

## Human Values Literature Review

Marlene Flores, MA student, Latin American and Border Studies

Note: this literature review does not claim to be comprehensive or perfect, but it may be useful in grounding our practical and scholarly work in the broader realm of human values.

For permission to use this document, please contact [jmheyman@utep.edu](mailto:jmheyman@utep.edu) (Josiah Heyman, MA program director)

## Table of Contents

### Section I

1. Introduction 1
2. Human Rights 1
3. Human Development 3
4. Human Security 3
5. Well-being 4
6. Social Justice 5
7. Limitations 6

### Section II

- The U.S. - Mexico Border 8
8. Human rights at the Border 8
  9. Human Development at the Border 10
  10. Human Security at the Border 11
  11. Social Justice at the Border 14

## Introduction

The goal of this paper is to lay out some starting points in terms of human values for envisioning research projects on borders and migration. Some of this is general (e.g., discussing the term “human rights”) and other parts are specific (e.g., literature on human rights at the U.S.-Mexico border). The literature review here is certainly not complete, but it may stimulate some useful self-reflection on the values from which we start our research, writing, and advocacy. By examining definitions of human rights, human development, human security, wellbeing, and social justice, along with their limitations, we may begin to discern which concepts are most useful toward achieving our goals.

Although many of us work towards development on the border, this development comes with strings attached. Sometimes ‘development’ has multi-dimensional considerations. In other words, the goals of development don’t line up neatly or they contradict each other. Development is focused on elevating the quality of life for people. In contrast human security tries not to dip below a basic level of safety. Human security is largely about the state apparatus protecting people from negative impacts and a freedom from a sense of terrible threat.

Social justice is then the potential of what people can receive. Naturally, this turns us towards the most famous concept of human rights. Human rights is a kind of measure of the behavior of the government towards its citizens. In this day and age we are responding to the homeland security rhetoric. Is this is smart way to frame our thinking? Are any of these terms useful or superfluous?

## Human Rights

In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the following Articles stand out as relevant- Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political, or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status (Article 2); Everyone has the right to life, liberty, and the security of person (Article 3); Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to this country (Article 13.2); Everyone has the right to a nationality (Article 15.1); No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality (Article 15.2).

Sjoberg, Gill, and Williams (2001) provide a definition of human rights as “Human rights, as we conceptualize them, are claims made by persons in diverse social and cultural

systems upon “organized power relationships” in order to advance the dignity of (or, more concretely, equal respect and concern for) human beings” (p. 25). The authors trace the sociological literature of human rights research. Since the events of WWII, specifically the Holocaust, human rights discourse was introduced. Before globalization it was easier to blame the nation state for committing human rights violations. The nation state, while still important, now has a weaker role in containing its influence. Transnational organizations (such as NGOs or institutions like the World Bank) and mega-corporations are becoming increasingly more powerful and influential that the study of organizational power is what current human rights analysis is centered around (p. 13).

As previously mentioned, human rights are an estimate of how the government treats its citizens. Estevez (2012) writes that human rights are inherently structural resources because they are connected to the United Nations. Estevez refers to Donnelly when she writes that ‘human rights’ work because there is an overlapping consensus between nations on what justice is. Human rights are *erga omnes* norms which humans have no matter their nationality. Human rights legislation then has the ability to force states to cooperate with each other giving human rights its legitimacy (p. 27).

Dunn (2009) writes that human rights has been framed two ways: as citizenship-national sovereignty rights or human rights (transnational). He writes “the key point of difference between the citizenship view of rights versus that of human rights perspective revolves around the question of whether rights are conditional or unconditional” (p. 7). Under citizenship rights, people can be counted upon to receive support and defense from their government (if they qualify as a citizen). Under transnational human rights citizenship status is irrelevant. Humans deserve rights because they are human (p. 9). Dunn finds that the human rights framework is much more valuable for respecting the individuals who cross the U.S.-Mexico border.

Simmons and Mueller (2014) write that concepts like cultural relativism and universalism are limiting in that they don’t contextualize human rights enough. “Human rights may possess universality, but they cannot be divorced from, or made sense of without considering concrete conditions in specific, complex, and multifaceted contexts. However, in a globalized world, the context in one country cannot be understood in isolation, without considering the actions or inactions of other states and transnational actors” (p. 3).

## Human Development

Alkire (2003) writes of human development as “the flourishing of fulfilment of individuals in their homes and communities and the expansion of valuable choices” which aims at growth with equity (p. 7). These choices are not just limited to income but also health, education, technology, the environment, and employment (p. 35). Anderson and Gerber (2008) frame development as having standards that “meet basic needs, including security in the event of unemployment, illness, disability, widowhood, and old age” (p. 222). As mentioned in the introduction, human development is focused on elevating communities to a higher standard and has a close relationship with human security.

## Human Security

Alkire (2003) puts forth the definition of human security as having “the objective...to safeguard the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats, in a way that is consistent with long-term human fulfillment” (p. 2). In their 1994 Human Development Report the U.N. defined human security as freedom from fear and freedom from want. This included “safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease, and repression as well as protection from sudden and harmful disruptions in the patterns of daily life- whether in homes, in jobs or in communities” (p. 1). In addition to this basic definition they also added the complex nature of current threats, an empowerment of citizens, and a non-aggressive allowance of State sovereignty (p. 6). They formulated four basic characteristics (universal, people-centered, interdependent, and early prevention) and seven key components (economy, food, health, environment, personal, community and political security). Only in the last ten years or so has the concept of human security gained traction in many areas. One thing that is clear is that human security, or rather human threats are increasingly interdependent between states. Meaning that war, pollution, or labor unrest is not contained within one region, but is affected by fellow systems at work.

Looking at the 6<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the U.N. (2010) we can see a clearer and narrower understanding of human security and who is responsible for it. Key points include the position that governments are responsible for the wellbeing of their citizens, the current circulation of people, money, and goods increases the risks of insecurity and development is essential in sustaining security. Security means having “healthy political, social, environmental,

economic, military and cultural systems...” (p. 4). New threats such as climate change and economic recessions have also further impacted marginalized people around the world. Internal threats like criminal activity increase violence in public areas and undermine the safety of the law. Because the U.N. supports education and development, they are in turn contesting poverty, disease, and hunger. The report is also under the opinion that strong security depends on strong government, who are able to anticipate conflicts and prevent them when possible (p. 6). At the same time countries cannot support foreign governments that participate in oppressive actions against their people. Human security then has the potential to bring citizens and their government closer. When crimes against humans occur we lose money, trust, and of course, lives. Policies should be contextual (that is, specific to the community they are trying to serve) and with the participation of many diverse actors so that all voices are heard. The ultimate empowerment that people can reach is when they participate in their own political authority.

What’s different about today’s current (in)security is the increasingly limited economic opportunities and accompanying poverty, the forces of which are no longer contained within one region. The first step is to acknowledge the crisis and the second is to put into place global partnerships. Some organizations like the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the World Bank have agreed to help. There is no need to wait until after a conflict occurs to introduce stability measures however. The report is of the opinion that protection and empowerment measures prevent conflict in the first place (p. 13). For areas in which conflict is already underway, post-conflict times are difficult but also opportunities to find the root of the problem and begin to heal while bringing back the trust of the community. Partnerships between the government and local agencies then sound reasonable as a way to reestablish that trust. One term often used in the U.N. papers is “people-centered”. What this means is the inclusion of regular citizens and their voices. State-society relations are of the utmost importance to cultivate.

### Well-Being

As scholars and advocacy members we are usually interested in the chronic and devastating problems that affect people in our region. Utilizing a different tone, we may want to shift our focus to the lighter side of human well-being. One question that arises is what is happiness? A handful of anthropologists tackle this question in the form of short essays (Colson 2012). Mathews and Izquierdo define happiness as “a qualitative dimension of health and well-

being” (p. 7). Other scholars say happiness cannot be defined because it is more of an experience. Happiness is then rooted in emotions, which are influenced by our environment. Bodley writes that leaders who are more focused on economic growth may sacrifice communal happiness to get there. Ultimately the deprived majority may have to pay the price for capitalistic growth (p. 11). Finally, Bodley writes that makes people happy in one culture may not in another and we should especially take into consideration the U.S. belief of individualistic responsibility for happiness.

McCay writes of happiness as resilience towards tragedy (p. 12). Wali writes that while well-being has been measured by economic indexes such as the GDP of a country, other concepts might be more useful such as the Gross National Happiness index. Still, human development may be an important factor to incorporate as it addresses economic inequality. “Dignity index” is also proposed as a way to measure our well-being (p. 13). Nordstrom writes that happiness is world creating while violence is world unmaking (p. 14). Without patronizing the real suffering of migrants, it is helpful to conceptualize where happiness may be found and resilience honored.

### Social Justice

Staples (2012) references Weil’s concept of social justice- “social justice implies commitment to fairness in our dealings with each other in the major aspects of our lives—the political, economic, social and civic realms. In society, social justice should foster equal human rights, distributive justice, and a structure of opportunity and be grounded in representative and participatory democracy” (p. 287). In Staples’ view, community organizing can be a powerful force in implementing social justice. In connecting justice with immigrants Seglow (2005) writes “justice also concerns what we *can* do for others, whether they have previously been affected by our acts or omissions, and what we *ought* to do for fellow members of our common humanity” (emphasis in original p. 319).

Using the National Association of Social Workers definition of social justice, Lusk, Staudt, and Moya (2012) write “the view that everyone deserves equal economic, political and social rights and opportunities” (p. 4). The authors point out that there is an emphasis on “rights, opportunities, access, and by implication, equality and inequality” (p. 4). Taking up the usual scholarly lens of race, ethnic, class, and gender, they also find it helpful to incorporate

nationality and geographic space (p. 4). In order to talk about social justice, a discussion of human rights is needed (p. 6).

#### Limitations to the Concepts

Gasper (2007) argues that the concept of rights gets criticized from conservatives to feminists to Marxists as a question of who gets to determine which rights are valid. The critique goes that perhaps the human rights discourse is another imperialist activity at play. Many times 'human rights' are used to defend already existing inequalities. For example, the claim to private property holdings by corporations can utilize a human rights approach. Gasper then asks the million dollar question- "where do human rights end and other rights begin?" (p. 12). What one group claims as their human rights can infringe upon the rights of another group.

While human rights is easily understood and approved of globally it has also been critiqued for being vague and appropriated by already powerful groups (p. 25). Gasper discusses the human development model which usually consists of humanitarian-type aid. This is not very effective as it usually consists of philanthropic rich people donating to 'poor deserving' ones. Gasper does not find debates to be problematic as long as they push forward thinking and creativity instead of shutting down conversation.

In their article Sjoberg, Gill, and Williams (2001) continuously refer to the changing causes of human rights issues. The problems faced today are becoming more complex as stratification increases between the have and have-nots (p. 27). The drawback of this complexity means there is no historic precedent to learn from. The upside is that international opinion does have the ability to influence policies (p. 40). In their book Lusk, Staudt, and Moya admit that evoking human rights has its drawbacks as it is very costly and time-consuming to implement (p. 6).

Estevez (2012) writes that 'universal citizenship' has been difficult to implement in real life (public policy) and can also fall back into the trap of historic discrimination. Estevez points out Baxi and Douzinas' proposal that human rights not be formulated as natural or moral constructs "but discursive constructions with a political-ethical weight..." (p. 4). Similarly Dussel advocates an ethical commitment towards material conditions rather than abstract notions of dignity. Here we can see that an appeal to human rights based strictly on emotions is not enough. A concrete goal may be easier to utilize and hold accountable.

In their critical review of human security literature Fukada-Parr and Messineo (2012) note the critique of the traditional view of security, which was seen as military intervention to protect the state. They reference Kaldor who claims that we now have new kind of wars, in which our old tactics won't work anymore. ul Haq adds this to this as well, claiming that there is a shift in security from nations to people. Nevertheless the concept of human security remains contested, with skepticism from security and development fields on how effectively it can be used. Human security has been praised for being the axis in which needs, rights, and development can work together. But it has been criticized for also being vague and relabeling problems with extensive literature (Gasper, 2007, p. 28).

Security is tied to human development and rights. Fukada-Parr and Messineo (ibid.) write that human security may apply to many different fields such as politics, economy, environment and it may reach different places such as governments, NGOs, press, and of course public opinion (p. 3). Governments, besides being responsible for providing security, are sometimes the source of internal and external migration and conflict. What makes human security difficult to pin down is that people feel it instinctively. Human security isn't visible until it isn't there (p. 6).

Another controversy is the issue of intervention. When a country commits crimes against its citizens, what rights do other countries have to intervene? This challenge to state sovereignty can possibly lead to unwanted interference, such as foreign military presence and its justification under the banner of human security. Fukada-Parr and Messineo (ibid.) allude to this again on page 13 when they write "several see human security as a concept deployed by the 'middle powers' ... primarily as a diplomatic tool to promote their foreign policy goals". Finally the authors write that the human security paradigm might kill revolutionary spirit in that it reinforces rather than challenges the status quo. Although it is critiqued in academia and politics, human security is a term that is increasing in use.



## Section II - The U.S. – Mexico Border

### Human Rights at the Border

Estevez (2012) writes that human rights are connected to migrant rights- "...conflict is the predictable but not inevitable result of the structuration relationship between globalization and migration (p. 1). Estevez argues that migrants are denied universal human rights, which then lead to conflicts which she defines as responses outside the law (p. 4). Some examples of conflicts include protests, dangerous border crossings, political extremism, racism, and commodification of migrants (p. 177). Countries can have either open or closed borders and corresponding attitudes (acceptance or hostility) towards incoming migrants. Utilizing Coutin's theory on illegality as nonexistence, Estevez writes that migrants occupy a "space where people *are* but they do not *exist*" (emphasis in original p. 3). She suggests a decolonized global justice to combat this problem. This is primarily done by responding to migrants through a legal channel which would first require a recognition of their human rights. Inequality between and within nations contributes to migration. Until these problems are addressed, migrants should be respected in their mobility. Estevez also discusses modern migrants who are often fleeing harsh conditions but who are treated as foreigners in their new location. In turn, they are not allowed the human rights of citizens. Another way to conceptualize this denial of rights to migrants as a denial to the right to life (p. 176). The U.S. has chosen to deal with migrants the same way they tackle drugs and arms- through law enforcement tactics. Estevez ends by stating that a closed border policy inevitably generates more violence.

In their book Simmons and Mueller (2014) focus on human rights on the border. The number of people killed during the recent (and ongoing) drug war has exploded since 2006. Corruption reigns within law and government circles, with a refusal to cooperate out of the question due to death threats. Numerous human rights violations occur, on both sides of the U.S.- Mexico border in various legal, economic, and social ways making detention, labor exploitation, and sexual/general violence common. While human rights has often rested on notions of universalism, the authors find that they must be localized simultaneously in order to reach a concrete strategy. The U.S. and Mexico are inextricably intertwined with the contradictory situation of the U.S. needing Mexican labor while increasing in hostile immigrant rhetoric (p. 4). Curiously, Mexico has a relatively new and decent history and practice of human rights activity and rhetoric yet violent crimes and abuses are commonplace. Why does this occur? First, the

forces of corrupt government officials, drug cartels, and difficult economic conditions are strong. Second, even when there is a desire for human rights practice and an endorsement from the Mexican president does not mean that actual change will occur (p. 17). There is also a consideration that human rights activity is birthed *because of* the extreme human rights violations occurring at the time. In Mexico's case, their human rights history is concurrent with the simultaneous violent activities happening.

Simmons and Mueller (ibid.) employ the term *states of exception* to explain spaces of general lawlessness where hyperlegality is employed by the powerful. In other words, justice from the law is uneven. Often the attitude in the U.S. towards migrants is if they performed the illegal action of crossing the border unauthorized, then this automatically erases any rights or sympathy they had previously. The war on drugs in Mexico has not been successful and has been disastrous for migrant's human rights. The authors state that U.S. policies (along with Mexican ones) have created states of exception that have made structural violence worse and populations even more vulnerable to human rights abuses. The authors write "the human rights abuses are the result of an interlocking series of states of exception where vulnerable people are made more vulnerable by the interplay of structural violence, cauterization, and public policies... There are multiple deployers of violence often acting with impunity" (p. 227). Migrants today are not just oppressed by the Mexican government but now by the increasingly powerful drug cartels as well. The current militaristic response to violence on the border isn't working and is likely to increase problems (p. 221).

Dunn (2009) writes about human rights abuses in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez border, both towards migrants and citizens. Operation Blockade occurred in September 1993 and consisted of placing hundreds of agents directly on the U.S. Mexico border to deter illegal border crossers. Since the implementation of Operation Blockade/Hold-the-Line in 1993 the region has seen a shift in border enforcement policies. Among them include higher numbers of border patrol agents, a militarization of law enforcement, higher costs per apprehension, and the succession of similar "Operation" practices along the border. Since 9/11 the border security rhetoric has no doubt justified these practices. Human rights abuses that have occurred include excessive force, ethnic profiling, targeting community institutions, abuse of authority, and a covering of abuse reports and evidence (p. 195). Taking a wider view, violations on the Southwest border have included "beatings and physical abuse, shootings and inappropriate use of firearms, sexual

assault, inhuman detention conditions, denial of due process, false deportation, illegal and inappropriate searches and seizures, destruction of property, verbal and psychological abuse, and reckless high speed chases” (p. 203). Operation Blockade and its follow-ups have not effectively curbed illegal immigration as migrants choose different and more dangerous routes. Dunn argues that border security and human rights can co-exist together but there is much reform to be done. If we advocate a citizenship-nationalistic attitude then the devaluation of immigrants increases the prestige of citizens. If we embrace a human rights attitude, any discrimination against people is wrong, even if it currently has legal standing (p. 162). Dunn (ibid.) writes “Clearly these various abuses collectively amount to “social triage” across time and location, as the rights of the disadvantaged groups were written off and repressed by agents of a powerful bureaucracy” (p. 162).

#### Human Development at the Border

In their book Anderson and Gerber (2008) discuss the border through a development lens. The authors write that human development doesn’t just help the local community but its ramifications enhance relationships between countries that exchange goods and labor as well. A stable Mexican infrastructure equals a better economic relationship with the U.S. as well. The authors adopted the Human Development Index to the border region, which measures income, education, and health as determinants of human development (p. 191). What makes the U.S.-Mexico border unique is that one is a developed country and the other a developing country, with one of the biggest income stratifications in the world. We cannot discuss the illegal border crossing situation without acknowledging the root problem: lack of economic opportunities in Mexico or what the authors call the “development gap” (p. 210). It is not so much that Mexico has not been able to create enough jobs for its citizens but that policies like NAFTA and other neoliberal practices have killed small labor practices like subsistence farming (p. 212). Migrants have lost certain forms of labor in their home country and see labor demand from the U.S. side as an obvious pull factor. Yet the journey to the states is rife with harassment, exploitation (from coyotes) and even death as seen from the migrants who die in the desert. In the name of ‘border security’, tactics intended for terrorists are applied to migrants. The authors write “policies that facilitate joint economic development are, in the end, the policies that have the best chance of easing the border migration and security tensions” (p. 225).

## Human Security at the Border

Heyman (2011) has written extensively about human security at the border, especially in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez region. He attempts to interrogate the myths of security threats. Often we assume that security threats are external and the usual methods for attaining security are appropriate to every situation. Living on the border gives a front row view of how migration law enforcement affects the border community. Heyman argues that the current enforcement policy has flaws. Criminal organizations are the main cause of violence and insecurity at the border. Yet immigrants crossing into the U.S. are given much more attention and resources in the form of raids and deportations. Instead of intercepting drugs and money at the border the goal is to stem the flow of immigrants attempting to relocate. “Public safety” is then used to justify discrimination against immigrants. The three perceived threats today are terrorism, guns-drugs-money nexus and illegal immigration and yet the same method is applied to all scenarios. Although fears are expressed that terrorists will sneak in through the U.S.-Mexico border, to date there is no evidence that this has occurred. Most immigrant communities have lower violent crime rates than regular citizen ones. Guns-drugs-money (and its players) are of concern but the violence usually doesn’t spill on the U.S. side. The increasing securitization on the border causes many problems. It reduces local authority while increasing military forces, requires a large budget, but most of all it targets the most vulnerable population: immigrants. The U.S. deports many people but doesn’t do very well at seizing money or arms from drug traffickers. Why are drugs and money able to travel across the border but not people? The U.S. spends more money on border patrol than in guns-drugs-money interception. Instead of putting money into better screening/processing between ports the reaction has been to increase the budget for migration enforcement. At some point a consensus on comprehensive immigration reform needs to occur. Immigrants will continue crossing attempts, sometimes with their lives while guns-drugs-money continue to circulate freely. According to Heyman constitutional rights cannot be violated because of our pursuit of security. Ironically this is what increases *insecurity* at the border.

Heyman proposes the following policy steps: 1) tone down border rhetoric and concentrate on other types of security 2) not conflate terrorism prevention with immigration-enforcement policy or use it to justify those actions 3) focus on guns and money interception 4) move border patrol to processing at ports so they can be of higher quality 5) investigate organizations rather than individuals; remove the market for those organizations and move from

Border Patrol to FBI type of activity 6) reduce the haystack so we can isolate the truly dangerous- “Comprehensive immigration reform is essential” 9) not force people to travel through deserts to die; increasing and reforming legal channels for immigration. 10) cultivate a better relationship between migrants and law enforcement agencies (especially in relation to the federal forces); all people in this country have civil liberties. 11) not bring in the military to enforce what civilian forces have traditionally done (2011, p. 8-10).

A little over a year later Heyman (2013) reported on the We the Border: Envisioning a Narrative for Our Future Conference which was held in El Paso, Texas. The conference was initiated by border residents to express their desires on border security. A preference for quality (dangerous goods interception) over quantity (mass deportation) methods was voiced. Different sectors were involved including academic, faith-based, local law enforcement, local officials, and NGOs. Border residents felt that living on the border has its unintended drawbacks. Central governments often dismiss the voices on the border, seeing it as an empty geography and central state imperatives are prioritized over the desires of local communities. In other words policies are applied to the border that are far removed from the actual reality on the border. Besides being seen as empty it is also seen as insecure with chaos or suffering reigning. Most people living on the border are Hispanic, bilingual and poor. Because of NAFTA ports have seen an explosion of activity. NAFTA has increased trade between countries but only delivered low wage jobs and limited infrastructure. The participants also alluded to long-term visions of border security. If the U.S. and Mexico could develop joint economic development then this would “enable potential migrants in Mexico and Central America to stay home, should they so choose” (ibid. p. 68).

Rather than accepting the bleak picture this paints, border residents argue that their biculturalism is an asset to national security, not a disadvantage. There also exists a richness of unique skills on the border; trade, linguistic, and cultural types included. “The border-security obsessed United States should recognize the crucial positive economic value of the border region, its infrastructure, and its people for the future national and continental economy” (Heyman, 2013, p. 69). Border security is often equated to security against terrorism. Yet no known terrorists has crossed through the U.S.-Mexico border. Border communities are some of the safest in the country (on the U.S. side). In the end the scapegoat is the illegal immigrant. The heart of the problem is “the perceived threats blend (in an undistinguished way) terrorists,

migrants, and drugs” (ibid. p. 65). The attendees argued that rights don’t just belong to U.S. citizens.

In her chapter on violence on the border Staudt (2009) addresses some additional lens in which to analyze the situation. Like Heyman’s report she agrees that the border is often seen as violent and drug dealers, immigrants, and terrorists are blended together. Border security is often closed towards people but open toward capital, goods, and services (p. 2). As consumers we are responsible for the instability in Mexico as much as anyone especially with the maquilas. Border communities are interdependent in various ways and a living wage should be a priority for both (p. 18). Staudt asks, why are U.S. border cities safe but not Mexican ones? Neoliberal policies have further marginalized developing countries by way of competitive exploitation. The “distribution of sadness” encompasses separated families and poverty (p. 9). Rising costs of living + stagnant wages + peso devaluations = the current situation. The solution to border security is always further militarization, which partly stems from the U.S. government’s refusal to look soft on border security.

There are increasing problems for border dwellers and crossers. For those on the borders who regularly cross for family, school, work, or shopping, this has been replaced by increasing surveillance and patrol. Border security often translates into human violations. Those who try to cross and get caught will end up between the two rough choices of deportation or detention camps. Those who do find work in the U.S. are vulnerable to labor exploitation because of their illegal status. Finally, there are those who don’t make it across the border. Staudt questions the migrant deaths in the desert. No one wants to take responsibility for those and they are not counted in official crime statistics (since they are of “natural causes”).

Staudt’s goal is to examine the different layers of marginalization, whether they be gender, race/ethnicity, or citizen status. Social Democratic Feminism (Staudt’s term) involves “new terminology like social democracy, critiques of crude neoliberal economic practices, redistributive practices within and across national boundaries, and alternative economies” (p. 21). Like the Heyman reports Staudt agrees that border voices are purposefully dismissed on their views and suggestions for border security (p. 22). Borderlanders are increasingly losing their rights for the sake of ‘human security’. Staudt proposes a three-tiered pluralism that incorporates “feminist, institutional, and social democratic lenses” (p. 24). As difficult as it is to

establish a democratic system it's just as important to have systems of accountability in place for those groups.

### Social Justice on the Border

In their book Lusk, Staudt, and Moya (2012) discuss social justice on the U.S.-Mexico border. The border region often suffers from problems of “poverty, health disparities, social inequities, and low-wage assembly, service, and agricultural employment. The endemic poverty coexists with institutional racism, gender violence, and structural violence” (p. 3). The authors explain the current militarization of the border with the rise of neo-conservatism along with non-state actors like powerful international corporations who needn't answer to governments (p. 10-11). They also put forth the idea of counterdevelopment, which expresses itself through corruption, terrorism, drug trafficking and other systems as a way to obstruct human welfare (p. 13). Moral panic about the Hispanic population and their motives for crossing in the U.S. have further fueled the fire (p. 14). The globalization of labor causes inevitable migration to places of employment yet “U.S. migration law can best be understood as the social and legal construction of nonpersons” (p. 16). Furthermore, what makes social justice difficult on the border is the fact that for border dwellers, law enforcement agencies provide decent employment in an area marked by poverty (p. 19). Despite the challenges the editors put forth examples of civil society activism on the border, as seen from NGOs and nonprofits like Border Network for Human Rights, Human Borders, No more Deaths, Annunciation House, and faith based organizations.

## References

- Alkire, S. (2003). *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security* (Working paper). Oxford: University of Oxford.
- Anderson, J. B., & Gerber, J. (2008). *Fifty Years of Change on the U.S.-Mexico Border: Growth, Development, and Quality of Life*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Colson, E., Falk, D., John, G. S., Bodley, J. H., McCay, B. J., Wali, A., . . . Slyomovics, S. (2012). "Vital Topics Forum: On Happiness," *American Anthropologist* 114: 6-18.
- United Nations. (1948). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html>
- Dunn, T. J. (2009). *Blockading the Border and Human Rights: The El Paso Operation that Remade Immigration Enforcement*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Estévez, A. (2012). *Human Rights, Migration and Social Conflict: Towards a Decolonized Global Justice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fukada-Parr, S., & Messineo, C. (2012). *Human Security: A Critical Review of the Literature* (Working paper No. 11). Leuven: Centre for Research on Peace and Development.
- Gasper, D. (2007). *Human Rights, Human Needs, Human Development, Human Security: Relationships between Four International 'Human' Discourses* (Working paper No. 20/07). The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.
- Heyman, J. (2013). "A Voice of the US Southwestern Border: The 2012 "We the Border: Envisioning a Narrative for Our Future" Conference," *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 1(2): 60-75. <http://jmhs.cmsny.org/index.php/jmhs/article/view/9>
- Heyman, J. (2011). *Guns, Drugs, and Money: Tackling the Real Threats to Border Security*. Washington, DC: American Immigration Council.
- Lusk, M. W., Staudt, K. A., & Moya, E. (2012). *Social Justice in the U.S.-Mexico Border Region*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Report of the Secretary-General. (2010). *United Nations General Assembly Sixty-Fourth Session Agenda Items 48 and 114: Human Security* (Rep.). United Nations.
- Seglow, J. (2005). The Ethics of Immigration. *Political Studies Review*, 3(3), 317-334.
- Simmons, W. P., & Mueller, C. M. (2014). *Binational Human Rights: The U.S.-Mexico Experience*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Sjoberg, G., Gill, E. A., & Williams, N. (2001). A Sociology of Human Rights. *Social Problems*, 48(1), 11-47.
- Staples, L. (2012). Community Organizing for Social Justice: Grassroots Groups for Power. *Social Work with Groups*, 35(3), 287-296.
- Staudt, K. A., Payan, T., & Kruszewski, Z. A. (2009). *Human Rights Along the U.S.-Mexico Border: Gendered Violence and Insecurity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.