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2019: The Newcomers
THAT’S WHAT REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT WAS, I DECIDED: ACTS OF COURAGE met by acts of generosity. Despite how fear-based the national conversation had turned, there was nothing scary about what was happening at South. Getting to know the newcomer students had deepened my own life, and watching Mr. Williams work with all twenty-two of them at once with so much grace, dexterity, sensitivity, and affection had provided me with daily inspiration. I would even say that spending a year in Room 142 had allowed me to witness something as close to holy as I’ve seen take place between human beings. I could only wish that in time, more people would be able to look past their fear of the stranger and experience the wonder of getting to know people from other parts of the globe. For as far as I could tell, the world was not going to stop producing refugees. The plain, irreducible fact of good people being made nomad by the millions through all the kinds of horror this world could produce seemed likely to prove the central moral challenge of our times.

How did we want to meet that challenge? We could fill our hearts with fear or with hope. And the choice would affect more than just our own dispositions, for in choosing which seeds to sow, we would dictate the type of harvest. Surely the only harvest worth cultivating was the one Mr. Williams had been seeking: GREATER FLUENCY, BETTER UNDERSTANDING.

(Thorpe 392)
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Welcome to the University of Denver! We are looking forward to your arrival on campus. As you get ready to begin this adventure, we’d like to introduce you to our One Book, One DU program—a series of shared intellectual experiences inspired by a common text. Entering its fourth year, One Book, One DU seeks to provide opportunities for our campus to reflect upon the roots of our beliefs, our aspirations, and our values, and to consider how we can leverage our collective experiences toward the University's mission of contributing to the public good.

One Book

As your first act as a member of the DU community, please join us in reading this year’s One Book selection, *The Newcomers: Finding Refuge, Friendship, and Hope in America* by Helen Thorpe. *The Newcomers* follows a year in the lives of twenty-two immigrant teenagers enrolled together in an English Language Acquisition class at Denver’s South High School—located just over a mile north of DU. Ranging in age from fourteen to nineteen years old, these newcomers have come from nations convulsed by drought or famine or war. Over the course of the 2015-2016 school year, these students adapt to life in the USA as they navigate teenage hopes, dreams, and fears. *The Newcomers* is a powerful and moving account of how refugee teenagers build a new foundation, confidence, and understanding of what it means to be American.

If you require the book in alternate format, please contact Brian Belcher at: brian.belcher@du.edu.

One Prompt

After you’ve read the book, you’ll respond to the shared prompt below as a way of reflecting upon the experiences that have shaped the perspective you will bring to DU. We encourage you to use this story as a way of introducing yourself during orientation. We believe that sharing this experience with your peers and faculty will help make a more successful transition to college and help you find your place on campus.

To write *The Newcomers*, Helen Thorpe spent a year inside Denver’s South High School documenting the lives of twenty-two refugee and immigrant students enrolled in Eddie Williams’s English Language Acquisition class. Of the students, Thorpe writes, they “walked into [Williams’s] room dazed at the abruptness of the transition, looking profoundly lost. And then they started over—started to figure out where they were, started to wonder who he was, started to ask whether to call this place home.”

Inspired by *The Newcomers*, this year’s One Prompt asks you to consider: What does it mean to belong to a community? What does it mean to be on the outside? Thorpe’s investigation reveals that welcoming a newcomer into an existing community and of being that newcomer are interconnected and challenging experiences. The reward, as both Williams and Thorpe describe, is “greater fluency, better understanding.”

Think of a time when your community welcomed a newcomer. Tell a story about this experience that considers multiple perspectives—including both your own and that of the new member of your community.
Tips:

- Be creative with how you imagine “community” (e.g., a classroom, a sports team, hobby group, neighborhood, family structure, online community, workplace, congregation, etc.).
- Use narrative devices to render your story—characterization, dialogue, imagery, figurative language, scene setting, exposition, etc. Provide context—set the scene and establish relationships.
- Keep it simple. Your story doesn’t need a “profound” plot; in fact, something “small” (some slice-of-life vignette) might make for a more engaging narrative.
- Choose any genre and/or mode to share this story. In the past, responses to the prompt have been rendered as podcasts, plays, poems, songs, spoken word performances, graphic narratives, paintings, etc.
- The only format requirement is the ability for your One Prompt response to be uploaded to Canvas. You will be sent directions on how to access Canvas later in the summer.

Please submit your response to Canvas (first-year students) or your Orientation Leader (transfer students) by Monday, August 19th, 2019. If you must delay submission of your response, please email your orientation leader to let them know.

One Prompt Programming

One Book, One DU fosters community building through both the generating and the sharing of stories. Once we’ve had the chance to reflect upon our experiences through responding to the One Prompt, we can create space for that “greater fluency, better understanding” by actively listening to others’ narratives. The first opportunity for our incoming students to share their One Prompt responses is Encountering Stories. Held annually in late October, this showcase and gallery of celebrates the vibrant voices and diverse life experiences of our new students. For your work to be considered in Encountering Stories, please e-mail it to OneBook@du.edu by October 1st, 2019.

For additional information regarding the One Book, One DU Program, the One Prompt, or programming opportunities, please reference our website: www.du.edu/OneBook. We look forward to receiving your stories and exploring other aspects of the book with you throughout the fall quarter

Sincerely,
Dr. Jennifer Karas, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Dr. Lili Rodriguez, Vice Chancellor for Campus Life & Inclusive Excellence
Lauren (LP) Picard, Director of One Book, One DU, Teaching Associate Professor, Writing Program
Background & Goals

How do individuals from a wide range of backgrounds and value systems become a community?

This is the challenge and reward at the heart of DU IMPACT 2025’s One Book, One DU—a program dedicated to building community through a series of shared intellectual experiences inspired by a common text. Now in its fourth year, One Book, One DU seeks to provide opportunities for our campus to reflect on the roots of our beliefs, our aspirations, and our values, and to consider how we can leverage our collective experiences toward the University’s mission of contributing to the public good.

Other institutions with common reading programs occasionally include an analytical writing activity. What makes One Book, One DU unique is that it invites members of our community to share stories. Inspired by the common text, each year’s One Prompt encourages DU students, faculty, staff, and alumni to learn about ourselves and one another through storytelling. These acts of shared engagement accomplish several goals:

1. Model intellectual inquiry and rigor for our incoming students;
2. Invite individuals to view themselves as part of a broader community;
3. Provide space for DU to grapple with the challenges that face our campus, community, + beyond, and define our values along the way.

One Book Selections

2016: The Truth About Stories: A Native Narrative by Thomas King
2017: Hillbilly Elegy: A Memoir of a Family and Culture in Crisis by JD Vance
2018: Season to Taste: How I Lost My Sense of Smell and Found My Way by Molly Birnbaum
2019: The Newcomers: Finding Refuge, Friendship, and Hope in America by Helen Thorpe
## Important Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday September 4th</td>
<td>All Campus Lectures</td>
<td>See next page for locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45AM – 11:45AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday September 24th</td>
<td>An Evening with Helen Thorpe</td>
<td>Gates Concert Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30PM – 9:00PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday September 15th</td>
<td>Submissions Deadline: Encountering Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail: <a href="mailto:OneBook@du.edu">OneBook@du.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday September 27th –</td>
<td>Colorado Migrahack 2019</td>
<td>Visit website for event details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday September 28th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday October 30th</td>
<td>Encountering Stories</td>
<td>AAC 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00PM – 7:30PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday December 1st</td>
<td>Submissions Deadline: Many Voices, One DU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail: <a href="mailto:OneBook@du.edu">OneBook@du.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please visit [www.DU.edu/OneBook](http://www.DU.edu/OneBook) for further events & programming details.*
In immigration prisons today, there are children—whether 17-years-old or 17-weeks-old. There are women—whether traveling alone or mothers who came to the United States with their kids. There are men—some hope to support families back home; others have green cards and decades in the United States. Like the children of Helen Thorpe’s focus whose resilience in the face of immense obstacles marks them as extraordinary, the half million migrants locked up face the difficult task of navigating a legal labyrinth from behind barbed wire, removed from friends and family, and standing on the precipice of a government official’s life-altering decisions. Combining legal doctrine and law-enforcement policies, this lecture contextualizes a key feature of immigration law and policy today, while pushing listeners toward the hard questions of why the United States incarcerates so many migrants and whether it should.

In The Newcomers, Helen Thorpe carefully documents the experiences of displaced students who have lost their homelands, students forced to navigate a new culture while gradually learning to share their stories “about fortitude, about resilience, about holding on to one’s humanity through experiences nobody should have to witness.” How have contemporary writers, similarly exiled from their homelands, shared their stories of immigration and exile? How do they negotiate with a new linguistic and cultural terrain while maintaining a commitment to their pasts? This collaborative presentation explores the ways in which contemporary writers, often displaced by war and poverty, have chosen to tell their stories in both poetry and prose.
"Muslim, Jew, Immigrant: Fear of Others in the US Today"
Dr. Andrea Stanton, Religious Studies
Dr. Sarah Pessin, Religious Studies, Philosophy

The Newcomers connects us to the lives of refugees in Denver at a time when newcomers to the United States do not always feel welcome. In this joint talk, we talk about the growing anti-immigrant sentiment in America today, and how a rise in anti-immigration sentiment goes hand-in-hand with a rise in anti-Muslim and anti-Jewish sentiment. Drawing on history, philosophy, and religion, our talk helps uncover deep connections between anti-immigrant, Islamophobic, and anti-Semitic talk and hatreds -- past and present. For example, we highlight how the percentage of immigrants in the US today (roughly 14% of the population) is the same as at the turn of the 20th century when Americans reacted to European immigrants (many Catholic or Jewish) by imposing increasingly restrictive immigration laws. We also consider how those laws were loosened starting in the 1960s, resulting in an increasingly diverse American immigrant population (including many Muslim immigrants). Within this context, we consider the roles of identity, memory, freedom, and generosity in a pluralist democracy, and we consider a range of tools for working our way out of today’s precarious American “landscape of hate”.

"No Longer Newcomers: Day Laborers, Working Conditions, & Engaged Research in the Denver Metro Area"
Dr. Rebecca Galemba, International Studies

The lecture will address themes in Thorpe’s The Newcomers including ethnographic research, engaged scholarship, and dynamics of, and barriers to, immigrant integration by focusing on immigrant day laborers in the Denver metro area who have been marginalized by the city’s growth. Many assume that day laborers are newcomers; with time and experience, they will transition to more stable working and living conditions and integrate. Nearly 90% of day laborers in the Denver metro area are foreign-born and 94% are Latino. However, nearly 70% lived in the U.S. for more than ten years. Instead of upward mobility, weak labor rights enforcement combines with discrimination, fear of immigration consequences, precarious work conditions to lead many day laborers to face prolonged barriers to integration. In some cases, they assimilate to the underclass, making it difficult to improve their living and working conditions. However, day laborers also organize and collaborate with community partners to uplift working conditions and raise awareness of the inequality of growth in the Denver metro area.
Join the DU community in welcoming the author of this year’s One Book selection, Helen Thorpe. This event will explore *The Newcomers* as a powerful and moving account of how we welcome newcomers into a community. All DU community members are welcome.

**FREE for DU faculty, staff, and students with DU ID**

Tickets $15 for the public on sale July 1st | newmantix.com/onebook
One Book, One DU: Connected Courses

A curated list of courses for students eager to explore the themes raised in Helen Thorpe’s *The Newcomers*.

Please note: this list is preliminary and subject to change. Up-to-date lists will be published before Winter and Spring advising periods.

---

Fall 2019

**First Year Seminar—The Right to Health in Theory and Practice**
FSEM 1111 (sec9)  
CRN: 5179

This course is an introduction to the “right to health”. It asks “is health a human right? And if so, what does that mean?” We will use film and literature to explore ideas and behaviors around health and health care. We will learn about the right to health through the reading of core documents that define it and academic and activist articles that explain it. We will contrast theory and practice through discussions, reflections and a problem-based project that will be part of a group project we will produce. This course includes a “service-learning” component that consists on volunteering with Casa de Paz, an Aurora, Colorado non-profit organization that offers support to migrants recently released from detention. More information on the specifics of the service learning will be given in class. However, there are a few things to note about your service learning commitment: It requires a significant time commitment—approximately 12-16 hours over the course of the quarter—spent outside of the classroom. To accommodate this time commitment, please note that the amount of reading and formal writing for the course have been reduced. If you are unable to meet this requirement, you should not enroll in the course.

**First Year Seminar—Immigrant Stories: Theirs and Ours**
FSEM 1111 (sec25)  
CRN: 5195

This course explores the different ways in which individuals displaced by emigration and exile have chosen to tell their stories. We will discuss texts by 20th and 21st century immigrants to the US (and back) in a variety of genres, from literary memoir and film to digital story and performance art. We will examine how these texts chronicle the intersection of cultures and to what extent they define a new culture with its own characteristics. We will also discuss the impact of social, political, economic, and academic factors on the writer’s self-definition as "hyphenated beings" and how these autobiographical texts fit within the broader frame of US literature. For the final project, students will explore their own stories of displacement (ancestral, familiar, individual or collective) in the form of a literary essay, short memoir, collection of poems, digital story, performed monologue (filmed), or documentary film.

**First Year Seminar—American Dream and Asian American Experience**
FSEM 1111 (sec55)  
CRN: 5225

Asian Americans have become one of the fastest growing minority populations in the United States, as both immigrants and long-time residents. The Asian American experience is necessary for understanding the past and current U.S. society, and this course will help us understand why. How does "Asian American" operate as a contested category of ethnic and national identity? How is the "American dream" perceived, imagined, challenged and debunked by Asian American experience? The seminar will address pressing issues in Asian American history and formation of Asian American identity, such as how gender, race and class differences inform this identity, relations between diaspora and homeland, the struggle for cultural citizenship in America. This course will provide a solid foundation of the history and culture of peoples of Asian descent in the U.S. Because this course is interdisciplinary, in our weekly meetings we will be exploring, discussing, and critiquing the diverse experiences of Asian Americans through immigration history, literary and visual texts.
First Year Seminar—Welcoming the Stranger: Hospitality, Culture, Language and Migration
FSEM 1111 (sec71)
CRN: 5241

Has a stranger ever invited you for tea? Have you ever eaten a lavish meal cooked by someone whose only water source was a pipe sticking out of a concrete wall? No matter how rich or poor, every culture has rules for welcoming a stranger. Some feed you delicious foods until you want to burst. Some wait until you speak first, not wanting to embarrass you. How does it feel to be a stranger in a new place? What if that place is a country where you don’t even know the language? This course explores differing cultural concepts of hospitality and how these affect attitudes toward immigrants and international visitors. Specifically, we will wrestle with three important questions: How do American values of generosity and hospitality compare with values practiced in other cultures? How might different cultural values, languages, and ideas about hospitality affect visitors’ experiences in the United States? How should these values affect Americans’ attitudes toward immigration and world events? We will use readings, discussions, and experiential activities to explore these questions.

Environmental Sustainability: Local and Regional Environmental Issues
EALC 2001
CRN: 1674

This course introduces students to Denver and the Front Range region as we investigate the current environmental issues this region faces today. We explore Denver’s environmental framework through visits to environmental non-profits and sustainable business, as well as by engaging in collaborative sustainability initiatives on our campus. Excursions to places such as Old South Pearl Street and historic Lower Downtown allow us to trace Denver’s past through geological and historical lenses. Restricted to Environmental Sustainability LLC students.

Spectator to Citizen: Community Organizing
AH 2580 / SS 2580
CRN: 2245 / 2246

This course is the first course of the three-course sequence, "Spectator to Citizen," offered by the Center for Community Engagement and Service-Learning (CCESL). This sequence is designed to provide opportunities for students to develop a set of public skills and a civic knowledge base that will allow them to actively participate in the public life of their communities. This course strongly encourages students of diverse backgrounds, politics and values to learn together, and from one another, in a safe and challenging learning environment. In this course, students learn about the history of community organizing in the United States and are provided with opportunities to learn and apply public skills, collect and produce knowledge that improves communities, and develop a collaborative and collective worldview across differences. In particular, students define their self-interest and individual public lives, build consensus across multiple perspectives, become experts on a community issue, and then bring this issue back out into the community for dialogue and possibly action. Cross-listed with CUI 3987, SS 2580.

Advanced Seminar—Sex and Globalization
ASEM 2687
CRN: 4805

This course examines the complex phenomena of "globalization" within the framework of critical gender, sexuality and race studies. Topics range from sexual dimensions of war and empire building to the ways in which sexuality and gender shape global migration, tourism and commerce. In addition to consulting scholarly readings, we also examine and research representations of these phenomena as they occur in the media, online, and in popular culture.

Geographies of Migration
GEOG 3340
CRN: 2679

This course explores contemporary movement of people across international borders and the social, cultural, political, economic, and environmental repercussions of such movements. The class looks at the global flow of people across national boundaries and the ways in which these dispersed peoples build and maintain social networks across
national borders. While doing so, we address the role of globalization in international migration processes. What motivates people to move long distances, often across several international borders and at considerable financial and psychological cost? How do migrants change—and how in turn do they bring change, social as well as economic, to new destinations as well as places left behind? This course examines politics and patterns of migration, transnational migration, and immigration to the United States.

Hard Choices in Public Policy
PPOL 1910
CRN: 1958

This course provides an opportunity to develop comprehensive knowledge of America’s most intriguing public policy dilemmas. Policy issues to be discussed include intergenerational equity, competitiveness, the budget and trade deficits, crime, AIDS, education, health care, the environment, entitlements, immigration, race and affirmative action, public involvement, and social welfare. This course counts toward the Scientific Inquiry: Society and Culture requirement.

International Disaster Psychology: Foundations
CPSY 4500 [Graduate Level]
CRN: 1586

This is the first course in a three course sequence designed to provide the entering M.A. student with a fluent understanding of the area of International Disaster Psychology. The course will cover the evolution of IDP from its beginnings to its present status. It will review the different innovations in the area. Potential subject areas include the treatment of refugees, torture victims, child soldiers, internally displaced persons and complex Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Introduction to Latinx Psychology and the Latinx Experience
CPSY 5825 [Graduate Level]
CRN: 3404

This course will highlight the current psycho-social research and literature relevant to the mental health of Latinx populations including influences of culture, acculturation, immigration, and language on utilization of psychological services. The course will explore the variables that can affect how different Latinx groups respond in a unique way to the various services offered in the community. This course will familiarize the student with the personal, social, cultural and institutional forces that affect the psychology of Latinx groups, to include history, religion, gender roles, emotional processing, violence, bilingualism, and stigmatization and oppression.

Language Development and Strategies for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners
CUI 4531 [Graduate Level]
CRNs: (sec1: PhD and EdD students) 3669 & (sec2: MA students) 4679

This course will evaluate methods, approaches, and techniques in language teaching. This course will also explore classroom strategies and practices for content-area instruction through sheltered instruction, and socio-cultural context of second language acquisition in U. S. public schools including how teachers can support bilingualism, multilingualism, biculturalism, and multiculturalism in the mainstream classroom. Furthermore, this course will explore the needs of special education and gifted culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

Topics in English: US Immigrant Narratives
ENGL 4701 [Graduate Level]
CRN: 3156

A topics class; topics may change.
**Critical Perspectives on the Latinx Context**  
*SOWK 4750 [Graduate Level]*  
CRN: 3294  

This course provides a framework for culturally relevant social work services designed to meet the needs of the Latinx community. This is a social work content course taught in Spanish. Students acquire core principles grounded in an understanding of social justice, privilege, and oppression including the interconnection between human and civil rights, globalization, immigration and poverty. Students will expand their oral and written Spanish expression as they learn about cultural, social and political theory. Students learn aspects of Mexican culture, community development, historical patterns of oppression, spirituality, and the role of indigenous movements. As a result of this course, students understand how to advocate for nondiscriminatory cultural, social and economic practices within a Latinx context and experience. It is designed for students in all concentrations who have an interest in understanding issues facing the Latinx community. Prerequisite: Initial placement is based on minimum language proficiency test results at the intermediate-advanced level. Further placement determination will consist of a comprehensive evaluation to ascertain oral and written proficiency. Enrollment in this course may be limited to Latinx Certificate students.

**Winter 2020**

**Spectator to Citizen: Denver Urban Issues and Policy**  
*AH 2581 / SS 2581*  
CRN: 3156 / 2126  

This course is the second course of the three-course sequence, "Spectator to Citizen," offered by the Center for Community Engagement to advance Scholarship and Learning (CCESL). This sequence is designed to provide opportunities for students to develop a set of public skills and a civic knowledge base that will allow them to actively participate in the public life of their communities. This course strongly encourages students of diverse backgrounds, politics and values to learn together, and from one another, in a safe and challenging learning environment. As citizens of the City of Denver, it is our responsibility and right to investigate important issues and be involved in developing a city that better the lives of the people in our communities. We do this through a community organizing model that includes; research, immersion, and learning of the powers, structures and stakeholders necessary to live in any democratic community, here in Denver or around the globe. Students perform both traditional and community-based research necessary to understand Denver's current issues and policy. Cross-listed with CUI 3988, SS 2581.

**Advanced Seminar—Sex and Globalization**  
*ASEM 2687*  
CRN: 3753  

This course examines the complex phenomena of "globalization" within the framework of critical gender, sexuality and race studies. Topics range from sexual dimensions of war and empire building to the ways in which sexuality and gender shape global migration, tourism and commerce. In addition to consulting scholarly readings, we also examine and research representations of these phenomena as they occur in the media, online, and in popular culture.

**Hard Choices in Public Policy**  
*PPOL 1910*  
CRN: 1873  

This course provides an opportunity to develop comprehensive knowledge of America’s most intriguing public policy dilemmas. Policy issues to be discussed include intergenerational equity, competitiveness, the budget and trade deficits, crime, AIDS, education, health care, the environment, entitlements, immigration, race and affirmative action, public involvement, and social welfare. This course counts toward the Scientific Inquiry: Society and Culture requirement.
Latin American Politics  
PLSC 2290  
CRN: 4730

Latin America is home to the uneasy marriage between politics and economics. This course will focus on two major themes in Latin American politics. First, this course will examine why Latin American countries swing between democratic and authoritarian regimes. Second, the course will examine how local and global economic forces interact with politics in the region. The course will also cover some contemporary issues in Latin America such as corruption, inequality, migration, and climate change.

Schooling and Society  
SOCI 2500  
CRN: 3431

The objective of this course is to examine the relationship between schooling and the larger social inequalities (e.g., racism, poverty, and gender) that profoundly shape education. The major focus in this seminar will be on U.S. K-12 public education. Prerequisite: SOCI 1810 or permission of instructor.

Literacy and Language Development for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners  
CUI 4538 [Graduate Level]  
CRNs: (sec1) 3150 & (sec2) 3730

Attaining age-appropriate English literacy skills poses many challenges to culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) learners. Educators must therefore develop proficiency in effective literacy instruction for CLD learners. Effective literacy instruction includes a repertoire of teaching practices designed to scaffold literacy and language across the content areas, and culturally relevant curriculum as an essential component to support the achievement of CLD learners. This course will focus on helping educators gain the necessary skills, orientations, and competencies to advance the literacy of CLD learners through linguistic and cultural knowledge.

Political Economic Development in Latin America  
INTS 4453 [Graduate Level]  
CRN: 3637

In the first five weeks of the class we consider various theories of political economy. These include dependency, hegemonic stability, class conflict, neoclassical economic theory, and the study of institutions and international regimes. Each approach is illustrated through and examination of a historic issue in development - patterns of land ownership, the role of the military, the rise or revolutionary politics, neoliberal development and the promotion of democracy. During this time, students are asked to choose a theoretical framework as a foundation for the required research paper. A term paper prospectus including a description of the framework is due week five. In the second five weeks of the class we consider specific topics in political economic development in the last three decades or what is often called the "global era." These topics include the emergence of "uneven" development, the rise of social movements and role of civil society, transnational migration, the rise of illicit networks of trade, and U.S. foreign policy considerations. Students are encouraged to draw from this or closely related material for the subject matter of the research.

Contemporary Issues in Refugee Studies  
INTS 4652 [Graduate Level]  
CRN: 3101

This course is designed to provide a stimulating interdisciplinary environment in which students explore contemporary issues in refugee studies. Through examination of relevant international instruments, research, case studies, agency policies and reports, students will begin to develop the skills necessary for understanding refugee-serving agencies and associated programs in large scale refugee operations. Specific emphasis will be given to recent developments in - refugee terminology, refugee status determination, urban refugee populations, refugee camps, durable solutions, and extremely vulnerable refugees. Throughout, the course will focus on humanitarian assistance and protection frameworks, including analysis of guiding principles and associated policies of refugee-serving
organizations such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The importance of reliance on refugee voices to frame the debate will also be emphasized. At the end of this course students should be able to integrate and apply knowledge of innovation policy and practice to begin to address contemporary challenges faced by humanitarian agencies working with refugee populations.

Human Security: Intervention Strategies for Economic & Social Development
SOWK 4465 [Graduate Level]
CRN: 2292

Human security is a new paradigm for understanding complex global vulnerabilities. Human security goes way beyond traditional notions of national security and highlights the security of the individual rather than that of the nation state. Human security uses a person, entitlement and human rights centered view of security. It is essential for national, regional and global stability and sustainability. In defining human security, the United Nations stressed "the right of all people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair,“ and recognized that "all individuals, in particular vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential" (A/RES/60/1). "Human security aims at ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of people in response to current and emerging threats - threats that are widespread and cross cutting. Such threats are not limited to those living in absolute poverty or conflict" (UN-OCHA). Today, the impacts of natural disasters, climate change and other forms of environmental change, and global economic crises, among others, are considered to threaten human security in developing as well as developed countries. The increasing numbers of internal violent conflicts, forced migration, natural disasters and environmental degradation have resulted in national and international security failings that reflect the challenges of the post-Cold War security environment. The failure of mainstream development models to generate growth, particularly in Least Developed Countries (LDCs), or to deal with the consequences of complex new threats (e.g., HIV/AIDS, climate change, social and economic inequality) reinforced the sense that international institutions and states are not organized to address such problems in an integrated way. Social workers focusing on human, social and economic issues in global settings will use various human development strategies and other capacity-building approaches in practice. This course develops students' skills in human and social development strategies, sustainable livelihood and conflict management strategies, and other capacity-building community strategies, and fosters a solid understanding of the programmatic and practical requirements for human security in a global context.

Culturally Responsive Practice with LatinX
SOWK 4749 [Graduate Level]
CRN: 3376

Addresses immigration issues, as well as intervention and theoretical approaches for Latinx populations. Covers the selection of interventions and strategies for cross-cultural use in adequately addressing the needs of Latinx. A required course for the Latinx Social Work Certificate.

Spring 2020

Spectator to Citizen: School-Based Civic Engagement
AH 2582 / SS 2582
CRN: 3065 / 2288

This course is the final course of the three-course sequence, "Spectator to Citizen," offered by the Center for Community Engagement and Service-Learning (CCESL). This course provides opportunities for students to engage with a Denver Public School (or urban youth organization) in a meaningful way that will challenge students to think about how our public schools are preparing students to be effective citizens. We also examine the role that universities and communities can and should play in the education process. Students are expected to take a critical look at their own education experience and compare this experience with the education experience of those with whom the student will be working with for the quarter. This course is arranged as a 10-week community learning project. Several classes take place in the community at one of our partner schools. Classes also include group
discussions and activities based on the assigned class topic and readings along with your experience in the schools. Cross-listed with AH 2582, CUI 3989, SS 2582.

Cultural Anthropology
ANTH 2010
CRN: 3417

This course is an introduction to cultural anthropology. As one of anthropology’s main sub-fields, cultural anthropology provides conceptual and analytical tools for a comprehensive understanding of culture and its manifestations. It is concerned with the ways in which individual experience is inserted in social and historical contexts, providing meanings to everyday life. We will explore ideas and behaviors related to culture in different societies and social groups. Topics include culture, meaning, development, globalization, experience, kinship, identity, social hierarchy, and conflict. Course material combines introductory readings, academic articles and films with the analysis of journalistic pieces addressing currently important issues. It also combines the study of culture in the United States with that of other countries. Class meetings will consist of lectures to introduce topics and concepts and group discussions to apply the concepts and examine them critically. Students will also work on an ethnographic project, derived from the service-learning component that consists on volunteering with Casa de Paz, an Aurora, Colorado non-profit organization that offers support to migrants recently released from detention.

Advanced Seminar— Philosophy of Migration and Global Citizenship
ASEM 2692
CRN: 3029

The 21st century is already being described by many as "The Age of Migration." This course explores the implications of mass global migration for the political philosophies of citizenship on which sovereign states are founded. Is something like a global citizenship possible? This seminar offers a cross-disciplinary perspective on this and other related issues. Completion of all Common Curriculum requirements is required prior to registering for this class.

American Jewish Literature: Immigrant Fiction
ENGL 2741 / JUST 2741
CRN: 3404 / 3564

This course surveys over 100 years of American Jewish immigrant narratives beginning with the great exodus of Eastern European and Russian Jewry at the end of the 19th century and ending with recent arrivals from Israel and the former U.S.S.R. Canonical works by central authors reveal the great successes of Jewish immigrants alongside their spiritual failures. A selection of memoir, novels, short stories, and poetry in English and in translation from Hebrew and Yiddish demonstrate the multilingual character of the Jewish experience in America. While helpful, no knowledge of Jewish languages, religious tradition, or cultural practice is necessary to succeed in this course. This course counts toward the Analytical Inquiry: Society and Culture requirement. Cross listed with JUST 2741.

Migration and Development
INTS 3111
CRN: 3589

This course will discuss the multifaceted relationships between human migration and development. We will explore both the ways that development influences migration and the ways that migration, in turn, shapes development. While the course will be global in scope, we will pay particular attention to the way that these global processes impact communities locally, applying our classroom learning to economic and social development challenges faced by immigrants and refugees in the Denver area. The course will focus on how human mobility (and immobility) affects prospects for economic and social development on three levels: the development of (a) the communities and countries people leave, (b) migrants themselves, and (c) the communities and countries that people enter. We will also consider modern barriers to mobility and the economic and ethical implications of modern migration management regimes. Students will be actively involved in their learning through group projects, debates, and reflective writing. Prerequisites: INTS 1500 and INTS 1700.
Human Trafficking
INTS 3220
CRN: 3839

Through the Education for Justice (E4J) initiative, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has developed a series of university modules with a focus on the subject areas of crime prevention and criminal justice, anti-corruption, organized crime, trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants, firearms, cybercrime, wildlife, forest and fisheries crime, counter-terrorism as well as integrity and ethics. In recent years there have been few topics garnering as much widespread interest as trafficking in persons (TIP) and smuggling of migrants (SOM). These issues have attracted the attention of Governments, NGOs, International Organizations, the media as well as academia. While this attention tends to provoke vivid discussions in political circles, social networks and other media platforms, there is little solid understanding of TIP and SOM, the difference between them and their implications. Last Spring, I joined 12 other academics with expertise in human trafficking and human smuggling from around the world for a week in Doha, Qatar to create a syllabus primarily for the teaching of TIP and SOM at universities and colleges. The 14 Modules on TIP and SOM will provide students with a practically oriented, though still theoretically grounded, tool to understand these issues. Thanks to the inputs received from an addition 100+ academics from all around the world, the Modules’ contents are substantively robust. This strength is reinforced with a series of illustrative examples and exercises aimed at generating debates and consolidating knowledge among students. Given the considerable safety risks posed by TIP and SOM and the related need to ensure that perpetrators are made accountable, the course relies heavily on a legal approach, acknowledging the importance of clarifying concepts and employing rigorous terminology. This notwithstanding, the course is also grounded in a multidisciplinary methodology, recognizing that the complexity of the trafficking in persons and migrant smuggling phenomena extends beyond the legal realm. Consequently, a comprehensive understanding of TIP and SOM is not possible without the convergence of various disciplines, expertise and perspectives, including the historical, economic, social, political, and gender prisms, that are all considered in developing the course. Prerequisites: INTS 1500 and INTS 1700.

Culture, Gender, and Global Communication
MFJS 3652 / MFJS 4652 [Graduate Level]
CRN: TBA / 3005

Explore the ways in which culture, gender, and communication intersect and shape a variety of issues from an international and intercultural perspective, including sexuality and gender identity, indigenous and immigration rights, women’s rights, and human rights. Using a global feminist perspective, the class examines paradigm shifts in creating social change through social and political movements.

Hard Choices in Public Policy
PPOL 1910
CRN: 1839

This course provides an opportunity to develop comprehensive knowledge of America’s most intriguing public policy dilemmas. Policy issues to be discussed include intergenerational equity, competitiveness, the budget and trade deficits, crime, AIDS, education, health care, the environment, entitlements, immigration, race and affirmative action, public involvement, and social welfare. This course counts toward the Scientific Inquiry: Society and Culture requirement.

Preparation for International Internships: Intercultural Competence
CPSY 4510
CRN: 1442

This is the second course in the three part introductory sequence. Students will continue to learn about the field of IDP and future trends for the field. The course will address specific subject areas within the field in order to provide students with the working knowledge needed to continue to pursue advanced training in the area. Potential subject areas will include treatment of refugees, torture victims and working in post conflict areas across the globe.
East African Development and Human Rights
INTS 4625 [Graduate Level]
CRN: 2119

For our purposes, East Africa encompasses the countries of Sudan, South Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti, Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, and Tanzania. This course begins with an introduction to the cultural richness and diversity of East African societies, with an overview as to how tribes, chiefdoms, and states function. Religious influences are noted. This history of development, as externally conceptualized, begins with the Berlin Conference of 1884/85 and the so-called “scramble for Africa.” If features socio-economic and socio-political processes. 20th- and 21st-Century external development programs are covered, most recently exemplified by the former Soviet Union, the United States, and China. Principles of induced development and participatory development are contrasted. Regarding the latter, indigenous innovations are stressed. The history of human rights, as externally conceptualized, begin much later, with the 1969 refugee-related innovations of the Organization of African Unity (now, the African Union). The “classic” issues of tribalism, corruption, and resource exploitation are covered, as well as the “late-breaking” issues of food security, refugee repatriation, and child soldier rehabilitation. Conceptually and theoretically, the course is grounded in disciplinary understandings derived from cultural anthropology, political science, ecology, and history. Resource use, in the context of socio-cultural systems development, are foundational. Special projects are featured, exemplified by those involving University of Denver personnel in Kibera, Kenya (water and sanitation); Mai Misham, Ethiopia (literacy); and Juba, South Sudan (indigenous leadership). At the broadest level, examples are most often drawn from the water/sanitation, agricultural, and health/mental health sectors.

Climate Justice
INTS 4909 [Graduate Level]
CRN: 3640

The science of climate change, while continuing to become more exact and nuanced, is clear – human behavior has caused the planet to warm unnaturally. Now that the science has been established the next question is how will it affect the ecosystem and, especially human habitation. As seems to be the norm, those most affected by climate change will be the poor, the disempowered, and native populations. The understanding and the possible solutions must be interdisciplinary – human rights, law, economics, development, gender and race equity, security, science – to name a few. The course will look at the history and philosophy of climate justice, which includes such disciplines as environmental justice and sustainability, move through an analysis via a number of different viewpoints, and conclude with a look into the future in terms of education and activism. Climate justice requires a sharp, critical look at systems and an understanding of the interconnectedness of science, ethics, and politics. Examples of this might include the rising of sea levels displacing very large numbers of people adding to the already impossible strain on refugee and IDP resettlement. Or the Brazilian economy’s almost sole reliance on hydro-electric power in face of the drying up of rivers and water basins. Or the role of the world’s religions and religious leaders in climate justice. One of the unique characteristics of this course will be the number of guest lecturers. It is incumbent on universities and colleges to take a multi-disciplinary approach to climate justice and lower the “silos” between academic units. To that end colleagues from DU and other institutions will bring their disciplines and insights to bear on the topic.

Immigration Policies and Services
SOWK 4635 [Graduate Level]
CRNs: (sec1) 2216 & (sec2) 3815

This course identifies challenges for immigrants and presents strategies for developing policies and services to meet these challenges. It not only examines specific policies and services that most affect immigrants but also considers broader questions concerning power and its distribution, allocation of resources, and the role of government in promoting individual and family well-being. This is a concentration policy course for all concentrations.
One Book
RESOURCES
Helen Thorpe was born in London to Irish parents. She is the author of three books, *Just Like Us*, *Soldier Girls*, and *The Newcomers*. Her books are works of narrative nonfiction that document in a human and intimate way the lives of immigrants, refugees, and veterans of foreign conflicts.

*The Newcomers* was described by *The New York Times* as “a delicate and heartbreaking mystery story” about 22 immigrant and refugee teenagers who share one classroom while learning English together. That newspaper went on to say, “Thorpe’s book is a reminder that in an era of nativism, some Americans are still breaking down walls and nurturing newcomers, the seeds of the great American experiment.”


*From the author’s website*
Helen Thorpe’s *The Newcomers: Finding Refuge, Friendship, and Hope in an American Classroom* offers a window into refugee resettlement and education in the United States. A journalist and author of several books, Thorpe builds on scholarship related to resettled refugees’ language acquisition and schooling (e.g., Bigelow, 2010), employing longitudinal participant observations and interviews to portray the education of newcomers within the sociopolitical contexts that inform their experiences. Through her journalistic narrative, Thorpe engages with a wide variety of topics related to refugee resettlement and migration and does so in a way that is accessible to a broad audience. Her portrayal of a newcomer English class in Denver, Colorado, allows her to write about language teaching and learning for new arrivals, refugee resettlement policies and practices in the US, and the details of various conflicts around the world, including in Syria and Burma, which directly affect the students she profiles. Her data collection focuses on South High School in Denver and extends to Goma, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), where she seeks to understand the political and personal histories that have brought one family from East Africa to the United States.

The book, organized by seasons, allows readers to follow the students’ academic school year. In the fall, we join seven students on their first day at South High School and meet their teacher, Eddie Williams, “the sort of teacher who devoted an enormous portion of his warmth, vitality, and intellect to his students” (p. 4). The seven students in Mr. Williams’s newcomer class wear “shut-door expressions on their faces” (p. 4). They’re all new to Denver and come from around the world, including from Mexico, Mozambique, and Thailand. They are at various stages in their English language and literacy development, with Saúl from El Salvador speaking the fewest words of English and Rahim and Ghasem from Afghanistan speaking and reading well enough that they would soon be transferred to more advanced English language classes.

As the seasons progress, we learn about some of the stressors that students face outside of school and also watch small victories within the classroom walls. By winter, Mr. Williams’s newcomer class has grown in size, and students are beginning to settle into what it means for them to live in the US. Lisbett, a student from El Salvador, worries about her upcoming immigration hearings, particularly as Donald Trump becomes the Republican presidential candidate. Jakleen and Mariam, originally from Syria, wrack up absences as the weather worsens, while Solomon and Methusela, from DRC, attend determinedly every day. By spring, the students have made considerable progress in the development of their English language skills, and we see them becoming friends, rambunctiously joking with one another. Some have even moved out of the newcomer class and into advanced English Language Acquisition classes, a major milestone for their integration into the larger South High School community.

Seeking a broader perspective on the refugee crisis, Thorpe shifts her focus away from Denver in the summer, when she travels to the DRC and Uganda. In this particularly incisive section of the book, she discusses the connections between diverse global conflicts and US involvement overseas. Through her time in DRC, she “became aware of the extensive economic links” (p. 341) between the DRC and the US, particularly as they relate to smartphone and laptop manufacturing. She explains that 30 percent of the world’s coltan and 60 percent of its Cobalt, which are used in
small electronic devices and lithium batteries, come from the Congo. The profits from these resources are used to fuel militia groups that continue to spur violence in the region, and children make up approximately 40 percent of the mining workforce. Thus, by buying electronics that use these materials, American consumers contribute to the conflict. As Thorpe explains, “What is happening in the DRC sounds barbaric and far-off, and we want to believe that we are not complicit,” yet, considering the materials that make up her cell phone, “we carry small parts of the Congo everywhere we go, in the very devices we use to define ourselves as belonging to the developed world” (p. 342). This chapter importantly shifts the tone of the book to show the links between the conflicts that have resulted in unprecedented numbers of refugees (UNHCR, 2017) and European and US colonial and contemporary resource extraction.

A key strength of the book is Thorpe’s deep look into the particular stories of students, following them both to their places of origin, as in the case of the students from the DRC, and into their families and neighborhoods in the US. These multisited observational and interview data allow the reader to see how struggles with housing and employment, for example, influence students’ experiences of education in the US. Describing the work of Troy Cox, a case worker with a nonprofit organization in Denver, Thorpe explains that he has the difficult task of explaining to refugees that “they must surrender the vain illusion that from this point forward everything would be easy. Not at all. Everything was going to be brutally hard” (p. 134). The uphill battle Cox references echoes research with resettled refugees in New York City who hope that resettlement promises a more certain future but more often experience unexpected challenges related to affordable and safe housing, stable work, and educational opportunities (Dryden-Peterson & Reddick, 2017).

Another strength of the book is its focus on what is working in the schooling that refugee students receive. Through Thorpe’s writing, for example, readers experience an educational environment that is enhanced by robust extracurricular opportunities such as track and student government, both of which refugee students join. Similarly, Mr. Williams is a dedicated teacher who embraces each student he receives and who works tirelessly to ensure that his new arrivals thrive at school. It’s important to remember, however, that many refugees resettled in the US and other wealthy countries do not find such enriching educational environments. Rather, newcomers often find themselves attending school in under-resourced environments, whether in New York or in Berlin (Davis, 2017; Dryden-Peterson & Reddick, 2017; Vergin, 2018). In many respects, Thorpe’s presentation of South High School offers a model of schooling that supports refugee students’ academic and social well-being, one that other schools can learn from. That said, it is vital that readers keep in mind how unusual this instructional environment is for newly arrived refugees and immigrants in US classrooms. It’s also important that readers understand that fully 84 percent of refugees are displaced to low-income countries neighboring their places of origin, with only 1 percent resettled to places further afield, like the US or Canada (UNHCR, 2017). It’s easy to imagine when reading The Newcomers that the US hosts one of the largest populations of refugees in the world; the book would be strengthened by acknowledging that the vast majority of educational opportunities for refugees are provided in low-income countries proximate to conflicts (UNHCR, 2012).

Finally, Thorpe does not include a section about her strategies for data collection and analysis, which would have enhanced the book. She shares that she sees the classroom as “a mirror of the global [refugee] crisis” and hopes that “by telling the stories of various students, it would be possible to illustrate the crisis as a whole” (p. 62), but it is not clear precisely how she collected and analyzed her data and how she chose which students or conflicts to highlight in her text. We learn early on that she is a journalist and thus using her experience and training in journalism to guide her work. We also know that she spends a year at the school and that she travels to students’ homes and to the DRC to
learn more about students’ families. As a scholar interested in research about migration and schooling, I would have appreciated more details about her data collection and analysis, as well as about how her own positionality as a white, female, US citizen shaped her work. Somewhat more information about her research design would have provided useful background information and made her an even more trustworthy narrator for this important story.

Through her ambitious project tracking refugee students and their families in Colorado over the course of a school year, and in exploring pre-resettlement experiences in the DRC, Thorpe offers a window into the world of one classroom and a jumping off point for a broader conversation about refugee resettlement in the US. For readers interested in learning about the global refugee crisis, and especially about the schooling experiences of refugee students living in the United States, The Newcomers is an excellent resource.

REFERENCES
Regional book review: Helen Thorpe’s new book, “The Newcomers,” is masterful

Toward the end of “The Newcomers,” an extraordinary book about a group of immigrant children at Denver’s South High School who are struggling to learn the language and customs in America, author Helen Thorpe tells of her visit to the Congo. There she meets Stivin, the cousin of Methusella, a Congolese boy Thorpe met at South.

She thinks Stivin will be pleased by how well Methusella is doing. Instead, when Thorpe shows Stivin pictures of his cousin in America, the boy’s face turns hard. “Tell him to work hard and send me money for a school uniform!” he tells Thorpe bitterly.

writes Thorpe: “Stivin was almost certain to become one of those children the world was going to leave behind. I believe I caused him real heartbreak, showing him pictures of all that he was missing. Stivin came to stand in my mind for all the children who had not been chosen, all the children who would spend their days collecting firewood and filling yellow jerricans with water.”

Yet for the “chosen” — teenage newcomers like Methusella — life in America is anything but easy. Many cannot speak the language and therefore cannot communicate. They live in poverty, supported by government and charitable aid programs. The students spend hours each day just getting to school and are sometimes harassed and told to go back to where they came from. A few want to do just that.

Most, however, work hard to become Americans — to learn English, complete high school, and find good jobs. It’s a difficult task, and they wouldn’t make it if not for their dedicated teachers. One such instructor is Eddie Williams, an English Language Acquisition teacher at South, which educates most of Denver’s teenage refugees. A third of the students there are foreign-born.

Thorpe spent a year in Williams’ classroom of some 20 immigrant students. They speak almost as many languages, and for some, English is not one of them. Thorpe was there at the beginning of the school year, when they learned their first words of English, and stayed with them until school was out in the spring. Almost all graduated into mainstream classes.

During that year, Thorpe, who was known as “Miss,” becomes the students’ friend and sometimes their advocate. She met their families, helped with their legal problems and provided transportation. From that experience, she wrote “The Newcomers,” a book that is bound to become a classic on integrating young immigrants into American society. Among Thorpe’s favorite students are sisters Jakleen and Mariam, who left their native Iraq nine years earlier to live in refugee camps in Syria and Turkey. When they arrived in America, they thought their hardships were behind
them. Hardly. The girls live in subsidized housing, where they are harassed by a guard. It takes them almost two hours to reach school in the morning.

While the family was living in a camp, the father returned to Iraq and disappeared. The mother is depressed and worried about whether she can find a job before her housing subsidy runs out. When she finally gets work and buys an old car, it’s stolen. Once, when “Miss” chides the girls for spending too much time on an iPhone, they tell her they are checking on friends in a refugee camp where a riot is taking place.

South’s ELA instructor Williams works hard to help Jakleen and Mariam and other teenage immigrants learn English. The first day, he asks the students their names and where they are from. Most just stare at him and don’t speak. Slowly, using pantomime, pictures and other techniques, Williams draws out the students. He pairs them with others who speak their languages or compatible ones. The refugees form friendships with those from similar backgrounds. Some use translations on their iPhones.

Just as the students are drawn to each other, Thorpe was drawn to them. She visited their homes, brought them gifts of food and ate meals with them. She quickly learned not to probe into their backgrounds, because so many of the refugees have had traumatic experiences before coming to the United States.

With politicians today battling over the issue of immigration and many calling for reduced quotas, “The Newcomers” puts a human face on the refugee question. The book is a journalistic triumph. Thorpe, the acclaimed author of “Soldier Girls” and “Just Like Us,” pens a masterful book that lets readers see the humanity instead of the facts and figures and politics of the immigration debate.

*Sandra Dallas (Sandradallas@msn.com) is a Denver author.*
What inspired you to write *The Newcomers: Finding Refuge, Friendship, and Hope in an American Classroom*?

My first book was about immigration and my second was about veterans returning from conflict overseas. I see writing about refugees and refugee resettlement as a natural extension of those two subjects. But specifically, I found South High School when I was doing background informational interviews. When I went there, the principal invited me to spend a year inside the school. The principal knew her student population and really had faith in the kids. She had read my first book and knew I wrote about undocumented students and would treat her students sensitively. I think she was trying to broker a marriage between me and the kids in the Newcomers Center. It was just an incredible opportunity; getting invited to spend a year inside a school is very rare.

Talk to me about what it was like going into the school, from the first day to a year in. What was the process like for you?

In the beginning I was so confused by the environment that I found myself in. I spent a year inside the beginner level English language acquisition class which is called the Newcomers Center, and it’s designed for kids whose lives have been interrupted by war and haven’t been able to go to school continuously because of that. There were twenty-two kids in the room who spoke fourteen different languages and used five different alphabets, some of these languages I had never heard of before. For me, I was trying to make sense of the English language acquisition curriculum, but I was trying to understand the backgrounds of all these different kids who were coming from countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Iraq, Burma—a lot of places where there has been conflict for several decades.

At the outset, I frantically tried to get up to speed on the histories of all these different countries and, at the same time, tried to get to know the kids. They didn’t speak any English; I didn’t even have a way of introducing myself to them. We had such basic communication issues, and I could see these students were in the middle of a big transition so I just decided to observe the room. I wasn’t even sure if I could successfully write about what I was seeing or if it was a story I could even tell. It felt like I was in a room where the kids had very big journeys but I didn’t have any way of accessing that. There was no dialogue happening. It was just the teacher talking.

The room transformed over the course of a year. About halfway through, I began bringing in interpreters and introducing myself to the kids, speaking to them in their home languages, and they began sharing their stories. That was incredibly powerful for me, the experience of learning what all of these kids were carrying. As we began communicating and they started opening up, the stories were just jaw-dropping. I was surrounded by kids with amazing stories, even though they couldn’t tell me those stories very easily.

What was it like interacting with these students through a translator? Did you feel like something was lost there?

First I had to find an interpreter, and it’s not easy. I began hearing about this nonprofit based in Denver called Spring Institute, and they work with former refugees and
train them to become interpreters. I ended up hiring 14 different interpreters from the Spring Institute, and one from a different agency. For the most part, the interpreters had arrived as refugees ten or twenty years ago. At first, I found it very clumsy. I felt slowed down in my ability to get to know the main subject I was trying to speak with. But over time, the interpreters and I became close, and sometimes they ended up telling me their stories, educating me about their homelands. I learned as much from the interpreters as I did from the students and their families.

I became very close, in particular, with my Arabic language interpreter, a very warm woman named Nabiha from Iraq. She helped me with the Iraqi family with two daughters in the Newcomers Center. They had lived in two war zones, they fled, they went to Syria, and they endured the Syrian Civil War. They had to flee again, they had seen terrible car bombings, and they arrived here with post-traumatic stress. This family wouldn’t have opened up just to me; they opened up because of the interpreter in the room who was able to say, “I’m from Iraq, I’ve lived through difficulties as well, and I came here as a refugee.” She was able to signal to the family that she shared their journey. She paved the way for me to connect with them emotionally.

Has working on this book—and working with so many different people from so many different backgrounds—changed the way you think about language as a writer?

Absolutely. I had studied French in high school, I had tried to learn Spanish as an adult, and I spoke a miniscule amount of German because we lived in Austria when I was little. But all of those are European languages that are very closely related to English. Before this book, I had no appreciation for other languages around the world and the difference in their structures, or even the different scripts that are used. With Arabic, for example, I knew that it used a different script that is written from right to left but I didn’t know that Arabic sentences are structured differently. They put the verb in the beginning of the sentence and the subject comes later. All these surprises about language were really amazing to learn, but I fell in love with just the idea of cognates and loan words—words that have a shared origin and travel down through languages simultaneously or move from one language to another.

At a certain point, the students began telling me that many of the students from the Middle East and Africa shared the same word for book, and then for heart. The kids were able to start speaking to each other when they had cognates in their two languages. I began to grasp that languages are much more fluid than I realized. They evolve as we share trade, conquest, and marriage. We start intermingling words, and words migrate.

What was it like to see these students bloom in front of you?

That’s the perfect term for what happened. At the outset of the year, the students were scared and apprehensive. I was slow to understand that there was a lot going on beneath the surface; they were silently listening to all of the English being spoken around them. They were furiously absorbing the sound of it and making sense of what those sounds meant. It was a lot like a fallow period or the time when a seed is gestating before it actually pokes through the surface of the soil, becomes a plant, and starts to bloom. The teacher was carefully cultivating these students, and then around the midway point, they began to speak more. About three quarters of the way through the year, the whole room was filled with this hubbub of noise and activity. The students were flirting and fighting. One student from El Salvador proposed to a young woman from Iraq during math class. I became much more appreciative of the individual personalities. It was such a joy to get to know them in their particularities. The teacher and the paraprofessional teacher who worked closely with the teacher were remarking on how much affection and gratitude was in the room. It was really scary for the students, moving to a new country, not speaking a word of the language there, and having to adjust to a big urban high school. As they were given the tools to acculturate, they became so grateful.
When I first started reading the book, I thought language would be the biggest barrier. But there are moments where people don’t understand how the mail works, or grocery stores—basic societal things. What was it like to see that integration and look at what our society is like in comparison to others?

As the year went on, I began to appreciate the extent of the transition that the kids were going through, but I didn’t fully understand it until I traveled to the Democratic Republic of Congo after the school year had ended. Some instructors from the Air Force Academy were traveling there and invited me on their trip. I then felt safe to go into a part of the Congo that is very conflict-prone. While I was there, we had a chance to understand more about life in the Congo and then I traveled to the refugee settlement. Two boys from the Newcomers class had lived with their families in this settlement. I actually found the house where the boys had lived and I was able to look at a structure that the family had built out of mud and a tin roof. It was a one-room hut; nine family members had been living there. I could see in an instant that there was no running water, no electricity, no light switch, no major appliances, no stove. Dirt floors. No glass windows, no doorknobs. Some of the huts just had a curtain. The extent of the differences between the lifestyle these boys had led in the refugee settlement versus what they had once they arrived in Denver, was monumental. They were getting used to the way people dress, snow and other weather patterns, the bus system, but also electricity, light switches, how to use a stove, what a fire alarm is, why it might go off in the middle of the night, food shopping in a grocery store as opposed to growing crops. In some cases, the kids in the room had witnessed violent conflict and were simultaneously struggling to put the trauma behind them.

At the same time, I was becoming more and more cognizant of what it means to be American, all the things we take for granted. I was in a room surrounded by students, many of whom had never been able to take a hot shower prior to coming here, had never lived in a safe place. I take my own safety and things like taking a hot shower completely for granted.

When I was in this classroom, I was meeting kids who represented the global refugee crisis, but I was meeting them on American soil and I needed to see their lives firsthand, to see a refugee settlement in order to really understand what they had lived through. While I wanted to describe the American chapter of their lives first and foremost—their resilience and transformation—I had to understand what they left behind in order to celebrate their strength fully and appreciate the enormity of what they were doing in starting over.

What was one of the biggest things that really shocked you before you started going into the classroom?

I want to be a quiet presence in the book, in the background, describing my own naïveté, discovering my naïveté as the kids educate me about these other parts of the world that I don’t fully understand. I tried to describe that process using the first person for the readers so they could have a journey similar to mine. I’m assuming my readers have never been to countries like Iraq, where I have never been. Through getting to know these students, like I did, the readers can have the same journey of discovery.

For me the big “aha!” moment was when the kids from the Middle East and Africa revealed to me just how many words their languages had in common. I could start to see how interconnected the Middle East and Africa are, linguistically and historically. It was a moment where I felt an awakening about those parts of the world that share a different heritage, and it revealed to me how ignorant we are of those cultures.

What is it like to write such transformative prose yet stay true to reality?

Part of what becomes important is to learn what to omit if you’re a reporter. You come away from a year of reporting with reams of material. If you include all of those details,
the reader will be snowed under. I had to decide what to emphasize. In the opening chapter I describe the teacher so you can see him, but I’m really focused on showing how skilled he is at putting these scared students at ease, how sensitive he is to their predicament, and how gifted he is at building trust.

I looked at Susan Orlean’s book *The Orchid Thief* because I think she’s brilliant at characterization, but I could have opened a novel just as easily. I wanted a very streamlined portrait of the teacher that didn’t get into too much right away, that gave you a really good feel for him as an introduction. Then with the students, especially because there were 22 kids, I couldn’t give you everything about every kid or you would never be able to differentiate them.

Lisbeth emerges as a main character; she’s from El Salvador. She arrived in this country without a guardian or parent. One of the most amazing things about her is her incredible gregariousness and sociability. She is constantly making friends around the classroom and she’s very bubbly. That bubbliness is at odds with her grim story of having to travel here on her own, getting arrested by the immigration officials and getting put in a Federal Detention Center.

Throughout the story, I focused on examples of her being very exuberant in the classroom despite her difficult history. I tried to summarize the kids, if you will, in a thumbnail kind of sketch so every time you encountered Lisbeth, she remained a presence, and there was a consistency to how I would describe her. Solomon and Methusella, two brothers from the Congo, are very studious. Almost every depiction of them shows them engaged and working very hard. Jakleen and Mariam, the two sisters in the room who are struggling the most with putting trauma behind, pout. They don’t want to participate, they don’t want to go to school, it’s too hard. They want to hunker down at home where they feel safe. That’s a habit they learned during the Syrian Civil War because it was too dangerous to go outside, but you don’t understand that right away in the story. I found myself honing the material down to give you the essence of each character.

When did you start writing?

I spent the 2015-2016 school year inside South and I attended school as often as possible. Sometimes it was every day of the week, sometimes it was three days a week. As soon as school ended, it was time to go to the Congo. I strictly reported until I returned from the Congo that summer. I wrote the chapter about the Congo right away while it was still vivid in my mind because I had only been there for a week. Then I went back to my notes and started writing from the beginning, all the way through the school year up to Africa, and then I wrote the end of the book. I had written about half of the school year when the kids returned for their second year at South. I still attended class about one day a week. I was both reporting and writing at the same time. I find that very hard to juggle but I thought it was important to see their second school year, and also how the presidential election, which was going to take place that November, was going to impact them. I ended up reporting all the way through the midpoint of their second year which is when President Trump was inaugurated and enforced his travel bans.

There’s a great deal of intimacy in this book—even more, I would say, than in your other books. What was it like to write *The Newcomers* versus your two prior books?

I really wanted to bring the readers into the homes of two families in particular: the Congolese family, with the boys Solomon and Methusella, and the Iraqi family with the two sisters, Jakleen and Mariam. It’s through the parents that we come to understand the families’ journeys. As a parent myself with a 15-year-old, I really identified with Jakleen and Mariam’s mother. Our circumstances are wildly different, but I nonetheless identified with her as a single mom, the loneliness of that role. I really wanted to bring her to life for the reader as somebody to empathize with, and I think I was aiming for that level of intimacy so the reader would really feel a kinship with this woman. When we write about refugees and immigrants, we put labels on them and then it’s really hard to identify with the person and you don’t have real empathy with
the struggle. I really wanted people to understand, on a visceral level, just how hard it is to be that mother.

How do you think this book has changed you personally?

My world was enlarged. I have a much different sense of what it means to be an American and how privileged my lifestyle is. Scales fell away from my eyes and I was then able to comprehend my own place on the globe and maybe some of the obligations and responsibilities that come along with so much privilege. That’s the primary piece.

I also found that after a full year and a half of constantly interviewing people without a shared language, I became a lot more in tune with nonverbal communication. In general, it’s changed my ability to get to know people. I find myself absorbing a lot more information. When you’re an English speaker, you can always rely on English. If you’re talking to somebody who can’t understand English and you can’t understand their Arabic, you end up watching them answer the translator, wondering if they’re upset, calm—how do they express emotion? Then you receive the translation from the interpreter. You witness the answer without knowing what the words mean. It’s surprising when you turn off your ability to understand another person’s language and realize how much you still get to know about them. It’s changed me in that way too; it’s made me a much more sensitive observer.

How do you feel about the message of this book and how it’s going to change the way we think?

In my understanding of Americans, we are typically very generous, but I think when it comes to immigration and refugee resettlement, there is rhetoric that stirs up fear and anxiety and causes us to exhibit a different side of ourselves. If the average person living in the United States, regardless of political affiliation, was to spend a year inside this classroom and get to know these students and families, they would have a similar awakening as I did, recognizing how much we have and how easy it is to be more generous. It is so enriching to get to know families from all around the world. I never felt that these families were taking things from us; I felt that they were giving things to me. All this time, they were feeding me, teaching me, illuminating things for me. I grew as a person as a result, and all of us can have that experience if we get the chance to meet one-on-one. It’s just this rhetoric that’s so divisive. I hope that when people read the book, they can have a vicarious experience of being in the room with these students and having that illumination as I did.
Helen Thorpe agreed to answer a few questions about her new book, *The Newcomers: Finding Refuge, Friendship, and Hope in an American Classroom* over at my Education Week Teacher column last week.

Helen observed a newcomer class in Denver for a year-and-a-half, and documented her experience in the book.

Eddie Williams, the teacher of that class and a central figure in the book, agreed to answer a few of my questions.

**LF:** First, can you share a little about yourself – how long you’ve been teaching, why you became a teacher, and, in particular, what drew you to teaching English Language Learners?

**Eddie Williams:**
This is my 14th year as a teacher. I went to Cal State San Bernardino to attend school and play college soccer. I coached a JV soccer team at a local High School while I was in my junior year and I realized how much I liked working with young people. So, I decided to go into teaching after trying out the business world for a couple of years and not feeling as fulfilled as I wanted.

**LF:** How did having Helen in your classroom affect your teaching during that year-and-a-half—if it did—and how do you think it affected your students? Were there any moments you had second thoughts?

**Eddie Williams:**
It was really helpful. Helen would get to know many of the students on a deeper level than I could since she was visiting their homes and often using an interpreter to go in-depth with her conversations with the students or their family members. She would frequently share what she learned about students and their struggles. This helped me get to know my students even better.

**LF:** What do you think of the finished book?

**Eddie Williams:**
I really agree with what I interpret the mission of the book to be. I feel this book gives readers some insight into the worlds of amazing young people who happen to be refugees or immigrants. Readers can get a sense for how our students make our community and our world a much better place.

**LF:** What would you hope the general public learns from the book? What do you think teachers of English Language Learners can gain from reading it? Are there two-or-three examples portrayed in the book of particularly good teaching for ELLs?

**Eddie Williams:**
The public can learn that our students from countries like Iraq, Syria, Thailand, Congo, Mexico, Guatemala, and so many other countries, bring amazing qualities with them. They have grit. They have a deep sense of gratitude for the opportunities that are available here. They are incredibly hard workers and they are very intelligent. Working with these wonderful young people for 5 years has been one of the greatest gifts I’ve ever received. I don’t think I’ll realize how important this experience has been until much later in life because it will take a while to sink in. Most teachers have stories like this to share, I think, whether they work with refugees, immigrants, English Learners, or native English-Speakers. It’s very rewarding work.
also hope the book can help the general public to celebrate the work of so many teachers that have the privilege of working with our young people.

LF: What other books about teaching in general and/or teaching English Language Learners would you recommend people read and why?

Eddie Williams:
I remember reading The First Days of School by Harry Wong in my first year as a teacher. It was really helpful. A lot of my reading about education is via blogs. Recently, I’ve been reading about different math intervention approaches since that’s what I’m teaching now.

LF: What are you doing now and what do you hope to do in the future?

Eddie Williams:
I’m teaching Math Intervention at a middle school in the Denver Public Schools. I’ve had some interest in teaching math for a while to stay challenged and refreshed. Also, teaching math has much greater job security than English or ELD. I also teach courses in DPS for new teachers on teaching methods for English Learners. During the summer, I usually support an elementary school with curriculum for English Learners and I coach new teachers. So, I’m staying really busy!

LF: Is there anything I haven’t asked you that you’d like to share?

Eddie Williams:
I’d share my concern in our schools regarding an overemphasis on data, record keeping, and standardized test scores. All of these issues are very controversial, I know. I guess I’d just ask our parents and community to stay informed and involved to make sure that our young people and our schools get what they need to be successful.

LF: Thanks, Eddie!
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Refugees, asylum seekers, and other immigrants
Help for teachers with problematic definitions
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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to provide historical and legal definitions for categories of immigrants while helping educators use facts to address their students’ misperceptions about the terms "migrants," "undocumented immigrants," "refugees," "asylum seekers," and "internally displaced persons." The 1951 Convention related to the status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol provided a clear definition for refugees, also used to create the 1980 Refugee Act. However, recent political and media rhetoric have increased public misunderstanding of immigration terms.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper uses over 30 news reports to demonstrate recent perceptions of refugees and other migrants. Other citations provide historical accounts, international documents, and legislation to explain ways in which the USA and other countries have defined refugees.

Findings – Findings suggest ways in which leadership have ignored research by denouncing resettlement in spite of statistics indicating that refugees are not a threat to the American people.

Research limitations/implications – The author’s perspective is as a researcher who has conducted research with resettled refugees for over 15 years. The author’s findings have created a pro-refugee stance.

Practical implications – This paper suggests the importance of exploring multiple perspectives and not settling for the claims of popular media. It also provides information for teachers to provide educational materials about refugees and other immigrants.

Social implications – Readers are called to look beyond popular opinion to consider accurate information about refugees and immigrants. Refugees and asylum seekers flee from terrorism; they are not terrorists.

Originality/value – This paper confronts contentious popular media reporting on refugees and migration. This is especially valuable in the current time, as negative misconceptions about such people abound.

Keywords Refugees, Rhetoric, Migrants, Asylum seekers, Definitions, Media

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

The years 2014-2017 have not been easy for teachers. The past four years have included thousands of children fleeing from Central America to the USA to escape crime, torture, or death. In many cases, these asylum seekers were met by US citizens holding placards telling them to “Go home” (Abdullah, 2014). Teachers struggled to explain the Paris bombings of late 2015. The European migrant crisis exploded into many questions about the “right thing to do” amidst fears of terrorism. The March 2016 bombings in Brussels increased fears of immigrants. In the first month of his presidency, Donald Trump worked to justify a ban on travel for all refugees for four months, immigrants from seven primarily Muslim countries for three months, and Syrian refugees indefinitely (Shear and Cooper, 2017; White House, 2017). Prior to his election, he proclaimed that Mexican immigrants are rapists bringing in drugs and crime; “And some, I assume, are good people (Kopan, 2016; Reilly, 2016). At the same time, many schools include refugees, asylum seekers, legal migrants, and undocumented immigrant students studying alongside their US-born peers. How is a teacher to respond in a fair and unbiased way?

As the numbers of global migrants increase, the 1951 Convention Related to the Status of Refugees definition of refugees and international acceptance of the protections included in the Convention remain contentious. To examine the problems, disputes, and responses, this paper will proceed as follows: a brief history of refugees, a consideration of definitions; an
exploration of problems with those definitions and expectations; and a current look at the situation of refugees and asylum seekers. The following organization is intended to provide educators and others tools to respond in the classroom and community.

This paper will focus on current media reporting, as it is the media reports that teachers will likely contend with in their classrooms. Students are more aware of contemporary media than historical documents. As an example, the Huffington Post provided an online video with clips from several media sources demonstrating ways in which negative rhetoric from the 2016 presidential campaign in the USA was influencing students. The video includes clips of white students jeering at Hispanic students at a sports event and students of color singled out in classes by white students who said they will be deported when Trump becomes president (Huffington Post, 2016). Understanding historical and legal backgrounds can help teachers regulate discussions about this contentious topic.

**Historical backgrounds**

In part, teachers can look to history. When the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees was crafted and signed in 1951, millions of Europeans had been forced to flee their homes in the aftermath of the Second World War. The document referred specifically to those affected by the Second World War prior to January 1951, because no one thought that such a terrible disaster would occur again.

They were mistaken. When more wars, especially the Vietnam War, created similar situations for citizens in Southeast Asia and Africa, the 1967 Protocol was added to the 1951 Convention to eliminate the geographical and temporal limitations of the Convention. It defined a refugee as someone, owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (UN High Commissioner of Refugees, 1951/1967).

By the end of 2015, the number of refugees, asylum seekers, and internally displaced persons (IDPs) was at the highest level ever recorded. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) placed the total at 65.5 million, over six million more than the previous year (UNHCR, 2016). The number of refugees alone was at 19.5 million, half of whom were children. The ongoing war in Syria, as well as other world conflicts, has resulted in hundreds of thousands fleeing in 2015-2017, in hopes of resettlement in European countries. The November 2015 terrorist attacks on Paris, followed by the March 2016 attacks on Brussels, had many US politicians viewing refugees as potential terrorists, even though the majority of attackers were born in the European Union and held EU passports (Shuster, 2016). Some governors are attempting to restrict entrance to Syrians refugees, and Congressional members are calling to restrict the refugee resettlement program, along with promoting religious discrimination (admitting only Christian refugees) (Walsh and Barrett, 2015).

The attention by media has greatly increased awareness of the general population about refugees and asylum seekers. Unfortunately, much of the information is misleading and inflammatory. Most notable are the remarks by President Donald Trump, who called for banning all Muslim immigration, including tourism, to the USA “until we can figure out what is going on” (CNN, 2015); and presidential candidate Ted Cruz, who has recommended surveillance in all US Muslim neighborhoods (Sulama and Lemire, 2016). Online responses to news stories include large numbers of Americans that promote anti-refugee sympathies.

This kind of rhetoric places teachers in a problematic bind. They have their personal beliefs and fears. Additionally, many US teachers and teacher candidates have little knowledge of
Glossary:

**Arrivals-Primary** - refugee and refugee eligible individuals who are initially resettled in Colorado.

**Arrivals-Secondary** - refugees and refugee eligible individuals who are initially resettled in another state but move to Colorado.

**Asylee** - refers to persons who are in the U.S. and make their claim for refugee protection here, rather than from overseas. Derivative asylees may arrive directly from overseas to join immediate family members who are asylees in the U.S. Like refugees, asylees seek protection based on persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution because of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a social group.

**Asylum seeker** - A person who seeks safety from persecution or serious harm in a country other than his or her own and awaits a decision on the application for refugee status under relevant international and national instruments. In case of a negative decision, the person must leave the country and may be expelled, as may any non-national in an irregular or unlawful situation, unless permission to stay is provided on humanitarian or other related grounds.

**Case** - an individual or group of refugees/refugee eligible clients.

**Client** - an individual served by the refugee resettlement program.

**Country of origin** - the country that is a source of migratory flows (regular or irregular).

**Cuban-Haitian Entrant/Parolee** - Cubans and Haitians who are granted special status or parole status under the U.S. immigration laws, have applied for asylum, or are in exclusion or deportation proceedings but have not received a final order of deportation. Cuban/Haitian Entrants are eligible for the same federal benefits as refugees.

**Family reunification** - The process of bringing together families, particularly children and elderly dependents with previous care-providers for the purpose of establishing or re-establishing long-term care. Separation of families occurs most often during armed conflicts or massive displacements of people.

**Presidential Determination** - The number of refugees who may be admitted in any fiscal year as the President determines after appropriate consultation with congress and is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.
Reception and Placement (R&P) - The Department of State has cooperative agreements with nine domestic resettlement agencies to resettle refugees and the number of refugees in the Presidential Determination for a fiscal year.

Resettlement Agency (Volag) - public or private agencies that provide initial reception and placement (R&P) services to newly-arriving refugees under cooperative agreements with the U.S. Department of State. Local affiliates of these national agencies are responsible for providing initial R&P services covering basic food, clothing, shelter, orientation, referral, and other services for the first 90 days after arrival in the U.S. for refugees.

Refugee - according to the 1951 Refugee Convention, a refugee is a person who, owing to well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his/her nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail him/herself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality or being outside the country of his/her former habitual residence, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.

Refugee Eligible - additional populations who qualify for refugee services including: asylees; certified victims of trafficking (VOTs); Cuban - Haitian Entrants; Special Immigrant Visa holders (SIVs); Central American Minors (CAMs); and Unaccompanied Refugee Minors (URMs).

SIV (Special Immigrant Visa) - a special status given to Iraqis and Afghans who worked as interpreters with American armed services; they qualify for the same benefits as refugees for up to eight months after arrival.

VOLAG (Voluntary Agency) - national organization that assists in resettling refugees in the United States; all local resettlement programs are affiliated with one or more of these national agencies.

For more comprehensive glossaries of terms:


http://www.iom.int/key-migration-terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahara Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (Agents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (Relatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (Family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (Ind)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (Refugee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (Total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
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<td>Total</td>
<td>3196</td>
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<td>597</td>
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<td>315</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>18761</td>
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INTRODUCTION

Immigrants in America

My family came to America in 1957, when I was three years old. We lived in an apartment on Bush Street in San Francisco, a ten-minute walk from the traditional Japantown first settled by Japanese immigrants a half-century before us. The 1950s were a time when not many immigrants came to America, at least as compared to today. My family arrived long after the early waves of Asian and European immigrants around the turn of the twentieth century. We arrived before the resurgence of immigration that would start in the late 1960s and still continues, so the America of my childhood wasn’t quite the nation of immigrants that preceded or followed it. Even in the rich diversity of a San Francisco childhood, kids with “foreign” names—like Ziad, Juanita, and Hiroshi—found that the early 1960s world of Ozzie and Harriet, Leave It to Beaver, and American Bandstand prompted deep and unsettled questions about what it means to come to America, and what it means to say that America is a nation of immigrants.

These questions seemed to have little to do with the legal issues that years later I would come to call immigration and citizenship law. The distinctions that mattered most in my family, as in immigrant families everywhere, had to do with generations and language. My parents came to America in their late twenties, while my brother, Akira, and I grew up in San Francisco. My parents learned English imperfectly, while English became the mother tongue for Akira and me.

I later learned that the line between citizens and noncitizens can make a big difference, and that in my family, too, legal status was a complex question. The law treated each of us differently. Though my father came to America as a young man, he had been born in San Francisco in 1925 and
was a U.S. citizen by virtue of birth on U.S. soil. His parents moved back to Japan in 1930. He grew up there, and in the 1950s he was able to return to the United States. Immigration law treated him simply as coming home, yet he felt, acted, and was treated as an immigrant. My mother was the one in our family whose legal status most clearly matched how she felt. She was born in Japan in 1924, which happened to be the same year that U.S. law made her ineligible on account of race to immigrate to the United States. We were allowed to come to San Francisco only to join my father (who had preceded us to America by several years, also a typical immigrant story), because we were coming as the spouse and child of an American.

Young children who immigrate to the United States with their parents usually have their parents’ nationality, but my own citizenship status was more complicated. A child born outside the United States with one citizen parent may be a U.S. citizen at birth, but only if the citizen parent fulfills a U.S. residency requirement, which my father had not. So I was stateless until I became a naturalized U.S. citizen at the age of fifteen. Akira was born in San Francisco three years after my mother and I immigrated. He and I were both children of immigrant parents, but as a citizen, he had a legal status quite different from mine.

My family history shows that the law makes distinctions of various kinds, most prominently by drawing a line between citizens and noncitizens, but that this line between “us” and “them” often does not match up with the ways in which families come to this country. Perhaps because the law cannot capture, let alone freeze, the ways that immigrants think about what it means to come to America, immigrants have crossed the line between us and them. Over the course of American history, families like ours have started as “them” and ended up—at least in part—as “us,” even if that process has taken time, sometimes even generations.

Just four years before my family came to America, the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Brown v. Board of Education* that public schools segregated by law are unconstitutional. *Brown* stands for the idea in the law that all persons are equal and should be treated accordingly. The Court’s decision is widely celebrated today as a landmark of national commitment to the equality that is central to any democracy. But thinking about *Brown* as a symbol of equality reveals how hard it is to apply the lessons of *Brown* to immigration and citizenship, where the idea of equality is elusive.
Citizens and noncitizens are not always equal. Among the noncitizens, some will be admitted to the United States, while others will not be. Citizens can insist on being treated as the equals of other citizens and having the same rights. But noncitizens are not always treated like citizens. Noncitizens generally cannot vote. Noncitizens can be deported. In short, “all men are created equal” only if those “men” are not noncitizens.

The reason for these differences between citizens and noncitizens—between those who are members and those who are not—is that a democracy must have the power to shape and preserve itself as a community of individuals who share interests and values. In order to do so, a democracy must have the power to grant or refuse membership to newcomers, as well as the power to say that members can do some things that nonmembers cannot. And yet, the line between citizens and noncitizens and the concept of equality in immigration are highly fluid and dynamic notions. As my own family history shows, the line between us and them has never been fixed or impermeable. The question is not just when “we” and “they” are equal, but also: when and how do “they” become part of “us.”

To start answering these questions, consider the imaginary but typical Juan and Rosalita Garcia, who came to the United States from Mexico six years ago. They are lawful immigrants, or “permanent residents” in legal parlance. Permanent residents are noncitizens who have been admitted to the United States for an indefinite period of time. They have what are often called “green cards,” although the cards have been off-white rather than green for some years.

Juan works in a small factory in the San Francisco Bay Area that makes cardboard boxes. Rosalita works taking care of elderly residents of an assisted living center nearby. Their son, Jesus, and their daughter, Maria, were born in the United States, which automatically makes the children U.S. citizens. Juan and Rosalita work hard and are saving what they can for a down payment on a house. They pay taxes and are active in their church and in several community organizations. They speak only halting English, but their heavy work schedules and the demands of parenting leave them no time for language classes. They have thought about becoming U.S. citizens, but they have heard that the paperwork takes a long time, and they are wary of cutting ties to Mexico.

How should we in America treat lawful immigrants like Juan and Rosalita? Should they be allowed to vote? Under current law, they may not
vote in state or national elections, and only a few scattered communities would allow them to vote in local elections. Juan and Rosalita have no health insurance and no money to pay for medical care. What if Rosalita is diagnosed with a rare blood disorder that requires continuous medical monitoring and leaves her too weak to work regularly? Under current law, lawful immigrants pay taxes, but a complex array of rules governs their eligibility for various public benefits. What if Juan is convicted of shoplifting? Under current law, some crimes can make a lawful immigrant deportable. But how serious a crime should—or should any crime—lead to deportation? These questions probe what it means for lawful immigrants in the United States to be something less than the equal of U.S. citizens.

Here are three considerations that might influence lawmakers as they decide how to treat lawful immigrants. First, it might matter that Juan and Rosalita have worked hard in their jobs and have paid taxes and have children who are both U.S. citizens. Second, a lawmaker might think that an immigrant who commits a crime has breached some form of trust implicitly bestowed when this country admitted him. Third, a lawmaker might be troubled that Juan and Rosalita recently became eligible to become U.S. citizens but have done nothing about it.

I recognize that the Garcia family story implicitly raises this question: Who should be allowed to immigrate lawfully to the United States in the first place? But public debate on this threshold admission question often reaches an impasse precisely because we have not thought enough about how we treat lawful immigrants after they get here. This boundary between lawful immigrants and citizens is the line of greatest intimacy but also of most pointed exclusion between outsider and insider. What the United States does with this line tells us most about what it means to be a nation of immigrants. Our treatment of lawful immigrants is the key to debating intelligently who should be let into the United States in the first place.

**Lawful Immigrants: A Brief Overview**

The legal concept of permanent residence first emerged in the 1920s. Before then, various laws barred many categories of immigrants—for example those with contagious diseases or unacceptable political views—but the number of immigrants was not limited. Starting in 1921, however, federal immigration law capped how many immigrants would be admitted to
permanent residence in the United States, and it distinguished such immi-
igrants from nonimmigrants, who are admitted lawfully but only for a
limited duration and a particular purpose, for example, to study or to
work in a certain job. (Of course, permanent resident status also contrasts
with undocumented noncitizens, who are unlawfully present.) Since 1921,
the terms “lawful immigrant” and “permanent resident” have meant the
same thing, and I use them interchangeably.3

There are five basic ways to become a lawful immigrant. Family ties
account for the largest number—about a half million annually, or over
63 percent of the total. Most favored are spouses and unmarried children
of U.S. citizens, and parents of adult citizens. Other relatives qualify but
must wait longer, sometimes much longer. Employment qualifies more
than 16 percent of lawful immigrants, who must meet various education
and experience requirements. Almost 12 percent of lawful immigrants are
refugees fleeing persecution, either chosen for admission from outside
the United States, or getting asylum at or inside the U.S. border. Four per-
cent are winners of an annual lottery open to noncitizens from countries
that have not sent many immigrants to the United States recently. Finally,
4 percent of lawful immigrants use ad hoc exceptions that allow nonciti-
zens to legalize their status.4

The number of lawful immigrants to the United States in any given
year has varied greatly by historical period. The highest numbers were
admitted in the period from 1900 to 1915, when the annual number of
new immigrants routinely approached or exceeded one million. Immig-
rant admissions dropped to a trickle during World War I, rose to half
of prewar levels during the 1920s, then dropped again during the Great
Depression and World War II. After 1945, the flow steadily increased
from decade to decade. Since 1980, annual lawful immigrant admissions
have sometimes exceeded one million and thus approached the histori-
cally high numbers of the early 1900s, but as a lower percentage of the
total U.S. population.

The source countries for lawful immigrants to the United States have
dramatically over the past century. European countries dominated
the flow in the period 1901–10, but Mexico had emerged as a significant
source by the 1920s. That mix prevailed through the 1950s, with a high per-
centage of lawful immigrants coming from Mexico, Canada, and a few Eu-
ropean countries. The source countries changed dramatically after 1965, so
that by the 1980s the largest numbers came from Latin America (especially
Mexico) and Asia. In 2004, 57 percent of lawful immigrants came from twelve countries—Mexico, India, the Philippines, China, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Cuba, Korea, Colombia, Guatemala, and Canada. Of the twelve, Mexico accounted for the most by far, with India a distant second, and the Philippines third. In 2004, more than a third of all lawful immigrants came from one of these three countries.

Permanent residents are not U.S. citizens. All countries divide persons into those who are citizens and those who are not. I will refer to the latter group as noncitizens; federal law almost always calls them “aliens.” Almost everyone born on U.S. soil is a citizen, regardless of his parents’ citizenship or immigration status. (The only exception is for children of foreign diplomats.) A child born outside the United States may also be a citizen, if one or both of his parents are citizens. A noncitizen who wants to become a U.S. citizen must generally become a permanent resident first. Then, after a waiting period—generally five years—and satisfying other requirements, he may become a citizen by a process called naturalization.

In 2003, about 11.5 million permanent residents lived in the United States, about 7.9 million of whom had lived here long enough to become citizens through naturalization. Of those noncitizens who have been permanent residents long enough to naturalize, about 60 percent do so—an average of about 550,000 new U.S. citizens each year from 1991 through 2004. But nothing requires lawful immigrants to naturalize. Unless they become deportable, they may stay indefinitely in the United States as permanent residents.

**The Lost Story: Americans in Waiting**

This book tries to recover a lost story that once was central to American thinking about immigration. The story is that for much of its history, America treated lawful immigrants as future citizens, and immigration as a transition to citizenship. Lawful immigrants—or as I will outline later, some lawful immigrants—could become “intending citizens.” For more than a century and a half—from 1795 to 1952—every applicant for naturalization had to file a declaration of intent several years in advance.

This declaration gave any noncitizen who was eligible to naturalize a precitizenship status that elevated him, even from his first day in America, well above those who had not filed declarations and therefore were not seen as on the citizenship track. Many statutes throughout this period expressly...
preferred intending citizens. The Homestead Act of 1862, the key to settling the western frontier, made noncitizens eligible for grants of land once they filed declarations. The U.S. government sometimes extended diplomatic protection to intending citizens who got into trouble overseas. And until the early twentieth century, many intending citizens could vote.

Today, the declaration of intent is optional, and few are filed. Intending citizens do not enjoy U.S. diplomatic protection. In 1926, Arkansas repealed the last state law allowing noncitizen voting. The significance of this shift goes well beyond the demise of the declaration of intent as a formal document and of intending citizen as a formal status. In the century from the mid-1800s to the mid-1900s, the basic idea that new immigrants should be treated as future citizens faded from prominence.

To capture this way of viewing immigration, I have coined the term immigration as transition. It treats lawful immigrants as Americans in waiting, as if they would eventually become citizens of the United States, and thus confers on immigrants a presumed equality. In a broad range of ways, we Americans no longer view immigration as transition, nor do we think of immigrants as Americans in waiting. In fact, the opposite is true; we treat new immigrants as outsiders until shown otherwise. They may later become citizens, but we no longer treat them as if they will. This book examines how this happened, why this has undermined the very idea of a nation of immigrants, and why it is important to once again treat lawful immigrants as Americans in waiting.

Three Views of Immigration

It is striking that a view of immigration and immigrants that was important for much of American history would largely fade from sight. To explain understand how this story was lost and how it might be recovered, this book reinterprets the evolution of U.S. immigration and citizenship law—especially its treatment of lawful immigrants—as a set of tensions among three ways of viewing immigration. Immigration as transition is only one of the three views, and it is less evident because the other two have eclipsed it.

One of these other two views of immigration is what I call immigration as contract. The Garcias may be lawful immigrants, but perhaps they have “promised” to stay out of trouble with the law, on pain of deportation. Or even if they do not commit any crimes, their admission to this country
may be just a temporary grant of permission that the government can re-
voke at any time. Or perhaps the Garcias promised to support themselves
financially. On the other hand, the U.S. government may have promised
not to change the rules governing their vulnerability to deportation, or
the rules governing their access to public benefits. These similar ideas
appear frequently in the making of law and policy, past and present.

By “contract” I do not mean a formal, legally binding document marked
by the parties’ signatures. Nor do I mean an agreement after back-and-
forth bargaining in the marketplace between two sides that both have
enough power to negotiate terms. Immigrants from poor backgrounds are
especially likely to accept any terms of admission, as long as they think
coming here is better than staying home. Nor do I mean a more modern
view of a contract among legal scholars, as a set of social obligations that
may evolve well beyond the parties’ original understanding.

Rather, by contract I mean a certain way of making immigration deci-
sions. The offer that immigrants accept by coming to America may be a
take-it-or-leave-it proposition. Their bargaining power is very weak, and
there is no real negotiation. And yet, immigration as contract is accurate to
describe this view of immigration because it adopts ideas of fairness and
justice often associated with contracts. The core idea is thinking about com-
ing to America as a set of expectations and understandings that newcomers
have of their new country, and their new country has of newcomers.

Underlying this way of talking about fairness and justice in our treat-
ment of lawful immigrants is a certain way of thinking about equality in
immigration and citizenship. Immigration as contract is based on the
sense that fairness and justice for lawful immigrants does not require us
to treat them as the equals of citizens. Though immigration as contract is
a model of justice, it is a model of unequal justice that turns not on conferr-
ing equality itself, but on giving notice and protecting expectations.

One reason that immigration as transition waned is that immigration
as contract assumed a prominent role, especially in the immigration law
decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the late 1800s. Over time, how-
ever, immigration as contract also had to share influence with other views
of immigration. One was the idea that simply being present in the United
States bestows certain minimum rights on lawful immigrants and other
noncitizens. This is what I call territorial personhood.

Gradually, territorial personhood evolved into a third view of immigra-
tion alongside transition and contract, which I call immigration as affiliation.
This is the view that the treatment of lawful immigrants and other noncitizens should depend on the ties that they have formed in this country. Newcomers put down roots. Immigration as affiliation is the foundation for the argument that lawful immigrants like the Garcias should be treated just like citizens, now that they have paid taxes, have children who are U.S. citizens, and have shown themselves to be reliable and productive workers.

As a way of thinking and talking about fairness and justice in immigration, affiliation drives arguments that lawful immigrants—though convicted of crimes that make them deportable—should be allowed to stay in the United States, if they have been here for a long time and have strong family and community ties. The longer they are here, and the more they become enmeshed in the fabric of American life, the more these lawful immigrants and citizens should be treated equally. This view of immigration is not based on the justice without equality of immigration as contract, nor on the presumed equality of immigration as transition, but rather on an earned equality.

“Immigration as contract” and “immigration as affiliation” are new terms, but they capture ways of thinking and talking that have become commonplace in discussions of immigration and citizenship. For example, the law’s recognition of noncitizens’ ties in America is a key part of our self-perception as a nation of immigrants. And the law’s insistence that immigrants adhere to the conditions of their admission reflects immigration as contract. The prevailing account of immigration and citizenship in the United States reflects a combination of immigration as contract and immigration as affiliation. But this account is incomplete, for it neglects immigration as transition as a third way that America has thought about immigration and immigrants.

These three ways of talking and thinking about immigration—as transition, contract, and affiliation—are not mutually exclusive. All three have important roles to play. No one who adopts an attitude toward any aspect of law or policy needs to choose one view of immigration and reject the other two. Any attitude or decision will likely reflect a blend, but typically not by conscious choice. When a legislator or the person on the street takes a position on an immigration issue—for example, that the Garcias should be allowed to vote—she is quite unlikely to say to herself, “Oh, I’m viewing immigration mainly as affiliation,” but the differences between immigration as contract, affiliation, and transition help us understand her position and how it differs from alternatives. In an area as
complex as immigration and citizenship, this way of assessing choices clarifies a great deal.

It is precisely because this book is concerned with ways of viewing immigration and citizenship that my focus is immigration law, not just as a set of legal principles, but as something that reflects broader patterns of thought and debate. Though I am not engaged in the traditional archival work of historians, this book is archival in a different sense. Whether in the form of court decisions, statutes, or agency regulations, law typically reveals our society’s values and attitudes in concrete, crystallized, and accessible terms. Even if the language of court decisions or the legislative history of statutes does not convincingly explain their holdings or rules, court decisions and statutes reflect influential thought about immigration and immigrants.

Constitutional law concerning immigration and immigrants is especially worth examining. In any area of government activity, there is a body of court decisions that uphold or strike down government decisions as consistent or inconsistent with the Constitution. For example, the U.S. Constitution plays an important role in saying how far government can go in displaying religious symbols on public property. The Constitution sets limits on interrogation of suspected criminals and on searches of their homes and cars. The Constitution also helps define the power of the federal government to enact gun-control laws. In immigration law, however, it speaks volumes about our attitudes toward noncitizens and their role in American society that courts often will not even listen to claims by noncitizens that the government’s immigration decisions violate the Constitution.

Even when no court issues a ruling on the constitutionality of a government decision, constitutional ideas crystallize the public values that permeate everyday discussions involving everyday people on topics of public significance. These values also guide legislators and government agency officials when they draft, debate, enact, and administer new laws. Consider the constitutional idea that unfair procedures may violate someone’s rights to notice and a fair hearing. A legislator may draft a bill with strong procedural protections, thus anticipating and allaying these concerns. A bill without those protections will likely draw the charge that it is unfair. Drafting choices and objections of this sort will not produce a court ruling on constitutionality, or on anything else for that matter, but it is still constitutional law at work, shaping the content of the law.
What it would take to revive the idea of Americans in waiting, and why it is important to do so? Here is a quick sketch of my proposal: new lawful immigrants should be treated like U.S. citizens until they fulfill the residency requirement (generally five years) to be eligible to apply for citizenship. This would mean that new lawful immigrants could sponsor their close relatives for immigration as if they were citizens. They would be eligible for public benefits just like citizens, and vote just like citizens. The only exception to equal treatment for new lawful immigrants is that they could be deported for serious crimes. In sum, new lawful immigrants would be treated not like noncitizens, but rather as Americans in waiting.

This is not a proposal to erase the line between lawful immigrants and citizens. If a lawful immigrant does not apply for citizenship as soon as he is eligible, his status would be only the status that a lawful immigrant has today. He would no longer have the same ability as a citizen to sponsor a family member for immigration. He would have only the limited welfare eligibility for lawful immigrants under current law, and he could no longer vote. The essence of my proposal is to treat a new lawful immigrant more generously, but also to use that extra generosity to help him take full advantage of the opportunity to integrate into America. If he chooses not to naturalize, he would lose that better treatment.

Some parts of this proposal are less politically viable than others, but I am offering not just a legislative recommendation, but also a way of understanding the basic tensions in immigration and citizenship over the past two hundred years. I want this proposal and its underlying rationale to help us understand and assess the choices that we face now and in the future.

This entire inquiry reflects my hope that national citizenship in the United States can be a viable context for a sense of belonging and for participation in civic, political, social, and economic life that is inclusive and respectful of all individuals. There are certainly other models of belonging, including transnational models that reflect a sense of belonging to more than one nation, and postnational models that think beyond national citizenship entirely. But the apparent inclusiveness of these other approaches to belonging can mask other modes of exclusion. If national citizenship matters less, ties of religion, race, class, and other groupings that are less cosmopolitan or democratic than national citizenship will matter even more than they do already. The result may be a world without national walls but also a world of a "thousand petty fortresses," as political philosopher Michael Walzer once put it.10
Making national citizenship into an inclusive vehicle is not easy. It requires a welcome of immigrants—crystallized in the idea of Americans in waiting—that has faded from law and policy in the United States. Although this idea has weakened and is in danger of weakening further, it should be restored to prominent influence because it captures this basic truth: a sensible we/they line must reflect the understanding that many of them will become part of us. This understanding was the conceptual engine for integrating generations of immigrants—mostly those from Europe. With much of this understanding gone, we should not be surprised if more recent waves of immigrants, especially immigrants of color, seem more reluctant to cross the we/they line into American society. Recovering the lost story of immigrants as Americans in waiting is thus crucial not only to giving immigrants their due, but also to recovering the vision of our national future that is reflected in the phrase “a nation of immigrants”—that America is made up of immigrants, but still one nation.
CHAPTER 6

The Lost Story of Americans in Waiting

The phrase “to naturalize” is a bit odd, at least in its literal meaning, “to make natural.” It refers to becoming a citizen, as opposed to being born one. The word’s origins lie in a time when divine will and natural law were thought to explain why someone was born a subject of one worldly ruler or another. Anyone who was not born to that status of subject, but later became one, was naturalized.1 The drafters of the U.S. Constitution gave Congress the power to enact a uniform rule of naturalization, rather than leave this making of new citizens to the states in an era when frontiers were vast, fluid, and unpatrolled.

Citizenship laws—especially naturalization laws—drew more federal attention than direct control over admission itself. In the Republic’s early years, naturalization required only a short period of residence. Signaling the new nation’s willingness to admit newcomers—or at least certain newcomers—the first naturalization statute in 1790 allowed “free white persons” to become citizens in “any common law court of record in any of the States” if they had resided in the United States for two years, were of “good character,” and took an oath to support the U.S. Constitution.2

In 1795, Congress increased the qualifying residency period from two to five years, and adopted a requirement of special interest here. Three years before applying for naturalization, every applicant had to file “first papers.” This term referred to a declaration of intent to become a citizen, which could be filed at any time after arrival. The declaration served an administrative function by allowing an early review of eligibility in the form of an examination under oath before a court clerk. The declaration
entailed no obligation to naturalize, though many immigrants did take that next step and became citizens.\textsuperscript{3}

The 1798 Naturalization Act increased the qualifying residency period to fourteen years and required a declaration of intent five years before naturalization. That year, the Alien and Sedition Acts authorized the President to order the deportation of enemy nationals and “dangerous” aliens. Those acts and the stiffer naturalization rules in 1795 and 1798 reflected the fears of the Federalists, who suspected that their political opponents, the Jeffersonians, drew key support from Irish and French immigrants. The Jeffersonians soon regained power, and in 1802 Congress generally restored the more lenient 1795 scheme, including five-year qualifying residency with a declaration three years in advance. Starting in 1824, the declaration had to be filed only two years in advance, and Congress began to relax the requirement with exceptions.\textsuperscript{4}

A declaration of intent in advance was a prerequisite for naturalization from 1795 until 1952, when it became optional. During this period, the noncitizens who filed one—whom I will call “intending citizens”—enjoyed a favored status, something close to citizenship itself. Even for the most recent arrivals, a declaration by a newcomer who was eligible to naturalize embodied the expectation of citizenship. Of course, the prerequisite that the intending citizen had to be eligible for citizenship was an enormous barrier as long as naturalization was racially restricted. For white immigrants, however—and after 1870 for the few immigrants who were black—the declaration conveyed a special status that showed how the idea of Americans in waiting was central to thinking about immigration and citizenship.\textsuperscript{5}

\textbf{Intending Citizens as Voters and Near-Citizens}

One prominent sign of the idea of Americans in waiting was the practice of allowing intending citizens to vote. Today only a few scattered localities in the United States allow any noncitizen voting, but it was commonplace until the early 1900s. Noncitizen voting began in the late 1700s, when giving some male immigrants the right to vote was consistent with the young nation’s desire to attract European newcomers. As attitudes toward immigrants changed, noncitizen voting waxed and waned. It fell into disfavor during the War of 1812 amid fears of foreign influences.\textsuperscript{6}

As the nation expanded westward with new territories and states, a
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he media attention on last summer’s unprecedented influx of child migrants to the U.S. southern border gave airtime to arguments old and new, from the humanitarian to the nativist, from left contextualizing to conservative race-baiting. Ultimately it put additional pressure on Obama to finally announce his executive action on immigration reform in late November, while also serving as the impetus for a new wave of U.S. funding for controversial anti-crime and anti-drug trafficking programs in Central America.

In late November, NACLA hosted an online panel to shed light on the biggest lessons to be drawn from the summer. In the first half of the panel, we discussed the causes of the crisis, both immediate and long-term: The crisis emerged out of a four-year long dramatic increase in migration of unaccompanied minors to the United States, during which numbers of young migrants leapt from a steady average of 6 to 8 thousand prior to 2012, to nearly 25 thousand in 2013, to nearly 70 thousand in 2014, according to the non-profit Kids in Need of Defense. In assessing the causes of the summer’s crisis, many analysts point to a 2008 anti-trafficking law that gave special protections to minors from countries not adjacent to the United States, rather than repatriating them automatically—an immigration policy loophole migrant smugglers were able to exploit. Analysts from the left further understand the crisis as the natural outgrowth of a history of U.S. military, political, and economic intervention in Central America, and the ever-increasing pressure on Central American governments to abide by neoliberal economic agendas that put downward pressure on wages, force rural farmers from their land, and fuel gang violence.

The crisis was considered more or less “over” by September, often explained by a combination of the seasonal drop in migration patterns, a deployment of resources into repatriation programs, and a highly coordinated campaign led by the Department of Homeland Security to circulate messages about the dangers of migrating on television and radio stations in Central America.

In this final print edition of NACLA, we feature highlights from the second half of our panel, with a discussion of the conservative allegations that President Obama’s Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) was responsible for the crisis, the activist response to the crisis, and the renewed call for “open borders.”

**David:** Many people have spoken and written about the structural and root causes for the displacement of Central Americans—family reunification, violence, poverty, gangs, and then also the causes of those causes, such as U.S. intervention throughout the twentieth century, neoliberal economic arrangements, U.S. deportations to Central America, the recent coup in Honduras, and finally, U.S. sponsored anti-drug and anti-crime efforts. What information do we have of the “stay home” public relations campaign between the United States and Central American governments?

**Denise:** The vast majority of the women and children we’re seeing are from Honduras and El Salvador, which are among the most violent countries in the world. What we hear is that unlike what members of the administration have suggested—that Obama’s policies have created an incentive for the families to come—what the families themselves are telling us is that they came because they had to, because they were about to be killed, generally by the gangs. And they’re generally able to identify the specific gangs and the specific members of the gangs, and sometimes specific police units that are also involved with those gangs. Most of them tell us that they had absolutely no idea what was going to happen to them once they arrived in the United States.

When people come here they are exercising their rights under International refugee law to seek protection in the United States or in any country that they can access in order to protect themselves from a dangerous situation.

A “stay home” public relations campaign is itself a cause for concern. It’s an effort to create a deterrent situation. The efforts are largely ineffective because people are coming for reasons related to sustained violence, but to the extent that they are effective, that itself should be questioned.

**Leisy:** I actually was offended to see that a deterrent campaign was the first response, that we’re trying to hide the realities of inequality, of corporations that take advantage
of labor in Central America to build such wealth. But it’s also not surprising. I started doing this research in the early 2000s, and I recently found text from a government website in El Salvador, a real ad campaign that did the exact same thing, telling parents, “Do not send your children into danger.” It’s in line with the way foreign policy plays out throughout the region. We pretend that migration is a problem at the individual level, for these individuals who make the decision to come and “break our laws,” erasing the notion that there are much larger structural issues.

Arturo: Agreed. It’s insulting to assume that people are so unsophisticated that they can’t understand that it’s an incredible risk to their lives to make this journey through Mexico. They’re doing it because they feel that they have no choice. There is a lot of misinformation out there, and the idea that DACA or rumors from coyotes have attracted people is complete nonsense.

David: So we have structural causes, the migration process, a return to mass detention as a response, and then the legal process. How do you think activists will move forward and address these challenges?

Denise: The government’s position right now is that children must be detained throughout their proceedings, and they’re detained in true jail-like facilities by Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, the same entity that is seeking to deport them, under any sort of conditions of monitoring that would normally be available for asylum-seekers. And there’s a new facility that opened in late December, with another 2,400 beds in Dilley, Texas. There’s a huge need for advocacy to be done to try to prevent this expansion of family detention. Australian researchers have begun to describe immigration detention of children as child abuse.

The legal community has come to the point where we will certainly try to provide representation to as many people as possible, but we also don’t want to be a crutch for the administration to be able to say, “well, it’s true that there are proceedings, but there are lots of lawyers working to represent individuals.” We’re trying to make very clear that the resources are not there to provide representation to everybody who needs to be represented in these fast-track proceedings.

At the same time, almost everybody in family detention and most of the unaccompanied kids have at least a potential asylum claim. And so far, every single case that has gone all the way through to the end of its case in our two facilities in New Mexico and Kearns, Texas, have been successes.

Leisy: It was a summer of first, shock, and then moving quickly to figure out how to come together from a bunch of different sectors, including lawyers, activists, educators, students. I’ve connected with people not only here in Los Angeles, but also with people in Queens, San Francisco, Texas. I’m hopeful that because it generated so much attention, even if it was short-lived, it created the possibility for longer-term change.

Arturo: The activism is not as developed as we would like it to be here in D.C. It seems to be coming from the national organizational lobbying environment, although there has been direct action by the National Day Laborers Organizing Network (NDLON) and others.

Hopefully we can see more Latinos take the lead—and also other immigrants, because we don’t want to invisibilize African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern, Asian, and other groups who also suffer from deportation and militarization in their home countries.

I do lobbying for School of the Americas Watch, and it’s important to note that refugee and immigration-related organizations need to increase their foreign policy IQ, need to look at the war on drugs, at U.S.-led militarization as part of the problem. They’re scared to do so, because oftentimes they are interfacing with government agencies and they don’t want to have that access closed, they don’t want to be perceived as leftist, as radicals. But they’re practicing their jobs in an incomplete way.

David: Many groups have mentioned the gravity and intensity of the humanitarian situation. I want to ask about the language that’s used for that, the language of “crisis.” What happened this summer was put in terms of mass abuse, mass detention, but also “the border’s out of control crisis”—a “surge.”

Leisy: It’s difficult to witness the way that the media created this narrative. On one hand, for certain sectors of the population, it did bring attention to what was
going on, and it made them care, at least about children, humanizing them for a little bit. But on the other hand, it erased the longer-term trajectory of what’s been going on, of who’s been involved. In some ways it erases the possibility of having a broader discussion if it’s thought about as a one-time, unexpected, surprising thing that no one could have predicted, that came out of nowhere. To call it a “crisis” erased all of the structure that did actually create it, that is continuing to lay that pathway for more and more people to have to leave their countries.

**David:** I want to now turn to the question of open borders. How do we replace the utopian idea of open borders with an honest conversation that allows us to speak about the advantages of open borders, and, certainly, the limitations? If we ignore the structural causes that we’ve discussed today, we’ll still have the same flow of people coming from Central America. But if there were strategies put in place that would confront the structural causes, is there a possibility for open borders as a way of changing immigration? What are the legal, economic, and perhaps even political feasibilities of this?

**Arturo:** Are we talking about the entire hemisphere, from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego, or are we talking about maybe NAFTA countries first? Either way, within that framework you’d have to start it off the way it’s set up, meaning with countries that are already in some sort of commercial agreement with one another, like under NAFTA. But I just don’t see it being a possibility in the United States, there’s just too much racism and paranoia. From the vantage point of a Latin American state, borders are one of the few protections people have against imperialism, against exploitation by multinationals and the United States. There needs to be more Latin American unity before there’d be any consideration of having an open-borders policy with the United States.

On a practical level, open borders also wouldn’t help people better their own governments, without their having to migrate and toil under bad working conditions and then send the money back as the only way to develop their countries of origin. There has to be a way to economically and socially develop without having the need for migration. It’s about the right to stay home.

**David:** Do you think this kind of sovereignty of borders that all nations claim can be renegotiated given these larger movements of culture, of family, of economic forces taking place?

**Denise:** There’s been a huge evolution in the conception of borders, even domestically, to an international human rights law perspective. Even as recently as 20 years ago, international human rights bodies were highly reluctant to talk about anything that had to do with state’s sovereignty over their borders. And now you find international human rights bodies regularly investigating, considering, commenting on the policies of states even at their borders. It used to be understood that sovereignty reigned supreme. While this idea broke down with the advent of human rights discourse in other arenas, it took a while in terms of immigration and borders.

What are the constraints that do exist now on the sovereign exercising of power at the border? It’s about recognizing that there are human rights limits on what states can do. What we should probably do is focus on the rights of individuals to seek asylum and not to be returned to a home country where they could then face danger. We should focus on those rights that do exist in the system that continue to recognize sovereign power but also impose real limits on that power.

**Leisy:** I don’t think that it has to be all or nothing. Right now we’re at the point where it’s either open borders or a hugely militarized border that’s causing the deaths and violence against so many people. I’m not saying we should keep what we have right now, because the way that it works now is so violent for those who are migrating. Many of the people that I talk to today say, “I don’t want to leave. I just want to be able to go to school, and work, and pay my bills, and live a life where I’m not hungry, where I’m not in fear.” This whole debate about borders assumes that everyone wants to leave, and that if we made that possibility happen right now, that’s what would happen—everyone would leave. But why aren’t we thinking about creating the conditions so that people will go if they want to—as an option—not as a mode of survival?
Global Income Inequality in Numbers: in History and Now

Branko Milanovic
World Bank

Abstract
This article presents an overview of calculations of global inequality, recently and over the long term, and outlines the main controversies and political and philosophical implications of the findings. It focuses in particular on the winners and losers of the most recent episode of globalization, from 1988 to 2008. It suggests that the period has witnessed the first decline in inequality between world citizens since the Industrial Revolution. However, the decline can be sustained only if countries’ mean incomes continue to converge (as they have been doing during the past ten years) and if internal (within-country) inequalities, which are already high, are kept in check. Mean-income convergence would also reduce the huge ‘citizenship premium’ that is enjoyed today by the citizens of rich countries.

When we think of income inequality, our first reaction is to think of it within the borders of a country. This is quite understandable in a world where the nation state is very important in determining one’s income level and access to a number of benefits (from pensions to free health care), and where by far the dominant way in which political life is organized is at the level of a country. However, in the era of globalization another way to look at inequality between individuals is to go beyond the confines of a nation state and to look at inequality between all individuals in the world. Once we do so, many of the things about inequalities in general that we believe or think we know change; it is like going from a two-dimensional world to a three-dimensional one.

As the world becomes more integrated, the global dimension of inequality is likely to become increasingly relevant. This is for at least two reasons: the much-increased movement of factors of production across borders, and the greater influence of other people’s (foreigners’) standard of living and way of life on one’s perceived income position and aspirations. Greater movement of capital, goods, technology and ideas from one side of the globe to another implies greater connectivity with people who are not one’s compatriots, and greater dependence on other nations for the generation of one’s income. Movements of labor that illustrate this interdependence in a most obvious fashion are still less important than movements of capital, but they are increasing. The knowledge of how other people live and how much money they make influences strongly our perception of our own income and position in the income pyramid. An imaginary community of world citizens is thus built gradually. And once this is done, comparisons of actual incomes and welfare between different members of that imaginary community acquire importance. This is why global inequality will gain in importance, even if it is not as relevant or important for an average individual as inequality within his or her political community (nation state). Once we compare ourselves with people from other parts of the world, we are indeed interested in global income distribution. Global inequality begins to matter.

1. Three concepts of inequality and how they have evolved over the past 60 years

When we talk about inequality that transcends national borders, often we have in mind not one but three different concepts – even when we are not fully aware of it. I am going to articulate these three concepts.

The first concept of inequality (let’s call it inequality 1) is focused on inequality between nations of the world. It is an inequality statistic calculated across GDPs or mean incomes obtained from household surveys of all countries in the world, without population weighting. To show how this is done, consider the three individuals in the top row of Figure 1. The height of each person represents the GDP or mean income of his or her country. Somebody from a poor country would be represented as a short person, somebody from a middle-income country as a person of medium height, and somebody from a rich country as a very tall person.
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and calculate the Gini coefficient. China and Luxembourg have the same importance, because we do not take population sizes into account. Every country counts the same, somewhat like in the UN General Assembly.

Consider now the second row of the figure, which would help us define concept 2 inequality or inequality 2. There, individuals from poor countries are all equally short as before and those from rich countries are all equally tall, but the difference lies in the fact that countries’ population sizes are now taken into account. We do exactly the same thing as we did for inequality 1, but now China and Luxembourg (or any other country) enter the calculation with their populations. Introducing population is very important. As we shall see in the next section, during the past 25 years the movements in concept 1 and concept 2 inequalities were very different. Recall, however, that in both cases the calculation takes into account not the actual incomes of individuals but country averages.

Inequality 3 is the global inequality, which is the most important concept for those interested in the world as composed of individuals, not nations. Unlike the first two concepts, this one is individual-based: each person, regardless of his or her country, enters in the calculation with their actual income. In Figure 1, this is represented by the different heights of individuals who belong to the same country. Not all Americans earn the average income of the US, nor do all Chinese earn the average income of China. Indeed in row 3, the poorest person is from the middle-income country, while his compatriot is the second richest (the second tallest) in our group of ten individuals.

But moving from concept 2 to concept 3 inequality is not easy. The chief difficulty comes from the fact that to calculate concept 3 inequality we need access to household surveys with data on individual incomes or consumption. Income or consumption have to be measured using the same or similar methodology, and surveys need to be available from as many countries as possible. Perhaps at least 120–130 surveys are needed in order to cover more than 90 per cent of the world population and account for 95 or more per cent of world income. Ideally, of course, we would like to have surveys from every country in the world. This is a very hard requirement. There are still quite a few countries, mostly in Africa, where household surveys are not conducted regularly and where methodologies change (sometimes rather brusquely) from one survey to another, thus rendering comparisons difficult.

Because the calculation of global inequality relies on household surveys, we cannot calculate inequality 3 with much precision for the period before the mid- or late 1980s. There are simply no household surveys available for many parts of the world. The first available Chinese household surveys are from 1982, the first usable surveys from the former Soviet Union are from 1988, and for many sub-Saharan African countries, the earliest household surveys date from the mid-1980s. Thus, for the past, we have to rely on much more tentative data, where countries’ income distributions are only approximated.
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE ONLINE:

The Refugee Project: https://www.therefugeeproject.org/
The UN Refugee Agency (USA): https://www.unhcr.org/en-us/
Immigration Research Library: https://www.immigrationresearch.org/
Migration Policy Institute: https://www.migrationpolicy.org
Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC): https://trac.syr.edu/
Pew Research Center: https://www.pewresearch.org/topics/immigration/
CO Refugee Services: https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/cdhs/refugee-services
African Community Center: https://www.acc-den.org/
Colorado Immigrant Rights Coalition: http://coloradoimmigrant.org/
Casa de Paz: https://www.casadepazcolorado.org/
Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network: https://www.rmian.org/
   RMIAN—local events and volunteering opportunities: https://www.rmian.org/happenings
American Friends Service Committee: https://www.afsc.org/
Please Note: The materials gathered here are intended to be used—individually or in pre-selected groupings—for further exploration of the themes raised in *The Newcomers*. In some cases, the materials provided are only a preview of a longer PDF available in a OneDrive shared folder: FSEM & One Book Faculty Resources. Please visit www.dufsem.com/one-book/ for folder access (login required).

**CLIMATE CHANGE**

Page 65: “How Climate Change Could Make the Migrant Crisis Worse” by Justin Worland, *TIME*


Page 70: *Suggested Activities & Questions for Discussion*

**IMAGES OF THE MIGRANT CRISIS**


Page 77: *Suggested Activities & Questions for Discussion*

**EDUCATION, PEDAGOGY, AND POLICY**


Page 85: *Suggested Activities & Questions for Discussion*
How Climate Change Could Make the Migrant Crisis Worse

By Justin Worland
December 21, 2017

Scientists have for years cited extreme weather events connected to climate change as a contributing factor in the ongoing European migrant crisis. Drought and crop failure have destroyed livelihoods and driven sectarian conflict, leading to mass migration from the Middle East and Northern Africa to Europe.

The problem is about to get much worse, according to a new study in the journal *Science.* Researchers behind the study evaluated asylum applications submitted to the European Union from migrants in more than 100 countries between 2000 and 2014, and found a link between dramatic temperature fluctuations and migration.

As temperatures rise, researchers say unchecked climate change could drive a 188% increase in the number of refugees seeking asylum in Europe annually by the end of the century, as migrants seek to escape temperature extremes that might disrupt livelihoods and aggravate some of the world’s thorniest geopolitical conflicts. Even if a global effort slows the pace of global warming along the lines outlined in the Paris Agreement, researchers expect close to a 30% increase in the number of asylum applications.

“A majority of [climate change] damages occur in developing countries, and you might think that we in Europe or we in the U.S. are isolated from this,” says study author Wolfram Schlenker, an economist at Columbia University. “But that overlooks spillovers and how we’re interconnected.”

The research is more comprehensive than previous work looking at climate change and migration. But the threat is nothing new. Senior U.S. military officials have expressed concern about the connection since the early days of George W. Bush’s presidency. More recently, a 2014 Department of Defense report described climate change as a “threat multiplier” that breeds instability and “can create an avenue for extremist ideologies and conditions that foster terrorism.” And a 2015 paper published in the journal *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* found that climate change had contributed to the Syrian civil war and the refugee crisis it caused.

However, President Donald Trump’s administration has paid less attention to the links between climate change and U.S. national security. Trump removed climate change from his National Security Strategy, released Monday, describing climate policies as part of “anti-growth energy agenda.”

Security experts say the Pentagon will continue to consider the effects of climate change despite Trump’s political rhetoric, but the broader U.S. shift on climate change will keep the U.S. from proactively addressing climate change in a way that could protect from a new migrant crisis. The Trump administration has said it will not consider the impact of climate change outside the U.S. when calculating the benefits of climate change policies. But, as the new research shows, the effects of climate change can quickly extend beyond borders.

“It’s short sighted,” says Schlenker. “Incidents that occur abroad come back to hurt you in your own country.”

Write to Justin Worland at justin.worland@time.com.
Asylum applications respond to temperature fluctuations

Anouch Missirian and Wolfram Schlenker

International negotiations on climate change, along with recent upsurges in migration across the Mediterranean Sea, have highlighted the need to better understand the possible effects of climate change on human migration—in particular, across national borders. Here we examine asylum flows at the regional level in 2013. We analyze data for 103 countries translated into asylum applications to the European Union, which averaged 351,000 per year in our sample. We find that temperatures that deviated from the moderate optimum (−20°C) increased asylum applications in a nonlinear fashion, which implies an accelerated increase under continued future warming. Holding everything else constant, asylum applications by the end of the century are predicted to increase, on average, by 28% (38,000 additional asylum applications per year) under representative concentration pathway (RCP) scenario 4.5 and by 188% (660,000 additional applications per year) under RCP 8.5 for the 21 climate models in the NASA Earth Exchange Global Daily Downscaled Projections (NEX-GDPP).

The relationship of international migration decisions to economic situation in both the source and destination country has been extensively documented. Migration’s response to income or wealth corresponds in an inverted U shape: Positively increasing at low levels and negatively increasing at high levels. These arguments have gained traction to the point that migration-income relationship as improving conditions in the home country enable individuals to overcome liquidity constraints and finance migration costs. Richer households are not liquidity-constrained and show a negative migration-income relationship as improving conditions at home make it less desirable to leave (9). (See supplementary text sections 1 and 2 for a more detailed analysis of these effects.)

Migration pressures have been described as one of the biggest distortions in the global economy (11). Causes of migration are not limited to the desire for better economic opportunities: humans flee persecution and war. We investigate how exogenous weather fluctuations affect one facet of migration—asylum applications, which equal roughly 1/6 of the overall migration flows over our sample frame. Our sample included the 103 non– Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) source countries that reported asylum applications to the EU in each year between 2000 and 2014. It covered, on average, 351,000 asylum applications per year, the majority (140,000) coming from the 31 Asian countries, including Afghanistan and Iraq, each of which supplied approximately 10,000 applicants. The 66 African and 11 non-EU countries in Europe accounted for 50,600 applicants each, whereas 16 countries in the Americas accounted for the rest (table S7 to S9). For example, 55,943 people from Serbia applied for asylum in the EU in 2000, and 378,000 per year—that is, our sample covered 93% of all applications to the EU. Recent research (12) suggests that, in agricultural production areas, there should be a negative relationship between economic conditions and conflict, which then translates into asylum applications.

Our baseline regression links annual asylum applications from each source country outside the OECD to any EU member state. We use a panel analysis with source-country and year fixed effects, which is equivalent to a joint demeaning of all variables and accounting for common annual shocks. In other words, we link anomalies in log applications to weather anomalies once common annual shocks are absorbed (e.g., the global financial crisis in 2008). Our specification examines whether hotter-than-normal temperatures will increase or decrease asylum applications from a given source country. Because our dependent variable is in logs, we estimate relative impacts, which is preferable as the number of applications differs greatly among source countries in absolute terms. We allow the effect to vary by the average weather variable: Hotter-than-usual temperatures can reduce asylum applications for cold countries and increase them for hot countries. Our model includes both average temperature and precipitation. The coefficients and standard errors are given in table S5 and figures S5 to S7.

We find a statistically significant relationship between fluctuations in asylum applications and weather anomalies: Applications are lowest for average temperatures around 20°C and increase if the weather is too cold or too hot. We choose to focus here on the EU because it receives the largest share of asylum application and, despite having a high rejection rate, remains a major provider of international protection (13); other target ensembles are considered in the sensitivity checks. Colder countries in Europe outside the EU are predicted to account for fewer asylum applications in a warming world, whereas hotter countries, especially in Asia and Africa, are expected to see sizable increases in a warming world (tables S7 to S9).

The coefficients on temperature are displayed in Fig. 1. We show a quadratic response function (dashed brown line), as well as flexible restricted cubic splines (solid brown line). Both use the contemporaneous average temperature in the source country, averaged over the maize growing area and season. These models correspond to columns (1a) and (3a) of table S1, respectively. Each line gives the point estimate and is normalized so that the minimum of the response function is zero. We find a highly significant relationship (P < 0.01 for joint significance) between logged asylum applications and average temperature over the maize growing area and season in our 103 source countries in our sample. If we average the weather on the basis of population in a grid cell (table S2), the P value becomes 0.14 and the temperature variables are no longer significant, which suggests that weather shocks over the agricultural area are the crucial channel. The use of different weather data sets yields comparable results for seasonal averages (table S3). Including data on political conflicts as controls
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Regression is in log points, a 1% increase of 100 log points, or a $e^0.01 = 1.01$-fold increase in the number of applications.

Although the quadratic specification lends itself easily to interpretation of the regression coefficients and allows for some nonlinearity, it remains restrictive by assuming symmetry around the optimum. The more flexible model using restricted cubic splines with five evenly spaced knots between 15° and 35°C (supplementary text section 2.2) enables us to relax this symmetry assumption, as well as the forced linearity in the marginal impact. The discovered relationship is slightly asymmetric, which suggests that temperatures above the optimum level are more harmful than those below this level.

Total precipitation, on the other hand, is not an important predictor of migration, consistent with previous research on conflict that indicates that temperature, as opposed to precipitation, is a stronger predictor of conflict (15). Moreover, the relative changes in temperature under future climate change scenarios translate into larger changes in yields than do precipitation changes (16). When we exclude precipitation from the regression (column 2a of table S1), we obtain similar results.

Having established a consistent and robust U-shaped relationship between the weather in a source country and asylum applications—that is, temperatures that are too low or too high will lead to higher asylum applications—we now turn to simulations of how these applications will be altered under global climate change. We present both the response to hypothetical uniform temperature increases ranging from 1° to 5°C, as well as the predicted changes under the 21 global climate models in the NEX-GDDP (NASA Earth Exchange Global Daily Downscaled Projections) CMIP5 (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5) archive that estimate spatially heterogeneous warming scenarios. The U-shaped migration-temperature relationship suggests that colder source countries will experience a reduction in asylum applications, whereas the US and other countries more suited to warmer temperatures will experience an increase. The quadratic response function is shown as a dashed brown line, whereas the restricted cubic spline is shown as a solid brown line (knots at 15°, 20°, 25°, 30°, and 35°C).

Standard errors for the coefficients are given in table S1. Because the models are in logs, the left y axis indicates the relative impact of changing temperatures on asylum applications. Each model controls for a quadratic function in season-total precipitation, as well as source-country and year fixed effects. The mean of the 15 annual average temperatures and log asylum applications (right y axis) for each source country are denoted by green "x" symbols. Because the models use weather anomalies in the identification, the green lines display the variation in annual average temperature in each country, ranging from the lowest to the highest observed value in the 15-year period.

Fig. 1. Response of asylum applications to the EU with respect to the annual average temperature over the maize growing season. The quadratic response function is shown as a dashed brown line, whereas the restricted cubic spline is shown as a solid brown line (knots at 15°, 20°, 25°, 30°, and 35°C). Standard errors for the coefficients are given in table S1. Because the models are in logs, the left y axis indicates the relative impact of changing temperatures on asylum applications. Each model controls for a quadratic function in season-total precipitation, as well as source-country and year fixed effects. The mean of the 15 annual average temperatures and log asylum applications (right y axis) for each source country are denoted by green "x" symbols. Because the models use weather anomalies in the identification, the green lines display the variation in annual average temperature in each country, ranging from the lowest to the highest observed value in the 15-year period.

Fig. 2. Predicted changes to asylum applications under uniform climate change scenarios. We used 1000 samples drawn from the joint distribution of the model parameters (solid brown line in Fig. 1) to repeatedly predict the change in the percentage of total asylum applications filed in the EU. The solid red line shows the predicted change in percent, whereas the shaded areas illustrate the 90% and 99% confidence intervals. The blue line (right y axis) indicates the probability that asylum applications increase.
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in asylum applications to the EU under warmer temperatures, whereas warmer countries will see an increase thereof, as they lie to the right of the temperature that minimizes applications.

When we simulate the aggregate effect of a uniform 1° to 5°C warming, we compare the extrapolated number of asylum applications to the predicted applications under the historic observed weather in 2000–2014. Figure 2 accordingly illustrates the predicted changes in total applications to the EU by using the restricted cubic spline model (solid brown line in Fig. 1 or column (3a) from table S1), as well as the probability that they increase compared with the baseline. We prefer the cubic spline specification because the model is better at capturing nonlinearities within the observed range of temperatures and is more conservative in out-of-sample predictions, as the relationship is assumed to be linear above the highest knot whereas the quadratic model assumes increasing rates. Truncating the response function and forcing it to become flat outside the observed range does not substantially affect the overall results (figs. S6 and S7). The results are comparable if we use the quadratic specification, as shown in the first row of Fig. 3. The likelihood of an increase in applications is shown as a blue line in Fig. 2 (right y axis) and ranges from 85% under +1°C warming to 99% under both +4° and +5°C warming. The change in the volume of applications is highly nonlinear: A 1°C warming results in a relative modest 6% increase in applications, but a 5°C warming leads to a 173% increase. The predicted mean change is positive in all models and under all warming scenarios.

Asylum applications are also forecasted using temperature data from the 21 climate models in the NEX-GDDP archive (supplementary text section 3.4) for the medium term (2030–2059) as well as the end of the century (2070–2099). We compare them to an analogous 30-year historic baseline (1976–2005) in the NEX-GDDP data. The mean estimate and the confidence intervals are constructed using the same sample from the parameter distribution as for the uniform temperature increases and are shown in figs. S8 and S9. Asylum applications are predicted to increase, on average, by 28% under representative concentration pathway (RCP) scenario 4.5 and 188% under RCP 8.5 by the end of the century, but there is large heterogeneity among countries (tables S7 to S9), with some colder countries seeing declines as they become warmer and closer to the optimal temperature.

These predictions are ceteris paribus. On the one hand, they might overstate the responsiveness, as the model uses historic weather shocks to identify the relationship while we apply it to a permanent warming scenario in which countries can engage in adaptive responses (e.g., shifting the growing season). On the other hand, these predictions might also be underestimates, as historic weather shocks are small enough in size that they likely do not capture disruptive events (such as major civil unrest) in case of continuous warming.

There are several likely mechanisms behind the sensitivity of fluctuations in asylum applications to temperature anomalies. First, there is a strong nonlinear relationship between agricultural yields and temperature (14, 17, 18). Moderate temperatures (i.e., in the lower 20°C range) over the growing season are ideal, with both hot and cold temperatures reducing yields. Second, gross domestic product (GDP) growth rates have been found to be very sensitive to temperature, even on the nonagricultural components of the GDP and even in industrialized countries (19, 20). For both yields and GDP, being too hot is worse than being too cold. An improvement in agricultural output or GDP will help producers and workers (if they are paid their marginal product, which increases) in those regions, reduce the incentive to join criminal activity, and lead to less conflict (12). Third, the same sign in the relationship with weather is found for aggressive behavior, which increases with temperatures that have been shown to reduce output (21). This relationship holds consistently across several spatial and temporal scales (22). The first two mechanisms are a priori conducive to increased distress-driven migration in the event that weather deviates from the moderate optimum, and all three predict that increases in very warm locations are likely to be associated with higher asylum applications.

The results of our baseline regression suggest that suboptimal weather (namely, temperatures that are too cold or too hot) increases asylum applications to the EU. One might

Fig. 3. Sensitivity checks to various modeling assumptions. Each row represents a separate model. (A) P value for joint significance of the temperature variables (values below 0.7 are shown as 0.7). (B and C) For cases in which there is a significant link between temperature and asylum applications (average significance level above 0.9 for the quadratic and spline model), (B) shows the temperature that minimizes asylum applications, and (C) illustrates the predicted change in applicants (x axis) as well as the probability that a +2°C uniform warming will lead to an increase in applications to the EU (number next to the estimate).

Missirian et al., Science 358, 1610–1614 (2017) 22 December 2017
wonder whether these additional applications are caused by heightened persecution or just by changing economic conditions, with both being credible intermediates in a causal chain linking weather anomalies and demand for asylum. To clarify this issue, we examine the numbers of accepted applications per year between a source country and the EU. We do find that the weather-induced spikes in applications translate into roughly three times higher acceptance rates in the following two years (see supplementary text section 2.4 for more detail), suggesting that destination countries classify the additional cases as mere weather-related inflows and not economic migrants.

We conduct several sensitivity checks of our baseline results that are summarized in Fig. 3 to rule out the possibility of our model picking up spurious correlations in the data. This figure includes three panels: Panel A shows the joint significance for all temperature variables. In cases for which there is a significant link between temperatures and asylum applications, panel B depicts the temperature that minimizes asylum applications, and panel C illustrates the predicted change in asylum applications under uniform +2°C warming, as well as the probability that applications will increase. Results displayed in panels B and C are generally robust.

The first row in Fig. 3 presents our baseline results for comparison. Results for the quadratic model are shown in red, whereas results for the model using restricted cubic splines are shown in blue (all models account for a quadratic function in season-total precipitation, but because they were not significant, the coefficients are not used when we evaluate climate impacts).

The second row limits asylum applications to openings (rather than second instances, appeals, etc.). In principle, both first and subsequent applications could be influenced by weather, and the results are comparable when we limit the data to first instances. In our baseline regression, we simply added all instances.

The third row includes two lags of all weather variables. We show the combined results of the contemporaneous term as well as the two lags. Lagged variables might capture two opposite effects: (i) delayed increase of applications, accounting for cases when people apply the following year(s), as they might not be able or willing to flee right away, and (ii) forward displacement, whereby weather shocks induce the applications of individuals who were contemplating to leave in the next year(s), in which case the contemporaneous effect should be counterbalanced by coefficients of the opposite sign in the following years. Either these two effects are of small magnitude or they balance each other out, as the model with two lags produces similar predictions.

The fourth row uses a model that includes all source countries, even if they do not report applications for all of the 15 years, with little change (the optimal temperature in the spline model in panel B becomes a bit larger, but this has little effect on the predicted climate impacts in panel C).

The fifth row derives the weather not just over the maize growing area and season but also over the growing areas and seasons of the other three large staple commodities: wheat, rice, and soybeans. These four weather variables are then averaged using area weights. The temperature coefficients are no longer significant for the quadratic model, but the remaining results are robust to these changes.

The sixth row averages the weather over the entire country and year and no longer produces significant results. This suggests that the results are driven by events that happen in the agricultural (rural) areas during the time the crops are grown and is in line with the predictions that a significant result should mainly be observed for agricultural production areas (supplementary text section 2.1). We are not able to distinguish whether these events affect agriculture directly or other sectors in the same (rural) area at the same time of the year.

The seventh and eighth rows break the destinate countries into two subgroups: the 14 richest and 14 poorest member states of the EU. Results are only significant for applications to the 14 richest member countries that absorb most of the applicants.

The last two rows examine applications to countries outside the EU, which we break into two subgroups on the basis of whether or not they belong to the OECD. There is no significant relationship with weather in the source country for the former, but these countries accept a small share of asylum applications (19). The rest of the world (non-EU, non-OECD) predominately accepts applications from neighboring countries, but we observe only a marginally significant effect of the weather in the source country for the spline model.

Finally, we also tested for heterogeneity among source countries but generally did not find significantly different sensitivities to weather for various subgroups. The results, in which we split the sample into roughly equal halves based on (i) the corruption index of the source country, (ii) the latitude of the source country, (iii) the population of the source country, (iv) the share of the source countries’ workforce that is employed in agriculture, or (v) the distance between the source country and the EU, are shown in tables S5 and S6.

In summary, we link annual asylum applications received by the EU member states to average temperature over the maize growing area and season in the source country and find a nonlinear relationship, especially for those applications filed into the richer EU member states. Moderate temperatures around 20°C minimize asylum applications. Both colder and hotter temperatures increase migration flows. Extrapolating these results, an increase in temperatures in source countries is predicted to lead to an increase in asylum applications to the EU as well, following a highly nonlinear response function. Our findings support the assessment that climate change, especially continued warming, will add another “threat multiplier” that induces people to seek refuge abroad. Weather impacts in low-income source countries will not be confined to those countries or regions but will instead likely spill over into developed countries through increased refugee flows.
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WRITTEN ANALYSIS AND/OR DISCUSSION:

Compare the article intended for a popular/non-expert audience (Worland) and the study intended for an academic/expert audience (Missirian & Schlenker). Consider differences and similarities in purpose, language/tone, and content.

**Purpose:** the goal of each text or what the audience is meant to take away from it.

**Language/Tone:** what the word choice/tone reveal about the intended audience and its assumed knowledge, values, and investment.

**Content:** what is included in one but left out of the other & why.

Use this activity to discuss expectations for academic writing and critical reading in college.

RECOMMENDED EXCERPT & DISCUSSION:

*Page 14 (“Near his desk…”) – Page 16 (“…making them less secure”)*

In the early days of Thorpe’s time at South High School, she observes: “The world was riven by ethnic conflict, gang violence, armed rebel groups, terrorist organizations, oppressive regimes, full-blown civil wars, and wars between countries. When families lost their homes, children often struggled to find a foothold in a foreign place.” She posits a question at the center of current political discourse: “What obligation, if any, did the rest of the world have to make things whole again for those children?” Not yet included in her 2015 observations are people displaced by climate change and environmental disaster.

Currently, the UNHCR recognizes “that the consequences of climate change are extremely serious, including for refugees.” However, they acknowledge that term “climate refugee”—popular in media coverage—“can cause confusion, as it does not exist in international law.”

Should the definition of refugee expand to include people displaced by environment, disaster, and climate change? What obligation, if any, does the rest of the world have to “make things whole again” for those people?
Iconic photographs and the ebb and flow of empathic response to humanitarian disasters
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The power of visual imagery is well known, enshrined in such familiar sayings as “seeing is believing” and “a picture is worth a thousand words.” Iconic photos stir our emotions and transform our perspectives about life and the world in which we live. On September 2, 2015, photographs of a young Syrian child, Aylan Kurdi, lying face-down on a Turkish beach, filled the front pages of newspapers worldwide. These images brought much-needed attention to the Syrian war that had resulted in hundreds of thousands of deaths and created millions of refugees. Here we present behavioral data demonstrating that, in this case, an iconic photo of a single child had more impact than statistical reports of hundreds of thousands of deaths. People who had been unmoved by the relentlessly rising death toll in Syria suddenly appeared to care much more after having seen Aylan’s photograph; however, this newly created empathy waned rather quickly. We briefly examine the psychological processes underlying these findings, discuss some of their policy implications, and reflect on the lessons they provide about the challenges to effective intervention in the face of mass threats to human well-being.

Imagery, Emotion, and Meaning

The power of visual imagery is well known, enshrined in such familiar sayings as “seeing is believing” and “a picture is worth a thousand words.” Iconic photos stir our emotions and transform our perspectives about life and the world in which we live. Who has not seen and been moved by such images as the mushroom cloud, the young Vietnamese girl fleeing naked from a napalm bombing, the Chinese man facing down a column of tanks in Tiananmen Square, the view of earth from space, and the jetliner flying into the World Trade Center? Psychological research confirms the greater impact of images over statistics, even when the amount of exposure is roughly equal (2–5).

More recently, on September 2, 2015, another striking photograph joined the list. A photograph of a young Syrian child, Aylan Kurdi, lying face-down on a Turkish beach, was viewed by more than 20 million people on social media (6) (Fig. 1). (The boy’s name was Alan Shenu, however we have chosen to use the name given by Turkish authorities and publicized in media reports, Aylan Kurdi.) The next day, the photo was on the front pages of newspapers worldwide. This photograph brought much-needed attention to the Syrian war and the plight of its refugees, which resulted in short-term but important increases in individual aid and refugee policy changes in many countries (6). However, the Syrian crisis had been ongoing for more than 4 y before Aylan’s death. During that time, sources such as the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights had been regularly releasing updates on the steadily rising death toll, conservatively estimated at 250,000 at the time of publication of Aylan’s photo. Clearly, the statistics of a massive human catastrophe and their moral rationale were available for people and governments to act on, but little response was evident.

New behavioral data from information searches and donations demonstrates that, in this case, an iconic photo of a single child was worth more than hundreds of thousands of statistical lives. People who were unmoved by the relentlessly rising death toll in Syria appeared to care much more about the crisis there after seeing Aylan’s photo; however, this newly created empathy waned rather quickly. We briefly examine the psychological processes underlying these findings, discuss some of their policy implications, and reflect on the lessons they provide about the challenges to effective intervention in the face of mass threats to human well-being.

Significance

We cannot assume that the statistics of mass human crises will capture our attention or move us to take action, no matter how large the numbers. The data that we present show that the world was basically asleep as the body count in the Syrian war rose steadily into the hundreds of thousands. The iconic image of a young Syrian child, lying face-down on a beach, woke the world for a brief time, bringing much-needed attention to the war and the plight of its many victims. But this empathic response was short-lived. We outline the need for better laws, institutions, and decision-making procedures to channel empathy into appropriate and effective humanitarian actions by individuals and their governments.
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having seen Aylan’s photograph. Here we briefly examine the psychological processes underlying these findings, discuss some of their policy implications, and reflect on the lessons they provide about the challenges to effective intervention in the face of mass threats to human well-being.

We first examined two datasets to assess the effect of the photograph of Aylan Kurdi on the public’s interest in and concern about the Syrian refugee crisis. We collected Google trend data on searches worldwide for the terms “Syria,” “refugees,” and “Aylan” from before (August 2015) and after Aylan’s photo was published. Such publicly available data track how often a particular search term is entered relative to the total search volume (7). As can be seen, these data show a dramatic increase in searches for the terms “Aylan,” “refugees,” and “Syria” on the days after publication of the photo (Fig. 2). These searches declined during the subsequent weeks, but still remained above the August 2015 baseline.

We also obtained data on monetary donations to the Swedish Red Cross for a fund specifically designated to aid Syrian refugees. The funding campaign started on August 4, 2015, almost a month before Aylan’s photo appeared, and continued until November 30, 2015. Thus, we can use these data to estimate the photograph’s effect in this specific context.

Fig. 3 shows the number of daily donations to the Red Cross, and Fig. 4 shows the total daily donation amounts during this period (excluding single donations exceeding 1,000,000 SEK). As can be seen, both increased greatly from the week before to the week after the publication of Aylan’s photo. The mean number of daily donations during the week after publication of the photo was more than 100-fold greater compared with the week before. This effect was sustained until 5 wk after the photo’s appearance, when the number declined to a level no different from that in the week before publication.

Similarly, the mean amount donated daily during the week after the photo’s publication was 55-fold higher compared with the week before (1,908,437 SEK vs. 34,284 SEK). During the second week after the photograph appeared, donation amounts were lower (404,626 SEK), but still approximately 11-fold greater than the week before publication. It was not until 6 wk after publication that the mean donations were at a level (57,990 SEK) that was not significantly different from that in the week before publication.

These data illustrate the iconic victim effect. The photograph of a single identified individual captured the attention of people and moved them to take interest and provide aid in ways that were not motivated by statistics of hundreds of thousands of deaths. The data also show that this form of empathy quickly faded and donations subsided, even though the number of Syrian refugees seeking asylum in Sweden was relatively high and consistent throughout the period that we sampled (36,000–40,000 per month).

Does the iconic victim response diminish rapidly as the image fades from memory and the media lose interest? Judging from the foregoing data, this appears to be the case. Additional data from the Swedish Red Cross are somewhat more encouraging, however. The number of monthly donors signing up for repeated contributions increased by a factor of 10 (from 106 in August 2015 to 1,061 in September 2015), and only 0.02% of those monthly donors had opted out by January 2016. This suggests that the iconic victim effect may lead not only to large and immediate increases in the number of one-time donors and average donations per person, but also to more prolonged and sustained commitment when individuals sign up for repeated donations.

Nonetheless, close to 1 y after the appearance of Aylan’s photo, and despite the publication of other touching images of imperiled refugee children, little seems to have changed (8, 9). After a string of boat disasters claimed 2,512 lives between January and May and put year 2016 on course to be the deadliest ever for refugees, Aylan Kurdi’s father said that “my Aylan died for nothing” (10). By the end of May 2016, leaders at the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul appeared to show little interest in addressing what has been described as the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II, angering many of the aid organizations in attendance (11). In June, the State Department dissenters could no longer keep silent. Other prominent statesmen, diplomats, and journalists have since joined the call for some form of military intervention to stop the relentless slaughter of innocent people in Syria (12–14). Even US Secretary of State John Kerry expressed (privately) dissatisfaction with the administration’s lack of forceful response (15).

What Have We Learned from the Story of Aylan?

One of the important lessons from the story of Aylan is that we cannot assume that the statistics of mass human crises will capture our attention or move us to take action, no matter how large the numbers. Our search data show that the world was basically asleep as the body count in Syria rose steadily into the hundreds of thousands. Perhaps this should not surprise us. A famous saying, sometimes attributed to Joseph Stalin, observed that “One man’s death is a tragedy, a million deaths is a statistic.” Similarly, economist Thomas Schelling (16) wrote that “the death of a particular person evokes anxiety and sentiment, guilt and awe, responsibility and religion...[but] most of this awesomeness disappears when we deal with statistical death” (p. 142).

Psychological research supports these observations. A single individual in distress, with a name and a face, often evokes a

Fig. 1. Cumulative Syrian death toll (data from the Jerusalem Center for Genocide Prevention and the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights).

Fig. 2. Google Trend data on the relative popularity of search terms “Syria,” “refugees,” and “Aylan,” August–September 2015. Note that Google Trends does not provide numbers of search requests; rather, the maximum number in the figure is scaled to 100, and the other values are proportional to that.
The Unsacred and the Spectacularized: Alan Kurdi and the Migrant Body

Yasmin Ibrahim

Abstract
While images can provide a transformative experience, they can also become objects of virtual voyeurism, functioning within regimes of representation while possessing the power to resist dominant ideologies. This article examines this phenomenon of “claiming the dead and dispossessing them” through the case study of Alan Kurdi who became an iconic symbol representing the trauma of people fleeing conflict zones in the Middle East. As an iconic image, it raised awareness of the plight of the Syrian refugees, but the image also became locked into a “sensorium” (Rancière) where it created communion through its pathos but equally was trapped into an aesthetic regime which re-centered the migrant body as a new type of (in)humanity in Europe. The Internet as a platform for this sensorium constantly re-appropriates iconic imagery into new artistic and creative formats where images can be stripped from context, re-hashed, and endlessly circulated as cultural artifacts, bearing the burden of history yet being disenfranchised from it.
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migrant, image, death image, iconic imagery, memes

Introduction
The Internet is a body snatcher. Dead bodies possess a certain cachet online, whether they be the results of beheadings or fallen bodies. Our abjection to the dead online and our remaking of dead bodies illuminate the Internet as a medium where the dead occupy a space of restlessness, kept alive through circulation and re-combination of form through the architecture of the Internet where they can be transformed into martyrs, figures of pity, or ‘memetic avatars’ that are invoked time and again. The dead occupy the spectrum between art and profanity and equally between the sacred and grotesque, opening ethical and moral limits in representing the unpresentable.

This article looks at the body of the “refugee” as a site of the spectacular through the numerous drownings of refugees crossing the Mediterranean Sea to seek salvation in Europe. Branded as the migrant rather than the refugee (see Goodman, et al., 2017), the drowning body speaks about how visually we claim the dead and repossess them through online rituals drawing on the Internet’s architecture where images cross over into an unstable regime where they can be morphed and stripped of their context, to be re-appropriated and reimagined through new consumption and commemoration rituals. The architecture of the Internet is also pledged to the “viral” where an object of exchange can be transformed through its mass circulation and the attendant communal gaze where an object can become publicly owned through these viral consumption modes where the rate of exchange and consumption can accord its value.

While digital technologies, particularly smartphones, can enable increased visibility into the hidden and the unknown, this very access to new media technologies and the enhanced visuality of the world through digital and convergent technologies constantly challenges our notions of the taboo and the sacred online. Hence, the notion of a “moral spectatorship” online is a site of intense contestation where attendant discussions are not only limited to moral action or responsibility or our sense to feel for the other but more fundamentally as a site of consumption culture where new meanings can emerge through re-appropriation of images in a platform which facilitates a multitude of activities beyond the altruistic. Images of pity and perversity online acquire cultural resonance through the specter of mass and viral consumption where they can be repossessed and remade. In the migrant
The “Boy on the Beach”

In 2015, the image of Alan Kurdi washed up on a Turkish beach drew worldwide attention. A dead child on a beach stood in stark contrast to the beach as a place of family retreat and sandcastles. But for Rob Shields (1990), the beach is also a space of liminality and the carnivalesque. The beach is a front line of Europe and becomes a site of death, devastation, and loss while the migration crisis confronts the West. Alan’s lifeless body bore testimony to the failed attempts by Syrians who drown attempting to reach European shores. The drowned and rescued bodies in the Mediterranean stood for the trauma of forced migration and the risks people take with their lives and their most precious possession, their progeny. The recurrent trope of dead bodies on the beach and the sea encapsulates the biggest migration crisis in living memory (Smith, 2015). The United Nations’s refugee agency reported that since September 2016, some 4,337 people are believed to have drowned attempting to reach Europe, and between September till August 2017, a further 4,185 people died (see Dehghan, 2017).

Three-year-old Alan Kurdi’s tragic death on foreign shores immortalized the humanitarian crisis of Syrian forced migration and invited global attention to the unfolding crisis. An image of Alan being carried by a grim-faced police-man went viral within hours, becoming the top-trending picture on Twitter under the hashtag #KiyiyaVuranInsanlik (humanity washed ashore; Smith, 2015). Nilüfer Demir of the Doğan News Agency photographed Alan and sought to “express the scream of his silent body” through his death imagery which became a symbol of all the children who lost their lives trying to reach safety in the West (Walsh, 2015).

As one of the biggest stories of 2015, the image was seen as shaping the debate on the migrant crisis and was responsible in part for Chancellor Angela Merkel’s decision to open Germany’s doors to refugees (Ensor, 2016). In the United Kingdom, it prompted a reaction from David Cameron promising that the United Kingdom would take in 4,000 Syrian refugees a year. An image of a dead child is a media taboo. Most organizations have a loose rule that images of corpses are not printed and it is rare to see a picture of a dead body in a newspaper. Not all news organizations ran the tragic images of Alan Kurdi. The BBC, for example, decided against using the most graphic image of Alan’s body. Others such as The Independent published the graphic imagery in full on its front page. According to the paper’s deputy managing editor,
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**ABSTRACT**

In this article, the authors analyse the news photojournalism of the 2015 European migration ‘crisis’ as a political encounter between western publics and arriving migrants, where the latter are not simply ‘the represented’ but people who act within the photographic space. Inspired by Azoulay’s view of photography as ‘civic duty’, where ‘those represented continue to be present there at the time they are being watched in the photograph’ and, in so doing, actively call for a response from their publics, the authors ask the question of who acts and how as well as what bonds of civic duty such action puts forward for those publics. At the heart of these questions on agency lies a conception of arriving migrants as specifically vulnerable actors – people whose very precarity becomes a resource for meaningful action. This visual analysis of front-page news images across nine western countries, (84 images in June–November 2015) demonstrates that their photojournalism of migration enables two types of political encounters with arriving migrants: ‘action on migrants’, where migrants are mainly acted upon within the procedural encounters of border institutions, and ‘action by migrants’, where migrants act upon and affect others within existential encounters that can potentially touch upon people’s emotional and activist sensibilities. While, in line with the canons of photography and migration studies, both types of political encounters restrict precarious agency within the binary positions of victimhood and threat, it is the latter, ‘action by migrants’ that has the potential to break with such binaries and cast vulnerability as resistance – as deliberate exposures of the body to the power of the border, which present migrants as political actors in activist practices of transnational solidarity.
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THE SEMANTIC AMBIVALENCE OF THE MIGRANT

The 2015 migration ‘crisis’ has not only been the greatest humanitarian emergency in Europe since the Second World War (UNHCR, 2018), but also a major journalistic event with continuous front-page coverage on national news platforms across the world, from June to November 2015 (Berry et al., 2015). From the ‘refugees welcome’ protests to rescue-hero narratives and from human tragedies on sea to reports on camps and reception centres, this unprecedented coverage of the migration ‘crisis’ in mainstream news contributed to shaping the continent’s collective imagination of arriving ‘others’. Photojournalism, in particular, has been a key genre of chronicling the ‘crisis’, capturing a wide range of contexts and circumstances through which migrants entered into various relationships with host populations (Chouliaraki and Stolic, 2017). Dominating the international photojournalism awards (World Press Photo, 2016), some of these depictions have been massively circulated, reproduced and debated – the Alan Kurdi imagery, for instance, or the crowded dinghy floating in the sea against a huge setting sun (Mortensen and Trenz, 2016).

In its intensive reporting of arriving others, such news imagery inevitably also raises questions about its own active role in staging the encounter between western publics and arriving migrants: who are the arrivants and what are they depicted to do? In public debate as much as in scholarly research, news photojournalism has been criticized for routinely portraying migrants as victims or threats and their hosts as aid-providers or security actors (Benson and Wood, 2015; Chouliaraki and Zaborowski, 2017; Musarò and Parmiggiani, 2017; Nikunen and Horsti, 2013). As a sufferer, the migrant is usually framed through aid interactions with her or his rescuers while, as a threat, the migrant appears in militarized representations of dark-skinned men entering the border (Little and Vaughan-Williams, 2017). In both cases, the migrant is predominantly anonymous, ahistorical and speechless. It is through the recurrent use of specific symbolic tropes that this effacement of migrant agency takes place. These include collectivization, the portrayal of masses of destitute people on boats or at the border (supported by the use of vocabulary such as ‘surge’, ‘tide’, ‘influx’ and ‘overflow’, as discussed by Abid et al., 2017); silencing, the marginalization of migrant voice in favour of elite voices (Georgiou, 2018; Nikunen and Horsti, 2013); and de-contextualization, the lack of insight into their histories, trajectories and emotions (Berry et al., 2015; for the three tropes, see Chouliaraki and Zaborowski, 2017). Whether suffering or menacing, then, migrants are placed within what Vaughan-Williams (2015) terms a ‘zoopolitical’ imagination that undermines their humanity and deprives them of the capacity to meaningfully act upon their lives.

This co-existence of victimhood and threat in news photojournalism of the migration ‘crisis’ reflects and reproduces the broader geo-political framework wherein the ‘crisis’ has acquired its dominant political meaning – what critical migration and security studies refer to as ‘humanitarian securitization’ (Chouliaraki and Georgiou, 2017; Vaughan-Williams, 2015).
RECOMMENDED EXCERPT:
Page 128 (“During the winter, Jakleen and Mariam…) – Page 130 (“…would they find there?”)

In the early days of December 2015, Thorpe notes that the sisters from Iraq, Jakleen and Mariam, could not focus on their work “because their hearts were not in Room 142.” Their best friends, Haifa and Noor, had just started the long journey from Damascus to Germany and were about to attempt a boat crossing over the Aegean Sea.

In September 2015, a photograph of 3-year-old Alan Kurdi, who died during a similar attempt, made global headlines and prompted intense debate (as demonstrated in these three readings). The discourse started by this photograph was in full swing as Haifa and Noor prepared to leave Turkey. “Jakleen and Mariam knew that thousands of people had died attempting to cross the Aegean,” Thorpe writes. “[E]motionally, the girls might as well have been en route to Germany themselves.”

WRITTEN ANALYSIS AND/OR DISCUSSION:

Compare and contrast these three perspectives on the photojournalistic coverage of the refugee crisis. What is the position or argument put forth in each article? How are these positions argued (with which frameworks, evidence, assumptions, etc.)? Where do you see overlap or consensus? Where do you see discord or disagreement? After you stage a conversation between these texts, join it. What might you add to this conversation?

Use this activity to discuss synthesis and expectations for college projects (e.g., students move beyond summarizing academic discourse into joining it through sound argumentation).
Pedagogies of Radical Hope: Funds of Identity and the Practice of Literacy in New Arrival Programs

In 2016, Junot Díaz published a widely read letter in The New Yorker in which he referenced philosopher Jonathan Lear’s discussions of radical hope:

Radical hope is not so much something you have but something you practice; it demands flexibility, openness, and what Lear describes as “imaginative excellence.” Radical hope is our best weapon against despair, even when despair seems justifiable; it makes the survival of the end of your world possible. (4)

As teachers, we are privileged witnesses to radical hope each day; it is among our students’ greatest strengths, regardless of background. The art of teaching is in our capacities to unlock radical hope and build contexts that allow it to flourish.

Nevertheless, this kind of work is never easy; to see students’ radical hope, teachers must have their own. The profession of teaching has little space for conversations about despair; we are reluctant to discuss, much less write about, instances when our work is painful, when we’ve struggled immensely with our pedagogies, assumptions about our connections with students, and tensions with colleagues or contexts, especially when we cannot offer useful solutions. In 2015, we worked together in a South Australian classroom with a group of twelve adolescent newcomers who had limited access to formal education prior to arriving in Australia. Our despair emerged in the seemingly impossible endeavor we faced: to reconcile what Brian Street defines as literacy as a social practice that values reading and writing as “rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, and being” (“What’s ‘New’?” 77–78) with an international culture of schooling that views literacy as an isolated set of skills “defined and performed in education” (Street, “Society” 221). Sometimes, this tension got in the way of our abilities to witness radical hope in that little classroom. That year, our conversations became our “best weapon against despair” (Díaz 4), and they have continued over the past two years, demanding “flexibility, openness, and ‘imaginative excellence’” (Díaz 4), even though we were in geographically separate and newly challenging contexts. The result of those conversations is this article; it hinges on the simple reminder, in these isolationist times, that our experiences as ELA teachers are not unique. Engaging in the intellectual dialogue surrounding teaching and learning, regardless of our fears and time constraints, is the uniquely transformative piece.

Here, we offer two honest snapshots of literacy classrooms in Australia and the United States where adolescents were learning to read and write for the first time in their lives, in spite of their trauma, informed by their experiences of forced migration, and in rejection of the deficit labels they have been given. We interrogate the in-between space where Moisés Esteban-Guitart and Luis Moll write that “funds of knowledge become funds of identity” (33) and unpack the challenge teachers often face in connecting students’ accumulated “bodies of beliefs, ideas, skills,
and abilities” (43) with the practice of teaching school-recognized literacy. To do this, we must see literacy as an expansive practice. Lew Zipin writes that teachers often build curricula around students’ “light” funds of knowledge but resist working with “dark” or disturbing pieces from students’ lifeworlds (318). In the two contexts we write about in this article, students brought “dark” knowledge with them; they knew about and navigated violence and forms of exclusion that we could never imagine, but they also knew love, camaraderie, and forgiveness. What mattered was how we, as teachers, privileged both of these “ways of knowing” (Zipin 318) as fluid parts of literacy as a social practice and one that is “defined and performed in education” (Street, “Society” 221). These are windows into what it’s like to be teachers, researchers, and students in contexts where “dark” and “light” funds of knowledge are integral in the practice of literacy as a means of negotiating identity.

BRONWEN’S STORY

My school in South Australia is a New Arrivals Program (NAP). In Australia, the New Arrivals Program is a federally funded, short-term, intensive English program for all school-aged newly arrived refugee or migrant students. We pride ourselves on our compassion and skill, particularly in working with students who have little or no prior formal education and who may have experienced significant trauma and dislocation. In 2016, we enrolled approximately 160 adolescent Syrian refugees whose needs were enormous; the students’ energy levels were high—this resulted in lively classrooms, passionate discussions, and, at times, violent conflicts, including serious self-harm and, inevitably, they had been stigmatized and labelled. These ways of being were part of their dark funds of knowledge; they had spent their lives fighting and now, in the context of school, we were asking for that behavior to quickly end. The first weeks were incredibly difficult; the students were angry about being singled out, at being labelled “the crazy class.” Much of what we tried didn’t work; two of the students were suspended for fighting within the first week. In my journal, I wrote: “Do I really think I can stem this with cups of Milo, toast, and kindness?”

COURAGE: LETTING GO OF THE KNOWN

As a school, what we did was courageous and innovative; we threw out the curriculum and standard classroom expectations and created a special class catering specifically to the needs of these students. As one of the two teachers for this class, I had to relinquish my go-to strategies from years of working with new arrivals and be willing to try anything that worked. My practice wasn’t artful; it was a reactive scrabbling for handholds in a landscape unfamiliar and tricky—the kind of practice that evolves when every day you are hitting your absolute limit. In this “unmapped territory” we built strong relationships, through a focus on strengths, and particularly on the students’ powerful cultural traditions of hospitality. It was not, however, a smooth ride.

The first dragons that we encountered were mine—my trepidation about managing extremely challenging and, at times, violent behaviors; my concern that misogyny would render me, as a female teacher, ineffectual; my reluctance to let go of the comfort of a curriculum that told me where to go. These particular students had been the perpetrators of violence in our school; they had engaged in significant self-harm and, inevitably, they had been stigmatized and labelled. These ways of being were part of their dark funds of knowledge; they had spent their lives fighting and now, in the context of school, we were asking for that behavior to quickly end. The first weeks were incredibly difficult; the students were angry about being singled out, at being labelled “the crazy class.” Much of what we tried didn’t work; two of the students were suspended for fighting within the first week. In my journal, I wrote: “Do I really think I can stem this with cups of Milo, toast, and kindness?”
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Abstract The number of refugees worldwide has increased exponentially in recent years, and children represent more than half of the refugee population. The needs of refugee children are complex. Many have traumatic experiences and disrupted education, and are then tasked with adapting to a new culture. The literature emphasizes the importance of education in determining the future of young refugees and its potential to transform lives for those who have access to it. This article will focus on the right to education and social inclusion of refugee children in the school system from a human rights perspective. The author proposes that schools play a critical role in helping refugee children find some sense of safety and helping maximize their learning potential. This human rights and social inclusion approach requires active participation from government, school administration, the ESL and mainstream teachers, the social workers, students and their parents, refugee students and their parents, and the community to partner together to create an environment for active learning and socialization for productive citizenry in the USA. The author maintains that social work is in a unique position and suggests strategies that facilitate a broader effort toward social inclusion which is vital to the well-being of refugee children and allows them to become an integral part of society.
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Globally each year, millions of individuals and families flee their native countries to find safety in other nation states. They escape because their governments will not or cannot protect them against human rights abuses. These refugees have a legitimate fear of being persecuted because of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group. The United Nations Refugee Convention signed in 1951 defines a refugee as a person who, because of fear and persecution, leaves their country of nationality and is unable or unwilling to access for himself the protection of that country (United Nations 2016). Resettlement in another country provides a durable solution for refugees unable to voluntarily return home or remain in their country of refuge (United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Development Program 2015, p.46).

Presently, the refugee crisis is at an all-time high since World War II. Due to civil war, violence, persecution, environmental disasters, poverty, and food scarcity, the number of refugees worldwide has increased exponentially. Each day, 42,500 people leave their homes to seek protection from conflict and persecution. They settle either within their countries’ borders or in other nations (United Nations 2016). Approximately half of all refugees are children under the age of 18 (Save the Children 2016; United Nations 2016) and all have the right to quality education.

For many refugee children, this new identity in a new culture is often associated with past traumas. In addition to the traumatic transition in a new environment, many refugee children have to cope with trauma from past experiences and the impact of displacement. They have experienced traumas such as disruption of their daily lives, the loss of their home countries, separation from their families, and food scarcity. Many have witnessed violence and death. The very nature of being a
refugee implies having one’s life—including one’s cultural environment—upended. It implies a transitory lifestyle in which there exists a great deal of uncertainty (Lerner 2012).

The application for refugee status is a rigorous process, especially in the United States (US), and it is extremely stressful for children. The initial trauma, the eventual move to safety, and the resettlement in a new country each bring different challenges (Fazel and Stein 2002). Many refugee children bring these past experiences and mental health issues with them into the school environment. Sirin and Rogers-Sirin (2015) found that almost half of the surveyed Syrian youth refugees experienced symptoms of PTSD. Refugee children, and their parents, have experienced unimaginable losses; many of them have actually witnessed the destruction of their homes and communities, and the injuries and deaths of friends and family. Often they have made a rapid descent into poverty, leaving everything they owned behind (Meda, Sookrajh and Maharaj 2012). Their entire way of life destroyed, flight to another country is the only option. Once they cross an international border, they find themselves detained, often for years, in refugee camps where years of school can be lost altogether. Sidhu and Taylor (2012) point out that prolonged periods in refugee camps may have devastating effects on their educational levels. In the US, they are often placed in lower grades that are not age-appropriate, causing more social isolation and humiliation.

Education in resettlement for refugee children has other challenges as well. They arrive at odd times during the school year with no records of their academic histories, upsetting teachers who are taken aback at their sudden appearance in the classroom. Many of those teachers feel resentful about the extra responsibility of teaching them (Bacakova 2011). Understandably, the statistics on school dropouts for refugees are also not very good. They tend to fall behind, and 25 % of those who are foreign-born drop out of school altogether (Kugler 2009). Refugee children are also victims of bullying in the schools. Hart (2009) describes how many refugee children start out believing that the time before their flight from home was a period of “persecution and danger,” and that the time after their arrival would be a “safe haven,” only to discover that in resettlement, they are not safe at school and feel threatened by their peers (354–355). Such impediments make assimilation, and therefore quality education, more difficult to attain.

Human Rights Watch (HRW 2015) emphasizes the importance of education in determining the futures of young refugees and its potential to transform lives of those who are able to access it. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) refers to education as “a right through which other rights are realized” (UNHCR p.18). Since education has rehabilitative and restorative properties, it can lead to positive outcomes for individuals, families, communities, and societies. Furthermore, UNHCR underscores that education is a human right to be realized and cultivated in any situation, even when refugees are in crises (UNHCR 2011, p. 9). Thus, education is not a luxury to be put on hold during times of displacement but an essential component of life for refugee children. Since refugees are often on the move, the effects of their access to education are far-reaching. “The quality of education refugee children receive in exile determines their ability to contribute to their home and host societies” (UNHCR p. 8). This report emphasizes that education is often a primary concern of refugee families—“The provision of educational opportunities is one of the highest priorities of refugee communities” (UNHCR 2011, p. 8). For many refugees, the USA is and has been a beacon of hope to begin a life with new opportunities, including access to an inclusive learning environment.

This article will focus on the right to education and social inclusion of refugee children in the US school system from a human rights perspective. The concept of social inclusion (Lyons and Huegler 2012) was defined in 1995 as “the capacity of people to live together with full respect for the dignity of each individual, the common good, pluralism and diversity, non-violence and solidarity, as well as their ability to participate in social, cultural, economic and political life” (UN 1995, p. 39). The World Bank (2013) underscored that social inclusion is both an outcome and a process of improving the terms on which people take part in society. The author proposes that schools play a critical role in helping refugee children find some sense of safety and helps maximize their learning potential. This human rights emphasizes a social inclusion approach that requires active participation from government, school administration, the ESL teachers, teachers, the school social worker, students and their parents, refugee students and their parents, and the community. Ideally, these forces would partner together to create an environment for active learning and socialization for productive citizenry in the US.

Social workers are in a unique position to create an environment of social inclusion where all students are respected and encouraged to meet their full potential (Koran 2015; Save the Children 2016). There is very little social work literature that addresses the right to quality education for refugee children through social inclusion. The micro/macro social work lens helps to facilitate a process of adaptation for refugee families to transition to a new culture, while respecting their traditions and addressing their challenges. Often, social workers are the bridge to advocate for children and families to work through their crises by their supportive counseling, case management, and policy advocacy functions in schools, communities, and political arena. Social workers play a key role in developing policies and programs that can influence social inclusion within educational systems.

The author explores strategies used in Hartford, CT, and suggests ways in which schools in urban settings, along with public officials, families, and communities help refugee students get a quality education. Enhancing the experiences of
Section II: Critiquing the State’s Role in Educational Policy and Politics
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Abstract
Despite the central role schools have played in the resettlement of refugees, we know little about how principals, teachers, parents, and staff at community-based organizations interpret and negotiate national immigration policy and state education policies. Combining critical discourse analysis (CDA) and actor-network theory (ANT), we capture how these actors work together and against each other to enact supports with regard to these newcomer students. Data includes a 36-month ethnography of refugee networks in Arizona. We argue that policies around English language acquisition and academic support further isolate refugee students and diminish their formal learning experiences in the United States.
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Introduction
More than half of the world’s 21.3 million refugees are under the age of 18 years. Since 1975, roughly 3 million refugees have resettled in the United States.
States—37% are school-aged children between 5 and 18 years, and an estimated 1.2 million refugee youth attend schools across the United States. Refugees are distinct from other ethnic minority groups because of their interrupted education, high levels of experienced trauma, and uncertain citizenship status (Dryden-Peterson, 2016). Refugees are also distinct from other immigrant groups and on average have less overall education and English language training (Dryden-Peterson, 2011). Although refugee youth also suffer from poor mental and physical health (McBrien, 2005), many speak multiple languages, come from families and communities rich in cultural assets and resources (He, Bettez, & Levin, 2017), and are eager to learn once resettled in the United States (Koyama, 2015).

U.S. school districts, though, are challenged to serve refugee youth under existing policies and programs steeped within global discursive climates that demonize migrants, in general, and refugees, specifically. Refugees have been metaphorically referred to as “‘swarms’ and ‘marauders’ who threaten to ‘flood’ Western countries in an attempt to ‘sponge off the welfare system’” (Esses, Hamilton, & Gaucher, 2017, p. 87). In the United States, the federal government has reduced refugee admissions and put forth a series of Executive Orders aimed at stopping the entry of travelers and refugees from particular countries deemed “dangerous” by the administration. Such discourses and actions construct refugees as “threatening national goals” (Aleinikoff, 2017, p. 3). Yet, contrary to national policy rhetoric and actions, the U.S. Refugee Act of 1980, Public Law 96-212 states that refugee youth should be enrolled in schools as soon as possible, usually within the first 30 days of their arrival. Although refugee resettlement agencies are accountable for meeting the mandates of the Refugee Act, refugee children are often denied access, opportunity, and quality school opportunities.

Barriers to refugees’ legal right to attend public schools is of particular concern in states such as Arizona, where the Governor continues to support a ban on Muslim refugees and much of the state’s populace supports nativism and protectionism. Several Arizona laws, including Senate Bill 1070, allow any law enforcement official to determine the immigration status of an individual during a routine stop, detention, or arrest (for a discussion of Arizona anti-immigrant legislation, see Campbell, 2011). Understanding how schools and school districts in Arizona enact policies that function to marginalize, assimilate, or accommodate refugee youth offers an important window to understanding broader national and international efforts to support the wellbeing and resettlement of refugees.

Drawing on a 36-month ethnography of refugee networks in Arizona collected between December 2013 and January 2016, we examine how formal school actors (such as, principals and teachers), parents, and staff at
community-based organizations (CBOs) make sense of and negotiate national immigration policy and state education policies. Framed by critical discourse analysis (CDA), bolstered with the conceptual resources of actor-network theory (ANT), we trace how policy actors, in and out of schools, work together and against each other to enact policy. Because the actors are drawn together from disparate organizations with varying aims, resources, and motivations, they selectively appropriate state policies to meet their needs. Capturing the shifting and precarious moments of authority, consensus, and contestations in policy and politics across Arizona, we demonstrate how specifically the policies around English language acquisition and academic support, in fact, further isolate the refugee students and diminish their formal learning experiences in the United States.

**Critically Examining and Interrogating Policy**

We situate this study within Critical Policy Analysis (CPA; Diem, Young, Welton, Mansfield, & Lee, 2014; Dumas, Dixson, & Mayorga, 2016). CPA departs from traditional “what works” orientations to policy studies and instead explores how policies reproduce or challenge prevailing societal and educational inequities (Diem et al., 2014; Webb & Gulson, 2015). Whereas prior policy studies investigated questions of policy implementation (Odden, 1991), CPA explores how actors appropriate and variably enact policy and how these enactments influence the distribution of policy resources, values, and knowledge (Ball, 1995; Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009; Werts & Brewer, 2015). Levinson et al. (2009) make important distinctions between official, often government-generated, policy and informal policy by conceptualizing policy as an ongoing sociocultural “practice of power” (p. 767). They demonstrate how policy circulates in multiple directions and becomes fragmented and localized into activities and practices that construct nonauthorized policy. Actors creatively appropriate policy, adapting and selectively incorporating particular policy elements and practices, creating new norms overtime that ultimately change local policy. The aim of CPA then is to analyze how power is embedded in these collective practices, which sustain or interrupt status quo social and material relations of power.

In general, CPA offers more expansive notions of policy texts and policy actors. In fact, those, such as teachers and school administrators, who in previous policy studies would have been seen as policy implementers, are restituted as policy makers in CPA. Several studies in educational leadership exemplify this perspective. Focusing on the ways in which educational leaders act explicitly and purposefully as policy actors, Carpenter and Brewer (2012) conceptualize leaders as “savvy participants,” able to
Readings | Education, Pedagogy, and Policy
Suggested Activities & Questions for Discussion

WRITTEN ANALYSIS AND/OR DISCUSSION:

Option 1 (Using 2 or 3 of the readings)—Compare and contrast these three scholarly articles on educational policy and pedagogical practices for newcomer students. What is the position, practice, policy, or argument put forth in each article? How are these positions argued (with which frameworks, evidence, assumptions, etc.)? Where do you see overlap or consensus? Where do you see discord or disagreement? After you stage a conversation between these texts, join it. What might you add to this conversation?

Use this activity to discuss synthesis and expectations for college projects (e.g., students move beyond summarizing academic discourse into joining it through sound argumentation).

Option 2 (Using 1 reading)—Identify a main idea from the reading—a policy suggestion, pedagogical practice, argument, etc.—and locate an excerpt from Thorpe’s The Newcomers that illustrates, supports, or complicates this concept. How might the interactions & teaching strategies seen in Room 142 speak to broader issues and concerns in education?

Use this activity to discuss synthesis and expectations for college projects (e.g., students don’t only compare and contrast assigned texts but must actively make new connections).

RECOMMENDED EXCERPT & DISCUSSION:

**Spring: Chapter 5, “Qalb” (Page 249 – 268)**

- How would you classify the strategies used throughout the academic year by Mr. Williams and other teachers for newcomer classes? Are these strategies effective? Why or why not?
- In “Qalb,” Thorpe notes how “becoming too close to your subjects is discouraged” in journalism because the journalist might lose their objectivity (pg 255). Earlier, in “Well-Taped Boxes,” Mr. Williams acknowledges that it sometimes helps his teaching to not know their families’ stories. “I know them as learners,” he tells Thorpe (pg 191). Both moments demonstrate a fragile line between Williams’s and Thorpe’s desire to develop genuine connects with their students/subjects as people and their responsibilities as teacher/journalist. How do you feel about this division? What are the benefits of maintaining distance & objectivity? What are the benefits of crossing over that line (pg 255)? What are the drawbacks or limitations?
- Throughout the book, Thorpe identifies the factors that affect newcomer students’ success in the classroom. What are these? How do you see these concepts illustrated by the various students of Room 142?
Questions for Discussion

• What did you already know about this book’s subject before you read this book? What new things did you learn? What questions do you still have?
• What do you think about the author’s research? Was it easy to see where the author got his or her information? Were the sources credible?
• What did you like best about this book? What did you like least about this book?
• What feelings did this book evoke for you?
• Why do you think this book may have been chosen as this year’s One Book Selection?
• What could you relate to from the book? What was harder to relate to?
• If you got the chance to ask the author of this book one question, what would it be?
• How did the arrival of Lisbeth affect the classroom? Why?
• What are some strategies Eddie Williams and Helen Thorpe used to build rapport with the students and their families? Which did you find to be the most effective? Why?
• How do Helen Thorpe and the students build rapport with people from other countries, despite language barriers? Why did these strategies/approaches work?
• Throughout the book, Helen Thorpe claims that high school students and teenagers are the same everywhere. What does she mean by that? Do you agree?
• How does Christina, the 21-year-old informal interpreter from Burma, affect Thorpe’s understanding of Room 142?
• In “Qalb,” Thorpe notes how “becoming too close to your subjects is discouraged” in journalism because the journalist might lose their objectivity (pg 255). Earlier, in “Well-Taped Boxes,” Mr. Williams acknowledges that it sometimes helps his teaching to not know their families’ stories. “I know them as learners,” he tells Thorpe (pg 191). Both moments demonstrate a fragile line between Williams’s and Thorpe’s desire to develop genuine connects with their students/subjects as people and their responsibilities as teacher/journalist. How do you feel about this division? What are the benefits of maintaining distance & objectivity? What are the benefits of “cross[ing] over [that] line” (pg 255)? What are the drawbacks or limitations?
• A very basic definition of ideology from political scientist Nancy Love is “An idea system that seeks to (1) explain how things are and how they should be; and (2) influence
members of a community through those ideas.” Ideology has at least four functions: it provides shared meaning, justifies action or behavior, legitimizes systems, and socializes individuals. Can you identify the appearance of ideology in Thorpe’s narrative? Where and how is Thorpe seeking to explain how things are and to influence readers?


From www.HelenThorpe.com/Guide

- Why did the author choose to situate herself inside Room 142? What takes place in that classroom and in the United States over the course of the 2015-2016 school year?
- The classroom is occupied by one teacher, a paraprofessional, a therapist, and twenty-two students, in addition to the author. Who were the main characters of the book, in your mind? Why did the author focus on those individuals? Who was your favorite character and why?
- In addition to spending time inside the newcomer room at South High, the author also spends a lot of time visiting several families at home. What did you learn by being offered a view into the homes of these families?
- What does it mean to be an “unaccompanied minor” and what does it mean to seek “asylum” in the United States? What is the difference in legal terms between an immigrant, a refugee, and an asylum seeker?
- How do the students in the classroom “map” the global refugee crisis as a whole, as the author says? Did the US play a role in these displacements?
- How did your sense of the students change over time? What was it like for the students when they first arrived? How did they evolve?
- Why did the author choose to put herself into the narrative? What purpose did that serve? As the author mentions, her family immigrated from Ireland. How did the author use her personal story in the narrative? Did she have feelings about the students and their families? How did the author manage the tension between trying to be a reliable observer and bearing witness to stories that moved her?
- Why did Eddie Williams teach in an English Language Acquisition class? What kind of teacher was he? How did his background affect how he behaved in the classroom?
- Did you have a favorite passage in the book? Which one, and why?
- At one point, the author visits the Congolese family, and after some conversation, both the father and the interpreter turn to stare at her. The author says she felt as if they were thinking, ‘What are we supposed to do about the terrible innocence of Americans?’ What did she mean by that phrase? What do Americans not know?
- How did this book leave you feeling about refugees? Should the United States accept more refugees for resettlement? How did the author handle the political backdrop, and did you feel she was fair-minded? Do you agree or disagree with current policies on refugee resettlement in the US?
Writing Prompts

SHORT-ANSWER PROMPTS

• Why did the author choose to situate herself inside Room 142? What takes place in that classroom and in the United States over the course of the 2015-2016 school year?
• Why did the author focus on those individuals? Who was your favorite character and why?
• Which countries are represented in Room 142? Which countries in the world send the most refugees to the United States?
• In addition to spending time inside the newcomer room at South High, the author also spends a lot of time visiting several families at home. What did you learn by being offered a view into the homes of these families?
• What happened in Iraq, and in Syria, that resulted in Ebtisam and her three children arriving in the United States?
• What happened in the Democratic Republic of Congo that resulted in Tchiza, Beya, and their nine children arriving in the United States?
• The classroom also includes two students, Hsar Htoo and Kee Reh, whose families originally fled from Burma (Myanmar), although both of those boys were born inside refugee settlements in Thailand. What led their families to flee Burma?
• Why are Lisbeth and Saúl in the United States? How did their journeys from El Salvador differ from the other students that the author focuses on?
• What does it mean to be an “unaccompanied minor” and what does it mean to seek “asylum” in the United States? What is the difference in legal terms between an immigrant, a refugee, and an asylum seeker?
• How do the students in the classroom “map” the global refugee crisis as a whole, as the author says? Did the US play a role in these displacements?
• Why did Eddie Williams teach in an English Language Acquisition class? What kind of teacher was he? How did his background affect how he behaved in the classroom?
• How does Christina, the 21-year-old informal interpreter from Burma, affect Thorpe’s understanding of Room 142?

ESSAY PROMPTS

• The classroom is occupied by one teacher, a paraprofessional, a therapist, and twenty-two students, in addition to the author. Who were the main characters of the book, in your mind? Why did the author focus on those individuals? Who was your favorite character and why?

• In addition to spending time inside the newcomer room at South High, the author also spends a lot of time visiting several families at home. What did you learn by being offered a view into the homes of these families?

• How do the students in the classroom “map” the global refugee crisis as a whole, as the author says? Did the US play a role in these displacements?

• How did your sense of the students change over time? What was it like for the students when they first arrived? How did they evolve?

• Throughout the book, Thorpe claims that high school students and teenagers are the same everywhere. What does she mean by that? Do you agree?

• Why did the author choose to put herself into the narrative? What purpose did that serve? As the author mentions, her family immigrated from Ireland. How did the author use her personal story in the narrative? Did she have feelings about the students and their families? How did the author manage the tension between trying to be a reliable observer and bearing witness to stories that moved her?

• Did you have a favorite passage in the book? Which one, and why?

• At one point, the author visits the Congolese family, and after some conversation, both the father and the interpreter turn to stare at her. The author says she felt as if they were thinking, ‘What are we supposed to do about the terrible innocence of Americans?’ What did she mean by that phrase? What do Americans not know?

• How did this book leave you feeling about refugees? Should the United States accept more refugees for resettlement? How did the author handle the political backdrop, and did you feel she was fair-minded? Do you agree or disagree with current policies on refugee resettlement in the US?
One Prompt
RESOURCES
The Prompt

To write *The Newcomers*, Helen Thorpe spent a year inside Denver’s South High School documenting the lives of twenty-two refugee and immigrant students enrolled in Eddie Williams’s English Language Acquisitions class. Of the students, Thorpe writes, they “walked into [Williams’s] room dazed at the abruptness of the transition, looking profoundly lost. And then they started over—started to figure out where they were, started to wonder who he was, started to ask whether to call this place home.”

Inspired by *The Newcomers*, this year’s One Prompt asks you to consider: What does it mean to belong to a community? What does it mean to be on the outside? Thorpe’s investigation reveals that welcoming a newcomer into an existing community and of *being* that newcomer are interconnected and challenging experiences. The reward, as both Williams and Thorpe describe, is “greater fluency, better understanding.”

Think of a time when your community welcomed a newcomer. Tell a story about this experience that considers multiple perspectives—including both your own and that of the new member of your community.

TIPS:

- Be creative with how you imagine “community” (e.g., a classroom, a sports team, hobby group, neighborhood, family structure, online community, workplace, congregation, etc.).
- Use narrative devices to render your story—characterization, dialogue, imagery, figurative language, scene setting, exposition, etc. Provide context—set the scene and establish relationships.
- Keep it simple. Your story doesn’t need a “profound” plot; in fact, something “small” (some slice-of-life vignette) might make for a more engaging narrative.
- Choose any genre and/or mode to share this story. In the past, responses to the prompt have been rendered as podcasts, plays, poems, songs, spoken word performances, graphic narratives, paintings, etc.
Readings

**Please Note:** The materials gathered here are intended to facilitate conversation regarding storytelling, narrative journalism, agency & empowerment through storytelling, the One Prompt, and the act of creating the prompt response. In some cases, the materials provided are only a preview of a longer PDF available in a OneDrive shared folder: FSEM & One Book Faculty Resources. Please visit www.dufsem.com/one-book/ for folder access (login required).


Page 99: Online Archives: Refugee Story Collections from Non-Profit Organizations

Page 100: Questions for Discussions

“[Mr. Williams] wondered, for example, what effect I might have on his students. Sometimes [he] and I stepped upstairs to the second-floor copy room, where teachers and paraprofessionals went to make photocopies or to eat their packed lunches, and we talked about my role in his classroom. ‘I think it helps them, to tell their stories, don’t you?’ he mused one day. And I could hear, behind the simple-sounding melody of his assertion, the harmony of a real question in his voice. ‘Maybe—it depends,’ I answered. ‘Some of them have lived through traumatic things, and they might not want to tell their stories. That’s fine. I would never push them to say more than they want. They have to feel empowered by the act of telling their stories.’” (pg. 23)
ON HURTING PEOPLE’S FEELINGS:
JOURNALISM, GUILT, AND AUTOBIOGRAPHY

CAROLYN WELLS KRAUS

On the back wall of the Sistine Chapel, in a dark corner of Michaelangelo’s painting of the Last Judgment, the apostle Bartholomew clutches an empty human skin. Flayed from the head to represent the saint’s martyrdom, the limp skin dangles, a shocking contrast to the mass of muscled, curving forms that dominate the fresco.

The shadowed image reminds me of a scene in Annie Dillard’s *Pilgrim at Tinker Creek*: a giant water bug attacks a frog and sucks its innards out, the skin collapsing like a kicked tent and drifting slowly to the bottom of the pond. Dillard evokes the scene sporadically in her book as an emblem for the essential estrangement of human experience from the world of nature.

These images came to mind on a cold December midnight when I picked up the phone to hear a hoarse voice whisper “Slut!” and then a click. Late the next night, the call came again—and again and again over the next month. Of course, I was terrified—terrified not only because this man had made me his demented project, not only because my life might be in danger, but also because the late-night caller preying on me could have been any number of my own victims.

My job consists of sucking people’s guts out.

Of course that’s not my job at all. I am a journalist. I tell other people’s stories, give them voice. I write with compassion and empathy. Forging people’s stories under the powerful label of “nonfiction” is a means of telling people they are not alone in the human comedy. “When I read your story,” a reader once wrote to me, “I recognized my own situation. I thought, ‘maybe I’m not just slime in the bottom of a jar.’” These are the elements of my job that don’t trouble the soul.

I try to be an honest journalist. I don’t misquote people, invent scenes, or forge composite characters. I agonize over contexts and triple-check my
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facts. Still, people I write about get angry for reasons that are difficult for them to explain.

Undoubtedly, reducing a person’s story to words on a page robs it of complexity. Subjects may perceive a gap between what they meant and how their exact words sound on the page. Perhaps those characters bearing their names are people they cannot recognize, or people who come to stand—in the stories—for ideas they never thought about. Reading about themselves in print is rarely the experience that people expect it to be. This is the story that journalists don’t tell.

* * * * *

In my early years as a Detroit magazine writer, I gained a local reputation for depicting the strangeness and varieties of human obsession. When my readers found someone with an eccentric claim to fame, they made sure I heard about it. Perhaps once a week a reader would write or call me at the editorial office. “There’s a drive-in exorcist operating in mid-state, just west of Nirvana. Why don’t you check it out?” someone wrote, enclosing a news clipping. The subjects of my articles began to read like a rogue’s gallery:

— the zoo director with his treatises on endangered species and his zeal for personally administering euthanasia to animals in his care.

— the leader of an international and highly organized anarchist network.

— the prominent naturalist who mined bat guano and sold it to marijuana growers in California.

— the artist (of the naive school) who encrusted the facades of houses with colorful debris: an aesthetic statement that drew rats and picketers to his Detroit neighborhood.

— the suburban guru who gathered his minions each Sunday and prayed into a Delco truck battery, storing up the “prayer energy” and releasing it on mountaintops during international crises. (“We’re pretty sure,” he had confided to me, “that we helped a lot during Chernobyl.”)

Perhaps my midnight telephone calls had come from the disgruntled genius who billed himself in press releases as “the smartest man in southeast Michigan—available for parties.” He was one of only two Mensa turncoats, he claimed, who had tested high enough to qualify as members of G.O.D.s (Geniuses of Distinction), an honor he shared with syndicated genius Marilyn vos Savant. Though Mensans loved the article and offered me an honorary
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membership in a local chapter (proposing to waive the IQ exam), both G.O.D.s were miffed.

People who hated me? I couldn’t even rule out the Cardinal. Only a month before, I had interviewed Detroit’s Edmund Cardinal Szoka. He was a pale, bald man in flowing white robes and glasses that magnified his eyes, making them appear enormous. Earlier in the year, the Cardinal had ordered the closings of forty-three Catholic churches in Detroit. He’d insisted the move would consolidate and revitalize the city’s dwindling parishes whose churches had been operating over the last two decades primarily as missionary outposts in neighborhoods that were poor, black, and mostly non-Catholic. But many in the beleaguered sections saw the closings as a ploy to withdraw their priests and plug them into affluent parishes in the suburbs.

Besieged by reporters and feeling wounded by the ensuing criticism, the Cardinal had retreated to his chambers. He was granting me his only interview in months, he told me, because I represented a magazine he read and trusted. In fact, as a freelance journalist who worked for many publications, I’d conscientiously written some of the offending newspaper articles myself, but he hadn’t recognized my name when I arrived to interview him on a different subject.

“Newspaper reporters,” he said ruefully. He stared at me until I nodded.

Passively, I’d allowed a sense of us vs. them to develop as the Cardinal railed against my colleagues, “the press.” Then, gliding to a file cabinet, he extracted an article about his church closings, clipped from The New York Times. As he dangled it like a dirty diaper, I glimpsed the familiar satirical image of scattered rosary beads that had accompanied my own article. My skin went clammy. I held my breath. “Put It Back,” I silently prayed, as if my guilty prayers could help me here. And, miraculously, he did put it back, still shaking his head at the injustice of the assault as his assailant exhaled and collapsed into the depths of the sofa.

The article the Cardinal had brandished before me with such displeasure was one of my better efforts, timely and well researched. One stranger’s injuries had seemed a small exchange for its socially provocative message. Yet here was the deflation of a man’s spirit, and I had caused it. It always relieved my guilt when my victim’s humiliation turned to anger.

* * * * *

You write something, knowing that people are going to be angry, and they are. Every journalist, wallowing in defensive misery, knows this. Every nonfiction writer I know has a hidden pile of mea culpas—like a Detroit magazine editor’s story about attending his high school reunion, describing how a whole
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This article brings an anthropological approach to bear on the question of ‘children’s voices’ and, particularly, on the stories told by some young migrants about their recent arrival as asylum-seekers in Britain. Young migrants’ narratives are examined as situated and self-conscious claims to a certain identity as child refugee. The question of why a particular narrative of ‘arrival in Britain’ was offered by a diverse group of young migrants and asylum seekers is discussed. These stories present a view of their tellers as alone and irreconcilably detached from past lives and relationships. These narrative repertoires as well as their telling draw from and elaborate certain views of the ‘proper refugee child’ that circulate through various regimes of immigration, welfare and emancipatory community work that all involved these young people. An approach to the stories as accomplished as well as situated performances that collapse the ordinary division between stories as ‘facts’ or ‘fictions’ is introduced. In this sense, the ‘children’s voices’ heard in this study are recognised as situated and interested products of a research relationship.
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Introduction

Maureen was already waiting for me when I arrived, early, to meet her at her aunt’s bare flat. The conversation between the young teenager and her aunt, in Somali, suggested that the hour or so that Maureen was to spend with me had placed unreasonable demands on her aunt. I offered to reschedule our meeting but Maureen’s aunt politely gestured her approval of my visit. Maureen, by now clearly anxious at the prospect of taking time out to spend with a relative stranger and researcher, assured me of her aunt’s blessing. ‘Auntie says that we have to tell people how difficult things are for here, how we have nothing here, how we are staying without help and alone. She says that it is better for a child to report this’. (Field notes, spring 2003)

For every story that sees the light of day, untold others remain in the shadows, censored or suppressed. (Jackson 2001, p. 11)

This article examines one way that some young immigrants in Britain participate in the construction of a series of recent perspectives on childhood and, particularly, on refugee childhood through personal stories and storytelling. An anthropological approach to the young people’s stories seeks to interpret, first and foremost, these practices form the point of view of the young people themselves.

The study takes as its starting point the question of why a culturally and socially heterogeneous group of young asylum-seekers should tell ‘how I am getting on in Britain’ in
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remarkably similar terms. Each story focused on young migrants’ experiences of arrival as a stark and absolute dislocation from past lives and previous relationships, a point of radical personal transformation and enduring isolation. The study reflects on the production of stories as ‘dramatic moments’, both meaningful and strategic performances that were shaped and circulated with a careful eye to what was necessary and convincing.

The argument is divided into five parts. First, the context and purpose of the research with young immigrants is described. Second, a theoretical perspective on narrative practices and the politics of representation is introduced. The merits of a recent anthropological development in approaches to narrative as summative performance are discussed. Third, the major themes emerging from the narratives are identified and examined. The story themes and practices are rooted in a series of views on ‘the refugee child’ that circulated through regimes of immigration, welfare and emancipatory community projects. Finally, the anthropological contribution towards the study of young migrants’ stories is highlighted. An anthropological view of narrative as dramatic practice avoids a view of stories as ‘either fact or fiction’; the anthropological method approaches such practices as socially situated claims of the moment.

The research context and the collection of young peoples’ stories

The collection of some personal narratives from young people staying as refugees in south east England was initiated in the final months of a larger EU Daphne funded project organised between the four ‘port’ regions of Europe (Spain, Germany, Britain and Sweden) during 2002 and 2003. The project brief was to compare and contrast the national and regional immigration and welfare policy structures that directed the life chances of young migrants. From the outset the British and Swedish project partners were concerned at the lack of involvement of young migrants themselves and, in the final weeks of the project, these research partners were able to undertake a very brief study to gather the views of some of these young people.

Given the time constraints and the exploratory nature of the study, the research objective was modest: to collect and analyse some young migrants stories about their life situations in their host society. My research informants were seven young refugees who were already known to me (personally or though friends or colleagues), who were resident in south east England and who happened to be aged between 11 and almost 18 years. My informants were asked to tell me about their lives as recent immigrants to Britain and it was suggested that they might be able to organise their ideas around the question ‘how am I getting on in Britain?’

My informants included two siblings born in Kosovo who had arrived as young children with their parents eight years previously and who were full refugees; two teenage boys from Albania who had arrived, unaccompanied, in the UK during the previous year and who were then accommodated by the Local Authority and awaiting outcomes of Home Office decisions on their refugee status; two Southern African teenagers who had each moved to the UK several years previously and who were staying with relatives whose own entitlements to stay in the UK appeared to be uncertain; and a 14-year-old Somali girl who had arrived in the UK the previous year to stay with a maternal aunt (who was a full refugee). In all, then, my informants were a diverse group of young people and all had some direct or indirect experience of the immigration process in the south east. They had arrived in the UK for a variety of different reasons, from different home countries, social class and family backgrounds; they had declared entry to the UK at different times (between 9 months and 8 years) previously. They had also taken various routes from home countries or through other European ports to arrive here. They also occupied different positions within the immigration and welfare systems, not least because some were part of families and others were lone migrants. However, all were engaged, directly or through close family members, in various statutory and voluntary sector services for refugees or asylum seekers within the south east. Also, all were, or had recently, faced the struggle to establish
themselves as legitimate refugees through both Home Office applications and later appeals. All the young people were also busy with the continual tasks of persuasion: they felt that the majority of educational and welfare workers were always doubtful of them being ‘real refugees’.

During the research, the two or three meetings held with my informants lasted between 20 minutes and 2 hours, were loosely structured and directed by participants themselves. All but one initial meeting were conducted in participants’ homes or lodgings while subsequent meetings were organised around social activities chosen by the young person. These activities included time in a coffee shop; visits to the beach; a window shopping trip; help with homework and sharing a small family meal.

It soon became clear that all of my research participants wanted to describe ‘how I am getting on in Britain’ in a particular way: their stories stressed the stark and dramatic contrasts between ‘life here and now’ and life in ‘past times and places’. These before/after stories raise the empirical question of why this diverse group of young migrants with different histories of arrival and relationships to homeland would tell a common story of radical and irreconcilable social dislocation.

Before the central themes and social contexts of my informants’ stories are considered more closely it is important to develop a view of the processes and products of young migrants’ narrative from within the rich body of available narrative theory.

**Narrative practice and the politics of representation**

Narrative approaches, including that adopted in this brief project, have a particular appeal in research with children and young people. They readily combine the ‘new orthodoxy’ of childhood studies that recognises and values ‘the child’s voice’, with an interpretive paradigm that recognises the partial and situated quality of research knowledge (Reeves 2007).

For various reasons, the telling of personal or collective stories is often a powerful aspect of experiences of migration. Jackson notes that the immediate refugee experience tends to generate an acute self-consciousness: the loss of relationships, possessions and home are circumstances where ‘any inner reflections on who one is eclipsed by the external definition of what one is in the eyes of others’ (2002, p. 68; original emphasis). Stories of migration might also circulate through and beyond migrant communities as a means of taking stock, bearing witness, shaping new forms of social identification or composing coherent versions of self and social experience against a turbulent past and uncertain future (O’Neal 1999).

Narrative researchers agree that stories do not so much reveal ‘the truth’ as craft it in a particular way. Stories are not transparent media for the communication of facts: they inevitably reduce experience to representational frameworks that carry value in particular contexts and for particular people (cf. Bruner 1986). As one of several ways of representing past experiences and events, certain narrative repertoires can become media through which tellers both express and negotiate their experiences and views from a particular social, cultural and moral vantage point. At the same time, several narrative repertoires, culturally respected ways of telling, can coexist in any society and, sometimes, for a single individual. Such repertoires are informally learned and selectively practiced by those occupying particular structural positions; they contribute towards the development of particular subjectivities as well as to collective histories of unity and difference.

The purposes and effects of storytelling, or of the elaboration of a particular narrative repertoire, are likely to be various and manifold. For example, certain stories at certain times carry therapeutic potential: they become a way of imposing order on disruptive and distressing events and experiences (Becker 1997). At other times narratives carry a more obvious rhetorical weight and exercise a political claim to certain reputations, resources or relationships. We refashion our experience and learn to tell it in ways that are recognisable and valid to
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Mercy Corps

“We asked refugees: What did you bring with you?”

Mercy Corps is a global team of humanitarians who partner with communities, corporations and governments to transform lives around the world.

Our mission: to alleviate suffering, poverty and oppression by helping people build secure, productive and just communities.

Their Story is Our Story

Their Story is Our Story is a 501(c)3 Non-Profit Organization under the United States Internal Revenue Code.

We gather and share first-hand refugee stories to reveal the individuals behind the “refugee” label and cultivate meaningful relationships with those seeking refuge locally so that, together, we can help build strong and inclusive communities worldwide.

Become part of the story. Get involved at https://tsosrefugees.org
Questions for Discussion

ICE BREAKER:

• What & whom did you write about? Why? — this question would allow them to talk about their prompt without having to share the intimate details of it or immediately share their creative works. It also reveals something about themselves & their identity—a community membership.

SMALL GROUP QUESTIONS:

• How did you approach your response to the shared prompt? Why this community? Why this newcomer? Why use this genre? Why use this tone/style?
• What was the most challenging part of creating your prompt response?
• What was the most rewarding or interesting part of creating your prompt response?
• If you were to continue working on your prompt response,* what might you revise, rethink, or develop?
• When have you been a newcomer in a community? What was that experience like?
• Does your prompt response illustrate or connect to a broader issue?
• What do you hope an audience would take away from your prompt response?

*This is a good plug for “Encountering Stories” and Many Voices, One DU
We are pleased to announce our **Call for Submissions** for the fourth annual celebration and showcase of first-year writers’ responses to DU’s *One Book, One DU* shared prompt.

We welcome *One Prompt* responses in all genres—including multimodal texts (e.g., songs, videos, graphic arts/comics) and spoken performances—by first-year students. If your work is accepted, it will be displayed at the showcase event on **Wednesday, October 30th from 6pm–7:30pm** in the AAC Special Events Room. Five authors will be invited to read or perform their work at the event. Submissions will also be considered for publication in *Many Voices, One DU* volume 4 (authors notified of publication in early January 2020).

**Submission Guidelines:**

1. Responses may be submitted electronically (by students or by instructors on behalf of students) to the selection committee at **OneBook@du.edu**.
2. Authors must be DU first-year students responding to the *One Prompt*.
3. Submissions must also include the following information:
   - **Subject Line of E-mail:** Name & “Encountering Stories Submission”
   - **Body of E-mail:** Name, FSEM Instructor, & Full Title of Submission
   - **Attachment:** Your Response to *One Prompt*. Written submissions should be Microsoft Word documents. Visual submissions can be sent as PDFs. Audio and movie files may need to be sent as a link.

**Submission Deadline:** **Sunday September 15th by 6pm**

**e-mail:** OneBook@du.edu

---

**CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS**

**Encountering Stories:**

a showcase of the *One Book, One DU* shared prompt responses

**event held on Wednesday, October 30th @ 6PM**
The University Writing Program and DU IMPACT 2025’s One Book, One DU present our annual call for submissions for a university anthology:

**MANY VOICES, ONE DU**

*Volume 4*

To write *The Newcomers*, Helen Thorpe spent a year inside Denver’s South High School documenting the lives of twenty-two refugee and immigrant students enrolled in Eddie Williams’s English Language Acquisition class. Of the students, Thorpe writes, they “walked into [Williams’s] room dazed at the abruptness of the transition, looking profoundly lost. And then they started over—started to figure out where they were, started to wonder who he was, started to ask whether to call this place home.”

Inspired by *The Newcomers*, this year’s One Prompt asks you to consider: What does it mean to belong to a community? What does it mean to be on the outside? Thorpe’s investigation reveals that welcoming a newcomer into an existing community and of being that newcomer are interconnected and challenging experiences. The reward, as both Williams and Thorpe describe, is “greater fluency, better understanding.”

Think of a time when your community welcomed a newcomer. Tell a story about this experience that considers multiple perspectives—including both your own and that of the new member of your community.

Submission Deadline: December 1st

e-mail: OneBook@du.edu

visit du.edu/writing
visit du.edu/onebook
The Prompt:

Think of a time when your community welcomed a newcomer. Tell a story about this experience that considers multiple perspectives—including both your own and that of the new member of your community.

Tips:

- Be creative with how you imagine “community” (e.g., a classroom, a sports team, hobby group, neighborhood, family structure, online community, workplace, congregation, etc.).
- Use narrative devices to render your story—characterization, dialogue, imagery, figurative language, scene setting, exposition, etc. Provide context—set the scene and establish relationships.
- Keep it simple. Your story doesn’t need a “profound” plot; in fact, something “small” (some slice-of-life vignette) might make for a more engaging narrative.
- Choose any genre and/or mode to share this story. In the past, responses to the prompt have been rendered as podcasts, plays, poems, songs, spoken word performances, graphic narratives, paintings, etc.

We welcome responses to the prompt from all members of the DU community—undergraduate students, graduate students, alumni, staff, and faculty. And because stories come to us in many forms, we want to celebrate the many print genres in which they are told: nonfiction essays, poetry, photographic essays, graphic arts, etc.

Submitting:

Please e-mail your response to the prompt to OneBook@du.edu by end of day on Sunday December 1st, 2019. We are happy to address any questions or concerns you may have about the prompt and the publication of Many Voices, One DU. Selected authors will work with an editorial team during the Winter 2020 quarter. The book will be launched in May 2020.

In your e-mail, please indicate your affiliation with the University of Denver (e.g., staff, alumni, graduate student, undergraduate student, or faculty) and include the title of your submission.

To view previous issues of Many Voices, One DU, please visit:

Volume 1—www.issuu.com/DU_Writing_Program/docs/mvod2017
Volume 2—www.issuu.com/DU_Writing_Program/docs/mvod2018
Volume 3—www.issuu.com/DU_Writing_Program/docs/mvod2019

Submission Deadline: December 1st
e-mail: OneBook@du.edu