TRAVEL INSECURITY IN NORTH AMERICA: THE MEXICO-US BORDER

Geoffrey R. Skoll
Buffalo State College, USA
skollgr@buffalostate.edu

Abstract

Using the Mexico-US border, this article argues for an expanded definition of 'tourist' to include those who travel to produce, and not only to consume tourist attractions. Millions of people have crossed the Mexico-US border to contribute to productivity, and much of it their productivity supports the tourist industry in the United States. With this expanded definition, the article goes on to examine what this means for both kinds of tourists—leisure tourists and work tourists. It also describes the dialectic between the two and how that dialectic relates to the world capitalist system. Mike Davis (2005) called it The Great Wall of Capital. Teddy Cruz wrote of "an imaginary line along the U.S.-Mexico border and extending it directly across a map of the world, what emerges is a *political equator"* (2008: 111). Wendy Brown (2010) noted that walled states coincide with a global waning of state sovereignty in which states use fences and walls instead of recognized and legitimated authority to control their borders. At the same time, travel in general and international travel in particular feed what arguably has become the largest revenue producing global industry: tourism and hospitality.

Key Words: Tourism, Immigration, Hospitality, Security, Work, Leisure, Borders

Introduction

As of 2011 tourism has multiplied to include travel for medical care, travel for sex, and travel for empire, along with the more traditional travel for sightseeing, food and drink, or various forms of entertainment. Indeed, a postmodern blurring between business and pleasure has made problematic the routine question of border control personnel: "What is the purpose of your visit?" One kind of travel left out is travel for producing—that is work. Cruz' political equator and Davis' wall of capital parse people of the world into a binomial class system. Not surprisingly, the system corresponds to Marx's observation that capitalism eventually results in but two classes: capitalists and workers. In the twenty-first century, it translates into Immanuel Wallerstein's (2004) world system with a center and a periphery. The center refers to a center of capital, the global north. It relationship to physical geography is at best algorithmic. For instance, Australia, situated in the southern hemisphere remains

firmly ensconced in the global north. Certain developing countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and China are near north. Moreover, elites within many societies reside, in a political economic sense, in the global north, even though the country of citizenship is in the periphery, the global south. Nevertheless, in North America, the Mexico-US border marks both a geographic and political economic divide into north and south. Traditional tourism, tourism for pleasure, took its modern form with the rise and expansion of the bourgeoisie in the nineteenth century. By mid-twentieth century a burgeoning middle income population in developed countries (the capital center and global north) traveled for pleasure. During the same period, say from about 1850 to 1970, productive industries split between the center and periphery with manufacturing in the center and extractive industries including agriculture, in the periphery. This took the political form of neocolonialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the late twentieth century the pattern shifted. Manufacturing moved to areas of the world with cheap labor, lax environmental protections, and compliant political orders. In the United States, it took the form of deindustrialization, first in urban centers, and later throughout the entire country. Less and less was made in the United States as US based companies out-sourced and located factories in climes more amenable to profit. Transition from a Bracero labor pool to Maquilladoras signifies the economic transition. The Bracero Program, or guest worker program, began during US involvement in the Second World War as labor scarcity threatened war time production. It continued through the heyday of US manufacturing until it ended in 1964. Since the rise of neoliberalism and deindustrialization, the same companies that used to have factories and employ workers within the United States have found more profit in locating factories in Mexico, the original home of the term maquilladora, and similar periphery countries. Despite the shift in manufacturing, service industries remain within the metropole. The US—partially because of government subsidies to giant corporate agribusinesses such as ADM (Archer Daniels Midland), Cargill, and Monsanto—still needs agricultural workers. It also needs workers in hospitality industries and other service occupations such as cleaning, child care, and so on. Unlike the mid-twentieth century manufacturing occupations which gained protection from relatively powerful labor unions, agricultural and service workers in the United States get little protection, either from unions or politics. Consequently, service industry jobs tend to offer low wages, little or no benefits such as health insurance and pensions, and generally tend toward the exploitive end of US employment. It is here that work tourism manifests.

Working Class Tourism

Every year more than 60 million tourists cross the border from Mexico to the United States (USDHS 2010). They are documented in that they enter the United States with visas through border control checkpoints. Nonetheless, if they overstay their visas, fail to register a change of address, marital

status, employment status, or otherwise stray from immigration regulations, they become 'illegal aliens.' They become criminalized despite entering according to US laws and regulations. In addition, some half million people cross the border outside of regulations, usually avoiding checkpoints and without entry visas. They are undocumented, and therefore criminalized as soon as the step into the United States. They join 11 to 12 million other undocumented, criminalized residents within US frontiers (Passel and Cohn 2009). Most undocumented, criminalized, non-citizen US residents come from Mexico, some from other countries, to work in the United States. They are work tourists. But that is not what they are called or how they are known. More commonly, they are designated as undocumented, or illegal aliens. They also are subject to great risks and have little security. Ironically, much of their risk arises from securitization of borders of the United States. The divide between pleasure tourists and work tourists becomes visible in the hospitality industry and the US criminal justice system.

The first hazard faced by work tourists from Mexico is the border area itself. Of the half million who cross from Mexico to the United States annually, about five hundred die because of the crossing. Since they cannot enter through the check points they have to go around them. For many years, they circumvented the checkpoints with treks of a few miles and possibly wading or otherwise traversing the Rio Grande River. Especially after the attacks of September 11 (9/11), the US securitized the border. A notorious fence separates Tijuana and San Diego. It runs from Brownsville, Texas to San Diego on the Pacific coast. Beginning in 1990, the United States constructed the fences in sections and stages. At points triply reinforced steel and concrete, other sections are virtual. They use electronic sensing and surveillance monitors. The US Border Patrol, subsumed under the US Department of Homeland Security after 9/11, maintains flyovers and vehicular human surveillance. The Mexico-US 'fence' rivals and in many places surpasses the Iron Curtain era borders during the Cold War. What this means for those who want to work in the United States, usually at exploitive wages, is risk of death and injury. The casualties result from preventable injuries, although some rise to the level of negligent homicide, sometimes by Border Patrol, sometimes by US vigilantes, and sometimes by the contractors who covertly move the aspiring workers (Jimenez 2009). Using these approximations—five hundred deaths out of five hundred thousand—gives a death rate of one hundred per hundred thousand, which is many times the current US homicide rate of about 5.5 per hundred thousand.

Once in the United States, the workers face additional perils. One of these they share with eighty percent of all other US residents—border patrol search and seizure. Through administrative directive, not legislation, the US Department of homeland Security has extended border policing one hundred

miles inland. That is, the Border Patrol and allied police agencies can treat the region within one hundred miles of the border as if it were the border itself. Just as Border Patrol, customs agents, and similar enforcers can search and seize anything and everything from travelers within a border area, they currently have similar authority within one hundred miles of the border. The hundred mile limit includes not only San Diego and Brownsville, Texas, it includes all port cities—New York, Los Angeles, Seattle, Miami, and the other coastal cities along the oceans, but it also includes inland ports such as Chicago. Consequently, eighty percent of all US residents live in the border area. The American Civil Liberties Union calls it a "Constitution Free Zone" (ACLU 2006). Those persons without appropriate documentation are subject to arrest and detention under immigration law. Unfortunately for arrestees, immigration violations generally fall under civil law, not criminal so that Bill of Rights protections under the US constitution do not apply. Arrestees do not have the right to remain silent or the right to an attorney. They are subject to search, including strip searches, and anything found may be seized. They do not have the right to a speedy trial. They do not have the right to bail. All those protections in the Constitution apply to criminal, not civil proceedings (AI 2009). The threat of arrest hangs over the heads of all those who are undocumented as long as they remain in the United States without documentation.

Other hazards await. Housing and employment present risks beyond mere exploitation. Indeed, the exploitation should be assumed, but that is addressed later in this paper. Housing and employment have high risks from illness, injury, and even death. Substandard housing is the norm for undocumented workers. They arrive in the United States with little or no money. They usually find housing that is overcrowded and unsanitary. Because of their precarious legal status, they dare not seek relief from local housing and building enforcement agencies. Lack of heat, inadequate plumbing, and the like, present serious and continuing health hazards. Moreover, dilapidated conditions in housing can lead to accidents such as falls that may present hazard of serious injury.

The workplace poses disproportionate hazards for undocumented workers. In a very general sense, undocumented workers face greater risks simply because of their disproportionate employment in high risk occupational industries, especially agriculture. Agriculture and mining, the latter usually not a target of employment for undocumented workers, are perennially the most hazardous industries in the United States. Undocumented workers find employment in hazardous industries, and they tend to occupy jobs at low skill levels and correspondingly high injury risk levels, and they are least likely to enjoy protections from labor unions and government regulatory agencies such as state and federal occupational safety regulators. Undocumented workers tend to find employment in non-union

workplaces. Government regulatory agencies afford relatively less protection for two reasons. First, those agencies concentrate their scrutiny on companies and industries with high profiles such as transportation. Partially because they are high profile, undocumented workers avoid them because of their undocumented status. Secondly, regulatory agencies, usually understaffed and over burdened, tend toward reactive rather than proactive enforcement. That is, the regulatory agency investigates complaints. Undocumented workers tend not to file complaints for fear of discovery of their undocumented status, which may result in arrest, detention, and deportation. Recording this state of affairs remains difficult. The main, relevant record keeping agencies of the US government—Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), Centers for Disease Control (CDC), and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) cannot keep track of occupational diseases and injuries of undocumented workers because they cannot get the data. They can and do keep track by race and ethnic identities. The racial-ethnic identity they use is 'Hispanic'. Accordingly, Hispanics show disproportionately high, work related injuries and fatalities (CDC 2006, Mondragon 2011, Walters et al. 2002).

Everyday interpersonal crime plagues undocumented workers. Not inconspicuously, undocumented workers tend to reside in areas with relatively high interpersonal crime. Their subaltern class status and their need to evade law enforcement attention channel them to live in areas and neighborhoods with high interpersonal crime rates and low protection from police. A truism in US criminology circles is that low income, minority neighborhoods are both under and over policed. They are over policed in the sense that police focus arrest efforts in such locales. They are under policed in the sense that police are less responsive to the needs and requests of those who live in them. Both ends of this truism present perils to undocumented workers. For over policing, they are more likely to face arrest, detention, and deportation because of their effective criminalized legal status. They, not unsurprisingly, evade police contact, including and maybe especially, calling for police assistance or in reporting crimes against themselves or their neighbors. Therefore, their environs and their legal status make undocumented workers disproportionately vulnerable to interpersonal, criminal predation.

Leisure Class Tourist Fears Versus Working Class Tourist Realities

Tourist guides and handbooks typically include cautions about economic and physical victimization. It is assumed that tourists are charged higher prices by local merchants. Pickpockets, thieves, and swindlers stir tourists fears of robbery. Peter Phipps (2010) highlights two as representative: Wexco's *The Complete Traveler's Guide* and Peter Savage's *The Safe Travel Book*. They warn travelers about robberies, food and drink, and of course terrorist attacks. Phipps (2010:75) quotes from the Savage book.

In public spaces, such as a restaurant, sit where you cannot be seen from the outside and try to sit on the far side of a column, a wall, or other structure—away from the entrance. You must be inconspicuous, out of the line of fire and protected from any bomb blast. The same precautions should be taken at hotels, at clubs, and even sitting on the deck of a yacht. (Savage 1993:21)

How leisure class tourists must envy the working class tourists. While the former must seek out inconspicuous safety, the latter live it. In restaurants, hotels, clubs, and other hospitality establishments, the working class tourists remain back stage, to use a felicitous locution from Erving Goffman (1961, 1963). Of course, the working class tourists, especially if they are undocumented, seek to remain out of sight, but for different reasons—they wish to evade agents if ICE (the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement) as well as other authorities. In this they collaborate with their employers. The kinds of jobs they perform are out of view, because managers hide them from the view of customers. They work in kitchens, garbage disposal areas. They are the cleaning staff in hotels; present when guests are absent. They carry the crates of supplies unload the trucks, and generally do the 'dirty work' (Hughes 1958). The wait staff and bartenders mingle front stage, but the dish washers are invisible, at least to the clientele, and presumably would-be terrorists too.

Moreover, the working class tourists do not have to worry that some local sharp will take advantage of them. Their employers, landlords, and most everyone take advantage of them routinely. Based on estimates because no one can determine correctly and exactly, two-thirds of undocumented workers are paid less than the legally permissible minimum wage in the United States—in 2011 7.25 USD per hour. Not only do employers exploit them, governments also exploit them. Since employers have to report wages to state and federal tax authorities, the money they take out of their undocumented employees pay is more than they should. That is, the employer reports a wage of 7.25 per hour and takes out the appropriate tax, but pays only 6.00 USD per hour. The employer pockets the difference. Furthermore, social security tax is taken out of all employees' pay. Documented workers have a chance of receiving payments from the Social Security System, but those who are undocumented cannot (DMI 2009, Jaeger 2006, US Chamber of Commerce 2011).

The US Office of Tourism and Travel Industries reported that the tourism and travel industry contributed 1.1 trillion USD in 2010. Sixty million international travelers visited the United States bringing over one hundred thirty-four billion USD (USDC 2010). In the twenty-first century, tourism became the single largest industry in the world accounting for roughly 6 trillion USD world wide and

9 percent of the global gross product. Included in these figures are the earnings of migrant workers in tourism related businesses (WTTO 2011). Such an accounting leaves out a significant portion of the economic contribution. For the United States, in particular, it does not include the economic contribution of undocumented workers.

Undocumented workers produce value, just as do all workers. Nonetheless, their unaccountable legal status means that their contributions cannot be reckoned. Even their numbers are mere estimates. For instance, Passel and Cohen (2009) estimate their number at 8.3 million out of foreign born work force of 23.3 million and a total labor force of one hundred fifty-three million. Further complicating the picture is that both the workers and their employers, for different but related reasons, do not give an adequate accounting of their productivity. Certain industries in the United States probably act as central for undocumented worker employment. In addition to hospitality, they find work in agriculture and food processing, domestic labor, and construction. These occupations, especially for undocumented workers, share several characteristics. They remain relatively unregulated by agencies that might report the illicit status of the work force. The industries and the particular jobs performed by the undocumented workers are low skilled (Passel and Cohen 2009:12-16). The construction industry employs high skill workers such as electricians, plumbers, and pipe fitters, but these are highly regulated as licensed occupation and represented by strong craft unions of long standing. Typically in construction, low skilled work is performed by general laborers who are neither licensed nor represented by strong unions. Overall there are approximately 8 to 9 million undocumented workers, most of whom come from the global south and enter through Mexico (Briggs 2010). As noted above, most undocumented workers receive less than the legal minimum wage, but even at the minimum, and assuming full employment, it would put them only slightly above the poverty level of slightly over 11 thousand USD per year for an individual. For a family of four with two children, the poverty threshold is slightly more than twenty-two thousand USD per year according to the US Census Bureau. Moreover, undocumented immigrants in the United States have extremely limited access to social assistance, because of their legal status. They cannot obtain income assistance, food stamps, medical coverage assistance, housing assistance, heating assistance, or similarly government administered programs. They can usually obtain extra food from local, privately operated food banks, but not much more than that. Therefore, what undocumented workers contribute to the economy far exceeds what they consume. They are net producers of wealth and value to a far greater extent than most workers in the United States.

Borders

Structuralism offers a deceptively simple account of borders, boundaries, and the like. Building on the linguistic structuralism of Roman Jakobson, Claude Lévi-Strauss (1949, 1958) applied structural analysis in anthropology, especially the ethnology of less complex societies. An example is the distinction tribal peoples make between village and bush in which the former is socialized space and the latter is wild, unsocialized. Nomos were early boundaries and borders administrative units within the Egyptian state beginning in predynastic times (c. 3100 BCE). They also served a similar function in Ptolemaic Egypt. The ancient Greeks had nomes, which also demarcated sub-state administrative units. Nomos and nomes contained the administration of law and justice. Carl Schmitt (1950), using a tortuous interpretation of a rather straightforward history, used the concept of nomos to argue against democratic government and in favor of a unified sovereignty. In ancient times, his conceptualization of politics, government, and law would be subsumed under the rubric of tyranny. In the twenty-first century various self-identified left intellectuals recuperated Schmitt's thinking. They apparently aimed at a critique of the new form of empire, which in current, realistic terms is the imperial, hegemonic United States. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1986) argued for an understanding of nomos and a militarized form of government. Their prescription was eponymously the title of their book: nomadology, which signifies transgressing boundaries, mainly by evasion—an approach not dissimilar to the strategy of undocumented workers crossing the Mexico-US border.

Borders and boundaries appear in psychological and sociological thought somewhat differently than in political applications. In the sociological sense, Peter Berger (1967) explained the boundaries among people and portions of social interaction in terms of norms—that is, rules of behavior. Treating the social as process means that society and its parts are continually created and recreated. The boundaries mark the limits of social behavior. The jurist Robert M. Cover (1983) used it similarly, noting that the narrative or statement of rules sets the boundaries. In still another sociological application, Niklas Luhman included borders and boundaries in his systems theory of society. Communication defines Luhmann's social system. Social systems are systems of communication, and society is the most encompassing social system. He says systems get their definition from boundaries between themselves and their environment. The interior of the system is thus a zone of reduced complexity: Communication within a system operates by selecting only a limited amount of all information available outside (Luhmann 1975, 1984). Although not usually identified as structuralist, in this respect, Luhmann's social systems theory resembles the structuralist binomial opposition.

Furthermore, each system has a distinctive identity that is constantly reproduced in its communication. If a system fails to maintain that identity, it ceases to exist as a system and dissolves back into the

environment from which it emerged. Luhmann called this process of reproduction from elements previously filtered from a complex and chaotic environment 'autopoiesis'. Social systems are autopoietically closed in that while they use and rely on resources from their environment, those resources do not become part of the systems' operation. For strictly heuristic purposes, the social systems approach finds an analogy with the human body. Cells make up the body, and they differ according to subsystems of organs. Each of the three levels of systems—cells, organs, and the body as a whole—devote energy to boundary maintenance. The boundaries are semi-permeable membranes, allowing some substances in and ejecting others. Boundary maintenance for biological systems is somewhat analogous to policing in that the cell, organ, or body regulates its internal activities partly by regulating incoming and outgoing material.

Psychologically, borders and boundaries become especially noticeable in their absence. Ego integrity requires distinctions between self and other. Schizophrenia's symptoms, such as 'voices', display a psychotic inability to distinguish between internal ideas and feelings and perceptions about others. Therefore, persons suffering from psychotic schizophrenia 'hear' voices that are actually their own thoughts. In psychiatry and medicine, psychosis arises when the system, the ego, no longer defends itself against intrusions. Its structures begin to break down, and its boundaries become insecure, which leads to loss of ego integrity. To continue the body-society heuristic, consider the United States an individual person. Its state apparatus operates as its ego, policing its internal and external activities. Mexico would be another person, another body. Neither can be self sufficient. Indeed, one way of understanding globalization is a development in which the interdependence of countries becomes more apparent. Just as there is no such thing as an unsocialized, unenculturated human being, the United States and Mexico are interdependent, although each engages in boundaries maintenance to preserve system integrity. The Mexico-US border has critical features for both countries, and it serves different functions for each. The following examines a part of the Mexico-US interaction to illustrate this last point.

Neoliberalism and the Agriculture Industry

Focusing on agriculture highlights a relationship between worker tourism and the political economic relationship between Mexico and the United States. Agriculture remains a main, if not leading, employer of worker tourists from Mexico in the United States. That fact has a certain irony to it, especially with respect to two common food crops—rice and corn (maize). For both crops, neoliberal economic policies figure prominently both nationally and internationally.

The United States is not a leading producer of rice. US rice production is about 5 percent that of the largest producer, China. Nonetheless, the United States has a vigorous export market sending half its crop out of the country, and it is among the top five rice exporting countries. Mexico is its biggest customer. Mexico imports over two hundred forty million USD of rice annually (US Rice Federation 2010). Most rice is grown in the United States in the lower Mississippi River valley, especially in the states of Arkansas and Louisiana. Nonetheless, California accounts for almost one fifth of the total US crop. Here is where the irony sets in. The rice growing areas of California, like much of the state, are arid, almost desert-like. Of course rice requires an extremely wet environment. The water for rice production comes from the high Rocky Mountains, especially from Colorado and bordering states. The water is pumped through pipes hundreds of miles to California, at great cost in energy, construction and maintenance. Most of the cost is borne by the public, as the system was built and maintained through US federal projects and subsidies. Therefore, the rice industry in California is highly subsidized. It is so highly subsidized that rice has become a large export item for the United States. Its effect on importing economies typically results in under cutting local markets and driving out small producers, such as subsistence and local market farmers. They are driven off their land as they cannot compete and go into debt. Some seek employment in manufacturing such as the Maquilladoras in Mexico. Others traverse the Mexico-US border to work in, inter alia, the rice industry in the United States.

The same obtains for corn, perhaps more so. Corn, or maize, has been an indigenous crop in Mexico since the beginning of cultivated grains in the Neolithic. Nonetheless and despite increasing production, Mexico is no longer self-sufficient in corn, and has become a corn importer rather than a corn exporter as in the past. Mexican corn production has risen despite keeping the same acreage. The reason is intensified agriculture and the economies of scale introduced by large commercial farming and genetically modified crops—both the outcomes of huge agribusinesses. Rick Relinger shows that these phenomena derive from the neoliberalism of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) begun in 1994.

> American corn subsidies, which led to the flooding of Mexican markets with American corn following the signing of NAFTA, is the primary factor responsible for the post-1994 internal displacement of rural farmers in Mexico. The trade agreement effectively eliminated all trade barriers and placed Mexico's domestically produced corn in direct competition with highly subsidized corn imported from the United States. Consequently, Mexican corn farmers, who comprise the majority of the country's agricultural sector, experienced drastic declines in the domestic price of their product

> and thus faced increasing difficulties to attain a sustainable living. Hence, we observe high levels of migration into Mexico's cities in the latter half of the 1990's, and the beginning of the 21st century, as these displaced farmers abandoned their previous livelihood in search of employment. (Relinger 2010:2)

For present purposes, the high levels of migration go not only into Mexico's cities, but into the United States as well. The implications of these developments for the border are several fold and they are revealing about the role of borders in the current state of the world. The advent of neoliberalism, probably beginning with the Reagan-Thatcher regimes in the United States and United Kingdom in the 1980s, soon became the paradigm for global political economic policies. It is hardly a novel observation to say that under neoliberal globalization, borders freely permit passage of capital, but they tend to restrict labor. Money circulates around the world largely without impediment, but people and their creative and productive capacities face increasing restrictions and obstacles for international travel.

While neoliberalism remains mainly an economic form of governance, neoconservatism represents its political, military, and ultimately imperialistic side. In fact, neoliberalism and neoconservatism are two sides of the same coin. Neoconservative politics of the United States have taken two, related forms—imperialist militarism and homeland security. The imperialist militarism mainly occurs in the Middle East and Africa in the notorious invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, but with smaller incursions in the 'Stans: Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Kygyzstan. US Military missions, not true full scale invasions, occur increasingly throughout the world as Chalmers Johnson (2000, 2004, 2006) has reported. The military dominance of the United States abroad takes on the guise of so-called homeland security in the metropole. What that has meant for the Mexico-US border is the 'Fence' and ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement). In other words, the border has become a dangerous crossing for work tourists from Mexico.

Borders throughout the world not only surround countries and their governing functions, they also surround and act as system boundaries. That is, borders and border maintenance, mark and maintain the integrity of two interacting but separate systems. Those systems are capital and labor. Forever antagonistic, they are necessarily interdependent. Neither can exist without the other. Borders, and the Mexico-US border show what this means for different kinds of people. Leisure tourist experience relatively easy passage, of course more so for US tourists headed south than Mexican tourists headed north. That is because leisure tourists carry money. They assist in circulating capital. Interestingly, so

do worker tourists, but most politicizations of Mexican migrant discussions slide over the fact. Worker tourists send money to Mexico, and other countries, but mainly Mexico, in the form of remittances. The average remittance to Mexico is about three hundred fifty USD per remitter, per month (Hernandez-Coss 2005). Clearly important for the Mexican economy, it is paltry for that of the United States. On the other hand, tourists from Mexico help repatriate US dollars and balance currency flows. Therefore, one effect and function of the Mexico-US border is to distinguish between two types of people—those who carry capital (leisure tourists) and those who produce capital (work tourists).

The Great Wall of Capital and Dialectics of Leisure and Work Tourism

Mike Davis' felicitous phrase captures the importance of borders in general and the Mexico-US border in particular. Like a semi-permeable membrane, borders make sure that capital and labor keep their respective places, at least in the current world system. Capital belongs in the center, for which capital is virtually definitive, and labor belongs in the periphery. Neoliberal globalization needs the flow of capital back forth. It emanates from the center, temporarily goes to the periphery, only to return to the center with accretions. Capital is "invested" in a maquilladora factory in Mexico where labor turns it into a part for some electronic gadget or other manufactured product, and then returns to the United States. Neoliberalism and NAFTA have ensured that no tariffs or other impediments obstruct the capital flow and its accumulation in the center.

The border is both a gatekeeper and a sign that interprets the character of those who cross it. Among other things, it sorts them into leisure and work tourists. Several other characteristics adhere to the persons whom the border sorts. Once inside the border, they are sorted into those who gaze at the front stage, leisure tourists, and those who work backstage. They are also sorted by those who linger, the work tourists, and those who move on, the leisure tourists.

Front stage and backstage placement refers to their positions with respect to tourist attractions. Dean MacCannell presented a model of the tourist attraction as "[tourist / sight / marker] attraction" (2004:57). The marker signifies that the object of the gaze is a tourist attraction. In a later article, MacCannell (2008) describes a change in what qualifies as a tourist attraction. Simply, what used to be back stage has become front stage. MacCannell used Erving Goffman's (1961, 1963a) distinction about social encounters. Front stage encounters are public, open to view, and to some degree rehearsed by the participant. They are staged. Back stage is the place for rehearsals. Although the back stage is not acknowledged, participants must infer it, as all participants have their own backstage where they prepare to encounter others. An example MacCannell uses is a salad chef. Previously strictly a back

stage hand (Finkelstein 1989), in a restaurant MacCannell visited, the salad chef appeared out front, preparing salads (2008:261). A common sight front stage today are sushi chefs who prepare customers' meals beneath their noses. MacCannell ascribes the historical change to a larger change, an increased yearning for authenticity. In part, the change transpired because of the increasing saturation of spectacle in everyday life so that the quotidian has become staged authenticity. "[S]taged authenticity, originally restricted to the limited domain of tourists and tourism, has replicated itself in every realm of contemporary life" (262). MacCannell went on to note "that radical visibility is rapidly becoming the central organizing principle of contemporary social life" (263). Think of the popularity of Facebook, or MacCannell's example of the popularity of lofts as living quarters "marked by the aggressive removal of walls, screens, barriers that once separated front and back" (265). Nonetheless, as MacCannell argued, back stage has not atrophied; it has merely moved into a different set of shadows.

Although restaurant customers may watch chefs prepare their meals, they do not watch the dishwashers. They do not watch workers cutting up carcasses in slaughter houses. They do not watch the stoop laborers harvesting strawberries. Of course, the work tourists inhabit those shadows. They are not part of the attraction, or as Guy Debord put it, the spectacle (1967). Restaurant customers might encounter the backstage workers, although usually not backstage. They encounter them in other locales and other contexts, with different front stage/back stage markers. In a kind of primal scene of social encounters (Goffman 1963b), leisure tourists and work tourists negotiate status according to various markers attached to each. Ray Gold (1952) described such status negotiations conducted by apartment house janitors (back stage workers) and tenants of apartment buildings in Chicago. In this situation, janitors perform dirty work in the same sense that many if not most work tourists also perform it. Their encounters give rise to interactions in which the janitors strive to minimize status differentials, and the tenants to maximize them.

From another viewpoint, Georg Simmel distinguishes two social types: the adventurer (1911) and the stranger (1908). The stranger is one who lingers in a social milieu, but always remains partly outside it, an observer of the social scene, partly, but not wholly integrated. The adventurer passes through. Adventurers enter social milieus as time bounded. They seek, and participate in creating a package for their visit. The package might be likened to packaged tours, or in MacCannell's terminology, staged authenticity. Leisure tourists fit Simmel's adventurer; work tourists his stranger. The risks faced by adventurers are partly of their own making as they seek adventure. Those of strangers are largely, almost exclusively, determined by social forces external to themselves. Simmel's model for the

stranger fit with Jews in Europe in the early decades of the twentieth century, and particularly Simmel himself (Frisby 1984). They were part of European society, yet not part of it, never fully accepted. Moreover, they faced risks, and in most European countries, had legal disabilities, to a lesser degree like undocumented workers in the United States.

The tourist industry, especially combined with the hospitality industry, creates a social framework in which leisure tourists and work tourists are in a dialectical relationship. In tourism's frame they meet, although typically not face to face. They depend on each other, as leisure tourists consume the products of work tourists' labor, and work tourists depend on the custom of leisure tourists in the various tourist establishments and businesses. With smaller dimensions, their dialectical relations partake of, and arise from the overarching dialectic of capital and labor.

Leisure tourists are of the global middle class, or more precisely, the strata of middle income and wealth. They travel on airlines, stay in hotels, eat at restaurants, and so on. They do not travel by private planes or yachts, stay in one of their multiple villas or townhouses, or dine at their private clubs. They are the mass bourgeoisie. Their patronage is the focus of the tourism and hospitality industry. They are also a product of the late modern capitalist world system, the system born of the mid-nineteenth century. If Immanuel Wallerstein (2004) is correct, and I think he is, that system is collapsing. One of the forms it takes is securitization of the world, led by the hegemonic world power, the United States. At its border with Mexico, the drama plays out, and gives the staging and context for a small part of the state of the world system—leisure and work tourists crossing that border.

The collapse of the world capitalist system and securitization has forced the leisure-work tourist dialectic into a different trajectory. In describing the front stage – back stage dialectic, MacCannell said that "Paranoid structures emerge at precisely those points where there is no longer any possibility of a dialectic: known-unknown, seen-unseen, recognized-misrecognized" (2008:264). The Mexico-US border is a microcosm of just such a paranoid structure. As a consequence of global securitization, the border becomes increasingly securitized. Border zone surveillance becomes increasingly extended, currently at one hundred miles interior to all US borders. Surveillance becomes increasingly intense, pervasive, and intrusive, as various forms of electronics, drone flights, and other marvels of modern technology examine everyone. Everything becomes a tourist attraction. As Guy Debord put it, "The whole life of those societies in which modern conditions of production prevail [currently, the entire world] presents itself as an immense accumulation of *spectacles*. All that once was directly lived has become mere representation" (1967:12 ¶ 1).

> As this system approaches perfection, everything and everyone at home, at work, or at play; everyone up to good or no good, clothed or naked, is bathed in the same dim moral light . . . . In this system, entertainment is a "reality show." (MacCannell 2008: 274)

One can imagine a particular "reality show" in which contestants act as work tourists who cross the border. Each one gets picked off, until there is one "winner" who has obtained and kept a permanent job paying at least minimum wage. In the current conditions, the leisure-work tourist dialectic assumes a trajectory in which each is a contestant in a globalized reality show, all is spectacle and tourist attraction, a giant Disney world.

References

ACLU, American Civil Liberties Union (December, 2006). Are You Living in a Constitution Free Zone, http://www.aclu.org/national-security_technology-and-liberty/are-you-living-constitution-free-zone (accessed 11/22/11).

AI, Amnesty International (2009) *Jailed Without Justice: Immigrant Detention in the USA*, http://www.amnestyusa.org/research/reports/usa-jailed-without-justice (accessed 11/22/).

Berger, Peter L. (1967) *The Sacred Canopy:Elements of a Sociology of Religion* (New York: Anchor Books)

Briggs, Vernon (2010) Illegal Immigration and Immigration Reform: Protecting the Employment Rights of the American Labor Force (Native-Born and Foreign-Born) Who Are Eligible To Be Employed**,** http://www.cis.org/employment-rights (accessed 11/22/11).

Brown, Wendy (2010) *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty* (New York: Zone Books).

CDC (2008) Work-Related Injury Deaths Among Hispanics—United States, 1992-2006. http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5722a1.htm (accessed 11/22/11).

Cover, Robert M. (1983) Nomos and Narrative. *Harvard Law Review* 97: 4-68.

Cruz, Teddy (2008) Border Tours: Strategies of Surveillance, Tactics of Encroachment, in Michael Sorkin (Ed.) *Indefensible Space: The Architecture of the National Security State*, pp. 111-140 (New York: Routledge).

Davis, Mike (2005) The Great Wall of Capital, in Michael Sorkin, (Ed.) *Against the Wall*, pp. 88-99 (New York: The New Press).

Debord, Guy (1967 [1994]) *The Society of the Spectacle*, Donald Nicholson-Smith (Trans.) (New York: Zone Books).

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari (1986) *Nomadology: The War Machine*, Brian Massumi (Trans.) (New York: Semiottext(e)).

DMI, Drum Major Institute (2009) Fact Sheet: The Exploitation of Undocumented Workers, http://www.drummajorinstitute.org/immigration/ (accessed 11/222/11).

Finkelstein, Joanne (1989) *Dining Out: A Sociology of Modern Manners* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press).

Frisby, David (1984) *Georg Simmel* (New York: Tavistock Publications).

GAO, Government Accountability Office (2006) *Illegal Immigration*, GAO-06-770. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, www.gao.gov.

Goffman, Erving (1961) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday).

——— (1963a) *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction* (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill).

——— (1963b) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall).

Gold, Ray (1952) Janitors Versus Tenants: A Status-Income Dilemma, *The American Journal of Sociology*, 57(5): 486-493.

Hernandez-Coss, Raul (2005) *The U.S.-Mexico Remittance Corridor: Lessons on Shifting from Informal to Formal Transfer Systems, World Bank Working Paper No. 7* (Washington DC:

World Bank), iteresources.worldbank.org/EXTAML/Resources/396511-1146581427871/US-Mexico_Remittance_Corridor_WP.pdf (accessed 11/26/11).

Hughes, Everett C. (1958) *Men and Their Work* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press).

Jaeger, David A. (2006) *Replacing the Undocumented Work Force* (Washington DC: Center for American Progress).

Jimenez, Maria (2009) *Humanitarian Crisis: Migrant Deaths at the U.S.-Mexico Border* (San Diego: American Civil Liberties Union).

Johnson, Chalmers A. (2000) *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire* (New York: Metropolitan Books).

—— (2004) *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic* (New York: Metropolitan Books).

—— 2006 *Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic* (New York: Metropolitan Books).

Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1949[1969]) *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, James Harle Bell and Richard von Strummer (Trans.); Rodney Needham (Ed.) (Boston: Beacon Books).

——— (1958[1963]) *Structural Anthropology*, Clair Jacobson and Brookew Grundfest Schoep (New York: Basic Books).

Luhmann, Niklas (1975 [1982]) *The Differentiation of Society*, Stephen Holmes and Charles Larmore (Trans.) (New York: Columbia University Press).

——— (1984 [1995]) *Social Systems*, John Bednarz Jr. and Dirk Baecker (Trans.) (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).

MacCannell, Dean (2004) Sightseeing and Social Structure: The Moral Integration of Modernity, in Sharon Bohn Gmelch (Ed.), *Turists and Tourism: A Reader*, pp. 55-70 (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press).

——— (2008) Staged Authenticity Today, in Michael Sorkin (Ed.), *Indefensible Space: The Architecture of the National Security State*, pp. 259-276 (New York: Routledge).

Mondragon, Rozana (2011) Injured Undocumented Workers and Their Work Place Rights: Advocating for a Retaliation *Per Se* Rule. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*, 44: 446-481.

Passel, Jeffrey S. and D'Vera Cohn (2009) *A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States* (Washington DC: Pew Hispanic Center).

Phipps, Peter (2004) Tourism and Terrorism: An Intimate Equivalence, in Sharon Bohn Gmelch (Ed.), *Turists and Tourism: A Reader*, pp. 71-90 (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press).

Relinger, Rick (2010) NAFTA and the U.S. Corn Subsidies: Explaining the Displacement if Mexico's Corn Farmers, *Prospect, Journal of International Affairs at UCSD*, April http://prospectjournal.ucsd.edu/index.php/2010/04/nafta-and-u-s-corn-subsidies-explaining-the-displacement-of-mexicos-corn-farmers/ (accessed 11/22/11).

Savage, Michael (1993) *The Safe Travel Book* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books).

Schmitt, Carl (1950 [2003]) *The* Nomos *of the Earth in the International Law of the* Jus Publicum Europaeum, G. L. Uelmen (Trans.) (New York: Telos Press).

Simmel, Georg (1908 [1971] The Stranger, in Donald N. Levine (Ed.), *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms: Selected Writings*, pp.143-149 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

——— (1911 [1971]) The Adventurer, inDonald N. Levine (Ed.), *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms: Selected Writings*, pp.187-198 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

US Chamber of Commerce (2011) Immigration Myths and Facts, www.uschamber.com/reports/immigration-myths-and-facts (accessed 11/22/11).

US Rice Federation (2010) The U. S. Rice Industry At-a-Glance, http://www.usarice.com/doclib/188/219/3674.PDF (accessed 11/26/11).

USDC, US Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration (2010) U.S. Travel and Tourism Industries: A Year in Review. http://tinet.ita.doc.gov (accessed 11/22/11).

USDHS, US Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics (2010) Table 1271. Foreign Tourists and Business Travelers Admitted by Country of Citizenship: 2000 to 2008. http://www.dhs.gov/ximgtn/statistics/publications/yearbook.shtm (accessed 11/2/11).

Veblen, Thorstein (1899 [1934]) *The Theory of theLleisure Class; an Economic Study of Institutions*. NewYork: Modern Library.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (2004) *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).

Walter, Nicholas; Philippe Bourgois; H. Margarita Loinaz; and Dean Schillinger (2002) Social Context of Work Injury Among Undocumented Day Laborers in San Francisco. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 17(3): 221-229.

Wexco Publications ([1980] 1994) *The Complete Travellers Guide* (London: Wexco).

WTTO, World Travel and Tourism Council (2011) *Travel and Tourism 2011* http://www.wttc.org/site_media/uploads/downloads/traveltourism2011.pdf (Accessed 11/24/11).