

they came from. I was confronted with how little I knew of the history of their regions, and the dynamics out of which their suffering exploded into a horrific violence that pierced the peace of a great and vibrant city, throwing a nation into fear. I listened closely to the words of bin Laden, and as the days passed and delivered us into a war waged under false pretences, I felt the room for dissent close around me. It became more difficult to announce how much sense bin Laden's words made to me, and what I was learning from them. Some of us were trying to address the important question: "Why do they hate us?" In the absence of any dialogue with those involved in or in favor of the 9/11 attacks, in the presence of state narratives that were largely based on lies and conscious efforts at social deception and manipulation of public opinion, it remains important—even ten years later—to carefully study the words of bin Laden who did offer his own perspective. We can listen to his words not to support his perspective; it is not to be a subversive to the U.S., or anti-Israel, or to endorse the use of violence or the attacking of civilians. It is to try to understand a perspective rather than to disappear it, so that we might be able to mitigate against the conditions that were part of what fed the anger and the eventual violence.

In his "Statement to the 'Infidel' Nations" on October 7, 2001, bin Laden inquires whether the American people can ask themselves "why all this hate against America and Israel." At the top of his list of American offenses is its role in the creation of Israel, what bin Laden calls "a continuous crime for 50 years." Next, bin Laden claims that 9/11 resulted from Americans supporting the government policies toward Israel and the empowerment of dictators. He applauds the fear created by 9/11, claiming that this is a little of what Islam has been tasting for the last 80 years. He says that we in America "will never dream," "never taste security and safety" unless Palestinians and Muslims feel security and safety in their lands. In other speeches, bin Laden makes it clear that 9/11 was also a violent blow back for U.S. military being too near to Islamic holy sites, our intrusiveness into Arab affairs, and our colonizing of Islamic cultural space.

Critical inquiry to discern repeating dynamics of problematic situation: Forced displacement

In his list of concerns bin Laden not only sees us being where we should not be (militarily present in other people's lands), but supportive of the forced displacement of Palestinians. To listen to this with the ear of history, we cannot help but hear the repeating chords in our nation's history that effect tragic forced displacements, chords that continue to sound in present policies of detention and deportation of largely Mexicans.

America as a nation was built on forced displacements and the derogation and often death of those who resist. Perhaps one reason we have been so supportive of Israeli policies of occupation and displacement is that we have so normalized and neutralized them in our own whitewashed history. Our national history is full of genocide and displacement of native peoples, the displacement of Africans for the slave trade, and then, after slavery, their forced displacement from communities through methods of terror (lynchings, burnings of businesses and homes) and systematic withholding of justice and equality.

To this list we must add the displacement of Mexicans from their national land in 1848. The land grab allowed believers in manifest destiny to have America own all the land "from sea to shining sea." They felt justified in using terror to forcibly displace

The Shame of Forcibly Displacing Others: 9/11 and the Criminalization of Immigration

Mary Watkins*
Pacifica Graduate Institute

What are psychologies of liberation?

Jesuit and social psychologist Ignacio Martín-Baró (1994), who worked for justice and freedom from violence in El Salvador, first named "liberation psychology." He was assassinated in 1989 by paramilitary forces trained by the United States. Through the exercise of prophetic imagination, liberation psychologies hold open the possibility of a world, of regions, of nations, communities, families, and psyches that are graced by increasing justice, peace, and sustainability. Their orientation begins with deep listening into people's experiences in the face of injustice, violence, and environmental degradation, and proceeds to collaborative critical inquiry to discern the dynamics that reproduce these conditions. This requires deconstructing dominant histories that distort the past and perpetuate injustice, profiting those who hold more power. People's histories are supported. This opens the way to create and undertake actions that can transform pernicious dynamics into ones that can be generative of—in Freire's (1989) words—a "world in which it will be easier to love" (24).

The arts are used to express the current dilemma, to empower artists and their audiences to see through lies and distortions, to announce forgotten history, to name and image their experiences, present its dynamics, and to imagine a world otherwise. Psychologies of liberation (Watkins and Shulman 2008) pay attention to the intrapsychic structures and affects that are residues of oppression for victims and perpetrators (and all those lying between these poles), outlining how they can be metabolized to create new forms of relations unmarked by the misuse and abuse of others. In this paper I will work from the fear occasioned by 9/11 to its misguided fueling of the criminalization of migrants who have been scapegoated. I will end with a consideration of the restorative potentialities of shame at displacing others.

Listening

First, for me—and I suspect for many of you—the actions of the perpetrators of 9/11 exposed how deeply I had not been listening to the experiences of those in the area of the world

bin Laden asks why the American government is "supporting the rotten governments of our countries." Ten years later this sentence strikes a much more familiar note, as we watch the present administration hesitate to support Arab pro-democracy protesters, fearful of losing the dictators who have accommodated American military and economic interests.

those of Mexican descent, including U.S. citizens, from the broad swath of what had suddenly become the United States. The lynching of Mexicans¹ and the burning of their homes and businesses were the methods of terror used to forcibly displace entire communities. Their history and pueblos were steadily removed, erasing Mexicans' former rightful claims.

In a remarkable sleight-of-mind, Mexicans are now seen as illegal intruders and aliens. Many Americans feel entitled to use migrants' labor when it suits them, denying them the rights given to citizens, and then self-righteously arguing for their forcible extrusion when it is convenient due to economic downturns.

Out of the fear that was engendered by the attacks of 9/11, the United States heightened attempts to secure its borders. The earlier effort to do this was begun in earnest in 1994 in concert with the passage of NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement. This agreement flooded the Mexican market with U.S. corn, made cheap by U.S. government farm subsidies. It undercut the price of Mexican corn, the country's staple crop, and led to the bankruptcy of millions of small farmers. While Mexican government corruption has also contributed to the hunger of millions of Mexicans, it is important for Americans to know that our own governmental policies contributed very substantially to the magnitude of the migration from Mexico that is now being complained of. This includes our failures to legalize drugs and to create adequate gun control policies. These failures create much of the violence in Mexico from which citizens are having to flee. Mexicans were also drawn to the border region to work in massive manufacturing plants that were set up in the newly created free trade zone. As capital shifted to areas of the world with cheaper labor, Mexican workers were stranded in a place far from home but close to the United States and it is hardly surprising that they came north to feed and sustain themselves and their families.

Re-definition of the migrant "Other" from one who belongs to a criminal thief

Liberation psychology tracks the ways we define the other and ourselves, knowing these definitions are prone to manipulation for self-serving ends. Before the Great Depression Mexicans were valued for their labor and their purported attributes. They were compared favorably to Asians and Eastern Europeans on the grounds that they were not aspiring to become citizens, and so would not drain the resources of the U.S. Their allegiance lay with Mexico. They were not seen as communists, and thereby not feared to create political unrest. Once the Depression hit, the United States sponsored the mass expulsion of immigrants. While Mexicans in the 1930s were only 1% of the immigrant population, they were 50% of those formally deported, and 80% of "voluntary" departures (Flores 2003, 363). Lisa Flores (2003) states that while the overt rhetoric for the deportation drive at that time was job scarcity, its underlying agenda was to create an atmosphere of fear that would produce massive voluntary repatriation. There are estimates that a half million Mexicans and Mexican Americans repatriated out of fear of the hostile anti-Mexican climate that was cultivated during the 1930s by media and government. This number included U.S. citizens of Mexican descent.

As Flores (2003) describes in her review of how Mexicans were portrayed in the media of the early 1930s, there were two prevailing narratives about Mexican workers in the U.S., one characterizing them as fulfilling a national need, and the other as constituting a national threat. When Mexicans were viewed through the lens of national need, they were hardly seen as valuable and precious individuals. Mexicans were seen as "peons," with qualities of docility, lack of ambition, ignorance, agreeableness, easily controlled as workers, comfortable with submission to authority, timid, painfully eager to conform, and well-behaved. They were purported to be only interested in earning a scant amount of money to provide for their own meager support and entertainment, and that they were eager to return home. Taking over the society was not on their minds, in contrast to the purported "yellow perils" from Asia and the Eastern Europeans who were presumed to be communists. The narrative of threat, on the other hand, emphasized Mexicans appearing in unexpected parts of the United States and beginning to settle there, challenging the sense that they were only interested in being temporary workers.

Mexicans, says Flores (2003), had been able to live in a space "outside the national body" (373) while in the U.S.

Increasingly the media seized on the narrative of threat, providing rhetorical arguments that served as a back-up to the use of police and immigration officials (Flores 2003). While Mexican laborers may have temporarily benefited from being positively compared to the Chinese, who were banned through the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, the same kind of racism that gave rise to that act soon bore its strange fruit in efforts to exclude Mexicans from the racial composition of American life. The same characterizations that had demeaned Chinese immigrants now came to rest on Mexican immigrants: disease-ridden, criminally disposed,

drug-dependent. The same population of Mexican laborers that had been lauded for their hard work and docility were transposed through the narrative of threat to "imported vermin," "alien dope dealers," communists, and dangerous and menacing criminals. Those promulgating such rhetoric seized the power to shape discourse about the permissible and impermissible roles for Mexicans in U.S. society, and to figuratively re-inscribe the border between "Americans" and "Mexicans," neglecting those many citizens of Mexican descent.

What is of particular note about this period for our own is the way in which entry into the United States became conceived of as criminal. The emphasis on criminality and the criminalization of entry combined to provide a rhetorical space in which the Mexican body became a criminal body (Flores 2003, 376).

Once entry became criminalized by categorizing it as a felony, the term illegal alien became more commonplace. People without documents who had criminal histories were confused in the public imagination with Mexicans who had entered without documents but who had worked hard and made many contributions to their local American communities. Flores (2003) reports how the Mexican immigrant is imagined as stealing into the nation, as a burglar would steal into a home: "Their theft included the taking of jobs and other limited resources from deserving Americans" (377). "The conflation of criminality and immigration status positioned Mexicans as



Triple wall construction on the U.S. side of the San Diego/Tijuana, Mexico border.

part of the problem and the solution” (377). Citizens who were Mexican American were swept up in the deportation drive and deported illegally. Social service agents warned Mexican families to depart voluntarily before they were deported and barred from re-entry later. Cities passed legislation barring Mexicans from employment on state and federally funded projects. In the 1920s poor Mexicans were seen as particularly prone to tuberculosis and infestations, and were subjected at the border to degrading rituals of cleansings, line inspections while naked, and spraying with DDT. Other nationals and Mexicans who arrived in first class train compartments were spared these humiliations.

The complex questions of what had caused the Depression, of who and what were responsible for the unemployment and misery that resulted, were answered summarily: Mexicans. Similar things are happening now. Once again Mexicans are being defined out of the national body by right-winged media, local legislation, and a corporate-state run detention and deportation system that is greedy for Mexican bodies and the profits from their imprisonment and forced removal from the U.S.

Frantz Fanon (1967) described colonialism as a “systematized negation of the other, a frenzied determination to deny the other any attribute of humanity” (182). Sadly, Mexican migrants in the United States still find themselves derided and reduced: “lazy,” “stupid,” “docile,” “dirty,” as “aliens,” “invaders,” “squat little Indians,” “animals,” “vermin,” “cockroaches,” “criminals,” “lawbreakers,” “diseased,” “parasitic,” “mongrels,” “half-breeds,” “ignorant,” “peons,” “bastards,” “greasers.”³

Following 9/11 the Immigration and Naturalization Service—do note the word “service”—was placed under the umbrella of “homeland security.” This created a category confusion that has caused much suffering for some, and much profit for others. The category confusion is that migrants and supposed terrorists were fused into a single category, criminalizing the approach to migrants. The propaganda that resulted from this fusion insisted that our borders needed to be tightened and further defended to protect us from terrorists. Please note that all those involved in the 9/11 attacks entered the country legally and on airplanes. To date not a single terrorist has been captured trying to cross the border between the U.S. and Mexico. The fusion of categories of migrants and terrorists, however, has led to increased xenophobia, calls for removal of people without documents, more border wall building, and increased surveillance of the border. How handy that as migrants are conceived as criminals and Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE) is given authority to create raids, that there are companies ready to build the facilities needed to house and imprison the laborers before their deportation.

The federal government pays approximately \$85-\$135 a day to the municipality housing each migrant. Some counties have found the detaining of migrants to be an acceptable approach to balancing their failing budgets. In a report by Amnesty International (2009), Santa Clara County in California was found to have built detention facilities for this express purpose. Some counties whose city jails have unfilled beds can get federal monies if those beds—jail beds—are filled with migrants on their way to deportation.

ICE created three categories to sort through migrants rounded up in raids, the first described as being for “your rapists and murderers,” the second for more minor offenses, and the third those without any criminal record at all. Municipalities without free beds in their prison and detention system house many of those in categories one and two. Unfortunately, the more beds for rent a municipality has, the more people in category three are detained and deported—innocent people.

Last year, 2010, nearly 400,000 people were detained and deported, half of them having committed no criminal offense. Indeed, most of these people have worked hard under inhospitable circumstances—low wages, few rights, denial of paths to citizenship, and surveillance.

The same corporations responsible for building the inhumane prisons in the U.S. that punish and control through isolation have found a new market niche: the detention of poor Mexicans. Corporations like the Corrections Corporation of America are building detention facilities all over America to enjoy considerable corporate profits and to construct the deportation pipeline that rids our communities of those we have now defined as criminals. Each migrant deported costs taxpayers \$12,500. What it costs migrants is incalculable, in terms of separation of family members, loss of livelihood, and living daily with fear, anxiety, and uncertainty. Young adult immigrants who grew up in the United States since they were babies are returned to a country they never knew, and to a language which is not theirs.

If you protest your deportation and request additional hearings, you must stay in detention facilities longer. It is only when you agree to deportation that your imprisonment as if you were a common criminal can end, once you get past the border. In Chicago the detainees are clothed in orange jumpsuits and placed in the Cook County jail along with criminals. When they are transported to the detention and deportation processing facilities and to the airport from the six states that house them in jail and detention facilities, they are leg and hand shackled, and placed in small cells within a bus that is painted so

that you cannot see in. They are taken onto and off of the bus at the processing facility in the dark of early morning behind a fence you can no longer see behind.

Corrections Corporation of America was at the table when Russell Pearce in Arizona drafted SB1070, the contested law that invites racial profiling.

Those whose human value has been reduced to being cheap labor now suffer the additional burden of being criminalized in order for the nation to support their forcible displacement once again; in effect, the second displacement that our nation has imposed. The category confusion between migrants and criminals is complete in many parts of the United States. It is a category confusion that is familiar to us not only from Mexicans’ history in the U.S. but also from that of Chinese and Japanese.

As the migrant has been linked in the public imagination to the criminal and the terrorist, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has morphed into a part of Homeland Security and Immigration Custom Enforcement. Civil rights have yielded to surveillance and enforcement. If security equals retaining excess privileges that includes being where others do not want you and removing at will others no longer wanted in your space, then there is no category confusion. A person who is a forced

The connections are clear between 9/11 and the building of detention facilities throughout the U.S. for Mexicans who have been placed in a deportation pipeline. When out of fear the U.S. post-9/11 moved to strengthen its borders, poor Mexican migrants and potential terrorists became part of the same imagined category of illegal criminals and terrorists who needed to be thwarted and removed. Those ready to profit from the burgeoning of a detention and deportation industry were quick to effect laws and budgets.

migrant has been turned into an illegal alien. A migrant is a terrorist. Migration itself is criminalized. This is the stuff of what is now called the Secure Communities Program. We need to ask ourselves if we feel more secure, and then turn to the question of what real security needs to be composed of.

We can turn to Asian American history for parallels⁴ to how NAFTA destroyed aspects of the Mexican economy leading to mass displacement and cheap labor. The beginning of large scale Asian migration was caused by colonialism. Because of a growing trade deficit from importing Chinese teas used to feed the workers on the production lines to fuel the industrial revolution, Great Britain came up with the idea of smuggling illegal opium into China which was grown by the British in India. When the opium was confiscated and burned by the Chinese, the Opium Wars were the pretext to gain control over the treaty ports. The Treaty of Nanjing (1842) with Great Britain and the Treaty of Wangxia (1844) with the United States led to foreign control of treaty ports such as Hong Kong to Great Britain and Macau to Portugal whose “spheres of influence” led to the “coolie trade” in Chinese and Asian Indians to replace the loss of enslaved African labor after the ending of slavery in the British empire. There are also parallels to be drawn regarding the race and ethnicity based criminalization and extrusion of immigrants, after their labor for the profit of others is no longer deemed desirable. After Chinese labor built the Transcontinental Railroad—the almost impossible engineering feat of laying track across the Sierra Nevada mountains—they were protected by the Burlingame Treaty (1868), which granted China the “most favored nation status”; however, when economic competition after the end of the Civil War was an issue, the U.S. passed the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, the first immigration law in U.S. history to target a group for exclusion by race and class. After the Chinese built the Transcontinental Railroad, the transportation which tied American together from “sea to shining sea,” this same railroad carried immigrants from the East Coast to displace the Chinese as well as Mexicans.

We can also turn to Asian American history to be inspired by the efforts to hold a government accountable for the withholding of civil rights from those who live within its borders. The apologies and reparation for the detention of Japanese Americans were hard won, and though inadequate, are impressive in the face of failures of national reparations for slavery and the injustices that continued beyond its formal ending.

Restorative shame

There is another contribution that some Asian cultures could potentially make to the present era of forced migrations to and from the United States. This concerns the constructive use of the experience of shame. Not all cultures cut themselves off from the learning that can happen when a psychic and social space is allowed for feeling shame. For the Maori people, shame is said to be one step removed from heaven. We are unfamiliar with what it looks like and feels like to allow ourselves to be suffused with shame in order to move toward greater compassion. As long as we avoid feeling and owning up to the shame that our actions have incurred, our compassion is like a shriveled or amputated limb. To learn to work with our shame would indeed allow us to feel the way it could be not an emotion that we loathe and avoid, but as a differentiated feeling that can be used to inform our basic stance toward others. Indeed, for shame not to predispose us to rage and violence we need to bring consciousness to it, and use it as a path to appropriate guilt, meaningful remorse, empathic connection, and more

caring, compassionate, and just treatment of others.

Hannah Arendt (2005) addressed shame in 1945, before the end of the war:

For many years now we have met Germans who declare that they are ashamed of being Germans. I have often felt tempted to answer that I am ashamed of being human. This elemental shame, which many people of the most various nationalities share with one another today, is what is finally left of our sense of international solidarity; and it has not yet found an adequate political expression. ...[T]he idea of humanity, when purged of all sentimentality, has the very serious consequence that in one form or another men must assume responsibility for all crimes committed by men and that all nations share the onus of evil committed by all others.” (121)

“Elemental shame” at the uprooting of others, those strangers far away and those neighbors close to home, needs to fuel our actions, and unlock our doors.

Nicholas Trist was sent to Mexico in 1847 as a peace commissioner. Before he began peace negotiations President James Buchanan ordered him back home, having decided he wanted even more land from Mexico. He wanted to send a tougher negotiator than Trist. Trist, with the support of General Winfred Scott, decided to continue. “The negotiations were difficult for Trist. He was aware of Mexicans’ humiliation and felt a strong sense of embarrassment. Trist himself knew that the war had been a pretext to seize Mexican land” (Acuna 2010, 51).

Trist wrote to a friend of the family upon his return:

If those Mexicans...had been able to look into my heart at that moment, they would have found that the sincere shame that I felt as a North American was stronger than theirs as Mexicans. Although I was unable to say it at the time, it was something that any North American should be ashamed of. (52)

We must write shame into our vocabulary for communal and psychological health, seeing it as a step toward living with others with more compassion and integrity. The shame caused to others inextricably seeps back toward the self.

There are sociocultural dynamics that mitigate against people being able to acknowledge shame. In considering Arendt’s work, Young-Bruehl (2009) underscores how feeling shame can be blocked by ideology. This is clearly the case in the United States today. We need to release ourselves from self-justifying approaches to history and find the means for nonviolently addressing shame, to appropriately give acknowledgment and apology for wrong doings, and make restitution for harms

committed. Acknowledgement, bearing of shameful feelings, apology, and restitution are the stuff of building authentic self-respect, of retrieving a sense of worth. These are the steps of reconciliation that can begin to reweave torn social fabrics.

To lock one’s door against a neighbor and his need causes shame for those on both sides of the door. Throughout the world today, in the face of forced migrations of unprecedented proportions, we can see these same efforts multiplied: to claim a place as belonging to us as we begin to define the other as not simply in our way, but as out of place, of not belonging in the very place to which they may have been before us. We

According to Jungian analyst Joan Chodorow (2009), in the Korean system of understanding emotions, shame is seen as a differentiated feeling as opposed to a basic emotion. “The *capacity to experience shame* ‘in recognition of one’s error,’ is the first of four noble qualities leading toward the development of compassion.”

see ourselves as better off without them, and through how we structure space as our own and begin to define the other as not simply in our way, but as out of place, of not belonging in the very place to which they may have been before us, seeing them as better off elsewhere and making this true through ill treatment and violence, overpowering their own efforts to find a place to be at home in the world.

It is by dint of brute power that America manages to not only claim the right to be a powerful force in other people's homelands but to define others as needing to get out of what we have conveniently and by force claimed as our own place, forgetting that it belonged to ancestors of these same others. Across the globe, uprooted by the effects of transnational globalization and its attendant violence and ecological devastation, people are having to leave their homes, communities, and families, and have become migrants.



“The Parade of Humanity” by artists Guadalupe Serrano and Alberto Morackis on the Mexico side of the U.S./Nogales, Mexico border.

My hope is that engendering restorative shame at a history remembered and taken to heart can be a positive force in how we greet and treat our neighbors.

* Mary Watkins, Ph.D. is Associate Chair of the M.A./Ph.D. Depth Psychology Program at Pacifica Graduate Institute, Carpinteria, CA. She co-directs the program's specialization in Community Psychology, Liberation Psychology, and Ecopsychology, and coordinates Community and Ecological Fieldwork and Research in that specialization.

Endnotes

1. For some sense of the scope of racist violence, between 1848 and 1928, it is estimated that at least 597 Mexicans were lynched. William Carrigan, “The Lynching of Persons of Mexican Origin or Descent in the United States, 1848 to 1928,” *Journal of Social History* (Winter, 2003).
2. G. Gordon Liddy describing Mexicans during his G. Gordon Liddy Show radio broadcast, July 6, 2010.
3. Poor Mexicans are subject to what anthropologist Nancy Scheper-Hughes (2007) calls “pseudo-speciation,” being considered a different species from those invoking the judgment. The negative judgments arising from this are used to refuse “social support and humane care” (178). Scheper-Hughes describes a continuum from everyday violence to outright genocide, all of which depend on “the capacity to reduce other humans to nonpersons, monsters, or things which give license to institutional forms of mass violence” (169). The current degradation of poor Mexicans in America is what she would call a “peacetime crime,” an “invisible genocide.”
4. I am grateful to Gary Mar for articulating these parallels to Chinese immigration.

References

- Acuna, R. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* (7th edition). New York, NY: Prentice-Hall, 2010.
- Amnesty International. “Jailed without Justice: Immigration Detention in the US.” www.amnestyusa.org/uploads/JailedWithoutJustice.pdf (October 10, 2009).
- Arendt, H. *Essays in Understanding, 1930-1954: Formation, exile, totalitarianism*. New York, NY: Knopf, 2005.
- Bin Laden, O. “Statement to the ‘Infidel’ Nations.” 2001. <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/binladen10-07-01a.htm> (March 4, 2004).
- Carrigan, W. “The Lynching of Persons of Mexican Origin or Descent in the United States, 1848 to 1928.” *Journal of Social History* 37 (2003): 411-438.
- Chodorow, J. “Soul’s Body: Emotions and Their Development.” Jung Memorial Lecture, Embassy of Switzerland, Washington, D.C., June 5, 2009, Jung Society of Washington.
- Flores, L. “Constructing Rhetorical Borders: Peons, Illegal Aliens, and Competing Narratives of Immigration.” *Critical Studies in Communication* 20 (2003): 362-387.
- Freire, P. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 1970. Reprint, New York, NY: Seabury, 1989.
- Martin-Baró, M. *Writings for a Liberation Psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Scheper-Hughes, N. “The Gray Zone: Small Wars, Peacetime Crimes, and Invisible Genocides.” In *The Shadow Side of Fieldwork: Exploring the Blurred Boundaries between Fieldwork and Life*, ed. A. McLean and A. Leibing. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2007.
- Watkins, M., Shulman, H. *Toward Psychologies of Liberation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Watkins, M. “Looking Both Ways at the Border: Upon Finding Oneself an ‘Other’.” Conference, “The Other,” The Malintzin Society, October 8-10, 2010, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Young-Buehl, E. *Why Arendt Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.