

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

One of the biggest Spanish speaker populations in the world live in the United States (US), with Hispanics constituting the majority of the population. In 2020, total Hispanic population in the US reached 62.1 million, constituted 19% of the entire country's population (Cary Funk, 2022). Such big population is not without geopolitical significance in the past since US-Mexico war in the end of 19th century, two world wars, the cold war, and modern era in the 21st century. Among huge Hispanic populations in the US, they are divided in a number of ways: either live long enough as part of Hispanic generations in the US-controlled territory, or pave their way out from Latin American countries to the US as either immigrants or asylum seekers. Hispanic populations in the US carry one of the most heated immigration debates in the country, a protracted political concern amongst both US citizen and decision makers in central and domestic jurisdictions. Latin immigration to the US is a complex and sensitive discussion, often times clouded the migrants with tough choices for simply trying to live in the US.

The US experienced an almost century-long history of modern immigration policing related with Latin American nationals and other foreign diaspora of interest. The Latin American migrants were of great importance for the US in the war time, proven by a bilateral cooperation with Mexican government in 1942 named "Bracero Program" or labor program to help the US economy during war time. The program was accounted for 4 million legal labors working under short-term contract. After the US terminated the Bracero program in 1964 for its loss of functional value, Mexican immigration in the

US was severely cut down by exclusion of approximately half a million workers due to change of priority in immigration control (Michael A. Clemens, 2018). The Bracero program termination was the first mass immigration control done to Latin American migrants after the world wars.

The termination of the Bracero program in the 60s did not end mass immigration from waves from Latin American countries. The US intervened in a number of proxy politics, to some extent proxy wars in Latin American regions against the growing Soviet influences in Cuba, Nicaragua, Mexico, Venezuela, and other Latin American states Soviet used to invest its influence in. These interventions had been vastly done in local scale operations through funding cartels and oppositions to incite violent contestations against leadership with dominant Soviet influence, local parties who later on became powerful enough to resist government policing force and control local assets. The US had miscalculated these interventions, for Latin American migrants started to swarm US-Mexico border as asylum seeker amidst uncontrollable violence in their countries in 70s and 80s (Massey, 2020).

When addressing immigration control in the US, it is important to look back on the country's commitment in migrant rights protection. The US initiated the 1990 Migrant Worker Convention (MWC) in New York, ratified by twenty-two states including the initiator. The International Labour Organization (ILO) is tasked to monitor migrant workers around the world following provisions stated in the MWC. Provisions stated in MWC were designed to provide legal protection for migrant workers and receiver state's responsibilities to fulfil migrant worker rights. The MWC provisions are generally effective on paper, effective under ILO's monitoring system, however has loopholes. There are multiple conflicting clauses in the convention due to inconsistent and rather awkward wording in the provisions,

including the very definition of migrant worker stated in the second article. The convention does not cover undocumented migrant workers under the protection umbrella, which is the biggest loophole that allowed states to deny responsibility despite ratifying the convention. The problem with the US and immigration control is mainly circumstanced in undocumented foreign workers, especially in the case of Latin migrant workers. Hence, the US has strong reasons behind its denial upon responsibility to fulfil migrant rights (James A. R. Nafziger, 1991).

To cope with national interest while bound with the MWC, the US applied campaigns to deny responsibility in protecting migrant rights, one of them was clearly shown in Bush administration. In late 20th and early 21st century, president Bush showed strong response against immigration from many origins, mainly Muslim migrants. President Bush initiated a new Act consisting provisions for immigration restrictions and legal grounds for cooperation between federal-state level agencies or government bodies (later discussed in Chapter 2). Doubled with Global War on Terrorism agenda, president Bush was responsible for the creation of the biggest security department intended for internal security in the country: Department of Homeland Security (DHS), along with a number of big departments. There are two DHS sub-agencies working in immigration control and security: Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and Immigration and Customs Enforcements (ICE) (Homeland Security, 2022). Both sub-agencies extensively worked in security department to conduct surveillance and control immigrant arrivals and movements in Bush era amid tensions with Muslim migrants.

On the contrary, president Obama limited some active protocols of immigration provisions in order to avoid destruction of public's trust with agencies responsible of immigration control (CBP and ICE). Despite relatively

high deportation rates, Obama dismissed a number of powerful provisions that allowed DHS sub-agencies to cooperate with state-level Police Departments simply to extend their functions (later discussed in Chapter 2), at the same time offered temporary free citizenship programs to vulnerable non-citizens (ABC news, 2014). Between Bush and Obama era, state-level government were already divided in their agenda in addressing migrants: different state passes different provisions. Clash between citizens and state governments were tense, some broke into violent protests about migrant's right. Certain populations, political parties, or even DHS sub-agencies have roles in this complex politics of federal-domestic immigration control (Armenta, 2017).

Circumstances drastically changed, when Obama finished his two presidential terms. The newly elected president in 2016, Donald J. Trump was a highly anticipated person for conservative populations in the US. Trump's vision of the entire country was clouded with conservative ideals, to some extent almost xenophobic as opposition mass media would describe. The Republican party (Trump's party), despite major support from conservative populations in the US, is not entirely trusted by the population. Trump, on the other hand, was a prominent far-right person of power, highly supported by far-right conservative groups including the Evangelist Christians until his presidential term ended (Time News, 2021). These far-right groups massively supported Trump as a candidate, for he raised concerns of threats coming out from US-Mexico border, blamed the Democrat party under Obama's presidential term for less restrictions and repercussion against criminal migrants, promised to put federal agencies and domestic powers into a particular framework designed to holistically restrict undocumented immigration (Times, 2016). For solely immigrant control plan, Trump made a record as the first US president who won the election for immigration-related concern (Jessica Bolter, 2022).

Trump blatantly securitize Latin migrants throughout his campaigns before his presidential term. The main focus of his illegal immigration campaign pointed out the threats illegal immigrants can pose when entering the US. The securitization of Trump's view on migrants can be directly seen through his campaign in Arizona in 2016 when he said "Then there is the issue of security. Countless innocent American lives have been stolen because our politicians have failed in their duty to secure our borders and enforce our laws like they have to be enforced...." (The New York Times, 2016). Trump merged the issue of citizen casualties with failure of law enforcement agencies in this particular statement. When Trump blamed the previous term politicians for "Countless innocent American lives have been stolen...", Trump referred to Obama's presidential term, for his less restrictions and protection programs for migrants. Albeit the fact that Obama had deported more people than Trump ever had until his second year as a president (The Wall Street Journal, 2019).

To be understood, among Republican and Democrat party, there is the so-called "cultural war". This "cultural war" takes place in multiple sectors, especially apparent in immigration topics. There is a contrast difference between the Democrats and Republican's response when faced with immigration related-issues. The Democrats holds a more liberal view on immigration, tends to expand its interests on migrants by help them in achieving better life in exchange for their support to the party. This pattern is found within Republican and far-right relation, where the Republican carries them far-right anti-immigrant sentiments to the senate in exchange for their support to Republican party. Both parties intensified these tactics especially in Trump's presidential term. In case of Trump's election strategy, undermining migrant's role strategically undermined Democrat's political power (Anna Maria Mayda, 2016).

The Republican party generally perceive migrant's presence as hostile foreign entity. Right-wing or conservative society in the US have been restructuring the Republican party after the second world war, showed especially clearly under Trump's administration. When Trump applied for presidency candidate, he appealed to white right-wing populations who are generally xenophobic to minority populations. The Republicans took a step on Trump's maneuver on the right-wing populations, took advantage of their voices to vote for Republican candidates in the 2016 election. In contrast with the Democrats which gathers majority of voters from migrants and liberal populations, the Republican gathers its voters from right-wing populations. In fact, Trump made alliance with a prominent conservative group: "The Tea Party", which was considered a far-right nationalist group with specific hatred towards Hispanic populations, combined with supports from Evangelist Christians to Trump's candidacy. Hence, when addressing immigration issues, the Republicans would prioritize immigration control for their politicians carry right-wing interest (Fowler, 2018).

Supports coming from conservative groups were accumulated in 2016 presidential campaign. Trump's presidential campaigns were done in places with dense conservative populations, made promises that highly appealed conservative views. Trump dragged the discussion of immigration in his presidential campaign, which turned out into huge success, appealed enough conservative populations who later on contributed to Trump's winning in the 2016 election. Conservative populations in the US are generally skeptic about immigrants, worsen by Obama's era for his immigrant protection programs. Trump's campaign in 2016 made the immigration topic the biggest determinant for presidential election factors (CNBC, 2020). The Democratic party supporters and Hillary Clinton strongly condemned Trump's campaigns about immigrants and his future immigration policies, hence had its popularity

among immigrant populations. Despite favorable popularity support for Clinton in 2016 election, Trump won the presidential election through a small gap in terms of congress vote (BBC, 2016).

As Trump sit in the presidential chair, Trump proceeded to restrict immigrants, especially the Latinos. Central American countries especially Mexico became the heart of Trump's attention due to his immigration plans, hence projected his agenda against residents of Latino descent in the US for his immigration policy enforcement, as well as his supporters. The anti-immigrant agenda was loudly voiced in almost every red state, as well as immigration enforcers. Misinterpreted information about Latino migrants was often used by pro-Republican party media to create a narrative which painted an image of Latino immigrants as brutal and dangerous (Center for American Progress, 2019). Trump's psychological nature in addressing Latin immigration issue was firm, straightforward, hence set a heavy attention to Mexican immigration in southern borders. Among Trump's promises in his presidential campaigns, his immigration plans appeared to be one of the highest priorities when he officially led the country.

Trump passed an executive order after a couple days in his earliest days of presidential term. The Executive Order number 13767 namely "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements" was the main legal basis for Trump's immigration control efforts internally and at the border. Trump's orientation was to reduce immigration numbers from all incoming factors, extend the legal power of federal agencies, revise immigration provisions in major scale. The order specified its role: promotes a system to cut down numbers of undocumented immigration with the deportation as the end result. (US Federal Register, 2017). The 13767 Executive Order acted as

a legal base for Trump and federal agencies to set up new standards. The real politics, however, happened at the federal-domestic dynamics in the country.

The presidency of Donald J. Trump started out with drastic changes over the entire country's view of immigration. First and foremost, the 13767 Executive Order criminalized illegal status, punishable by deportation. The executive order goes through federal agencies in the US: the US internal security agency namely Department of Homeland Security (DHS) gained fresh powers when Trump issued the 13767 Executive Order, gave power to federal agencies working under DHS in immigration control to extend their reach to domestic authorities in the entire country. Despite several legal limitations (especially due to government and party politics) DHS sub-agencies could still operate with the largest capacity ever recorded in terms of immigration control. (Armenta, 2017). To some extent, Trump's power among federal agencies especially the DHS was nearly untouchable by the Democrats. The Democrats, however, were not completely powerless in contesting Trump's immigration agenda, for the party controls a number of states with the biggest source of undocumented immigration on the west coast.

To sustain the continuity of the 13767 Executive Order without significant disruptions from Democratic party, Trump did not appeal to the congress at all for his immigration plans, instead he appealed to mostly executive actions and lobbied the executives of federal agencies related with immigration. Trump massively employed executive actions for his immigration plans in his entire four years of presidential term, to some extent made the US congress nearly lost its role as a law-making body, hence there was almost no contestation for Trump's executive order in federal level. Trump was highly committed to his immigration agenda, for a total of 472 executive actions were issued for immigration purposes alone (Jessica Bolter,

2022). Due to massive executive actions in Trump's era, the Democrat party shifted its focus of immigration agenda from congress to domestic affairs by trying to block Trump's federal assets to reach domestic grounds in deeply blue states.

Domestic immigration control is the hardest part of Trump's immigration agenda. Despite the powerful legal standing of the 13767 Executive Order, the administration found that it could not entirely gain control of the domestic operation, especially each local Police Department (local PD) in every state or county (David Scott FitzGerald, 2019). The domestic complexities forced Trump's administration to apply multitudes of measurements to especially concentrate tight immigration control in states along US-Mexico border. This thesis debunks Trump's securitization against Latin immigrants through influencing US immigration system.

1.2. Research Question

Based on presented background, the research question is: Why did Trump's Administration Restrict Latin American Immigrants?

1.3. Research Objective

This research aims to achieve a number of objectives:

1. To debunk Trump's mindset in influencing government authorities to securitize Latin American immigrants.
2. To debunk political process between federal and domestic jurisdiction in the US federal system in responding Trump's immigration control.

1.4. Literature Review

In addressing Trump's immigration policy, it is important to view his protectionism ideology. Trump's protectionism ideology found in immigration plans and securitization against Latino immigrants were found in

a number of studies. In terms of foreign policy, there is a number of studies that show Trump's protectionism nature in engaging international politics. Ian (Lesser, 2020) explained the US foreign policy under Trump's administration in the broadest way possible. He argued that Trump's leadership was quite lucky to survive an entire term without having to face threats of the 9/11 or the 2008 economic crisis scale due to drastic changes in foreign policy. Carlos and Gary (Carlos Oliva Campos, 2019) bring about the foreign policy overlook under Trump's administration to Latin American countries. The article found that despite Trump's administration continued Obama's prospect to Latin American countries, the administration viewed Latin American countries with significant lack of trust, especially to these four countries: Nicaragua, Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico. This article did not provide detailed discussion regarding Trump's protectionism agenda in terms of Latin immigration to the US. Further regarding foreign policy, Trump's protectionism agenda was found especially loud against China, as Rasmus (Rasmus, 2018) found that Trump's allegation against China for trade war was due to unfair trade system and that China was "cheating" on currency game.

While foreign policy is important to assess, immigration problem has developed down to domestic level, hence federal government is barely effective to conduct monitoring irregular migration flows scattered around different local jurisdictions. A book by Amada (Armenta, 2017) discussed in one of its chapters regarding complex history of immigration control in the US. The chapter found that dynamics of law enforcement systems and actors evolved by gradually shifting their focus to appeal to local or domestic authorities. The article did not discuss in detail modern laws and immigration system, however is highly informative for historical data. In terms of immigration policy, Massey (Massey D. S., 2013) provided a criticism over US immigration restriction policies in restricting Latin American immigration.

The article found that the restriction system applied at that era (Bush Junior's administration) increased Latin immigrant's arrival instead of deterring the arrival numbers. Despite being published before Trump's administration era, the article provided detailed explanations about flaws of policies and specific provisions which later on used by Trump's administration. Alex (Alex Nowrasteh, 2020) discussed the US immigration regarding crime rate and immigration in Texas. The research found that migrants neither contributed to increase or decrease of crime rates in Texas, rather domestically produced crime did. The article lacks immigration enforcers viewpoint, however provides a comprehensive picture of domestic immigration dynamics. Eckstein and Peri (Susan Eckstein, 2018) explained the so called "immigration niche" anomaly in the US. The article found that an immigrant group is normally segregated among another immigrant group in terms of role, wage, area of expertise. The article does not contain any specific discussion regarding immigration policy, however contains valuable information regarding geopolitics among immigrant populations deep in the US. Sergio and Barreto (Sergio I. Garcia-Rios, 2016) found how Spanish-language media influence could empower Latino immigrants to create a politicized Latino immigrant identity in the US that led to immigration reform in 2012. The article did not discuss immigration control's effect on Latino immigrants in their participation over political identity, however provide a detailed explanation regarding the use of media as political tool, which reflects the Democrat party's efforts in gaining supports from immigrant populations.

The US is a melting pot of foreign national attentions across the continent and inside the continent, hence attract potential risks elements along with immigrants coming to the US territory. Among the obvious ones is the risk of terrorism. Alex (Nowrasteh, 2016) conducted research specifically on foreign nationals to calculate the risks of terrorism through series of attacks

done by them in the US. The article found that the probability for foreign-nationals to commit terrorism still exists despite being low in its probability. The article was not detailed in debunking the immigration and law enforcement system, however is informative as a reference as it compiled a wide range of terrorism attacks from 1975 to post 9/11 attack. Seung Whan (Whan, 2018) conducted research regarding the effect of restrictive immigration policy to risks of terrorism. He found mixed results, where terrorism was likely to decrease when state applied immigration restrictions based on skill and wealth, however it was likely to increase when state offers limited rights for residence and employment. Both researches do not explain the federal-domestic relations in the matter. Alex made another research on espionage-related issue in immigration (Nowrasteh, Espionage, Espionage-Related Crimes, and Immigration: A Risk Analysis, 1990–2019, 2021) as he compiled data of foreign nationals who were found committing espionage in the US. The research found that within 1990 to 2019, the espionage event's probability to be happened in US soil was low. Another finding was that US government's choice to mitigate Chinese espionage through cutting down visa application did more harm than good to the US. It is similar with the terrorism research where he did not specifically address the technical work of immigration system in order to contain espionage-related immigration, however provide a wide range of data regarding risks of espionage committed by foreign nationals.

Majority of studies shown above showed little to no attention in addressing Trump's immigration system through specifically securitization framework. Most of the literature sources discuss Trump's immigration system through technical issues and broad foreign policy issues. Majority of the findings are circulated around the impacts of Trump's immigration policies. This thesis employs the securitization concept to debunk Trump's

efforts in projecting his securitization efforts against Latino immigrants through federal and domestic barriers. Protectionist policies made by Trump's administration were designed to unify federal and domestic authorities to effectively cooperate in securitizing Latino immigrants, hence tough immigration restrictions and control came to be. Majority of immigration-related literatures did not explain such mindset inside Trump's immigration policies, which is where this thesis is present to fill the gap.

1.5. Theoretical Framework

This research uses the Concept of Securitization. Securitization, according to Ole Wæver, is a political process which conceptualizes a political issue as a security matter that is not limited to the involvement of military affairs while still provide a criterion for differ security from other subjects of politics (Ulrik Pram Gad, 2011). Securitization is a process to frame a particular issue, by highly escalating the urgency of particular issue to be seen as a form of threat, hence putting its position beyond a normal political subject (Ulrik Pram Gad, 2011). The Copenhagen school defined Securitization as an extreme version of politization, dragging the issue out of the domain of politics, as what had had been a previously any non-security issues got forged or escalated into one (Baysal, 2020). Through the communication process, a political actor would create an image of a threat out of a political subject to then refer to some other political object in which is threatened by the securitized subject. Through sparking awareness among people, the political actor will then justify the act to terminate what is called as the threat (Baysal, 2020).

In order for securitizing actor to reach its goal, securitization is not simply done through persuasive statements or a speech. The securitizing actor requires legitimacy in the political setting, which means the actor has a certain

power or control over authorities with capability to enforce the security measures promoted by the securitizing actor. Hence, securitization is applicable, in this case, in political practice instead simply staying as a mere speech (Neal, 2009). The securitization process is not restricted to a particular subject of research (ex: policy making process, political campaign, or any specific activity that indicates elements of securitization) as it is able to operate the basis of an analysis of an entire political system of a state(s) and non-state actor(s) (Thierry Balzacq, 2014).

The term securitization, is a form of frame. Buzan, a senior of the Copenhagen School's theory of Securitization argues that to ensure an effective securitization a security actor forms what so called as **Securitizing move**. **Securitizing move** is a way of reasoning committed by the security actor to convince the audience (in this case is the whole country) by framing that there is an incoming existential threat, hence the securitizing actor would justify the urgency for emergency actions. When the securitizing actor stresses the urgency to address the issue, the actor neglects conventional politics where one party shares different view than others upon the issue of interest. The main point of the neglection is to raise everyone's awareness that if they fail to address the incoming threat every other issue does not matter, for in the future they will be unable to solve them or lose the capacity to solve (Taureck, 2006). Legitimizing the urgency to address the so-called threat does not it, hence the securitizing actor should offer a decisive solution(s) in order to contain the so-called threat, which can only be done by enforcing new set of rules (Baysal, 2020).

Securitization is not always a deliberate mean of fabricating a status of a threat out of no context. In specific, the key of securitization is located at the cruciality of the subject or issue of concern. Hence, depending on the context,

if the existing issue already has or have degrees of threatening potentials or records, the more sensible it is for the securitizing actor to legitimize measures to contain the issue. The main goal for securitization for decision makers is to bridgehead their security measures or policies to be immediately implemented. To construct a strong bridgehead, securitizing actors need strong reasons to convince people to get them agree on applying new security measures. The securitizing actor does not convince random people in the process. The effectivity of the convincing process highly depends on people's nature or stance upon the concern at hand. Hence, the concept of securitization works does not always work by creating a subject, it also works within an already existing subject which security concerns are already visible to people who the actor is trying to convince (Thierry Balzacq, 2014).

In a more specific discussion, Bourbeau brings about the term "securitized migration". He argues that the term "security" is not supposed to end as a binary notion. Instead, "security" is seen as a continuum with certain measurable parameters or degrees as to what extent or intensity the "security" notion exists at. If previous discussions in security were circled only at the definition and coverage of the concept, Bourbeau opens a discussion in how one measures the intensity of the security concept. Specifically in immigration topic, Bourbeau argues that securitized migration is not a mere status, for there is a variation of level in securitization in each migration case. By comparing securitized immigration scale in Canada and France, he found that each state differs than the other in its degree of being securitized. In measuring these differences, Bourbeau puts basic indicators to measure the degree of state's securitization of immigration (Bourbeau, 2011).

Bourbeau puts two categories of indicators in measuring the level of securitized migration in a nation-state level. The first category is institutional

indicator, the second category is regarding security practices in accordance to securitized migration (Bourbeau, 2011):

- Institutional Indicators:
 1. Indicator **(1-1)**: Legal institutional components, consist of most prominent acts and provisions that contribute to the course of securitized migration.
 2. Indicator **(1-2)**: Institutional view of migration as security issue, specifically about how serious the security concern is for immigration in affecting state's policy. State's immigration control and internal security departments play critical role as parameters of this indication.
 3. Indicator **(1-3)**: Saliency of linkage between migration and security. In specific, this indicator qualitatively measures the position of the security degree of the immigration case, whether the immigration is seen as a main or only one of the main existential threats to the state.
- Security Practices in securitized immigration:
 1. Indicator **(P-1)**: Interdiction. Interdiction is an act of restricting migrant's movement to reduce migrant's activities in the country. Interdiction significantly contributes to securitization indicators for it provides qualitative evidences of a securitization intensity. The activity includes sanctions against migrants in transportation, preventive security measures in form of immigration officer placements in places concentrated with migrants, interception in international areas close to border's proximity.

2. Indicator **(P-2)**: Detention. Migrant detention provides numerical evidences of detained proportion when compared to total immigration arrival. Migrant detention in securitization represents immigration policing, which reflects the pattern of preventive measures done for security reasons. It serves as important evidence of how far state immigration and security departments treat migrants as subjects of security threat.

The writer applies Securitization theory for this particular research for it is highly accurate in describing the administration's restriction of Latino immigrants. Trump's administration decision to prioritize restriction to Latino immigrants is highly relevant to the concept Securitization. To be specific, the administration's considerations for immigration system accurately follows Wæver's Hourglass model. In issuing the 13767 Executive Order, Trump's administration put legal measures, institutional missions, security justification into consideration. These aspects accurately resemble Bourbeau's first indicator. In applying security measures, Trump's administration applied pressures to opposition party (Democrats) and its controlled jurisdictions to follow the administration immigration agenda. When applying security measures, Trump's immigration agenda applied immigration security standards by mainly increasing restrictions on migrant movements (interdiction), as well as increase of migrant apprehension target set for DHS agencies (detention), both of which are measurable aspects in Bourbeau's second indicator.

1.6. Hypothesis

Trump's administration restricted Latin American immigrants because the administration believed Latin American Immigrants were the source of national security threat.

1.7. Research Methodology

This thesis is forged in qualitative manner. Due to the complexities in federal-domestic politics in Trump's era, the writer applies a specific qualitative methodology: **Cross-case analysis**. Cross-case analysis is a qualitative technique that is normally used to systematically debunk a large-scale phenomenon, most notably social and political issues, through mixing two types of analysis to find related patterns regarding the issue of interest. As proposed by A. Michael Huberman and Matthew Miles, cross-case analysis can be dismantled into particularly two approaches/strategies: **Variable-oriented analysis** and **Case-oriented analysis**. **Variable-oriented analysis** emphasizes on assembling multiple variables to then conduct an analysis based on partial or overall explanation of the key variables assembled for this approach. This approach is effective to collect multiple sources detailing news, reports, literatures, and other generally academic sources. **Case-oriented analysis**, contrasted to Variable-oriented analysis, conducts a full-scale surgery on a particular variable for a maximum gain of understanding of every aspect the variable contains. This approach is effective in dismantling a major or the most vital variable of the assembled variables, however, is not enough without support explanations from related variables in order to explain the issue on the bigger picture. With that in mind, Cross-case analysis was instead proposed by the mentioned scholars to maximize the potential of both techniques (Babbie, 2011).

Due to intricate nature of immigration system in the US, the writer applies cross-case analysis technique to discover patterns regarding securitization against Latin American migrants and US agencies working in immigration control. The focus of Trump's immigration control system was to prevent crime tendencies by immigrants and restrict illegal immigrant's movements within different jurisdictions, hence the administration has

priorities in certain domestic jurisdictions for some jurisdictions have more Latino population than others. In four years of Trump's administration, securitizing Latino immigrants involved numerous government agencies where they systemically projected their security agenda in a way to reach local law enforcement agencies. Hence, there are patterns of securitization in field-level enforcement. To cope with such intricate system, the writer divides the discussion into a number of focuses, which specifications are in the next paragraph.

The cross-case analysis employs two approaches of contrast difference. The case-oriented analysis technique is designed to look upon one specific issue as detailed as possible. Using the Hourglass model, the writer employs **case-oriented analysis** for its ability to dissect Trump's immigration laws in national-scale through Bourbeau's institutional indicators. Using case-oriented analysis technique, the writer lays down detailed information regarding Trump's securitization efforts situated in the 13767 Executive Order as the main reference of the analysis. The case-oriented analysis debunks reasons behind measures initiated under the 13767 EO: immigration quota, immigration restrictions, immigration control authorities, border security, cooperation between federal-domestic platforms, etc (US Federal Register, 2017). The same technique is employed to debunk external and internal factors influencing the 13767 Executive Order, as well as further executive actions committed by Trump in federal domain.

The discussion regarding federal-domestic dynamics and immigration control at the border US-Mexico border falls under the **variable-oriented analysis** domain of this thesis. When the administration employed Securitizing Move, the administration prioritized its most effective provisions on particular state-level jurisdictions located mostly on Southern US, where

most Latino immigrants in the country were located at that time. Hence, using variable-oriented technique this thesis debunks Bourbeau's second indicator: security practices. There were patterns indicating Trump's objectives in those specific jurisdictions. As Trump's administration set new rules to restrict immigrants, efforts were met with challenges from Democrat-controlled state jurisdictions, hence the condition pushed the administration to apply extra efforts in getting the Democrat party to cooperate with Trump's immigration plans. These extra efforts reflected further evidences of the administration's priorities in immigration control due to its focus on certain Democrat-controlled jurisdictions. The writer employs variable-oriented analysis as to find evidences of immigration control related with Latino immigrants, to then link back the securitization patterns to provisions Trump's administration promoted. The same technique is also applied to debunk Trump's efforts in reducing external factors of Latino immigrant's arrival through pressuring Mexico.

In terms of data gathering, this thesis covers a wide range of data from the internet published within four years of Trump's administration. The writer uses scientific articles, published reports, as well as news coverages. Trump's era immigration politics got massive attention from national and international media due to his highly controversial immigration plans, hence the writer uses both national and international media coverage specifically regarding Latin immigration and immigration control in the US as reference to Trump's immigration plans. In terms of official data, there are multiple government websites that become the writer's main references: Federal Register (for presidential documents, including executive orders), US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) website, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) official website (hosts federal agencies responsible for immigration control), Congressional Research Service (CRS) documents, etc. The writer

also puts reports from non-government institutions regarding police activities related with Latino immigrants (migrant detainment, police violence) for further reference regarding securitization in the field.

1.8. Systematic Writing

Chapter II: This chapter discusses Trump's legal approaches in his immigration agenda and factors influencing the agenda through Bourbeau's first indicator. The discussion in this chapter is circumstanced at Trump's orientation in US immigration and Trump's key law: 13767 Executive Order.

Chapter III: This chapter discusses institutions responsible in enforcing Trump's laws. The discussions include a key agency: the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), specifically its history and responsibilities. The later part of the chapter discusses the US federal system, specifically the political terrain where president Trump and the DHS had to go through.

Chapter IV: This chapter discusses Bourbeau's (P-2) indicator: security practices. Following the institutional indicators, this chapter lays down what transpired within US domestic political system, specifically regarding domestic responses to Trump's immigration enforcement system. The later part of the chapter links back the discussion into Bourbeau's indicators.

Chapter V: This chapter summarizes all the discussions above. This chapter answers why Trump's administration framed Latino immigrants as national security threat.