Saskia Sassen, "America's Immigration 'Problem'"

1. Why, according to the author, are US opponents to immigration mistaken?
2. Why are even those who support immigration for "humanitarian" reasons mistaken?
3. What is the common ground shared by both liberals and conservatives on immigration?
4. How did the 1965 amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act fail to achieve its objectives?
5. What is the central flaw at the core of US immigration policy?
6. How did US dominance in the globalizing process contribute to increased migration to the US?
7. Note the links between globalization, deindustrialization, wage, and immigration.
8. What were some of the unexpected developments of the post-1960s "new wave of immigration"?
9. Was increased immigration spread throughout the US?
10. Is there a causal link between poverty, overpopulation, economic stagnation and increased emigration?
11. What role did the US itself play in increasing migration to the US? What are some of the key elements of the pattern identified by Sassen?
12. What role does foreign direct investment play in *increasing* migration?
13. What roles does "Westernization" play?
14. Why has immigration increased even as wage levels in the US have fallen, and unemployment has risen, in the very places where migrants tend to cluster?
15. To which jobs do immigrants tend to gravitate?
16. What is the "informal economy"?
17. In which ways does this article remind you of some of the key propositions of Dependency Theory?
18. If policy-makers in the US do not understand the nature of the immigration issue, then how likely to succeed are their attempted solutions?
19. What is Sassens' solution?
20. By the end of the article, did the author's theory convince you? Do you see any problems or omissions that might weaken or challenge the author's theory?

Luis F.B. Plascencia, "The 'Undocumented' Mexican Migrant Question: Re-Examining the Framing of Law and Illegalization in the United States"

1. Why do labels matter? What interests are vested in the usage of "undocumented" vs. "illegal"?
2. When these labels are used, to which particular immigrants are they attached by most American speakers?
3. What evidence is there that these labels have a taken-for-granted quality about them?

4. Do the concepts of "undocumented (im)migrant" and "illegal immigrant" have any basis in the relevant law of the US?
5. How does the label "undocumented" contribute to the production of illegality?
6. Do the concepts of "undocumented" and "illegal" share basic points in common?
7. When and why did "undocumented" rise to prominence in US public discourse?
8. What are the two common problems and limitations shared by both labels and the assumptions underpinning them?
9. How does "illegal alien" as a juridical concept differ from the popular concept?
10. What are the three legal reasons for classifying certain persons as "subject to removal"?
11. Why are drones, border patrols, security fences, etc., all flawed methods of restricting unlawful presence in the US, according to the author?
12. Which agencies, external to the US, have promoted use of the term "undocumented"?
13. What is the problem with looking at migrants as the principal determining actors?
14. What is the *homo economicus* perspective as applied to migrants?
15. What does the author propose as better, alternative labels?
16. Which interests are shielded by placing the weight of "illegality" squarely on the shoulders of migrants?
17. Has the discourse of "illegality" achieved success in making itself central to public debate?
18. What does the focus on "undocumented" and "illegal" obscure? What is left out of the picture?

Andrew Kipnis, "Anthropology and the Theorisation of Citizenship"

1. Why has citizenship been such a blind spot in Anglo-American anthropology?
2. What are some of the analytical consequences of downplaying or neglecting citizenship?
3. How does reducing the law to little more than an instrument of class exploitation limit our analysis?
4. Can a critique of neoliberalism function as a critique of migration regulation, in Kipnis' view?
5. Given the author's own acknowledgment of how limited migration has been historically, is it then a logical basis for the kinds of solutions he tries to advance?
6. What personal factors inhibit potential migrants from actually moving?
7. Are Kipnis' proposals practical and realistic?
8. What impact would an "open doors" policy have on the least economically advantaged citizens of a receiving nation? How does Kipnis address this?
9. Could one make the argument that Kipnis' proposed solutions are more in the spirit of neoliberal *laissez faire* and "survival of the fittest" than a form of global social justice?
10. On the other hand, how could labour mobility challenge, and maybe overturn, some of the worst consequences of neoliberal globalization as we have known it?

11. Is Kipnis clear about the target of his critique? Does he clearly identity the origins and context of the problem he analyzes?
12. How do some of Kipnis' proposals directly contradict Sassen's?