UC San Diego
UC San Diego Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
The Effects of Deportation on Separated Families

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/973613vw

Author
Sánchez, Dinorah Liliana

Publication Date
2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org
Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

The Effects of Deportation on Separated Families

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Masters of Arts

in

Anthropology

by

Dinorah Liliana Sánchez

Committee in Charge:

Professor Thomas J. Csordas, Chair
Professor Steven Martin Parish
Professor Nancy Grey Postero

2015

Copyright

Dinorah Liliana Sánchez, 2015

All rights reserved.

The Thesis of Dinorah Liliana Sánchez is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm and electronically:

Chair

University of California, San Diego

2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Signature Page …………………………………………………………………………...iii
Table of Contents ……………………………………………………………………...iv
List of Tables ……………………………………………………………………….....vi
Acknowledgements …………………………………………………………………....vii
Abstract of the Thesis ………………………………………………………………...ix

Part I: Introduction ……………………………………………………………………...1
    History and Background …………………………………………………………….2
        The Effects of NAFTA and the War on Drugs ……………………………7
        September 11th and the Rise in Enforcement ……………………………..9
    Current Deportation Rates ………………………………………………………..12
    The Effects of Deportation on Separated Families ……………………………...14

Part II: Literature Review ……………………………………………………………15
    Deportations …………………………………………………………………………15
    Family Separation…………………………………………………………………...21
    Political Violence……………………………………………………………………...27
    Consequences for the Conceptions of Self…………………………………………28

Part III: Methods ……………………………………………………………………….32
    Demographics and Research Site ……………………………………………….32
        North County, San Diego ………………………………………………………34
        The Border as an Extra-Constitutional Zone ……………………………….36
    Research Methods ………………………………………………………………….36
    Research Aims………………………………………………………………………...37
    Research Observations and Limitations ………………………………………...37

Part IV: Findings: Themes from Research ……………………………………………39
    The Political Violence of Deportations …………………………………………..39
        Immigration Arrests ………………………………………………………………40
        State Terror at Home ……………………………………………………………..44
        Detention Centers and Incarcerations ………………………………………...46
        Caught in the Violence of Two States ………………………………………...48
    Family Structure ……………………………………………………………………...51
        Immediate Changes to Family Structure ……………………………………...51
        Identity and Changing Roles ……………………………………………………..52
    The Precarity of Family ……………………………………………………………...56
    The Embodiment of a Deportation ………………………………………………..59
    Deportation and Mental Health …………………………………………………...62
        Substance Use and Mothering Across Borders ……………………………….62
        Emotions ……………………………………………………………………………...66
        Depression …………………………………………………………………………...69
        Stigma and Mental Health ……………………………………………………….72
    Coping with the Deportation of a Loved One ……………………………………73

Part V: Conclusion ……………………………………..……………………………77
    Policy Implications and Suggestions ……………………………..…………85
    Future Research ……………………………………………..………………89

Appendix …………………………………………………..…………………………...90
Works Cited …………………………………………………..……………………………93

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographics of Female Participants ……………………………………………33
Table 2. Demographics of Male Participants ………………………………………………33

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have accompanied me on my journey and have made this thesis possible. I begin by thanking my committee members, Professor Thomas Csordas and Professor Nancy Postero for their comments and guidance throughout the process of writing this thesis. I am also very appreciative of their flexibility in meeting and emailing as often as I needed. I would also like to thank Professor Steven Parish for his ongoing support. Professors Janis Jenkins and Suzanne Brenner have also provided support and advice for which I am very thankful. I am also grateful to Dr. Leslie Lewis, a wonderful role model who has been instrumental to my success as a graduate student. I would like to express my gratitude to Professors Lynne Miller and Eduardo Aguilar at MiraCosta College for their years of encouragement and support. My colleagues Ellen Kozelka and Jennifer Thunstrom have also provided valuable encouragement and insights throughout the writing of this thesis, and for that I thank them. I am also very appreciative of UCSD's McNair Program and The Mexican Migration Field Research Program for the training I received as an undergraduate student that helped prepare me.

This thesis and my education are indebted to many more people who have helped and encouraged me along the way. I would like to thank the 1994 Congresistas de UCSB who put their own education, and some even their lives, at risk so that future generations could have better access to higher education. I carry your fire with me always. I especially would like to thank Benny Torres for introducing me to la lucha and teaching me the true importance of education. Thanks also to Karen Plascencia for keeping up with the struggle and being there for me to lean on whenever needed. Also to Iris

Mendoza for the continuing support, encouragement, and constant reminders of why we must do what we do.

A million thanks are owed to my family for their unwavering patience and support. Para mi madre Luisa Chávez, gracias por darme vida y amor y por todos tus sacrificios que me han enseñado a nunca renunciar. A mi tía Teresa Chávez, gracias por todo el apoyo y enseñanzas que siempre me has dado. I would like to thank my brother, Omar, my sister, Laila, and my prima-hermanas, Ana and Cristina for all of their support and understanding, especially when I had to miss several family events. I am very grateful to my prima-hermana, Marcela, for a lifetime of encouragement and guidance, not only for myself, but also for my daughters.

There are no words that can fully express my appreciation to my compañero, Carlos Aquino. Your unconditional love and full support give me unimaginable strength. You take better care of me than I do of myself by somehow anticipating my needs. I am forever thankful to you for all that you do to make things easier for me. I am also very grateful to my shining star, Citlalli Aquino, and my precious heart, Yolotzin Aquino for being so loving and understanding. Your love and light are the fuel that keeps me going.

Finally, I would like to share my deepest appreciation to everyone involved in my research. I am indebted to many friends who came to my aid and helped me recruit participants. A profound thank you to each and every participant, who shall remain anonymous, for trusting in me and for making this thesis possible. I recognize that I have benefitted significantly from your struggles and can only hope to be able to return the favor.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

The Effects of Deportation on Separated Families

by

Dinorah Liliana Sánchez

Master of Arts in Anthropology

University of California, San Diego 2015

Professor Thomas J. Csordas, Chair

The number of deportations in the United States has broken records under the Obama Administration. Issues of national security and sovereignty have allowed a criminal framing of undocumented migrants and the rise in deportations. Immigration policies have made clandestine border crossings extremely dangerous and expensive, therefore, greatly avoided. This has resulted in migrants settling in the United States and bringing or starting a family. Deportations, then, separate migrants from their family often on a long-term or permanent basis. Because of San Diego's proximity to the US-México border, the landscape throughout the county is filled with immigration agents and their expanding resources. Collaboration between Immigration and Customs Enforcement and local police departments in North County San Diego has led to high levels of immigration enforcement and deportations of settled migrants and the separation from their families. These separations have lasting psychosocial effects on family members remaining in the United States. This thesis discusses the ways the political violence of a person's deportation causes ripple effects within his or her family. Ethnographic data is analyzed in order to understand how these have lasting impacts on the self, identity, and bodily experience. Findings include immediate and sometimes permanent changes to family structure, identity and roles within the family, as well as mental health issues. Implications for policy and future research are also discussed.

PART I: INTRODUCTION

> I came home to an empty house. Lights were on and dinner had been started, but my family wasn't there. Neighbors broke the news that my parents had been taken away by immigration officers, and just like that, my stable family was gone.
> Not a single person at any level of government took any note of me. No one had checked to see if I had a place to live or food to eat, and at 14, I found myself basically on my own. – Actor Diane Guerrero from *Orange is the New Black*

In November of 2014, The LA Times published actor Diane Guerrero's op-ed piece in which she described the deportation of her family at the age of 14. She shared her story 14 years after it had occurred. The timing of her revelation came at a time of increasing and record-breaking deportations from the United States by the current Obama administration. Branded the "deporter-in-chief", President Obama has overseen over 2 million deportations since he took office in 2008 (Epstein 2014). Too often, these deportations have resulted in long-term and even permanent separation of families. Communities of migrants are well aware that they may be subjected to the violence of family rupture. Yet, investigations of the effects of these separations have been limited. Most especially absent are studies on the effects of deportation and family separation on the self, identity, and bodily experience. Ever-fluid concepts of the self change and adapt as needed in response to losing an important and influential family member to deportation. One's identity changes throughout the lifetime and is shaped by those around us as well as by losing those who had a strong impact. Impressions made by others on the self are often deeply rooted and when that connection is lost the effect may be expressed somatically. Through this, it becomes obvious that political violence in the name of state sovereignty and safety of some citizens fractures the bodies and identities of others, including other US citizens. This thesis uses ethnographic data to inform the emerging anthropology of deportations, political anthropology, and the anthropology of the self and identity.

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

Paul Farmer (2004) has suggested that a thorough understanding of any issue must go beyond the ethnographically visible and requires a broad consideration of both politics and history. Therefore, an overview of US immigration and foreign policies, as well as border enforcement strategies is necessary. To begin, it must be recognized that México and the United States have a long history of interconnection. In 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo resulted in the transfer of almost half of the Mexican territory to the United States. Those residing in the ceded territory had their nationality converted, unless they left the territory or declared their wishes to remain Mexican nationals. The two nations were connected through politics, friendships, and familial bonds that had been established long before the new border (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey 2007, Del Castillo 1990). Yet, historically these links have not been recognized in the treatment of Mexicans living in the United States.

David FitzGerald and David Cook-Martín (2014) have written a comprehensive history and analysis of US immigration laws and the racism that has continuously undergirded it. The United States, just as other democratic nations, overtly made race-based exclusions in the name of, and to protect, democracy. Their nation-building project resulted in the selection of some and exclusion of others and in their justification certain groups were framed as "…naturally incapable of self-government." (FitzGerald & Cook-

Martín 2014: 4). The earliest restrictive immigration laws excluded Chinese and other Asians. These were then followed with literacy requirements and national origins quotas favoring the immigration of northwestern Europeans. Immigration policies regarding Mexicans have varied and shifted throughout the years in response to concerns based on both race and capitalism. Historically, employers sought Mexican laborers due to the perception that they were unable to assimilate to US culture. Coupled with México's proximity, it was assumed that Mexican workers would return to their home country, keeping labor costs low for employers eager for temporary workers. Still, eugenics lobbyists, public health agencies, and patriotic societies sought to limit Mexican immigration. In response, the restriction of Mexicans was accomplished, not with new laws, but by enforcing existing provisions as they pleased. For example, in 1929, the Department of State instructed embassies to become stricter with Mexican immigrants. Enforcing prohibitions against contracted laborers and those likely to become public charges, Mexicans were easily excluded. If one said he already had a job, he was excluded as a contracted laborer. If he said he had no work waiting for him, he was deemed likely to become a public charge. Changing enforcement practices enabled the restriction and expansion of Mexican entries while balancing capitalist and racist interests (FitzGerald & Cook-Martín 2014). In addition to restrictions, two major deportation campaigns were waged against Mexicans in the United States. During the Great Depression of the 1930s, half a million persons of Mexican origin were deported, including some who were US-born. "Operation Wetback" in 1954 also led to the deportation of more than one million Mexicans (FitzGerald & Cook-Martín 2014, Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013, Hagan, Rodriguez, & Castro 2011, Fernandez-

Kelly & Massey 2007). The United States has a long history of controlling Mexicans through several state actions.

US immigration practices have historically changed with variations in international politics. In response to US war involvement, the Bracero Program was initiated in 1942 and recruited temporary Mexican male workers to work in agriculture. More than four million braceros were brought to work in the United States before its end in 1964 (FitzGerald & Cook-Martín 2014, Fernandez-Kelly & Massey 2007). By the end of World War II, the quotas on the Eastern Europeans were highly problematized. In the attempt to equalize entries and to limit restrictions, all countries were given an annual quota of 20,000. In 1976, the year the quota took effect on the Western Hemisphere, there was an immediate 40 percent drop in legal entries from México (FitzGerald & Cook-Martín 2014). While attempting to seem neutral, US policymakers ignored their interconnected history with México. Family ties were already well established by Mexicans on both sides of the border, and the need or desire to work in the United States did not slow. Mexicans lacking specialized skills and wealth had very few opportunities to attain a visa to enter and work legally; however their migration to the United States was not deterred (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey 2007).

In the decades that followed, the United States passed several bills regarding immigration and their effects are still very visible today. The Immigration Reform and *Control* Act of 1986 (IRCA) legalized many undocumented migrants. It also attempted to penalize employers who hired unauthorized workers, increased funding for Border Patrol and, much more significant, initiated the concentration in border enforcement (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey 2007). The 1990s brought several acts that militarized the

US-México border in an attempt to keep out those who did not get the elusive proper permission. In 1993, the Clinton administration began the securitization of the US southern border. A significant budget increase was allocated to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) (Cornelius 2001), the predecessor of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The rise in budget for border enforcement has continued through the Bush and Obama administrations. It is important to note, a significantly greater share of resources has been funneled to the southern border, while the border shared with Canada has not been framed as a problem.

More than funds, the Clinton Administration began a strategic mode of border enforcement by focusing resources on the sections of the southern border that were traditionally used the most. The goal was to prevent clandestine entries through deterrence by installing multiple barriers and using surveillance technology. Additionally, the number of Border Patrol agents grew and thousands were placed in a limited number of narrow corridors. The Automated Biometric Identification System, known as IDENT, was initiated to photograph and fingerprint all migrants caught entering the United States clandestinely. This data was collected along with dates and locations of apprehensions in order to detect repeat entrants. The new resources were installed in sections, beginning with Operation Hold the Line in El Paso, Texas (1993), Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego, CA (1994), Operation Safeguard along the 300 border miles in Arizona (initiated in 1994 but significantly funded in 1999), and Operation Rio Grande in Texas (1997). The concentration on certain sections left open other areas, the most dangerous, life-threatening deserts and mountain regions. The heightened dangers led, not to an avoidance to cross the border, but to a rise in coyote contracting and to their substantial pay increase (Cornelius 2001).

The goal of border militarization was to deter migrants from attempting to cross into the United States by focusing on specific sectors. The results were significantly higher coyote costs and increased risks to migrants, too often resulting in death. Wayne Cornelius (2001) argued that the deadly consequences of border enforcement were not unintended as the strategic positioning of resources was wholly intentional. Prior to 1994, the majority of deaths along the US-México border in California were attributed to drowning and other accidents. Since then, deaths along that same sector rose significantly and have been mostly ascribed to "environmental causes", such as hypothermia in the mountain regions and dehydration and heat stroke in the deserts. What was truly unintended was the rise of undocumented migrants permanently settling in the United States. Although an increase in settlement predates the border enforcement initiatives of the 1990s, they undoubtedly hastened the trend. As Cornelius argued, "By making it more costly and difficult to gain entry illegally, the US government has strengthened the incentives for permanent settlement in the United States. Thus it is entirely possible that the current strategy of border enforcement is keeping more unauthorized migrants *in* the United States than it is keeping out." (2001: 669, emphasis in original). The Mexican Consulates received reports of 1,700 deaths along the US-México border between 1994 and 2001 (Cornelius 2001) with thousands more migrant deaths the following decade, and tens of thousands of killings connected to drug trafficking just south of the border (Magaña 2011). Yet, in 2010, US Customs and Border Protection spokesperson Lloyd Easterling confidently proclaimed that the US-México border was safer than it had ever been, making it very clear whose lives truly mattered. As Rocio Magaña succinctly put it, “in the politics of protection at work on this border, not all vulnerabilities or deaths count equally.” (2011: 158). Migrants are well aware of the current extraordinary risks of crossing the US-México border.

While the border was being fortified, the US congress also passed bills regarding immigrants. Fashioned after California’s Proposition 187 (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013), the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) funded new technologies, such as biometric identification systems, the building of a triple-layer fence, motion and heat sensors, and again increased the number of Border Patrol agents (Stuesse 2010). IIRIRA also expanded deportation eligibility categories, restricted the ability to appeal deportation, and produced an expedited deportation process. (Hagan et al. 2011, Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) weakened judicial review for most immigrants subject to deportation and eliminated relief once available for those with family ties within the United States. It also authorized arrests of previously deported noncitizen felons (Hagan et al. 2011, Varsanyi 2010). In sum, since AEDPA, “Noncitizens convicted of certain crimes—aggravated felony, drug trafficking, drug abuse, terrorist activities, multiple crimes of moral turpitude, or one crime of moral turpitude resulting in a one-year sentence—are to be detained immediately following their release from incarceration and held until their removal.” (Peutz 2006: 221)

The Effects of NAFTA and The War on Drugs

The rise in settlement of Mexican migrants in the United States can also be attributed to higher numbers of migrants eager to leave México due to the increased violence brought by their northern neighbors. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) took effect in 1994 and was designed to ease trade, expand capital investment opportunities, and give US companies access to cheap Mexican labor. Mexican President Salinas de Gortari originally initiated NAFTA in an effort to improve the Mexican economy. The goal was to export goods, not people, by creating jobs in México. The agreement promised to benefit both countries; US companies would gain access to laborers in México while the Mexican population would receive access to a host of new jobs. Yet, collective farms were privatized, agriculture was deregulated and its subsidies were eliminated. Mexican markets of seed, feed, and food were opened to US and Canadian competition. While economic and political interests were served, NAFTA was highly detrimental to ordinary people. Unable to compete with US companies, many Mexicans were displaced. Still, NAFTA has been successful for few capitalists as it accomplished high economic returns, and greatly advanced class inequality. Far from the initial intentions, Mexican migration to the United States was not reduced. Instead, NAFTA created conditions that forced many to emigrate for work at the same time that the US-México border was becoming more and more militarized (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey 2007).

Equally significant in pushing people out of México is the so-called war on drugs. The suppression of Columbian drug trafficking networks led not to a reduction in drug smuggling, but to a change in route and transport, thereby shifting drug transport through Mexican lands. Mexican drug cartels proliferated and where ironically assisted by NAFTA. Some of the displaced farmers that stayed in México shifted to drug cultivation and trade. Routes created to ease international trade were also used to move drugs across the border to their US consumers. The number of trucks crossing into the United States tripled due to NAFTA. In assuring the speedy entry of goods, only a fraction of those trucks are inspected. In response to the proliferation of the drug economy, in 2006 Mexican President Felipe Calderón initiated military strategies against drug cartels. The effect was a significant escalation of violence within México. Although the official discourse places cartel rivalries as the source of increased violence, many have argued that it is in fact due to the militarization. The majority of Mexicans view the violence initiated by cartels and by Mexican federal forces and police equally problematic. The militarized presence in many Mexican communities does nothing to minimize, but is instead partially responsible for, the rise in violent murders (Muehlmann 2014). The dangers brought by the war on drugs and the restrictions placed by NAFTA on Mexicans undoubtedly shapes decisions to migrate and settle in the United States.

September 11th and the Rise in Enforcement

The events of September 11, 2001 further increased efforts to secure the border and halt illegal entries into the United States. They led Attorney General John Ashcroft to issue a memo, overturning prior memos, affirming state and local police authority to enforce immigration laws (Varsanyi 2010). The USA PATRIOT Act passed in 2001 made it easier to apprehend, detain, and deport any immigrant by labeling them a threat to national security. In 2003, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was created and oversaw the newly formed Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), eliminating the INS. ICE is tasked with identifying and apprehending "public safety threats – including criminal aliens and national security targets – and other removable individuals within the United States" as well as detaining and removing persons apprehended by ICE and Customs and Border Protection, including the Border Patrol (US ICE 2014). The placement of immigration enforcement under the Department of Homeland Security framed immigration as a threat to the United States comparable to terrorism, for which the DHS was initially created (Fernandez-Kelly & Massey 2007). The creation of DHS in 2003 advanced the discourse of national security. The threat of “criminal” and “fugitive aliens”, conflated with terrorists, framed deportations as a crucial approach to protect the nation. The convergence of national security and immigration enforcement created a powerful discourse that criminalized migrants and normalized deportations (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013).

ICE soon initiated programs touted as aids in the removal of “criminal aliens” from the interior of the United States. These include the Criminal Alien Program (CAP), the 287(g) program, and Secure Communities (Hagan et al. 2011, Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). With CAP, ICE agents were able to conduct immigrant screening at state prisons. Part of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Section 287(g) gave immigration enforcement abilities and training to local police agencies. Although it was previously available, all 287(g) agreements were signed after September 11, 2001 (Varsanyi 2010). The agreements meant that ICE would deputize state and local law enforcement officers after receiving four weeks of training. This led to considerable immigration enforcement initiated from minor traffic violations. Thus, these agreements resulted in increased racial profiling and policing of Latinos. For example, in Alamance County, North Carolina, the Justice Department reported in 2012 that Latino drivers were much more likely to be stopped compared to non-Latinos (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). The infamous Sheriff Joe Arpaio of Maricopa County, Arizona has led the most egregious enforcement through 287(g) and although he has been reprimanded for his racial profiling by the Department of Justice he refuses to end immigration enforcement. The ironically named Secure Communities has had similar results. Long before a judge could declare innocence or guilt, all arrestees in participating jails get fingerprinted and these are submitted and compared to national databases, including ICE. An ICE Hold is placed on anyone who is found without legal status, allowing local law enforcement agencies to detain the person arrested and hold them for the arrival of ICE agents, regardless of any charge. Through Secure Communities, many migrants have been deported before ever making it to trial, bringing much insecurity to migrant communities. In 2011, 26 percent of those deported through Secure Communities had no criminal convictions. That same year, 29 percent had been previously convicted of level three crimes, which bring sentences of less than a year (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). According to their own report, there has been a dramatic increase in non-criminal removals since DHS and ICE initiated interior enforcement campaigns (Hagan et al. 2011).

Local enforcement of immigration laws has been on the rise in the United States. Since 2010, states, such as Arizona and Alabama, have legislated immigration enforcement at the subnational level that target Mexicans and other Latinos. Hagan and colleagues argued that current policies enforced at the local level, "open the door to racial profiling and unlawful arrest responses and practices" (Hagan et al. 2011: 1377). Yet, racial profiling in immigration enforcement has actually been sanctioned for decades. In 1975, the US Supreme Court ruled that Border Patrol agents could not stop vehicles solely based on the occupants appearing to be of Mexican ancestry. However, the court “allowed officers to stop vehicles near the border if they had a reasonable suspicion that the vehicle contained illegal immigrants…[based on] such ‘factors as the mode of dress and haircut’ by which trained officers could ‘recognize the characteristic appearance of persons who live in Mexico.’” (FitzGerald & Cook-Martín 2014: 135 with excerpts from United States v. Brignoni-Price 1975). Furthermore, current immigration discourse places an emphasis on “illegal border crossers” rather than migrants who overstayed their visa, thereby merging Mexican and “illegal immigration” in popular media and minds (FitzGerald & Cook-Martín 2014: 134). Although unauthorized migrants come from many parts of the world, “illegal immigration” and Mexican have been conflated, resulting in the present-day targeting of Mexicans and other Latinos.

The marriage of immigration enforcement agencies and criminal law enforcement has dire consequences for migrant communities. It not only reinforces the discourse of the criminalization of migrants, but has also resulted in the mistrust of police agencies and a discouragement to report crime. For example, only about 50 percent of cases of domestic violence are reported to law enforcement agencies. These rates are considerably lower in migrant communities: 43 percent amongst those with legal status and only 19 percent for those without status (Quereshi 2010 cited in Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013: 279). A truly secure community requires local law enforcement agencies to earn the trust and support of all residents. An alliance with immigration enforcement agencies disenfranchises and marginalizes an already vulnerable population.

CURRENT DEPORTATION RATES

For the larger part of the last century, there was an annual average of 20,000 deportations. These began to grow in 1996, primarily due to new rules brought by

IIRIRA. However, by the end of the decade deportations rates had stabilized. The events of September 11th and the consequent creation of DHS and ICE in 2003 initiated the return of a rise in deportations. By 2005 there were 208,000 removals, and by 2012 that number nearly doubled to 409,849 (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). The most recent statistics released by DHS are for fiscal year 2013 and include data from October 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013 from all DHS entities, including ICE, Border Patrol, and Customs and Border Protection. During that period, 178,000 migrants were returned – no removal orders were required because these persons agreed to "voluntarily" depart. This number includes persons who wish to avoid prolonged detention as well as those who are convinced, or strongly persuaded to waive their immigration hearing. At 438,000, 2013 brought a record-breaking number of removals – those physically removed due to actual deportation orders. Of these, 39 percent were reinstatements of removals, in other words, those individuals had previously been deported and returned to the United States in violation of their deportation order. No hearing is usually granted to persons in this category (DHS 2014). ICE recently released its own numbers for 2014 and boasted that 85 percent of all persons removed from the interior in 2014 had been previously convicted of a crime, although the types of crimes are not yet clear (US ICE 2014).

The data demonstrate that the majority of those deported have been Latinos and most likely Mexican. At 97 percent, the Americas were well over-represented in deportation rates of 2011. Prime targets of the deportation regime, deportations of Mexicans increased 10-fold from 1993 to 2011 (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). While DHS estimated in 2009 that 62 percent of undocumented immigrants were from México, 86 percent of their 2009 removals were Mexican (FitzGerald & Cook-

Martín 2014). More recently, the Pew Research Center estimated that in 2012 only 52 percent of all unauthorized migrants were Mexican, yet 72 percent of persons removed for fiscal year 2013 were Mexican (Pew 2014, DHS 2014). While there is no official data released on how many of those removed had families, a 2009 report by Human Rights Watch estimated that at least one million people had experienced family separation due to deportations (Hagan et al. 2011). Current politics at the international level are believed to restrict the US federal government from reverting to overtly race-based exclusions (FitzGerald & Cook-Martín 2014). Nevertheless, data released by DHS and ICE clearly show that those from Latin America, and especially those from México are disproportionately affected by current immigration policies and practices.

THE EFFECTS OF DEPORTATION ON SEPARATED FAMILIES

The deportation of a family member may bring dire psychosocial consequences to many. This thesis will present an analysis of ethnographic data collected by interviewing family members of deported persons. Immediate impacts included changes in family structure, which sometimes become permanent even if uncertain. These alterations often resulted in changes in identity due to new roles that must be undertaken within the ruptured family. Disruptions in relationships were also expressed on the body, demonstrating the strong influences of others on the self. Of upmost importance was the resilience that emerged among those who experienced terrible losses.

PART II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This section will review relevant literature on migration, deportation, and family separation. Many psychosocial issues have been identified in children of deported parents and in adults whose spouses were deported. Still, the problem of deportations and family separations are in critical need of anthropological investigation and insight. Deportations are political and violent; therefore, a short list of pertinent literature will be reviewed. Because deportations also affect a person's sense of self, this section also contains a brief theoretical overview of this concept from a few relevant scholars.

DEPORTATIONS

Traditionally, male migrants have come to the United States to earn wages while their families remained in their home country, expecting the men to return periodically. However, the militarization of the US-México border accelerated the number of migrants settling in the United States (Cornelius 2001). Because they are no longer able to easily return to the United States from a visit to their country of origin, many have opted to bring their families. This has resulted in more women and children migrating than decades ago, in order to maintain a unified family structure (Butler & Bazan 2011, Dreby 2012). The meaning of deportation has changed along with these recent trends. If deported, men were returned to rejoin their family waiting for them in their home country (Dreby 2012). Now, deportation means separation from their family settled in the United States. With very few avenues available for their return, it is often unknown how long the separation will last or if it will ever end.

In her 2006 article, Nathalie Peutz called for an anthropology of removal or deportation. She contends that deportees exemplify the ways neoliberalism and globalization “generates a disturbing sort of immobility (and opacity) for some individuals in conjunction with the more transparent ‘flexibilities’ forced upon others.” (Peutz 2006: 218). Deported persons and subjects are made invisible and unnecessary to the nation-state, except to emphasize its sovereignty. National projects of citizenship are strengthened by deportations, which make the divide between citizen and “alien” more visible and results in the devaluation of the “alien”. Peutz argues that a study of deportations “is critical and should enrich the anthropologies of citizenship and governmentality, transnationalism, globalization, and the state.” (2006: 218). She states that ethnographies of deportations are needed to reinforce the research brought by political science and historical case studies. According to Peutz, anthropologists are well poised to find deportees and to question the naturalness of their political condition. Ethnography may help expand their stories’ reach in order to get to those who may not easily see the arbitrariness of deportations. She writes, “Most significant, the anthropology of removal is, in the end, an anthropology of ‘our’ own current crises and of the desire for law at all costs.” (Peutz 2006: 231).

Through her fieldwork, Peutz found that the deported body is perceived as “polluted and polluting” (2006: 223); therefore, stigma for the deportee is doubled. By being deported, the deportee is marked as a type of criminal. Once in their country of origin they are also suspected of being contagious, bringing with them pollution from their country of removal. Additionally, their return is not experienced as a homecoming but an arrival into “a certain place and time” (Peutz 2006: 225) that is often unrecognizable.

In responding to the call for an anthropology of removal, Peutz and De Genova (2010) arranged several essays in a groundbreaking book that critically analyzes deportations. They argue that deportation has been construed as the single and natural option to deal with unauthorized migration. Deportation is the response when a person is found working, or simply being, without permission. They refer to the communities where persons are taken from and forcibly returned to as “sites (distributed across the planet) where the expansive and punitive ramifications of deportation insinuate the inequalities and excesses of state power and sovereignty into the everyday production of social space and the disciplining of mundane social relations.” (Peutz & De Genova 2010: 2). They contend that dominant notions of national identity, public health, race, citizenship, and class privilege are manifested in the deportation regime. These must be considered as a global response, not simply as a transaction between the sending and receiving countries. Additionally, deportations occur along race and class lines, and in the United States, they have historically been used in order to exclude “the socially ‘undesirable’” and to regulate the market by removing foreign labor (Peutz & De Genova 2010: 10).

Prior to the 1990s, Asian and Latina women were more vulnerable to deportations because they were perceived “as drains on social welfare resources and probable public charges” due to their reproduction (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013: 273). On the other hand, migrant men (authorized or not) were allowed because of their labor production. However, since the US labor market has shifted to more service jobs rather than construction and manufacturing, men have become disposable. Additionally, the War on Terror and the focus on criminality frame men as terrorists and “criminal aliens”.

Currently in the United States, men seem to be at higher risk of deportation than in the past, making them more prone to family separation. Building off of Mae Ngai's racial removal concept, Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelo (2013) suggest that since 1997 deportations have become racial and gendered. They argue that the current deportation crisis is due to changes in immigration laws in the 1990s, the War on Terror since September 11th, and racial profiling in local law enforcement, which disproportionately affects men. Dehumanizing labels, such as "fugitive alien", "criminal alien", and "illegal alien", ease the path for ICE and DHS to argue they are making America safer by targeting and deporting migrants. Programs, such as Secure Communities and 287(g) have made immigration enforcement at the local level, and in the US interior, easier. Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelo (2013) contended that those deported from the interior are more likely to be settled, therefore, the majority leave behind families. The authors cite a 2012 ICE report which showed that from January to June 2011, 46,486 persons deported left behind at least one US citizen child (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013) Boehm (2009) also discusses the racializing dimensions of state power. Mexican, Latinos, and others who may look Mexican, are assumed to be deportable and placed under higher surveillance. This makes fear of deportation pervasive among the Latino community. In 2008, a Pew Hispanic Center survey found that 68% of Latino respondents worried about deportation for themselves, a relative, or close friend (Dreby 2012).

For men, an unexpected return to their country of origin may bring about a loss of status. In Peutz's (2006) study of Somali deportees, men's narratives focused on their loss of productivity and careers. The problem of being a migrant failure crept up continuously, as they expressed shame of being returned rather than returning on their own free will and without the spoils of abundant foreign wages. Any financial success that may have existed was of no use to the Somali deportees, as their sudden deportation gave them no time to arrange any of their finances. Upon their arrival in Somaliland, the deported men were transformed from remittance senders to remittance receivers and a burden on their family. "[S]ociety's expectation of a prosperous and promising return" (Peutz 2006: 224) was not met.

Women are still subject to deportation, however, especially if caught in the US criminal system. In her 2006 article, Peutz predicted that the rate of women deportees will rise following the increasing rates of women incarcerated in the United States. In a 2012 study, Robertson and colleagues interviewed 12 deported women who were injection drug users. Their drug use led to criminal histories in the United States and eventually to their deportation. The new social and physical environments in the Mexican border town of Tijuana presented the women with more risk compared to the United States. They lacked money, work, a safe place to live, and social networks because of barriers that did not allow them to communicate with their families. The women's physical vulnerability increased after their deportation and they became more emotionally distressed and increased their drug dependence. Financial need led to half of the women engaging in sex work. Many wanted to return to the United States in order to join the family they left as well as earn more income. However, fear of incarceration, lack of money to pay a coyote, and fear of the dangers in crossing the border clandestinely prevented them.

Many of the women in the study conducted by Robertson and colleagues "got clean" while in immigration detention but relapsed soon after "release" into Tijuana. Most women looked for drugs immediately after deportation. The two who tried to stay clean were not able to because drugs were found everywhere around them. Instead, drug dependence increased for these women in Tijuana. Some of them reported feeling sad and lonely because they were separated from their children and other family. One woman spoke about being ashamed and said she did not want her family to see her in that condition; she was not yet ready for them to live with her (Robertson et al. 2012). Although intentions may exist to get off drugs, the effects of deportations make it difficult for some women to succeed.

Joanna Dreby describes actual deportations and family separations as, "just the tip of the iceberg" (2012: 830). She found that "deportability", that is the simple possibility of deportation, affects the greater number of migrant families. To better grasp the issue, Dreby introduces readers to the deportation pyramid, similar to the injury pyramid used in public health. At the top of the pyramid are the most damaging events, which happen less frequently. Forming the wide base are the least harmful and most frequent events. For example, family dissolution is placed at the top, US citizen children having to leave the country is just below that, and fears of deportation of self or family members is at the base of the pyramid. The visual helps demonstrate the way that severe and rare events sometimes obscure the more numerous ones that may often be overlooked.

At the top of Dreby's deportation pyramid is the most damaging, family dissolution. Whether experienced personally or by a member of one's household, deportation is a clear example of social rupture and chaos that can turn one's world upside down, especially for young children because it threatens their “ontological security” (Giddens 1984 cited in Quesada 1998). Most cases of deportation are unexpected and occur without warning, therefore, the sudden loss of a family member may lead to an imbalance of emotional well being for other members of the family (Butler & Bazan 2011). A great concern for some was losing custody of their US-born children. A 2011 report by the Applied Research Center found that there were over 5,000 children placed in foster care that year strictly due to the deportation of their parent(s) (Wessler 2011). Clearly, fear of deportation is not simply the fear of getting caught. Deportation for many now means a separation from their loved ones, with fears and concerns about the unknown consequences for one’s family left in the United States.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Family separation related to migration is not a new phenomenon; however, the majority of studies that have investigated this topic focused on families where the parent(s) opted to migrate while their children remained in their home country. These families are commonly referred to in the literature as transnational families. Only a few studies are available regarding forced separations caused by deportations. In transnational families, the family may benefit economically from the separation, even if they may suffer emotionally. In the case of deportations, their economic situation typically worsens (Dreby 2012). In transnational families, remittances may serve to relieve the problems that arise from being separated. In addition to providing essential resources, migrants may send gifts or extra money to console an emotional child or worried partner (Menjivar 2012). For deported parents and partners, their miniscule salaries make remittances and gifts to their families still in the United States highly unlikely to be an option.

Even while receiving much needed remittances, studies of children that remained in their home country while a parent migrated have shown that some children are affected emotionally and may resent the parent, even when the economic benefits are understood. Researchers have also found behavioral problems in these adolescents (Dreby 2012). Other studies have found these children experience negative psychological and psychosocial consequences, such as depression, grief and loss, and academic decline (Brabeck et al. 2011). Although these separations were not due to deportation, the experiences of separation may be similar in nature. Like in the case of deportations, the options for parents in transnational families to easily travel and see their children were constrained.

A limited number of social science researchers have sought to understand the experiences of families when a member is deported by investigating the psychological and social impacts of deportation and family separation. The studies below identified the impacts of the deportations of parents. The majority focuses on children remaining in the United States by interviewing their parents and caregivers. Several studies found that the psychological distress of parents may also affect their children. The children may experience fear, chaos, confusion, uncertainty, and anxiety when a parent is detained or deported. Deportation may remove or deconstruct family relationships and supportive social networks, which can be harmful to the psychological well being of children. Approximately 5 million children residing in the United States live with at least one undocumented parent, and the majority of those children are US citizens (Levers & Hyatt-Burkhart 2012; Henderson & Baily 2013). The current anti-immigrant climate and the heightened threat of deportation put these children at risk of distress, abandonment, and psychological trauma (Levers & Hyatt-Burkhart 2012).

Edgar Butler and Celia Mancillas Bazan (2011) conducted an exploratory study of migrants who lived in the United States, Tijuana, and other parts of México. Participants included individuals who belonged to a separated family. As prerequisites, deportees interviewed had family in the United States, and those interviewed in the United States had a deported family member. Some deported participants admitted they were afraid to attempt returning to the United States due to fears of being caught while crossing and being consequently detained for years. This fear concerned mothers more often than fathers. Many of the women responded that the reason they migrated to the United States was to reunite with their husbands. Deportation was yet another case of separation for them, and the threat of long-term incarceration was too risky (Butler & Bazan 2011).

Brabeck and colleagues (2011) conducted a qualitative study of 18 migrant families in Massachusetts. Of the parents who participated, 44% affirmed that the psychosocial development of their children was affected by the actual or threat of deportation. Parents reported depressive symptoms in their children, such as crying, sadness, sleep and appetite disturbances, and lack of pleasure in previously enjoyed activities. Anxiety symptoms, including insecurity about the future, nightmares, worry, fear, and separation anxiety, were also reported. The uncertainties of a parent's whereabouts may worsen the psychological effects of deportation for some children. Also impactful, if the children themselves or the remaining parent are also undocumented themselves, they may not be able to visit the detained parent before deportation (Brabeck et al. 2011).

A report conducted by the National Council of La Raza in 2007 found that workplace raids led to the separation of 500 US-born children from their parent(s). The children in these cases experienced, “feelings of abandonment, symptoms of trauma, fear, isolation, depression, and family fragmentation.” (Brabeck and Xu 2010: 345). The raids also had an impact on children who were left at school with no one available to pick them up when parents were apprehended. These children exhibited numerous changes in behaviors, such as increased frequency of crying, sleeplessness, increase of fear and anxiety, as well as general fears of law enforcement officials (Dreby 2012). Deportation vulnerability may be linked to financial hardships and may negatively affect parent and child emotional well being (Brabeck & Xu 2010; Brabeck et al. 2011; Levers & Hyatt-Burkhart 2012).

Kalina Brabeck and Qingwen Xu (2010) conducted a quantitative analysis of themes that arose from a larger project that included Latino migrant parents with at least one child living in the United States. This study focused on children’s psychological and academic performance and well being. Of the 132 parents interviewed, 73% had at least one child born in the United States. More than half of the participants stated that deportation policies and practices affect how their children feel (67%), as well as their school performance (63%). The authors pointed out that deportation policies are part of immigrant children’s distal context, or macrosystems, that influences their development. This must be considered on top of the other disadvantages children of migrants may experience, such as lack of adequate health care and education, and food insecurity, to name a few, due to the parents’ typically low-wage jobs. Latino children may also face the additional challenges of English language learning, discrimination and racism, and adjusting to a new culture and society (Brabeck & Xu, 2010).

Ninety-five caregivers participated in a study conducted by Allen and colleagues, including 20 caregivers of children with a parent in the process of fighting deportation and 23 caregivers of children with a deported parent. The majority of the caregivers were the children's mothers (79%), and the majority of the children were US-born citizens (87%). Participating caregivers filled out Spanish versions of the Child Behavior Checklist, used to measure emotional and behavioral problems of children. This is the most widely used international measure. To control children's unrelated history of trauma, the UCLA PTSD Reaction Index was also used. A relationship was found between the experience of traumatic events and internalizing problems. After controlling for this and demographic factors, children with a deported parent were more likely to have higher levels of both internalizing and externalizing problems, versus children with no deported parent. These results support previous findings of increased stress and aberrant development following the loss of a caregiver (Allen et al. 2013).

Dreby conducted a study of Mexican migrant families in New Jersey and Ohio that included in-depth interviews of nine families who had experienced deportation. She was able to talk to both parents and children. One of the most common fears parents expressed was losing custody of their US-born children if detained or deported, as parents had heard about the high number of children in foster care due to parents' detainment or deportation (Dreby 2012). As Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelo (2013) pointed out, deportations are gendered. The majority of parents deported are fathers, and their paternal bonds with their children may be severed (Dreby 2012). It is unknown what the long-term effects for the children may be. As they become older, these children may find themselves resenting their fathers. Dreby also discussed that men returning to their country of origin have traditionally been respected and admired. Those that are deported and return empty-handed may feel ashamed and defeated. Not only are they unable to provide for their family, they become their burden as well, possibly making them feel emasculated (Dreby 2012).

Deportations of parents have forced many children into single-parent households, most often headed by women. This abrupt shift of suddenly being part of a single-parent household was the most common adverse effect on children found by Dreby. Some families reported that the effects were long-term and were felt even after the family was reunited. For some, the deportation of the father led to the family's structure being permanently changed. Dreby also found that the family's finances are severely affected after a deportation, with the stress more often borne by women. It was common for women to have to take on more waged work, either joining the workforce for the first time or having to add to their current job (Dreby 2012; Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). Some of Dreby's participants simply could not keep up with their household expenses and had to relocate to less expensive housing. Additionally, some participants had to come up with money to pay for their husband's expensive clandestine return. Another burden for some women was the sudden lack of transportation if they did not know how to drive, leading to creative strategies to maintain their household while lacking transportation (Dreby 2012).

The literature on family separation reveals the issues many families must deal with when a parent is deported. It has been found that deportations have psychosocial impacts, especially on children. Dreby (2012) has identified that changes to family structure occur and can sometimes be permanent. However, ethnographies of the ways that family structures are changed, and the meaning these changes have on those who experience it, are lacking. This thesis is an attempt at filling that gap.

POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Political violence, as described by the World Health Organization, is the use of power and force in order to accomplish political goals. It is characterized by physical and psychological acts aimed at both injuring and intimidating populations through detentions, arrests, and torture (Sousa 2013). Arthur Kleinman (1995) emphasized the importance of social experience and wrote about trauma as social suffering. The suffering that comes from political violence includes pain, fear, loss, anguish, and grief. It destroys families and communities, with suffering consisting of, “lost relationships, the brutal breaking of intimate bonds, [and] collective fear” (1995: 180). As a result, cultures of fear are created which intimidate, suppress criticism, and prevent resistance. All of these occur when there is family separation due to deportations.

Also of importance is the concept of structural violence. This originated with Johan Galtung (1969) who defined violence as being present “when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations.” (1969: 168). He went on to describe structural violence as one without an actor that perpetuates direct violence. Paul Farmer (2004) developed the anthropology of structural violence and described it as violence that is applied in systematic ways. Because it is systematic, it is applied indirectly by all who belong to certain social categories. He adds that an anthropology of structural violence necessitates the investigation of erasures of history and other ways of desocialization. This goes beyond that which is “ethnographically visible” (Farmer 2004: 305) in order to make evident the links across time and space that led to the violence.

Deportations are a clear example of unfettered state power over persons’ lives. Agamben (2003) argues that the state of exception allows powers to the government that enables the state to ignore its own constitution in order to maintain power and sovereignty. This is always framed in a way that promises it will be temporary and only to be done in the most crucial times. However, this state of exception – in which laws apply to the people within a state, while the state itself (and those serving it) is exempted from following them – has become the rule. This is all done in the name, and in protection, of “democracy”. Agamben states that the democratic-revolutionary tradition created the concept of the state of exception, not an absolutist one. It extends “military authority’s wartime powers into the civil sphere” and suspends the constitution or any of its parts that would guarantee individual liberties, even during peacetime (Agamben 2003). The current militarization of the US-México border can be viewed as a state of exception in action. Not only has this zone been securitized, but laws are suspended giving immigration agents impunity in the name of border protection.

CONSEQUENCES FOR THE CONCEPTIONS OF SELF

Deportation, whether it occurs to an individual or one’s family member, can be highly stigmatizing. According to Erving Goffman (1974) a stigmatized person is one who has been blemished, no longer considered a whole person but one who is tainted and diminished. This blemish could be a physical marking of some sort that makes the stigma obvious, or it could be invisible and, therefore, “discreditable” information must be negotiated constantly in order to avoid being “discredited” (Goffman 1974: 42). While a discredited person must manage problems that may arise from her status being known, a discreditable individual needs to manage that information and decide when, where, and to whom it is safe to reveal the stigma. Exposing one self may end up harming reputations and relationships. Stigmatized persons are identified as being not fully human and “normals”, those without the stigmatizing blemish, may discriminate against them and perceive them as being inferior and even dangerous, thus limiting the person (Goffman 1974: 5). Social symbols may be used in order to announce their stigmatized status to the rest of society. As a socially constructed category, shame comes about when the stigmatized individual shares the same opinion that she is not fulfilling society’s expectations. Failing or succeeding at maintaining norms of identity has a direct effect on the integrity of the individual whether or not conforming is within her control. In managing discreditable information, the stigmatized person presents a “precarious self, subject to abuse and discrediting” (Goffman 1974: 135). The precariousness of revealing one’s undocumented status or that of a family member is not only stigmatizing, but can also be dangerous.

Because culture is expressed in the body, the body is optimal to study culture and the self (Csordas 1990). The paradigm of embodiment helps us see the effects of deportation on family members. Thomas Csordas cited Bourdieu who wrote that the socially informed body is a system with all of its senses, including among others, the sense of duty, sense of responsibility, common sense, and moral sense. The body systematically generates and structures the senses, tastes, compulsions and repulsions into practices and representations. The focus is “on the psychologically internalized content of the behavioral environment." (Csordas 1990: 11). Spontaneous manifestations occur within the body; however, these original acts appear within a shared habitus and are therefore limited in form and meaning. The body is the "existential ground of culture" (Csordas 1990: 23) therefore the paradigm of embodiment enables the study of culture and the self.

In his 2014 article, Douglas Hollan used the concept of "selfscapes" to discuss the ever changing self-other boundaries and the ways these are affected by memory and self-organization. Selfscapes are memories and emotions that are continuously processing and, even during interactions with others, are constantly changing. Selfscapes make self-other distinctions fluid and dynamic. According to Hollan, memory can bring a reorganization of feelings and emotions; and the meanings may change depending on the person one is interacting with. Therefore, self-organization is contingent; the less conscious and more emotional merge with the conscious and highly organized parts. The ways in which the less conscious mind and memory move are then embodied, enacted, and animated in a particular social and cultural way (Hollan 2014: 175-6).

In recalling Hallowell, Hollan reviewed the ways the boundary of the self and not-self is fluid; gradually socialized, with its boundaries set and shaped by culture. The boundary never becomes firm, but is instead "highly dynamic and mutually constitutive throughout life" (Hollan 2014: 179). Interactions with others reorganize self-boundaries and less conscious, more emotional, parts merge and animate the conscious parts of the self through transference. This process is critical to connect "the past to present and future, of memory to perception, and of emotion and motivation to action and behavior." (Hollan 2014: 181). When transference breaks down, "ghosts"– the less conscious parts trying to get recognized and articulated – can haunt us as recurring memories, dreams, and somatic symptoms. "Complexities of the social world" are tied to the complexity of embodied memory and emotion through selfscapes. Socially, culturally, and politically influenced interactions with others awaken our "ghosts" and these induce the particular cultural form that will be used in their manifestations (Hollan 2014: 191). Stigma as well as concepts of the self and bodily experience is necessary to thoroughly analyze the effects of deportations and family separations.

PART III: METHODS

For the past 15 years, I have lived in San Diego's North County, approximately 55 miles north of the US-México border. Constant immigration enforcement in the area has been very visible and difficult for anyone who lives here to ignore. I have met many people who have lost family members to deportation and came to recognize that seeing it through an anthropological perspective may help us better understand the phenomenon.

DEMOGRAPHICS AND RESEARCH SITE

Ten participants graciously allowed me to interview them about their experiences with deportation and family separation. Demographic and deportation information are provided on Tables 1 and 2. The majority of participants were women, only three were men. None of them have experienced deportation themselves; each discussed the deportation of at least one close family member with whom they shared a household at the time of deportation. The median age was 28, with the youngest 18 and the oldest 57. Most participants had a high level of education. Two had earned master's degrees, another two attained bachelor's degrees, one is currently in a master's program, and three are working on their bachelor's degrees. All participants were either born in México or were born in the United States to Mexican parents. One participant was undocumented, six were US citizens, three were "Dacamented", meaning they had obtained Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (or "DACA" as it is commonly referred to), giving them temporary reprieve of deportation, but no legal status. Although they are protected from arbitrary deportation for two years, they do not have permission to re-enter the United States if they were to exit the country. Together, the ten participants shared their experiences of losing a total of 16 family members. Two participants had family members who presented themselves to immigration agents in Ciudad Juarez, México, in an attempt to adjust their status, which led to the separation from their family. One participant's parents were deported from San Luis Obispo County. The remaining family members were deported from North County San Diego. These included two participants who lost family in the city of Escondido and five in the city of Oceanside.

Table 1. Demographics of Female Participants

Pseudonym	**Status**	**Age**	**Age at most recent deportation**	**Relative(s) deported**	**Length of separation**	**Deported from:**
Carolina	Undocumented	57	53	Husband	4 years	Escondido
Gabriela	DACA	27	27	Father	3 months	Oceanside
Isabela	US Citizen	31	29	Husband	9 months	Ciudad Juarez
Kelly	US Citizen	22	21	2 Brothers, 2 Uncles, 1 Aunt	1 year*	Escondido
Maya	US Citizen	23	17	Father	7 years	Oceanside
Olivia	DACA	27	26	Father	3 months	Oceanside
Patty	US Citizen	23	5	Mother and Father	18 years	San Luis Obispo

Table 2. Demographics of Male Participants

Pseudonym	**Status**	**Age**	**Age at most recent deportation**	**Relative(s) deported**	**Length of separation**	**Deported from:**
Luis	DACA	26	20	Father	7 years	Oceanside
Miguel	US Citizen	28	21	Mother	7 years	Ciudad Juarez
Vicente	US Citizen	18	11	Mother and Father	2 years**	Oceanside

*Kelly has experienced family separation for over 10 years. However, many of her relatives have returned after deportation and the most recent event occurred one year before our interviews

**As a child Vicente was separated from his mother for two years, but was never reunited with his father, as he was killed in México after his deportation.

North County, San Diego

North County encompasses a large part of San Diego County. The North County coastal region extends from the city of Del Mar to Oceanside. Inland, it extends from Poway to Fallbrook. This area is considered more politically conservative than the rest of the county. As in many parts of the United States, the anti-immigrant sentiment is felt throughout these communities. In addition to federal and state policies, many cities in North County have their own tactics used against migrants. For example, since 2010 there has been an increase in the number of Driving Under the Influence and Driver's License Checkpoints. Vehicles impounded during these operations are much more likely to belong to an unlicensed undocumented driver than a person driving under the influence. Due to California law, undocumented drivers have been barred from applying for a license since 1994[1]. Many in the community feel that these checkpoints are used to target undocumented drivers. Although it is a state policy, local police departments choose to conduct the checkpoints.

In North County, the federal and local levels are intertwined and difficult to separate. Border Patrol agents are highly visible throughout San Diego. It is not uncommon to see Border Patrol agents pull vehicles over on the freeway, more than 50 miles away from the actual border. Likewise, immigration agents commonly stop pedestrians and board public transportation to question people about their status. Some local police agencies have espoused federal immigration agencies, intensifying enforcement of immigration laws in those communities. The worst and most infamous offender is the City of Escondido. Currently the only program of its kind in the country, Operation Joint Effort is a collaboration between ICE and the Escondido Police Department. Eleven ICE agents are located within the police department and regularly respond to calls and serve as back-ups for police officers on a routine basis. Cases have been reported of victims being deported after calling Escondido police to report a crime (García & Keyes 2012). When the program was initiated in 2010 there were three ICE agents housed at the police department. Within two years, the number of agents increased to eleven and over 800 migrants were deported from the city[2] (Hall 2012). The uniforms of Escondido police officers resemble those of ICE agents, making it very difficult to distinguish between the two agencies, especially since both respond to calls made to the police department. Two ICE agents are also housed within the Oceanside Police Department. Although no Memorandum of Understanding exists, police department officials claim that ICE agents are only called in for serious offenders, insisting that the additional resources provided by ICE are needed in such cases (Capt. Ray Bechler, personal communication 11/04/2014). Immigration laws and enforcement are not required to follow constitutional norms (Belcher and Martin 2013). Therefore, local police agencies gain more than just material resources when they enter into an alliance with ICE. The increase in enforcement at the local level has led to many migrants living with uncertainty and fear of even mundane tasks. The reality for many undocumented migrants is that there is no legal recourse. If detained, deportation is highly likely (Boehm

---

[1] California Assembly Bill 60 was passed in 2013 allowing undocumented drivers to apply for driver's licenses beginning January 2, 2015. During the month of January 2015, out of 236,000 applicants, 59,000 AB60 licenses have been issued throughout the state; no local information has been released. Many applicants have been sent to secondary inspection and may face charges of identity forgery if they previously applied for a license with a social security number that was not their own. Many migrants have not yet applied due to fears of information sharing with ICE and DHS.

---

[2] 2012 is the most recent year that the Escondido Chief of Police released local deportation numbers.

2009). Therefore, those at risk of deportation are in constant fear of the possibility of being stopped, detained, and deported.

The Border as an Extra-Constitutional Zone

A constant state of exception (Agamben 2003) exists along the southern border region of the United States. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has arbitrarily decided to treat any area within 100 air miles of any boundary as part of the US border. The legal code states that CBP officials have the authority to stop and search any vehicle within "a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States." (8 U.S.C. § 1357(a)(3) cited by Rickerd 2014). Almost without challenge, CBP officials have interpreted that code to mean 100 air miles from any boundary, including coasts. That encompasses 200 million people, or about two-thirds of the population. CBP interpretations have allowed agents to enter private property without any warrant within 25 miles of any border, excluding residences. Although courts have determined that probable cause is required in order to search vehicles within this 100-mile zone, Border Patrol agents ignore or misunderstand their limits on a consistent basis. Border Patrol operations and checkpoints are conducted far from an actual border and often on roads without direct access to the border. Without real oversight, CBP officials treat an ever-expanding area as the border and routinely claim extra-constitutional powers (Rickerd 2014). In North County, Border Patrol strategies are combined with interior enforcement tactics deployed by ICE and local police agencies. Through these combined enforcement practices, the southern border region, including all of San Diego County, could be thought of as a *zone of exception*.

RESEARCH METHODS

In-depth interviews were conducted between August and November 2014. Most participants were interviewed once, each lasting between one to two hours. Most were conducted in San Diego, the majority in North County, and one in Los Angeles. Some participants were met at parks and secluded areas were located in order to conduct private interviews. Other interviews were conducted in participants' homes. All except one interview were digitally recorded. One interview was conducted in Spanish and the rest were in English or a mixture of both languages.

RESEARCH AIMS

This study sought to investigate the effects of deportation on family members remaining in the United States. It aimed to find the ways deportation affects health and wellbeing, as well as the self and identity. I was also interested in learning how family members coped with the loss of their deported relatives. Early in the interviewing process, it became evident that the simple notion of family was also affected; therefore, these were added to the research questions.

The first part of the interview included demographic questions. These were followed by open-ended questions regarding their relationship to the deported family member and their migration and deportation story. Participants were asked to describe a typical day before the deportation, their experience during the deportation, and the ways their life had changed since the deportation. Because this is a study regarding the family, participants were also asked which member of the family was most impacted by the deportation. A list of all questions used to guide the interviews can be found in the Appendix.

RESEARCH OBSERVATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Due to the highly personal and possibly stigmatizing nature of the matter, finding willing participants was a difficult task and limited the sample size. However, the majority of them either knew me personally or were recommended to me by someone they trust, making me confident that they trusted me as a researcher. The majority of participants were interviewed years after their family members were deported, and in some occasions, the event occurred when they were children. This caused many details to have been forgotten, but also allowed the long-term effects to be investigated. On the other hand, some participants' family members were recently deported, bringing to light the immediate effects of deportation. The limited amount of time for fieldwork meant that the long-term effects in those cases were not captured. Despite the limitations, the ten participants brought forward important topics for anthropological consideration, which will be further discussed below.

PART IV: FINDINGS: THEMES FROM RESEARCH

Policies and practices surrounding immigration and enforcement have created much suffering endorsed by the United States. Many participants discussed the political violence that has surrounded and profoundly shaped their lives through the deportation of loved ones. Family members of deported persons must simultaneously deal with the logistics surrounding the deportation and its everyday effects, their emotions regarding the loss, and the precariousness of revealing the discreditable information. Immediately after a deportation, changes must often be made to the family and home structure. These changes may become permanent and shape one's identity and sense of self. On some occasions, long-term separation from a family member blurs the relationship and the precariousness of family emerges. The effects of family separation are not limited to the children of a deported person. Adults' sense of self may also be altered when one loses a partner of many years, and this loss may be expressed on the body. Mental health issues may arise from a deportation, either among the deported or their relatives. Yet, through all of these harrowing transitions, participants learned to cope and many even emerged empowered.

THE POLITICAL VIOLENCE OF DEPORTATIONS

Kleinman (1995) described wars, executions, and torture as forms of asserting state power. Borders and their enforcement are also forms of political violence in the expression of state power. Deportations often have serious detrimental psychosocial effects and could lead to emotional pain, fear, and grief. Loss comes about from missing the family member, as well as their contributions including their household responsibilities and income. Emotional pain and fear may take over one's feelings, especially when one is also at risk or witnesses the violence of deportations. Below are the narratives of the brutal execution of state power on migrants and their families.

Immigration Arrests

Undocumented migrants are apprehended and detained in a variety of situations. For the most part, family members discussed in this study were detained without deportation orders. Two had previously been deported and were located only after minor traffic violations, although others also suspected a traffic violation had triggered their relative's deportation. Some migrants were detained while on public transportation, pulled over while driving, and during raids at work and home. For migrants living in North County who fear deportation, not even mundane activities are considered safe. As one participant shared, an uncle was apprehended on his way to buy dog food.

For two fathers who had previously been deported, a minor traffic violation brought them to the attention of ICE agents. In both cases, they were placed under surveillance and were eventually apprehended and processed as reinstatements of removal. Such was the case for Gabriela's father. Soon after paying off a traffic ticket for an illegal U-turn, a woman working at the court called his home to verify his address. Within days, Gabriela's father was apprehended in the early, dark morning hours as he was preparing to leave his Oceanside home for work. Her mother saw that he was being arrested and immediately woke Gabriela up. Half awake, she threw whatever clothes were nearest and ran outside. She saw a black Yukon with dark tinted windows, and assumed her father was inside. She approached a man she saw near the vehicle whom she described as being 6'4", wearing dark clothing with a black vest. He explained that her father was in violation of a deportation order and was in the country "illegally", which confused her because she was not aware of any prior deportation. She later found out his first deportation had occurred well over a decade ago, when she was about 10 years old. The man outside the unmarked Yukon allowed her to quickly grab some clothes and $60 in cash to give her dad. As she handed the man the items she realized:

> I don't even know who he was, he didn't identify himself, I didn't see no badge, no nothing. It was very secretive…I asked him again, "I, I need to know what was the crime he committed. Why did you guys detain my dad, in his home?" And then I also said, "Did you even explain to him about his rights?" and that moment, when I said that he said, "You know what? I'm not going to play that political game with you. All I'm going to tell you is your dad is going to be at the San Diego Federal Building, and that's it."

As soon as they drove off, Gabriela quickly began making phone calls to family members, friends that she thought might be able to help, and attorneys. Gabriela is a 27 year-old Dacamented college student who has been involved in migrant advocacy for a few years. This gave her a network of friends and attorneys she could reach out to. That day everyone gave her the same advice, to wait. Without knowing his location, or his immigration identification number, attorneys could not step in. While she waited to hear from him, other members of her extended family expressed their fear that he had been kidnapped, not detained by immigration agents. They stressed the fact that the vehicle was unmarked and the agent did not present a badge or arrest warrant. As the hours went by, Gabriela continuously searched for his name in the US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) system, which provides detainee location information on their website. His name was not appearing and feeling desperate Gabriela called the detention center in San Diego. The agent who answered explained that it was too early for him to have been processed; all she could do was wait. Finally, six long hours later, her father called them from the detention center. Although the family was relieved to find out that he had not been kidnapped, they did not get much information from him, as he himself had not been informed about what was going on. Gabriela pressed her father to not sign anything at all, as she is aware that many migrants unknowingly sign a voluntary deportation order. He assured her that he would not and had not signed a single document; except for one the immigration agents insisted he sign from the Mexican Consulate. About three hours later, he called again. This time the call was from Tijuana and he was letting them know it was too late; his reinstatement of removal had been processed. Her father later shared with Gabriela that while he was being transported to the detention center, the agents revealed that they had been watching him since 4:30 that morning. They let him sleep, they said, and also pointed out that he was making good money "for an illegal". The ICE agents wanted him to know that they had gathered plenty of information in advance of his apprehension.

Olivia's father was also apprehended near his Oceanside home as he was leaving for work. He was also being processed as a reinstatement of deportation, triggered by a traffic violation. Olivia is a 27 year-old Dacamented college student who took issue with the legal label ascribed to her father. The use of terms like "criminal alien" and "fugitive alien" has been recognized as framing migrants as threats to US society and making them "convenient scapegoats" (Peutz 2006: 220, Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013). More than that, these categories produce the "crimes" that DHS is supposedly undertaking. These politically constructed categories produce the statistics that are used to allude to the necessity for increased enforcement. They make it socially acceptable to arbitrarily target, apprehend, detain, and expel persons who, for the most part, never hurt anyone, but instead helped sustain US society and economy. Olivia explained how her father was given the label of "fugitive alien" after he was apprehended at the border and unknowingly signed a voluntary deportation form in 2001:

> For me, being here without documents is not a federal crime. It's like a misdemeanor. But once you sign, [once] you've been deported, it's a federal crime. So, what they were calling my dad was a fugitive, but it's like, don't use that freakin terminology, you know? And, yeah, that's how ICE, I feel, are [saying] "Yeah, we're getting all these criminals" because they can call them criminals now. But that's not true, they're not *really* criminals, you know? They just have to come back because, I mean, their lives are here.

In other cases, immigration enforcement operations were conducted with no individual person in mind, which is how Maya's father was captured. Maya is a 23 year-old college graduate whose father was deported shortly after her high school graduation. After his vehicle was impounded at a Driving Under the Influence checkpoint in Oceanside, he began taking public transportation using the light rail train to go to work in Escondido. On his way home one night, he noticed immigration agents were on board, asking certain people for their identification cards. As soon as he arrived at his stop he quickly jumped off, just a 5-minute walk away from home. Unfortunately for him, the agents also got off and continued their questioning. In fact, a Border Patrol van was waiting at the stop with several other migrants that had been apprehended earlier. That night, Maya and her family waited for his arrival. She kept asking her mother where he was, and she answered that she did not know, but maybe he was hanging out with his friends or having a drink after work. Her parents had been arguing so her mother supposed he might be avoiding coming home. Yet, he had never done anything like that before, and Maya countered that he did not even have any friends. Even though her mother kept trying to reassure her, Maya knew something was wrong. The next morning her grandmother called from México to inform them that he had been deported the night before and she had picked him up in Tijuana. Immigration agents had persuaded him to sign a voluntary deportation form and convinced him he would be deported one way or another. Refusal to sign would only extend his stay in detention and whether it was that night or four months later, they promised, it would all end with his deportation. Believing he had no other options, Maya's father quickly waived his rights to see an immigration judge and volunteered for deportation. Upon hearing this, his family quickly contacted an immigration attorney who told them it was too late to do anything. Because Maya is a US citizen the attorney might have been able to make a case allowing her father to stay. Unfortunately for Maya and her family, her father believed the agents and was given a ten-year bar from returning. If he attempts to return before that, he will be dubbed with a criminalized label, such as "fugitive alien", just as it was done to Olivia's father.

State Terror at Home

Another tactic used to enforce immigration policies are raids, at both home and work locations. Kelly is a 22 year-old US citizen who grew up sharing a home in Escondido with her mother, siblings, and uncles. The first time her house got raided, she was about 10 or 11 years old. She remembers them throwing gas bombs into her house and destroying cherished items. She never knew whether the officials that stormed her home were police officers or immigration agents. To Kelly, there was no difference. One morning when she was 16 years old, agents again raided her home. She was woken up by the loud noise and had no idea what was going on. When she looked up she saw an agent pointing a gun at her and demanding she get dressed and go out to the living room. She always mistrusted officials, but this time the fear and uncertainty was worse:

> That was a really traumatic experience, I feel. Because, I mean for one, waking up like that, I feel like I've experienced that before, the house getting raided and stuff before, but I feel like when I was younger the cops would try to play like good cops with me. They'd be like, you know, trying to start conversations. But this time they were really rude, *really* rude. And it was scary because it was a lot of them. It was a lot of men and we had the dogs and he was saying to "put the dog in the room or we're going to shoot him."

Kelly's mother demanded to know why the agents were in her house. One of the men answered that they were looking for a particular woman and showed her a picture. No one in the family had ever seen or heard of that woman. Kelly's mother insisted that they leave, as the woman was not there. Instead of leaving, an agent yelled at Kelly's mother to shut up and asked one of her uncles for his identification card, which he did not have. Kelly still does not understand why these men came to her home yelling, demanding, and pointing their weapons. She truly felt it was not just an agent trying to perform his job:

> He had something personal, he was angry. He was trying to tell my mom his views, "It's your fault that this is happening. It could have been another way. I know plenty of people who suffer and they don't leave México and so you could have done the same thing" and this and that. Pretty much excusing his behavior…They just made us feel, like, so ashamed. And my mom was trying to stick up for herself and for the family and they would just say, the captain or whatever, was just trying to argue with her. Not just, "Let me do my job" no. Like, we're going to sit here and we were sitting down and they were standing up, you know, like the power, you can totally see it, you can totally see it.

Her uncle was taken and deported that day. They transported him in a van with other undocumented migrants who had been apprehended earlier. The agents then continued and made one more stop at another home while her uncle and the others waited in the van. It is unknown if they were truly searching for that woman or if she was just a made-up excuse to enter into these homes. That day Kelly, still in high school, was too overwhelmed to go to school. She could not stop crying until she got a friend to take her downtown to San Diego to attempt to locate her uncle. That year, Kelly missed many days from school in order to attend court dates and visitations while her uncle was in the detention facility. None of her other uncles, older siblings, or mother could do any of it, as she was the only one with US citizenship.

Detention Centers and Incarcerations

Most undocumented migrants have the ability to fight their case instead of being immediately deported. Officials have the discretion to release these migrants either on house arrest or on their own recognizance while they wait for their court date. In the cases below, officials opted instead to detain the persons. Such was the case for Olivia's father. She considers herself very lucky compared to most people in her situation because her father has two adult daughters that were able to help in ways that young children cannot. She is also an immigrant rights advocate and has volunteered with local organizations hosting events in her community. This has allowed her to make connections with immigration attorneys and has given her an awareness of their rights. As soon as her father was picked up she rushed to call their attorney who quickly moved to work on his case. Luckily, they had met with this attorney just days before and she had gathered enough information to be able to locate him within the system. The attorney succeeded in keeping him in detention instead of being deported that same day. Yet, when Olivia called the detention facility, the agent that answered lied and said her father was already on the bus heading to Tijuana. Feeling desperate and defeated, she called to inform their attorney. After contacting immigration officials herself, the attorney assured Olivia that her father was still in the detention facility, in San Diego. Confused, she asked why she had been told otherwise, to which the attorney answered, “Welcome to DHS.”

Olivia’s father was encouraged when he learned his attorney had enabled him to stay and fight his case, as reinstatements of removal are processed expeditiously. However, the conditions within the detention facility quickly deteriorated his hopes of returning home. By the second week all he could think about was getting out of detention and the only way to do this immediately was by giving up his case and agreeing to the deportation. Olivia begged him to stay and fight his deportation because she feared that once in México he would never be able to return safely. Olivia does not know what happened inside that detention facility, nor does she want to find out. What she does know is that her father described it as “the worst thing in his life. Like an animal, he was in a cage…it got harder and harder.” Her father insisted that he was not a criminal and he did not deserve to be incarcerated in there.

Kelly also discussed her relatives’ experience in immigration detention centers. As the only US citizen in her household, Kelly was the only person who was able to visit the detention centers whenever anyone in her family was detained. She described them as being run-down and in terrible conditions. This was true even in the visitation areas, which are usually better than the incarceration areas. The conditions were too much for her uncle. Immigration agents warned him that fighting his case could mean another 14 months of detention. He could not deal with one more day in there and opted to stop fighting:

> He really, mentally, he just was like, “I can’t. I can’t be here any longer.” And he’s been through, he’s been in jail when I was younger, younger. I want to say he did at least 4 years. And I remember I would go visit him [in immigration detention] and ask him how he was doing and I remember one time he was in tears because it was so bad.

Like Olivia, Kelly is unsure of what exactly went on inside the detention center. However, her uncle did share that they were not properly fed. Any food given was often rotten or spoiled, making it difficult for anyone to eat. Therefore, her family had to ensure they always put money into his commissary account. If one was not convinced or tricked into signing their “voluntary” deportations, the conditions in detention ensured that few migrants could withstand the process of fighting their case.

Caught In the Violence of Two States

Miguel, a 28 year-old US citizen, shared the story of his mother who is currently seeking asylum in the United States. About 16 years ago, she entered the country clandestinely through a mountainous region. Eight years ago, while Miguel was an undergraduate student, his mother attempted to adjust her status and was instructed to present herself to USCIS agents in Ciudad Juarez, México. She confessed to have entered the United States without authorization, and the agents used that information to deny her case. She was unable to return to San Diego. She settled in Tijuana along with her youngest son who was in third grade at the time and a US citizen. She was able to find work as an office assistant in a local government agency. After some years, her boss began to receive death threats at her office. As these worsened, Miguel’s mother feared for her life and decided to seek asylum in the United States. She presented herself to immigration agents at the border. There she was detained and sent to an immigration detention center in Arizona. Within days, while still incarcerated, she learned that her boss had been kidnapped and tortured. They later found out that the new assistant, who replaced Miguel's mother, was also tortured. Miguel is very grateful that his mother was able to leave the city in time, yet he was very troubled by her detention:

> She was in prison for 2 months. It was a really bad living situation. They didn't really take care of them. My mom told me that they had them in chains, literally chains, when they were transporting them. She felt like a criminal. It's a very interesting, visually, it's like a dichotomy, an interesting thing, to think of my mother, in handcuffs, wearing a jumpsuit. All she's trying to do is come back, reunite with her family… My mom is trying to stay alive. [If] she goes back to Tijuana she will die.

Miguel's mother seems to be caught between the trenches of two different states. On the one hand, the United States blames her for having entered the country without inspection and punished her by denying her legal status and penalizing her with a ten-year ban from reentering. On the other hand, the violence and corruption in México has made it so that the return to her country of origin was life threatening. The effects of the drug war and failed policies, such as NAFTA, have made it impossible to make a living for far too many. These policies have led to the expansion of violence throughout México, especially in the border town of Tijuana. Several drugs, such as heroin, methamphetamine, and cocaine, are trafficked through this city on their way to the United States (Robertson et al. 2012). Rates of violence in Tijuana far outpace those of San Diego, directly on the north side of the border. Without the granting of asylum, this mother will have to choose between living in one country where her life is at risk or another where she will be in constant fear of being imprisoned and expelled.

It is evident that these families have experienced much violence at the hands of the state, not only in the broken bond with their deported family member, but also in the brutal practices they experienced during the process. This violence is clearly systematic and therefore a form of structural violence (Farmer 2004). Although it is an indirect violence, many of the participants felt as though it was very personal. As Kelly described, the agent who stormed her home was making it personal by blaming her mother for not staying in México and putting up with the suffering, as those he knows have done. It was as if his duty was to enforce the suffering she was due. Early morning apprehensions done in the cover of darkness and without clearly identifying themselves; pointing guns at teenagers, threatening to shoot the family dog, and even the terrible conditions at immigration detention centers are all used to create a culture where migrants either believe they have no rights or find it impossible to assert them. Living in North County, migrants feel at constant risk of being apprehended; driving puts them at risk of being pulled over, yet public transportation is not any safer. This reality has led many undocumented migrants to have the impression that they have no rights. The high presence of Border Patrol and ICE agents, and their collaboration with police departments produce a state of exception (Agamben 2003) in this area. Maya's father, as well as all others on the train that night, was stopped and asked for papers with no probable cause, other than his appearance. Kelly's home was raided with the excuse of some woman that did not and had not lived in that house, yet agents still stormed in and arrested her uncle whom they were not looking for. Whether or not there was a real warrant to enter that home is questionable. It is clear, however, that they had no warrant with her uncle's name on it. The collaboration between local police departments and immigration agencies increase the susceptibility of migrants' exposure to a state of exception. Military tactics are used to make migrants feel marginalized and in danger even in their own home.

FAMILY STRUCTURE

As previously documented in the literature, upon a deportation there are immediate and long-term changes in families as a response to their missing relative. In the cases below, men who were the primary income earners were deported. Their wives and adult children suddenly had to start sending money to them, in addition to keeping up with their household costs. For former dependents, this impacted their roles within the family and, in turn, their identity, as they had to transform into responsible adults.

Immediate Changes to Family Structure

Gabriela shared some of the immediate effects of deportation as her father was deported just a couple of weeks before her initial interview. Although her father's deportation was very recent, their family life had already changed significantly. After the initial shock of his early morning arrest, she, her mother, and siblings have all made significant changes to their daily routines, and Gabriela now sees that her father was behind many of the old ones. She describes her current home life as chaotic and unorganized, as everyone's new priority is to ensure there is enough money to pay the household bills:

> We would *always* eat dinner all together. Now nobody eats together any more. Everybody does their own thing. They either ate at their job, or they took some little snacks from here, from the house. It's *not* the same thing. Mom used to cook dinner before, now she does it maybe like once a week. There was like a routine, the dinner had to be made a certain time, the laundry had to be [done] a certain day, the house had to be clean and organized in a

> certain way. So now there's like, no organization, there's just, everybody's, our basic needs, is just to have income for the house. If you, no matter if you have sleepless nights we *have to* bring money in for the rent.

In addition to covering household expenses, many families had to send their deported family members money in México to help them make ends meet. Often, this reflected a switch in responsibilities. Carolina is a 57 year-old undocumented woman whose husband was deported four years ago. Since then, their adult children must all pitch in to send their father money every now and then just so he could have enough to eat, "de vez en cuando le mandamos algo de dinero para que coma." 26 year-old Luis is a Dacamented graduate student who also provides money and goods to his father in México. Rather than send small amounts throughout the year, his strategy has been to send one lump annual sum when he gets his tax refund. For many men, deportation takes them from a breadwinner position to relying on remittances from their wives and children remaining in the United States, a change that undoubtedly affects their self-esteem.

Identity and Changing Roles

Luis not only provides income to his deported father, but also largely contributes to his family's household expenses. He was 20 years old at the time of his father's deportation and a sense of panic and fear came over him. Luis almost instantly went from being a young college student to an adult suddenly responsible for his mother and two younger sisters. He had a part-time job before, however, his earnings were considered spending money as he had no real obligations. Although his sisters are US-born citizens, Luis himself was undocumented, as DACA did not exist at the time. It became very important to him to stay out of trouble, both to avoid his father's fate and because he felt responsible for his household. He quickly became preoccupied with ensuring there was enough money for their rent:

> A lot of things that people turning 21 years old do, I didn't do. Not [that] I wanted to do them, like go party, that's not the type of person I am. I don't like that scene, it's just not my style. But, I didn't have a chance to like, goof off, you know? Or like, to be irresponsible for a second. That was not an option, you know, because my mom and I were left here to pay rent. We had to do what we had to do to pay rent, to keep on going, you know? And that was a shock, because, you know, I was young. I still feel young, but I feel old because I have all these things in my head, all these responsibilities, you know? Things that I never thought about, I had to start doing.

His father's deportation forced forward the reality that he too may be deported one day. He could not stand the thought of his mother being left on her own to provide for his sisters with no other financial help. He found himself with the sudden urge to save money:

> I wanted to save money, I wanted to pay rent. With me it was always like, when it happens to me I want to make sure that the rent for the month is paid, that there's a couple of thousand dollars saved for my mom. I became *obsessed* with saving money. That's another thing, another reason why, you know, when I turned 21 I was never like, "Let me go to the club, let me party, let me do this and that." I became obsessed with saving every single dollar. Other than paying rent, I didn't buy anything for myself, I remember. No shirts, no shoes, no, nothing. I just became obsessed, not because I was greedy. I saved so much money and never touched it. The money just sat there, I built an emergency fund, for reals, for my mom, like an emergency kit. I was working, working, working, saving, saving, saving.

The change from a growing young man to a sudden adult with family responsibilities influenced Luis in every decision he made from that point on. Going to school became very important to him as he saw it as a way to increase his income potential to help his mother. Yet, school also meant a tuition bill and too often Luis had to take fewer courses so that he could work to earn enough money. Still, he feels that the deportation of his father influenced him to see his education in a different light. Although it took a little longer than students without his responsibilities, Luis graduated with a bachelor's degree. He is now in graduate school, a step he feels he might not have reached if he would have had only himself to worry about.

Family members witness the ways these sudden changes in roles affect deported persons as well. Kelly currently has two uncles living in Tijuana since their deportation. She grew up viewing them both as father figures since they lived together and had helped raise her. Although they sometimes sell wares in Tijuana, it is not nearly enough to make ends meet. As Kelly described it, "it's not even worth the gas sometimes." As Dreby (2012) had postulated, Kelly described seeing them both emasculated:

> I think the biggest struggle is, I feel like a part of them is like, especially as men, that they feel super incapable money-wise. That's one thing. There's been times that they had to call my mom because it's like, "We *really* don't have money." You know? I think that they feel like they're not doing what they're supposed to be doing. They're not working, they're not taking care of their family, you know? I think that's part of it. I think another thing too is I feel they've really been dehumanized. I think that they feel that, but they feel that as men. Because when they're in handcuffs and I'm there, and I'm their niece, and I see them as my dad. My tío (uncle), he was in tears [while in detention], that's not what I'm used to and they *know* that. They know how I usually see them and how I'm seeing them now. And that's a big, big thing. But also, not being with their family. They have to be strong, "It's ok, pues aquí estamos (well, we're here)." But they don't talk about being sad, like, "I'm sad about not being with my kids." They don't do that, but all of that just over time it must take a big toll on them. You know?

One of Kelly's uncles is married and depends on his wife to send him money from San Diego. Their oldest sister, Kelly's mother, is called upon when matters get really tough and they are in dire need. She sends them money whenever she can as well as food and other needed items. Kelly is the only one in her family that can cross the border safely. This takes a toll on her as well, as she sees them struggling, yet has to appear as if everything is well in order to not bring them down. After seeing the condition they are in, she then has to return home and reassure her mother that they are doing well in Tijuana. There is no room for Kelly to express her worry and sadness for them. Instead she must be strong and pretend for everyone else's sake. Even those with the privilege of US citizenship often carry heavy burdens due to deportations. The ability to cross the borders translates into the obligation to handle the responsibilities of being messenger, delivery person, counselor, and any other responsibilities that must be done to keep the family connected.

The switch in roles of provider to dependent presented a difficulty for Maya's father. He was able to get a factory job and lives in his parents' house; therefore, he is better off than many other deportees. Still, his wages are not enough to cover everything, especially when there is an unexpected expenditure. When he became seriously ill, he was in need of expensive medical treatments in México. He was too ashamed to ask for financial help. Maya does not know how long he was ill before her aunt called. Against her own brother's wishes, Maya's aunt thought it was important that his family know what he was going through, and that he was in need of money. Maya's father was well aware that his duty was to provide for his children. Not meeting this expectation but needing from them instead led to his shame (Goffman 1974) and kept him from asking them for the help he needed to receive treatment. In addition, Maya also believes that as a father he did not want to worry his children. Especially his son, who is unable to cross the border to see him. Fortunately, her aunt made the call and Maya and her family contributed for his medical treatments.

THE PRECARITY OF FAMILY

With time, some family ruptures created precarious family notions, as family members struggled to define “family” after years of separation and absence. For these participants, the notion of being a family goes beyond that of genetic relation and requires stability and security. Deportations and the increased militarization of the US-México border have assaulted the ability of their family members to share a life with their loved ones. This has placed them in a sort of ghostly existence. This issue was something unexpected that quickly emerged in the initial stages of the research. The collections of demographic information often led to interesting answers alluding to a precarious family structure due to deportations. For example, Carolina struggled to give her marital status. She had been married for 30 years when her husband was deported. Although they now communicate through phone calls, she has not seen him since his deportation four years ago. Therefore, when I asked about her marital status she became anxious and visibly upset, hiding her face in her hands. She finally answered that she did not know any more. Legally, they were married and she still considers him her husband. Yet, they had been apart for so long with no concrete plans for a reunification, she wondered out loud if they could still be considered married or if she should instead answer that they are separated.

Similarly, Patty has struggled for years whenever she is asked about her family. She is a 23 year-old college graduate, born in central California. When she was a young child Patty and her older brother lost both parents to deportation. Their father was deported first and about a year later their mother was also apprehended when Patty was about five years old. After a work raid, agents drove her mother to Patty's school. She waited in the patrol vehicle while the agents went inside to pick up Patty from the school office. Her older brother happened to be at a family friend's house at that time. After allowing her mother to pack a bag for her, the officers drove Patty to a foster home and her mother to an immigration detention center. Her mother gave instructions that Patty's godparents, who were also her aunt and uncle, were to assume her care while she fought her deportation case.

Unfortunately, Patty's mother lost her case and the family she was born into was never reunited. It took a few months to locate her godparents and, in the mean time, Patty went to several foster homes. Her brother remained at the family friend's home, and the friend became his legal guardian and "*his* mom". During grade school, Patty was always aware that her family was different than that of her classmates. She knew the rest brought parents while she brought her aunt and uncle. She eventually began calling them mom and dad, and when they had children they became her brother and sisters as well. That has led to a complex family system for Patty. She and her brother share a mother and father, yet they each have their own mother and father and other siblings. Questions regarding her family continue to cause her to pause and decide which family she will be talking about. When talking to her older brother, Patty will discuss "mom", "your mom", and "my mom" in order to distinguish who she is referring to. In any other conversation, if she mentions "my brother", she could be talking about either one of them. She is not always comfortable sharing the complexity of her family, often opting to simply answer, "it's a long story." She only shares her story with her closest friends. The situation scares her, however, and she wonders how it will continue to impact her family into the future:

> I don’t know, it scares me. It scares me because my brother right now, he has a partner and she’s pregnant. I don’t know how to, like when she [the child] gets older, obviously she will ask “Why do you look different?” from, you know, *their* family. Because my brother and his mom, and he has two other adoptive siblings, his brother and sister, and I’m just wondering how we’re going to handle that. Like, explaining to her that our family is different than most families because of the fact that our parents got deported when we were so young. So I feel with her, with this baby girl coming into the picture, we’re going to struggle with that, my brother and I. And he’s going to have to, because my brother still struggles with it. That’s really been on my mind lately, how are we going to, even though she is not going to have any understanding for like the first five years, or maybe the first ten years, but she’s going to start asking questions at some point. And so that scares me, having to show her, or tell her, this is where she comes from. This is her history too, this is her story too, so that really scares me.

Luis also revealed a precarious sense of family early in his interview. He described both his family and his household in the same way – both included his mother and two sisters, but not his deported father. Although one of his sisters had moved out over a year before the interview, she was still included. His father, however, was excluded because they no longer share their lives together, “no convive con nosotros”. He explained that he loves his dad, he loves talking to him and they have the best conversations the few times he gets to call him, but their relationship is just not the same as it was before. His father used to drive Luis to school and work every day, and they also ate together daily. He went from always being with him to a phone call every few months. As a current full-time graduate student with a full-time job, his schedule makes it really difficult to find a good time to call. Because of his own status, Luis cannot leave the country to see his father; it has been seven years since they last saw each other. Memories of their life together seem far-gone and surreal, “It’s like it wasn’t real. I love my dad, but it feels like he was an imaginary friend." After years of separation, it often becomes very difficult to unequivocally express what family is.

THE EMBODIMENT OF A DEPORTATION

Deportations have significant effects even on adult family members. Especially after decades of marriage and sharing a life together, being suddenly and unwillingly separated from one's spouse can be a jarring experience with extensive consequences. As mentioned above, Carolina was physically separated from her husband of over 30 years upon his sudden deportation. She is legally married to him; yet she struggled to give this answer when I asked the simple demographic question. For Carolina, marriage is contingent on being together and sharing a life. US immigration policy has torn them apart and their relationship is no longer the way it was, the way it is supposed to be.

Carolina's self-other boundary was for decades shaped by her husband. His presence built her selfscape (Hollan 2014). Her daily routine included him; he was there every morning when she woke up and she always knew he had gotten up earlier to get their cafecito and pan dulce (Mexican sweet bread and coffee); every evening she knew they would go out for dinner and together visit one of their adult children's homes. Not knowing how to drive, she knew he would drive her to the grocery store and anywhere else she needed to go. After he was apprehended in the front yard of their Escondido home and subsequently deported, all of that was gone. From the moment she wakes up to the day's end, his absence is felt. Not only does she miss his company, but she is also, in a way, trapped at home without him. Going out now depends on her busy children's schedule and she feels desperately lonely. During her interview, Carolina kept stressing that she needs him, to be there for her and to help her with their adult children who still need their guidance. It is not just that her role of "wife" has been interrupted, but her wholeness is contingent upon her sharing her everyday life with him.

In both the United States and Mexican cultural context, a wedded couple makes a whole. In the United States, it is common to refer to a spouse as, "my better half" while in México it is just as likely to call one's spouse, "mi media naranja" or my orange half, as the whole and complete orange makes the couple. At the end of our interview, Carolina added, "Sentí que me partieron en dos", she felt like she had been split or cut in half. Earlier in our conversation after I asked about her health she shared that she had something like a stroke following his deportation. She had not seen a biomedical professional, therefore, she did not have an exact diagnosis. When she became ill, half of her face became paralyzed, which is why she believes it may have been a stroke. Her face has since recovered, however, she still has recurring problems with the left side of her body. It sometimes becomes difficult for her to move her arm and leg, it is so painful at times that she cannot do anything but lay and wait for the pain to pass. She is unable to work or perform any household chores during those episodes.

As Hollan described, explicitly political and power-related dimensions of scapes affect subjectivity and lived experience – selfscapes tie these "complexities of the social world" (2014: 191) to the complexity of embodied memory and emotion. Carolina's selfscape is now shaped by her husband's absence. Her marriage is currently split and divided by the US-México border. Her husband cannot return, as there is no way to adjust his status. The arduous border crossing is too perilous for a man his age, and their family does not have the money required to attempt a safer clandestine entry. As in many towns in México, violence has erupted in their hometown, making it too dangerous for Carolina to return and join him. Her husband was kidnapped soon after he arrived, and their children insist that Carolina remain in the United States, with them, where she is safe. She is torn between her children and her husband. She feels *split in half* as she constantly debates whether to ignore the dangers and join her husband or stay with her children and grandchildren. There are loved ones who need her in both places. She is split by this decision and it seems to have manifested in the pain on the left side of her body. Just as she is now unable to move freely, the left side of her body is also incapable of movement.

This is all unbeknownst to Carolina and her family. As Csordas explained of embodiment, it is a buried possibility, “at a level beneath awareness” and is “inevitably misrecognized” (1990: 23). Carolina’s socially informed body is expressing the physical separation of herself and her husband. The orange of her marriage has been cut in half, and this has expressed itself as half of her body unable to move and causing her great pain. Just as Csordas contends that, “The locus of the sacred is the body, for the body is the existential ground of culture” (1990: 39) Carolina’s body also holds, acts out, and expresses the deportation of her husband as she is haunted by the “ghost” (Hollan 2014: 191) of her marriage.

Deportation affects every member of the deportee’s family in different ways. For Carolina, her lifetime partner was seized and taken from her, leaving her not only alone, but also torn and stuck to her home. Her marriage is no longer what she meant for it to be; they no longer make one whole. To her, whether or not she is married is unclear, and disturbing. Her body expresses the frustration of having her husband torn away from her and leaving her split in half and confined to her home.

DEPORTATION AND MENTAL HEALTH

There are several ways that deportations and health are interconnected. This section will focus on the mental health themes that emerged in the present study, such as drug and alcohol use, emotions, and depression.

Substance Use and Mothering Across Borders

Two participants shared that their mothers used drugs or alcohol prior to their deportations. In both cases, their fathers had already been deported and the children in both families were split into different homes. Also in both cases, the mothers resisted assuming responsibility for their children. Although I did not interview these mothers, the synergistic effect of both their substance use and deportations had lasting impacts on their children's lived experiences.

Vicente, a US citizen, is an 18 year-old high school student whose mother was deported the summer before he entered middle school. At the time, his mother was using methamphetamines on a frequent basis. Fortunately, they had many family members near Oceanside that came to their aid. Vicente's godmother, his mother's sister, attempted to get her help to get off drugs. When his mother refused, police were called and she was eventually arrested. Vicente was 11 years old when his mother was deported to Tijuana, following two months of incarceration in the San Diego County Jail. His father had been deported years before, therefore Vicente and his two siblings each went to a different aunt's home. He went to live with his godmother in the nearby city of Bonsall, and was in a whole new school district when school resumed. He had always loved and looked forward to attending school. However, during this period in his life, all of that changed. He described being very well taken cared of and loved, but it was just not the same as having his mother. Vicente often cried himself to sleep, and at that tender age thoughts of suicide often crept into his mind. His godmother pressured his mother to return and take charge of her children once again, yet for a while she refused. Two years later, after attending a women's rehabilitation center in Tijuana, his mother was finally able to return and Vicente's family was reunited.

Patty's mother began to consume alcohol when she has having marital problems with Patty's father. Upon her deportation, Patty's mother returned to her hometown in México and dramatically increased her level of alcohol consumption. Family members recently shared with Patty that her mother, "would just drink all day, every day. She would wake up drunk and she would drink." Patty's mother returned often to the United States, where she eventually died from cirrhosis of the liver. Still, Patty and her brother never saw their mother alive again after her deportation. Her last memories of her are of their visitations in the immigration detention center where her mother would coddle her and braid her hair. And each time the visitation was over her mother would break down in tears as she was handcuffed and escorted back to her cell. Patty never thought they would be permanently separated. Yet, after her deportation this mother refused to resume care of her children and she cut off all communication with them. When she returned to the United States, Patty's mother lived with a cousin. From her, Patty later learned that her mother had "felt like she had abandoned us and that she wanted to clean up, sober up, antes de que nos buscara (before she looked for us), but she never got to it. She never got to that point where she wanted to be. And my brother and I didn't, we never got to talk to her, see her or anything."

For women who migrated in order to reunite with their husbands and keep their family together, deportation may represent a failure of fulfilling their roles of wife and mother. Patty’s mother had followed her husband to the United States, eight years after his initial departure. As her marriage began to fall apart in the United States, “she picked up the bottle”, and her consumption continued after his deportation. Her own deportation and separation from her children seemed to be final blow. Both a mother’s inability to fulfill her roles and the use and abuse of drugs and alcohol each carry their own stigmas and shame. Having to leave children behind combined with substance use may push forward an identity as being an “unfit mother”, especially when they see others taking care of their children. Both Patty’s and Vicente’s mothers may have seen that their children were doing well enough without them.

In the case of Vicente’s mother, it is unclear what happened to her following her deportation when she was in Tijuana, away from family. Vicente was uncertain whether she went to the rehabilitation center right away and stayed for the entire two years or if she only went for a short period before her return to the United States. Robertson et al. (2012) discuss the ways that women very easily increase their frequency in drug use as well as graduate to harder drugs upon deportation, especially when they are deported into Tijuana and other border towns. The easy access to drugs in Tijuana could exacerbate women’s addiction problems and make it more difficult to be a “fit mother”.

Goffman explains that “deviants” may sometimes find a solution in isolation and detachment from the community upholding the norm (1974: 129). While these two mothers did not themselves seek to be isolated, once they were forcibly separated from their children and the stigma made public, they sought to keep a distance between themselves and their children. It is also possible that their drug and alcohol use was employed as an excuse to avoid taking responsibility, what Goffman termed “secondary gains” of holding a stigma (1974:10). However, Patty’s mother made it clear to her cousin that she was ashamed and wanted to be sober before contacting her children again. These mothers share with their society the same values that constitute what a “good mother” ought to be. Being addicted to a substance, therefore, may have brought the shame and desire to shield her children from sharing in that burden. This could be the reason why these mothers opted to stay isolated from their children, even when they clearly needed and preferred to be with them instead of any other family members. Failing or succeeding at maintaining sociocultural norms of identity, such as that of being a mother, has a direct effect on the integrity of the individual whether or not conforming is within her control (Goffman 1974: 128). The situations for these mothers worsened when they were forcibly removed from their children, directly affecting their ability to care for them and assaulting their integrity of being mothers.

Patty and her brother are still living the consequences of being separated from their mother. Growing up in her godparents’ home, Patty always felt like she was “la hija regalada” or the daughter that was given away. There were marked differences between her and her other brother and sisters. As a teenager, she was not allowed to eat unless she cooked the meal herself, often eating cereal after the rest of the family finished the warm dinner their mother had made. As soon as she turned 18 she was kicked out of her home because she refused to work full time for the family business. She had been accepted to a university outside of their county and she made the decision to go. Because of that, she became homeless about a month before her high school graduation. Those are all issues that she is undoubtedly still dealing with, in addition to her worries about how to explain "family" to their future generations. While Vicente and his siblings were fortunate to be eventually reunited with their mother, the separation occurred at a critical time for Vicente. It heavily affected his emotions as well as his educational trajectory. Although it is not uncommon to still be in high school at 18 years of age, he does not have enough credits to graduate at the end of this school year. He has been in and out of the juvenile court system, and at the time of his interview, his younger brother was incarcerated. Both Patty and Vicente were able to remain with family members after their parents' deportations. Some would say they were lucky compared to children who end caught up and lost in the foster care system. Yet, clearly, they both would have been much better off if their parents could have remained with them. Especially if they could have received treatment for their addictions instead of being expelled from the United States.

Emotions

Deportations carry huge emotional tolls on everyone in the household. In Gabriela's case, she was very concerned about her mother. Three months after her husband's deportation, she still cried daily. If her mother had the day off of work, she would rather stay in bed all day and ask Gabriela to care for Gloria, her youngest sister, because she felt depleted. Her mother lost a considerable amount of weight, as she scarcely ate after her husband's deportation. Gabriela's mother almost stopped cooking all together; she went from cooking daily to less than once a week. Even on those occasions, she would not join the family for dinner, insisting that she already ate as she made her way back to her bedroom. Olivia had a similar experience with her mother. She cried so much that it made Olivia angry that she could not be stronger for her younger siblings. Witnessing both her mother and sister fall apart and become overwhelmed by tears made Olivia feel like she had to be the strong one. As Olivia put it, “crying didn’t get us anywhere.” She felt it was her duty to show them strength and resiliency, working nonstop to handle the logistics of her father’s case, communicating with the attorney, and ensuring there was enough money on his commissary account, all while she went to school full time. She is unsure of how she was able to control her emotions in front of her family, but she knew it had to be done. However, sometimes her emotions took over her when she was away from her home environment. She found herself unable to control her tears while on her college campus. She was thankful to have found a classmate with whom she could share her grief, as she was going through the same situation.

Kelly also felt the need to demonstrate strength for her family, both while visiting relatives in detention or in Tijuana, and once she returned home with her mother and the rest of her family. She too releases her emotions away from family members, either with her longtime friend, whose father had also been deported, or in private. Unlike Olivia, Kelly did not find solace on her college campus. Instead she either felt the need to put up a guard or was not able to even attend class. Following each deportation, she was unable to listen to the professors or focus on class material. Instead she found herself worried sick about her relatives, wondering if they were detained or deported and in Tijuana; would they stay there or attempt to return? If they stay, will her mother ever see them again? If they attempt a return, will they get caught and incarcerated? Will they get injured – as has happened before – or, worse, killed by the harsh trek or by a Border Patrol agent? Understandingly, she is unable to focus on any schoolwork and never felt she could share her troubles with her professors. As she is usually a very good student, it became noticeable to her professors when something was wrong. There were periods where she found herself unable to express anything without bursting into tears; therefore, it would take her a while to share her experiences with those who reached out to her. All others never found out what her situation was, because she would rather drop a class than to expose herself to an intolerant professor. As Kelly put it, “in class you’re on your own. You don’t know how they [professors] are going to take it and you ask, do you want to put yourself through that?” It was not a stigma that she attempted to avoid, but rather any possible confrontations that would add insult to injury.

Those who have been deported also found themselves overcome by emotions. Carolina recalled that immediately after arriving to his hometown her husband called her crying, as he could not believe he was so far away from her and their family. Maya also shared that her father cried for several days following his deportation. Her grandmother was very worried because it was very unlike him; everyone considered him very tough, yet he cried all day long for many days. Maya herself had a difficult time imagining this, as she had never seen him crying; in fact, no one in their family had. His deportation has also been difficult on her brother, because he is undocumented and has not seen their father in almost a decade. Although he is not one to show his emotions, Maya knows it has been very difficult for him. Whenever she returns from visiting her father, he asks her all about him, wanting to know how he is doing, what he looks like, if he is getting older. Although he could see him in pictures, he counts on Maya to tell him how he is doing, as he is not able to see for himself. Even though she visits him a couple of times a year, Maya misses having her father at home. He was able to attend her high school graduation before he was deported, but missed her two college graduations. His absence was an immense void that tarnished her family's celebrations.

Depression

The theme of being depressed was one that was often brought up by many participants. However, only three diagnoses of depression were found during my fieldwork. These included two participants, and the father of a third. Patty received a diagnosis at the young age of 12. She had many issues at school and was involved in numerous fights. When she was in middle school her godparents sent her to counseling for anger management:

> I still had a social worker for a while that, um, they like, took me to anger management and they took me to this counselor guy and he diagnosed me with depression and he wanted to give me medication for it. And he said it was because that, I struggled with all that, what happened with my parents. Like, I didn't know where my mom was. I struggled a lot with that.

She refused the medications and did not receive any further treatment for her depression.

A diagnosis of major depressive disorder was given to Isabella, a 31 year-old US citizen whose husband was undocumented. After their son was born, they decided to attempt to adjust his status. Like Miguel's mother, he presented himself to USCIS agents in Ciudad Juarez and had to wait in México while his case was being decided. Isabella described it as "a huge gamble", as there was no way of knowing if his case would be accepted or if he would be barred from returning. Being separated from her husband was really difficult for Isabella and after a few months she sought therapy. Unfortunately, she was not comfortable with her therapist. Instead, she felt judged and her therapist made it clear he had no understanding of her situation:

> It was just too much. I couldn't handle that. I mean, I just felt really stressed. The only way I got through is, I went to therapy twice, um, but I didn't really feel a good connection with the therapist, I didn't feel like he understood. I didn't feel like anyone understood, but let alone this therapist in particular that my insurance covered, I didn't feel like it was really helpful. I felt really judged. Um, so I just went with him twice but what I did decide to do for the first time in my life was to try meds. Um, because I was feeling *really* anxious and really depressed so I was on Zoloft for, for that year. And I didn't feel anything, I didn't feel, I felt tired.

As a marriage and family therapist herself, she had expected more support. Still, the medication allowed her to not think about anything and suppress her worries and anxiety. After visiting his parents whom he had not seen in years, her husband settled in Tijuana while waiting for his application to process. This allowed her and their son to visit every weekend. Although it was very time consuming and inconvenient to leave her home and cross the border on a weekly basis, it was what kept Isabella going. As she described it, "I lived for my weekends." Fortunately, her husband was eventually approved for legal permanent residency. Upon his return, Isabella stopped taking the medication, which resulted in serious withdrawal symptoms, including intense headaches and the inability to function. She went through a period of about three weeks of feeling like she was going to die, "I had seriously started writing my eulogy because I felt that I was, I wasn't going to make it. I felt really bad. I couldn't keep my head up. I couldn't care for [my son]." All the while, medical professionals insisted it was all in her head because the medications would not cause any withdrawal symptoms. This, along with several insensitive comments, made it really difficult for Isabella to trust her clinicians.

Olivia's father suffered from depression aggravated by his undocumented status. After his apprehension, he was diagnosed within the detention facility and given medication as well as counseling services. At the time of the interview, approximately six months after his release, he was continuing his medication and therapy sessions. Olivia described how her father's fear of being deported exacerbated his depression:

> That also contributed to my dad's depression, was having to live like, two lives. At his work he was this, you know, assimilated immigrant, you know, that had papers, was very acculturized, and he had to play this part to have that employment. At home it was like, he was an undocumented person, he didn't know, we were afraid to just step out, we were afraid to even return something at the store because they ask for your ID. You go get a library card, they ask for your ID. For everything, you know? Once he went to this bar, they wouldn't let him in with his valid, they used to give driver's licenses to people here in California so he has an expired license, so they wouldn't let him in because of that [the expiration]. So all of that, it's like, oh my god, such downers. Whenever there were events in like Long Beach, there were these conferences for his work, he always had to come up with an excuse why he couldn't go. He couldn't just say "Hey, I can't go because, you know, there's a [Border Patrol] checkpoint on the 5 [freeway] and I can get deported and I support my family and they depend on me, so I can't go." He couldn't. He was living a lie, *we* were living a lie, we *still* are, but you know.

Similarly, in the 2011 study conducted by Brabeck and colleagues, parents reported that the emotional affect of the threat of deportation influenced the interactions with their children. All of the parent respondents in their study admitted to being psychologically affected by the experience or threat of deportation. Some of the symptoms they reported were loss of energy, hopelessness, anxiety, crying, weight fluctuations, fear, distrust, and nightmares (Brabeck et al. 2011). According to Peutz and De Genova (2010) the "real effect" of deportations is deportability – the vulnerabilities that the possibility of being deported brings. The pressure of constantly presenting a "precarious self" (Goffman 1974: 135) led to the depression and even suicidal thoughts for Olivia's father. Revealing his undocumented status would be stigmatizing and dangerous, as he feared being separated from his family and not being able to provide for them.

Stigma and Mental Health

The recent deportation of Gabriela's father has had an impact on each family member in different ways. Her youngest sister, Gloria, is a seven-year-old second grader. Their father was deported a couple of weeks before the school year began and this has been affecting Gloria's education. Any mention of her father brings her to tears. In class, it is unclear what triggers her, but she suddenly bursts into tears, something she has never done before. Within three months of the deportation, Gloria's inability to control her emotions during school led to her older brother's job loss. He was the only one in the family that could take calls and leave work during the school day. Unfortunately, he left work far too often for his employer's liking. Gloria's current teacher also taught her in first grade and knew that her behavior was not at all normal for her. She contacted her mother and insisted that Gloria get counseling. With their limited income, counseling is something her family could not afford. Fortunately, her teacher was able to arrange services for her free of charge. However, with her father gone, everyone is working more than before and time has become very limited. Even if only once a week, taking Gloria to counseling services would disturb someone's work schedule. Eventually her teacher was able to arrange for her to receive services at school and she will soon begin counseling.

Every time a school official contacted Gabriela regarding her sister, Gabriela shared that Gloria's condition was due to the "absence of father, and that's it." This is also what was filled out on all forms. Gabriela is not comfortable telling them that their father was deported. She chose instead to manage this discreditable information

(Goffman 1974) for her youngest sister, without knowing how it may affect her treatment. This is because they are part of a mixed status family. Although young Gloria and one brother are US citizens, Gabriela only has DACA, and their mother and oldest brother are undocumented. Therefore, it could be very dangerous to reveal that her father was deported because it may lead to further questioning regarding their immigration status. The stigma of being undocumented may also lead to judgments about Gloria. There is no way for any one to know how her teacher, school administrators, the counselor, and even other students feel about immigration. As mentioned above, when Isabela sought therapy she felt judged and decided to stop attending. Gabriela is unaware of Isabela's experiences, yet she has lived with her undocumented status for years and knows very well the reality of being stigmatized and too often not knowing when sharing is safe. The risk is too great for Gabriela; she has chosen to protect Gloria by stating that she cries simply because her father is now absent.

COPING WITH THE DEPORTATION OF A LOVED ONE

Getting through the stresses that deportations bring is an arduous task. Nonetheless, it was achieved and even made some participants stronger. Janice Jenkins describes a persistent and "strong love of life, family, and native land" as aids that engendered resistance and resilience among Salvadoran refugees (1991: 156). Likewise, many participants spoke of their strong connection and love for family that kept them going. Although many did express a connection to their Mexican Motherland, none of the participants considered it home, nor did they view it as a place where their entire family could safely live. Therefore, the separation from their deported family member was something they had to learn to live with.

Household finances were a top concern that several families had to immediately arrange. Many family members coped with the significant loss of income by taking on additional work. This was also done in order to be able to send remittances to their deported relative. Increasing work hours often disrupted schedules. Routines had to be rearranged and expenses cut. It suddenly became evident that certain utilities, such as cable and telephones, were unnecessary. Essential utilities often took turns getting paid; one month the water bill would get paid off while the electricity company gets the minimum amount required to avoid disconnection. College students too often found themselves dropping classes in order to cut down their tuition bills, to have the time to deal with the immediate logistics, or to work additional hours.

Many of the participants expressed that their experiences made them stronger in the end. The ability to get through the toughest of days demonstrated that they are capable of tolerating considerable adversities. The separation from his mother at a young age has made Vicente feel that he can now withstand anything. He described how this sets him apart from others his age:

> I'm not scared. I'm not scared now because I'm 18, because people, like, once people turn 18 they get all scared, they turn 18 and they think that the world is going to fall on top of them. And me, I know how to handle it, I know how to balance. Don't panic, don't be scared, everything has a solution to it, and that's what I learned…By you going through this, it makes you strong. It makes you not be scared of anything. Because you went through it at a young age, and once you go through that you're not afraid of nothing. For me, I'm not scared, I'm not scared. You know, sleeping out here on a park, or, I'm not scared of working by myself. I wouldn't be scared living by myself at my age, you know. I know how to get money, the easy or the hard way, you know. I always make it the hard way because making money the hard way, you know how it feels making that money. You don't spend it all crazy. For like, oh, this is for this, this is for that, and

> whatever is left over, this is how much I'm going to spend…I started buying my own clothes. I have my brother to take care of, and my sister. So in a way I had to kind of grow up at a young age.

While Vicente's peers are considering leaving home and being away from their parents for the first time, he has already lived through it. He survived not knowing when or if his mother would ever return and even the death of his father, who was killed in México some years after he was deported. Vicente became fearless and has no doubts in his ability to make it on his own and even take charge of others.

Organizing and advocacy helped other participants cope. Organizing ties everything together for Kelly. She feels the need to speak out and to be an activist, not just for her family, but also for all families that have experienced or lived in fear of deportation. She has addressed local politicians and networked at international migration conferences. Although Olivia advocated for migrant rights before her father was detained, her involvement increased afterwards. She made calls and traveled to Washington D.C. with other advocates to push for administrative relief. Likewise, Miguel has publicly advocated for support for his mother's asylum case, by personally contacting local representatives and using social media to outreach and increase support. Through their organizing and advocacy networks, several participants have gotten informed about laws, rights, and politics, and are able to spread their knowledge to their families and communities. They have all reached the point where they came to accept and respect their situation enough that they felt it was not necessary to conceal the stigma of a deportation (Goffman 1974) and became political instead. As Isin (2002) put it, "'Becoming political is that moment when the naturalness of the dominant virtues is called into question and their arbitrariness revealed [and it is] that moment when one constitutes oneself as a being capable of judgment of just and unjust, takes responsibility for that judgment, and associates oneself with or against others in fulfilling that responsibility' (p. 275-76)." (Cited in Peutz 2006: 231). For Luis, that moment came years after his father's deportation, when he was visiting his girlfriend in Oceanside one evening. As he prepared to leave, her father insisted that Luis stay and wait to leave later, as he knew that Border Patrol agents usually roamed the streets at that hour. That's when he came to a realization, "I remember thinking about Anne Frank…and I remember thinking, damn, [that] is what this is, straight out persecution." Now he has, "lots of anger towards the state. A lot of what I went through, what my family went through, is because of politics." Like other participants, Luis changed his major and decided to pursue additional degrees. Many shared that learning about others who have gone through something similar, as well as learning about the system that led to their family's separation, has been very empowering. Many family members emerge from their experience with a sense of responsibility to get through their adversities in order to keep their family going as well as help others who may also go through a similar experience.

PART V: CONCLUSION

In studying Salvadoran refugees it became clear to Jenkins that "the role of the state and other political, religious, and economic institutions must be examined to interpret the dominant ethos of a people" (Jenkins 1991: 141). Although the present study is not large enough to establish a dominant ethos, the findings illuminate the ways political institutions in the United States lead to "psychic and bodily suffering" (Jenkins 1991: 150). Deportations from the United States are clearly instances where we see "large-scale forces alter interpersonal relations. Certain categories of persons and certain individuals are placed at great risk, while local worlds protect or even strengthen the position of others." (Kleinman 1995: 186). Deportations and family separations are social and political problems that must be thoroughly addressed at various levels. Federal immigration laws and local policies and practices intertwine to produce insecurity in North County. Participants repeatedly described the ways undocumented migrants are targeted by several enforcement agencies, producing fear within their everyday activities. Whether it is traveling for work, returning an unwanted item, going out to buy dog food or simply to go home, mundane activities represent uncertainty and danger for those at risk of deportation and their families. The US government has been using the "war on terror" as an excuse for their constant state of exception (Agamben 2003), which has led to the militarization of communities and the increasing numbers of deportations and fractured families. However, historically, Mexicans and those of Mexican descent have always been bodies marked for removal from the United States. What has changed is that it is no longer permissible to be overtly racist, therefore, "neutral" language is used instead (FitzGerald 2014). Still, Mexicans experiencing the heightened enforcement feel targeted. Additionally, the exaggerated militarization of the US-México border and the framing of Mexicans as “illegals” elucidate the true goals of those policies.

As Goffman (1974) noted, stigmatized categories are established by society. In the case of immigration status, it is clearly evident that these categories are socially and politically constructed by federal immigration laws in the United States, local law enforcement practices, as well as media representations. Undocumented persons have no visible markings, nor do they necessarily have any shortcomings in intellect or behavior. Yet, like other stigmatized persons, they are identified as being not fully human and “normals” may very well discriminate against them and perceive them as being inferior and even dangerous (Goffman 1974: 5). Danger is constructed by politicians and pundits claiming threats to national security or drains to the national economy due to their supposed use of public resources. The conjoining of criminality and immigration has led to labels such as “fugitive alien”, “criminal alien”, and “illegal aliens” that emphasize supposed criminality while dehumanizing migrants (Golash-Boza & Hondagneu-Sotelo 2013: 281) and adding to their stigmatization. Yet, each time that a participant recalled their family member in detention they emphasized their relative’s feelings of not deserving this treatment and insisting they were not criminals. The political construction of criminality does not coincide with what migrants conceive of as criminal.

Clearly the political violence of deportations has resulted in a sense of insecurity for the migrant community of North County. This has stemmed from the possibility of being targeted any time persons step out of their home, as well as the unnecessarily brutal apprehensions even while at home. The incredibly punishing conditions inside immigration detention centers are another ploy used to speed up and increase expulsions.

While this country claims to be just through its due process, the reality for many undocumented migrants is that they are not given fair access to the judicial system. Too many persons detained are not informed of their options but are instead bullied into waiving the rights they were not even aware they had. Once deported, whether they volunteered or not, migrants are prohibited from returning to their families, and those who risk all to return get branded with labels of "criminal aliens" and "fugitive aliens", which then places them at the top of enforcement priorities.

The tactics deployed upon undocumented migrants increase the potential for deportation and subsequent family separation. Family members who remain in the United States do so because it is not a practical option to join their relative in México. Whether it is due to the dangerous conditions or the inability to earn a living, leaving the country they consider home is not a viable alternative. Instead, most have to cope with the reality of a fractured family. In the effort to make up for the missing relative, many take on several responsibilities they had never considered before. Sometimes the increased sense of responsibility and obligation changes a person so deeply that several other aspects of their life change. Luis went from being a college student with a part-time job to working full time and keeping track of finances as he had never done before. Everything he has done from the moment of his father's deportation was with the security of his family in mind, especially his mother. While this resulted in a positive change for Luis, those who were deported may experience an opposite effect. Their transition from providers to roles of dependency proved to be difficult for Kelly's uncles. Even if they did not express it, she sensed a change in them.

The permanence of the separation was found to be problematic and unsettling for many. It caused some participants to reveal the precarity of family. Carolina and her husband had a decades-long marriage, yet after his deportation she became apprehensive about the status of their relationship. Likewise, that Luis' father is a part of his family is not rapidly resolute. For Patty, her mother's deportation when she was five years old led to an inability to build a secure sense of family. The loss of Carolina's husband was so deeply felt it has expressed itself in her body.

Deportations arguably affect the mental health of many involved. They place enormous emotional tolls on the deported person, spouses, children, and other close relatives. When combined with other issues, such as substance abuse, the effects on family members are exacerbated. Not surprisingly, the immense stresses on those affected by deportation and family separation place some at risk of developing depression. Fortunately, some are able to receive professional help; yet, immigration status and deportations carry with them heavy stigmas that may affect possible treatments.

Perhaps the most uplifting of the findings is that the majority of the participants was able to overcome their adversities and emerged stronger and empowered. For Vicente the simple fact that he survived demonstrated that he can withstand hardships and is now unafraid of what the future may bring. Unfortunately, the negative effects of his parents' deportations are still with Vicente. Having few resources as an adolescent mixed with a sense of responsibility to provide for his younger siblings steered him into stealing and eventually he was entangled in the juvenile court system. Now that he is 18, any violation of probation could put him at risk of serving time in county jail or even prison. Even though he is now an adult, Vicente needs support to get him on the track he wishes to be on, which starts with his completion of high school. Several participants were able to use their hardships as fuel to advance their education and excel in order to support their family and even help others they may not yet know in the same situation. Many also became political or increased their advocacy efforts when they realized that what they had been put through was not just. These different trajectories have lasting effects in their communities and may not even be recognized as having anything to do with immigration policy.

The reality is that not all family members are able to excel after a deportation. The most vulnerable are also the most difficult to reach, which represents a noteworthy limitation to this study. Those whose trust I was able to gain had stable homes, dependable household income even if limited, and most had at least some college education, some even had graduate degrees. These are all factors that may have mitigated some of the effects of their relatives' deportations. Nevertheless, they all experienced more than their fair share of hardships. In the case of Patty, she was able to overcome more than the loss of her parents. At the age of 23, she now has a college degree and a stable residence, and teaches in a classroom of adolescents that are in need of the guidance her unique perspective can provide. All of those were achieved long after her parents were deported, therefore these did not serve as protective factors in her case.

The understanding of suffering includes those ways that it is kept quiet and hidden. According to Farmer, the anthropology of structural violence must take into account not only the living but also the "dead and those left for dead" (2004: 307). While there was not enough time to fully delve into this, two participants had parents who perished after their deportations. The death of Patty’s mother mentioned above was due to her alcoholism. However, her consumption intensified after her deportation, and she was never able to heal from this. Vicente’s father was murdered in his hometown a few years after his deportation. Carolina’s husband was kidnapped shortly after arriving in his own hometown. Kelly’s uncle has witnessed the kidnapping of children in Tijuana, and Miguel’s mother had to flee from there because she genuinely feared for her life. There are also rumors that Gabriela’s father has been approached by cartels who may be trying to recruit him. A deportation may very well put a person’s life at risk. They may face violence in México, whether they decide to stay in a nearby border town or travel to their hometown. Or, they may risk their lives trekking through the harsh environment that US border enforcement has funneled them through. They could also be at risk of being killed by Border Patrol agents who could get away with it by simply stating they were being thrown rocks at. Whether these persons are left for dead or not is not the concern of the state deporting, nor the one receiving them. By ignoring these implications of deportations, we are witnesses to the erasure of history and the covering up of “the clear links between the dead and near-dead and those who are the winners in the struggle for survival.” (Farmer 2004: 307).

Although not represented by the participants in this study, many undocumented migrants living in North County concede that they are in the United States without permission and are willing to correct this by accepting some sort of penalty if given a chance. A separation from their family, however, has quite often been described as being too arduous of a punishment. Still others sometimes see themselves as right-less individuals who ought not complain, and should not resist or even criticize immigration policy. However, deportation is only one single response to migration and not an absolute one. It is defended by some as “imminent and immutable” (Peutz & De Genova 2010: 9) yet, many people around the United States have realized that there are other options.

The overwhelming majority of the participants in the present study have all been raised in this country that claims equality and freedom as its foundation. Whether they were born in México and brought at a young age or born in the United States, they have a sense of justice that has persuaded many to become involved in their community and advocate for migrant rights. All over the country, numerous Dreamers – the undocumented migrants who were brought to the United States as children – have become very political. In recent years, many have traveled to the White House, as Olivia did, or have chained themselves together blocking the entrance roads in and out of detention centers. Some have even occupied politicians’ offices. These Dreamers have all put themselves at risk of not only arrest but also deportation, all in the name of justice for their families. These youth are not satisfied with their own ability to defer deportation through DACA when their parents, older siblings, and other relatives are still at risk of deportation. They demand that their entire family be protected from deportation, otherwise the risk of family separation still looms over them.

President Obama continuously vowed to take executive action if Congress did not address the issue of immigration. After a string of promises, he was expected to announce administrative relief from deportations in the summer of 2014. Instead, he decided to wait until after the midterm elections in order to shield the democrats running, yet the elections on November 4th did not turn out well for his party. On November 20th President Obama finally announced a series of executive actions to grant administrative relief for millions of undocumented migrants. These included an expansion of DACA to remove the age limit of applicants; anyone who arrived before the age of 16 and has continuously resided in the United States since January 2010 would now be eligible. Additionally, a new program would grant relief to parents of US citizens and legal permanent residents. The Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) would allow parents relief of deportation and a work permit for three years, that is if they do not meet any category for enforcement priority (USCIS 2015). Just days after the publishing of her op-ed piece, an emotional Diane Guerrero was in the audience and even met President Obama after his announcement. As a US citizen, these executive actions would have kept Diane's family in tact, so it was no surprise to see a deluge of online images of an overjoyed Diane with tears of happiness filling her eyes. It has been estimated that approximately five million undocumented migrants would be eligible to apply for administrative relief, and for that, many advocates are truly grateful. But, what about the Dreamers who risked so much for their parents? Unless their parents have other children who are either US citizens or legal permanent residents, they remain at risk, as do those parents who have been placed into priority enforcement categories.

Almost half of those eligible for administrative relief live in one of the 26 states that filed a lawsuit against President Obama in an attempt to put a stop to the executive actions. (Lopez & Krogstad 2015). The USCIS was prepared to accept applications for the expansion of DACA beginning on February 18, 2015. The process to apply for DAPA was expected to be open by the end of May 2015 (USCIS 2015). The lawsuit has put a halt to both application processes and now five million persons are awaiting news of the results to see if they may soon get some relief from the constant threat of deportation. Participants of this study expressed anger and exasperation with politicians who do not consider the lived experiences that their policies advance. They either have no idea about the real life effects or absolutely do not care about the effects. Olivia described deportations as, "So inhumane, it's not the American thing to do…[politicians] don't care about our lives, it's about votes. We can't wait for elections, this is our lives, they can't play with them." She felt that she and her family were simply pawns in the game of politics. The back and forth debates of comprehensive immigration reform, the "need" to secure the border, and now the relief President Obama promised and the lawsuit to stop it, all feel like ploys to get a good sound bite and future votes. Families are in need of real relief and deserve a real conversation to truly initiate humane immigration reform.

Policy Implications and Suggestions

Five million undocumented migrants and their families are currently waiting the court's decision on the legality of President Obama's executive actions. These executive actions are very much welcomed but are not enough to fix most problems. Those who have been deported must keep waiting for their ban to expire before they can return. Once it does, they may still not have a feasible prospect of receiving a visa. The backlog of visa applications must be addressed and the system improved to avoid future backlogs, especially for Mexicans. The history between México and the United States cannot be ignored and should be recognized in immigration policy by removing or significantly increasing their annual quotas. The United States should also recognize that the militarization of the border has not decreased the number of undocumented migrants, rather it has been responsible for far too many deaths of migrants. The securitization of the US-México border must be reduced. At the very least, Border Patrol should increase water stations and ensure their locations are not policed.

It has been established that agents wrongfully persuaded many migrants to waive their rights and sign their voluntary deportation. Some, like Olivia's father, were not aware of what they were signing; others, like Maya's father, were lied to and convinced there were no other viable options. As a result of the class action lawsuit Lopez-Venegas v. Johnson, immigration agents now have to clearly state that signing a voluntary deportation waives their right to a hearing in front of an immigration judge, along with other changes in practices and procedures. Additionally, a select group who were coerced into signing their voluntary deportation between June 2009 and August 2014 will be able to return to the United States. This only applies to those who were apprehended by the San Diego Border Patrol sector and the San Diego and Los Angeles ICE field offices (ACLU 2014). Although the changes to agents' practices are applauded, the limited five-year period excludes far too many families that will remain separated. Expanding this class membership to 10 years and including deportations from other sectors would increase the number of families that could be reunited.

The issues of criminalization also need to be addressed. All programs and reform proposals exclude "criminals" from eligibility. First, it is necessary to recognize the ways that immigration policies have created these categories. In cases that no criminal laws were broken, it is completely unfair to exclude persons simply on the basis of a political category dubbed a crime. Second, the issue of all other criminality is highly problematic in the United States and is beyond the scope of this paper to fully address. All people of color are under heightened surveillance, are more likely to be targeted by law enforcement agents, and receive harsher penalties when convicted. After serving what was probably an unfair sentence to begin with, many migrants are deported either immediately or years after their release. For persons under such great scrutiny, it is unjust to add deportation to any punishment. Additionally, steps must be taken to end racial profiling in immigration enforcement. Simply stopping persons because they look Mexican is unacceptable, just as the 100-mile border zone is as well. Border enforcement should not extend beyond the actual border. It should be recognized that migrants in San Diego County, and all others along the border, are settled and not in the process of entering. Therefore, the border needs to be officially defined as perhaps ten miles or less from the edge of US territory and any enforcement should exclude residential neighborhoods. Issues of substance use and abuse should be addressed with rehabilitation, not deportation. Also, when a migrant is apprehended officials should clearly identify themselves and provide family with any information they have. If they are arresting someone because of a deportation order, they likely have their immigration identification number and that information should be released to the family so that they can easily locate their relative within the immigration system. Finally, the United States must assume responsibility for the consequences children bear when a parent is deported. Cases, such as Diane Guerrero's, of children left without ever being checked on should never occur. Support must be given to help youth process the harrowing changes and their emotions, as well as succeed in school. Government officials simply ignoring the consequences of their own policies is inhumane.

The Mexican government also has much room for improvement in dealing with their returned citizens. Resources are needed immediately upon deportation, such as nutrition and health services, as well as telecommunication services to help keep them connected with family in the United States. Hagan and colleagues recommended that the Mexican government "take seriously the problem of return migration." (2011:1389). They state that programs have been established for Mexicans abroad while programs for those returning have been lacking. The majority of those deported return with skill sets learned in the United States that could be of use in México. With proper support, these may be able to stimulate the local economies and may even reduce the need for others to emigrate (Hagan et al. 2011). Both Mexican and the United States governments need to seriously consider revising failed policies such as NAFTA and the drug war. These have undoubtedly increased the need for migration. Any serious attempts to reduce immigration to the United States should amend foreign policies that have been responsible for inducing it.

Outside of policy, other changes must be made in response to deportations and family separation. Mental health professionals should be trained to treat patients affected by deportation without judgment. Professors and teachers should also receive training in order to reduce the stigma that comes with the deportation of a loved one. In college settings, supportive professors should identify themselves so that students can easily tell whom they can rely on for support. For example, some universities have developed safe space symbols for LGBTQ students, which are placed on office doors. A similar system should be developed to identify safe spaces for students who are undocumented or part of mixed status families.

A few participants expressed the necessity for a support group. Because of the stigma related to unauthorized migration many participants were unable to share their emotions and experiences with others. This was a very lonely process for some. Isabela saw parallels with military families. As with a deportation, spouses of deployed soldiers do not know if their loved ones will return safely. However, in addition to still receiving their spouses' income, they have an immense support system built along with other spouses. These include cooking meals, swapping childcare duties, and simply calling or visiting regularly to see how the family is doing. Replicating that support through community organizations could provide much needed relief after a distressing deportation.

Future Research

Research is needed to study the long-term psychosocial effects that may persist years after a distressing separation, for both the family members that remained in the United States and their deported relative. Accessing a greater number of participants may provide a more representative sample with more diverse experiences. Likewise, adding the perspective of the deported persons themselves would provide a more complete understanding of the changes families go through. I am in agreement with Golash-Boza and Hondagneu-Sotelo who pointed out that many activists and scholars have willingly stood up for undocumented migrants and maintain that they are hardworking persons, not criminals. Very few are willing to contest the "demonization" of "criminal aliens" (2013: 287). Researchers of deportation and migration in general should problematize the criminalization of migrants through their work.

Appendix

The following was used as an interview guide. All demographic questions were asked, however, the rest of the questions were asked depending on the interviewee's situation. Likewise, some participants were saved from certain questions if they had already provided information in answering a previous one.

Age: Education: Marital Status:

Birth town, state, country: Current town:

Total time in US (years/months): Time in US since last entry:

Occupation:

How many people do you live with?

Are any members of your household US citizens or Permanent Residents?

Do you have any children? (yes/no, #):

Are any US citizens?

Are any Permanent Residents? Own status:

How many people are in your family?

- Who are they, ages?

Can you tell me your (or parents') migration story?

Who was deported, yourself or a relative?

- How are you related?
- What was her/his occupation?
- Did you share a household at the time of the deportation?

How did s/he arrive? What is their migration story?

What was a typical day for you before the deportation?

What happened when you (or your family member) got deported?

- What led to the deportation?
- Was there an arrest?
- Were there any criminal charges?
- Was there contact with a police agent / ICE agent / Border Patrol agent?
- Was this the first time you/your family member was deported?
- Did an immigration agent come looking for you/family member? Home or work?

- Was there an arrest warrant / deportation order?

Did you / your family member get held in an immigration detention center?

- How long was the detention for?
- Was there a voluntary deportation signed? Were any papers signed? Did anyone explain what the papers were?
- Did you / your family member see an immigration judge?

How did you feel during the deportation procedures?

- Were you able to contact your family during detention?

What happened immediately after the deportation?

- Were you able to contact your family?

How do you stay in contact now?

- How often?

Does the deportee currently work?

How has the deportation impacted your life and the life of your family members?

- What has changed since the deportation?
- Please tell me about your family's finances since the deportation
- Please tell me what your family has done differently since the deportation
- Did the deportation impact your ability to work/school?
- Were other family members impacted in their work/school?
- Did you have to change any plans you had prior to the deportation?

Have there been any problems at home because of the deportation?

- Any arguments? Problems with finances?

Has there been any substance use/abuse since the deportation?

Have there been any health changes since the deportation for your self or any one else in the family?

Has anyone in your family been especially affected by the deportation? How?

Has the deportation changed any of your or your family's long-term plans?

- Do you plan to be reunited?
- Will you be moving your family out of the country?
- Do you / your deported family member plan to return to the US?

What do you know about deportations in general, are they common?

- Have they been increasing or decreasing?
- Why do you think there is deportation enforcement right now?

Do you think there will be immigration reform in the next 5 years?

- What type? To improve or worsen the situation?
- What do you think it takes to pass immigration reform in the next 5 years?

What has been your biggest struggle regarding the deportation? For yourself, the deported, and other family members

What did you do / are you doing to persevere?

- Is there someone/a group that helped you? In what way?
- Is there something that would have helped you?

Is there anything else you would like to share?

Is there any question I didn't ask that you think I should have asked regarding this topic?

Are there any questions you would like to ask me?

Works Cited

Allen, B., Cisneros, E. M., & Tellez, A. (2013). The Children Left Behind: The Impact of Parental Deportation on Mental Health. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 1-7.

American Civil Liberties Union. (2014). *ACLU achieves class action lawsuit settlement that ends deceitful immigration practices*. Retrieved from https://www.aclusandiego.org/voluntary-return/

Belcher, O., & Martin, L. L. (2013). Ethnographies of closed doors: conceptualizing openness and closure in US immigration and military institutions. *Area*, *45*(4), 403-410.

Boehm, D. A. (2009). "¿ Quien Sabe?": Deportation and Temporality Among Transnational Mexicans. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, 345-374.

Brabeck, K. M., Lykes, M. B., & Hershberg, R. (2011). Framing immigration to and deportation from the United States: Guatemalan and Salvadoran families make meaning of their experiences. *Community, Work & Family*, *14*(3), 275-296.

Brabeck, K., & Xu, Q. (2010). The impact of detention and deportation on Latino immigrant children and families: A quantitative exploration. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *32*(3), 341-361.

Butler, E. W., & Bazan, C. M. (2011). Beyond National Borders: Family Frontiers and Expulsion from the US. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, *26*(1), 53-63.

Cornelius, W. A. (2001). Death at the border: Efficacy and unintended consequences of US immigration control policy. *Population and development review*, *27*(4), 661-685.

Csordas, T. J. (1990). Embodiment as a Paradigm for Anthropology. *Ethos*, *18*(1), 5-47.

Del Castillo, R. G. (1990). *The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A legacy of conflict*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Department of Homeland Security Office of Immigration Statistics. (Sept. 2014). *Immigration enforcement actions: 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/publication/immigration-enforcement-actions-2013

Dreby, J. (2012). The burden of deportation on children in Mexican immigrant families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *74*(4), 829-845.

Epstein, R.J. (2014). National Council of La Raza leader calls Barack Obama ‘deporter-in-chief’. *Politico*. Retrieved from http://www.politico.com/story/2014/03/national-council-of-la-raza-janet-murguia-barack-obama-deporter-in-chief-immigration-104217.html

Farmer, P. (2004). An anthropology of structural violence. *Current anthropology*, *45*(3), 305-325.

Fernández-Kelly, P., & Massey, D. S. (2007). Borders for whom? The role of NAFTA in Mexico-US migration. *The ANNALS of the American academy of political and social science*, *610*(1), 98-118.

FitzGerald, D. S., & Cook-Martín, D. (2014). *Culling the Masses*. Harvard University Press.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, *6*(3), 167-191.

García, A. S., & Keyes, D. G. (2012). Life as an Undocumented Immigrant: How Restrictive Immigration Policies Affect Daily Life. *Center for American Progress*.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Jason Aronson.

Golash-Boza, T., & Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2013). Latino immigrant men and the deportation crisis: A gendered racial removal program. *Latino Studies*, *11*(3), 271-292.

Guerrero, D. (2014). ‘Orange is the New Black’ actress: My parents were deported. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-guerrero-immigration-family-separation-20141116-story.html

Hagan, J. M., Rodriguez N., & Castro, B. (2011). Social effects of mass deportations by the United States government, 2000-10, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34:8, 1374-1391.

Hall, M. T. (2012). Escondido's chief explains city's illegal immigration policy. *Union Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2012/jun/26/chief-aim-of-escondidos-illegal-immigration-polic/?page=1#article

Henderson, S. W., & Baily, C. D. (2013). Parental deportation, families, and mental health. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *52*(5), 451-453.

Hollan, D. (2014). From Ghosts to Ancestors (and Back Again): On the Cultural and Psychodynamic Mediation of Selfscapes. *Ethos*, *42*(2), 175-197.

Jenkins, J. H. (1991). The state construction of affect: Political ethos and mental health among Salvadoran refugees. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, *15*(2), 139-165.

Kleinman, A. (1995). *Writing at the margin: discourse between anthropology and medicine.* Univ of California Press.

Levers, L. L., & Hyatt−Burkhart, D. (2012). Immigration reform and the potential for psychosocial trauma: The missing link of lived human experience. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *12*(1), 68-77.

Lopez, M.H., & Krogstad, J.M. (2015). States suing Obama over immigration programs are home to 46% of those who may quality. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/02/11/states-suing-obama-over-immigration-programs-are-home-to-46-of-those-who-may-qualify/

Magaña, R. (2011). Dead Bodies. *A Companion to the Anthropology of the Body and Embodiment*, 157-171.

Menjívar, C. (2012). Transnational Parenting and Immigration Law: Central Americans in the United States. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, *38*(2), 301-322.

Muehlmann, S. (2014). *When I wear my alligator boots: narco-culture in the US Mexico borderlands*. Univ of California Press.

Peutz, N., Chavez, L., Collins, G., Fekete, L., Gingrich, A., Kroner, G., ... & Peutz, N. (2006). Embarking on an Anthropology of Removal. *Current Anthropology*, *47*(2), 217-241.

Peutz, N., & De Genova, N. (2010). Introduction. In *The deportation regime: sovereignty, space, and the freedom of movement*. N. De Genova, & N. Peutz (Eds.). Duke University Press.

Pew Research Centers. (2014). *Unauthorized immigrants in the US, 2012*. Retrieved from http://www.pewhispanic.org/interactives/unauthorized-immigrants-2012/

Rickerd, C. (2014). Customs and Border Protection's (CBP's) 100-mile rule. *American Civil Liberties Union*. Retrieved from https://www.aclu.org/immigrants-rights/aclu-fact-sheet-customs-and-border-protections-100-mile-zone

Robertson, A. M., Lozada, R., Vera, A., Palinkas, L. A., Burgos, J. L., Magis-Rodriguez, C., ... & Ojeda, V. D. (2012). Deportation experiences of women who inject drugs in Tijuana, Mexico. *Qualitative health research,* 22(4), 499-510.

Quesada, J. (1998). Suffering Child: An Embodiment of War and Its Aftermath in Post-Sandinista Nicaragua. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, *12*(1), 51-73.

Sousa, C. A. (2013). Political violence, collective functioning and health: A review of the literature. *Medicine, conflict and survival*, *29*(3).

Stuesse, A. C. (2010). Challenging the border patrol, human rights and persistent inequalities: An ethnography of struggle in South Texas. *Latino Studies*, *8*(1), 23-47.

US Citizenship and Immigration Services. (2015). *Executive Actions on Immigration*. Retrieved from http://www.uscis.gov/immigrationaction#2

US Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2014). *FY 2014 ICE Immigration Removals*. Retrieved from: http://www.ice.gov/removal-statistics/

Varsanyi, M. W. (2010). Immigration policy activism in US states and cities: interdisciplinary perspectives. *Taking local control: Immigration policy activism in US cities and states*, 1-27.

Wessler, S. F. (2011). Shattered Families: The Perilous Intersection of Immigration Enforcement and the Child Welfare System. *Applied Research Center*. Retrieved from https://www.raceforward.org/research/reports/shattered-families?arc=1