B. (Eds.). (2004). *Comparing political communication: Theories, cases, and challenges*. Cambridge University Press 2004.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Harlow, England: Longman Group Limited.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis*. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse as social discourse: A multidisciplinary interdiction* (p. 258-284) London: Sage.

Fan, M.M. (2007). The immigration terrorism illusory correlation and heuristic mistake.

Harvard Latino Law Review, 10, 33-52.

Feingold, R. (2006). *Protecting what matters: Technology, security, and liberty since*

9/11. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.

Feldman, O. & Landtsheer, C.D. (1998). *Politically speaking: A worldwide examination*

Language used in the public sphere. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Find law. (2001, October 26). Retrieved October 23, 2007, from

[http://fl1:findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/cnn.docs/terrorism/hr3162.pdf](http://fl1.findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/cnn.docs/terrorism/hr3162.pdf)

Freeman, G.P., & Hill, D.K. (2006). Desegregating immigration policy: The politics of

skilled labor recruitment in the U.S. *Knowledge, Technology, and Policy*,

19, 7-21.

Frey, M. (1925). Les transformations du vocabulaire francais a lepoque de la Revolution

(1789-1800) [The changing political vocabulary during the age of the French

Revolution]. Paris: n.p.

Fujiwaria, L. H. (2005). Immigrant rights are human rights: The reforming of immigrant

entitlement and welfare. *Social Problems*, 52, 79-107.

Gallegos, G. A. (2004). Border matters: Redefining the national interest in U.S.-Mexico

immigration and trade policy. *California Law Review*, 92, 1779-1728.

Goldsborough, J. (2000). Out of control immigration. *Foreign Affairs*, 79, 89-101.

Green A., & Martin, J. (2004). Uncontrolled immigration and the U.S. healthcare system.

The Journal of Social Political and Economic Studies, 29, 205-241.

Harty, M. (2005). U.S. visa policy: Securing borders and opening doors. *The*

Washington Quarterly, 28, 23-34.

- Hethmon, M. (2003). Diversity, mass immigration, and national security after 9-11: An immigration reform movement perspective. *Albany Law Review*, 66, 387-411.
- Hines, B. (2002). So near, yet so far away: The effect of September 11th on Mexican immigrants in the United States. *Journal of Law and Policy*, 8, 37-47.
- Hines, B. (2006). An overview of U.S. immigration law and policy since 9/11. *Texas Hispanic Journal of Law & Policy*, 12, 9-28.
- Howard, R.D., Forest, J.J.F., Moore, J.C. (2006). *Homeland security and terrorism: readings and interpretations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2006, March). ICE-led border task force Seizes ieds, weaopons in major arrest. Retrieved July 11, 2008 from Inside ICE: www.ice.gov/insideice.
- Kellner, D. (1995). *Media culture: Cultural studies, identity, and politics between the modern and the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Leach, C.W. (2005). Against the notion of a “new racism.” *Journal of community And Applied Social Psychology*, 15(6), 432-445.
- Lilleker, Darren G. (2006). *Key concepts in political communication*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- LoBreglio, K. (2004). The border security and immigration improvement act: A modern solution to a historic problem? *St. Johns Law Review*, 78, 933-963.
- Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideology: Developments in critical discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 96-110.
- MacDonell, D. (1986). *Theories of discourse*. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.

- McPhail, M.L. (1994) *The rhetoric of racism*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Ngai, M.M. (2004). *Impossible subjects: Illegal aliens and the making of modern america*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Nuebeck, K.J. & Cazenave, N.A. (2001). *Welfare Racism: Playing the race card against America's poor*. New York: Routledge.
- No Author. (2006, February 3). Border task force seizes weapons cache in texas. Washington Times. Retrieved July 11, 2009 from <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2006/feb/03/20060203-111444-9836r/>
- O'Hanlon, M., Shapiro, J., Steinberg, J., & Orzag, P. (2006). *Protecting the homeland*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.
- Ranft, P. (1908). *Der Einfluss der Franzoesischen Revolution auf die Franzoesische Sprache [The influence of the French Revolution on the French Language]*. Darmstadt, Germany: n.p.
- Rudolph, C. (2006). *National security and immigration: Policy developmental in the United States and Western Europe since 1945*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Saito, N.T.(2005). The costs of homeland security. *Radical History Review*, 93, 53-76.
- Schmid, A.P. (1982). *Violence as communication: Insurgent terrorism and the western news media*. Sage Publications: London.
- Sears, D.O. (1988). Symbolic Racism. In P.A. Katz & D.A. Taylor (Eds.) *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp53-84). New York: Plenum Press.

- Silberstein, S. (2002). *War of words: Language, politics and 9/11*.
Routledge: London.
- Simpson, K. E. (2008). Triumph of the Will, *Teaching of Psychology*, 3, 103-108.
- Smith, A.D. (1991). *National identity*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Smith, A.S. (2006). Paddington bear: A case study of immigration and otherness.
Children's Literature in Education, 37, 35-50.
- Short, R., & Magaña, L. (2002). Political rhetoric, immigration attitudes, and
contemporary prejudice: A Mexican American dilemma. *The Journal of
Social Psychology*, 142, 701-712.
- Tancrado, T. (2004). Immigration, citizenship, and national security: The silent invasion.
Mediterranean Quarterly, 15, 4-15.
- Tumlin, K. C. (2004). Suspect first: How terrorism policy is reshaping immigration
Policy. *California Law Review*, 92, 1776-1239.
- Walker, C.J. (2006). Border vigilantism and comprehensive immigration reform.
Harvard Latino Law Review, 10, 135-174.
- Widdowson, H.G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext: Critical issues in discourse analysis*.
Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Curriculum Vitae

Cesar H. Rodriguez, Jr. was born in El Paso, Texas. The first son to Cesar H. Rodriguez, Sr. and Magdalena Rodriguez-Zamora, he graduated from Jefferson High School, El Paso, Texas, in the spring of 1997 and entered The University of Texas at El Paso in the fall of 2001 and completed his bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice in the spring of 2006. In the fall of 2006, he entered The University of Texas at El Paso once again to pursue his Master of Arts degree in Communication. While pursuing his Master of Arts degree in Communication he worked for the Student Support Services Center at The University of Texas at El Paso, and later worked for the El Paso County Civil/Criminal Department at the El Paso County Courthouse.

Permanent Address:

6247 Algonquin Rd.

El Paso, Texas 79905