



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY**

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 25
Issue 3 September

Article 11

September 1998

Review of *Immigrants Out: The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. Juan E Perea. Reviewed by Robert L. Boyd, Mississippi State University.

Robert L. Boyd
Mississippi State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Boyd, Robert L. (1998) "Review of *Immigrants Out: The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. Juan E Perea. Reviewed by Robert L. Boyd, Mississippi State University," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 25: Iss. 3, Article 11.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.2513>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol25/iss3/11>

This Book Review is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY**

exploitation of popular concerns by the media. These negative attitudes are not, however, generally directed against Jews.

The issues raised in this book are not only interesting and enlightening from an academic point of view but from a public policy point of view as well. There is real danger that unless decisive action is taken, hate groups will exert greater influence in the future. The book deserves to be widely read. It is a very valuable resource for anyone interested in antisemitic and xenophobia, the resurgence of neo-fascist and other right wing ideologies in Germany.

Frank Hirtz

University of California, Davis

Juan F. Perea, *Immigrants Out: The New Nativism and the Anti-Immigrant Impulse in the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1997. \$ 19.95 papercover.

The debate over U.S. immigration policy is complex, but in essence, it is a debate between the "admissionists" and the "restrictionists." The former want immigration to be increased, or at least kept at its present level. The latter, conversely, want it reduced. As the debate between these two sides heats up, recent surveys show that a growing number of Americans are siding with the restrictionists. It is evident, moreover, that the leaders of the restrictionist movement are becoming more vocal and are waging a well-funded and highly-organized campaign to curtail immigration and to make English the nation's official language. There are indications, too, that the intensification of this campaign has coincided with a rise in prejudice and hostility against foreigners. In light of these trends, some admissionists claim, the U.S. is experiencing a resurgence of nativism.

That is the thesis of this book, a collection of essays edited by a law professor at the University of Florida. An admissionist, he assembled the book to express his dismay over the most salient victory (to date) of the restrictionist movement: the passage in California of Proposition 187, which, among other things, seeks to deny many public services to illegal aliens. The editor sees the arguments behind this proposal, and the other goals of the restrictionists, as reminiscent of the anti-immigrant rhetoric of

the turn of the century. Thus, he surmises, we are in "an era of recognizable nativism," and, to be fully understood, this "new nativism" must be critically analyzed (p. 5). To provide this analysis, he has drawn 17 contributors from the social sciences, policy studies, and the law. Most are legal scholars who have written extensively about immigration and ethnicity. Virtually all are, like the editor, strongly opposed to policies that would limit immigration or encourage cultural minorities to assimilate.

The book consists of six parts. The first two introduce the book's main topics. Part 1 presents two theses: one, the nativism of today is akin to that of the past; and two, Anglo-American elites have, traditionally, taken conflicting positions on immigration, sometimes welcoming foreigners, often rejecting them. Part 2 identifies some fundamental features of the new nativism, focusing on efforts by conservative politicians to secure the U.S. border, restrict immigrants' access to citizenship and social services, and make English the official language. The thesis here is that such efforts stem from Anglo-Americans' denial of the modern realities of transnationalism and multiculturalism.

Part 3 asks, what is driving the new nativism? One answer points to the job insecurities of natives, cultural differences between the latter and foreigners, and high, sustained levels of immigration. Another answer is that conservative foundations and think-tanks are orchestrating a campaign to promote the idea that immigrants cause many economic and social ills. According to still another answer, the bellwether state of California is the hotbed of the nativistic sentiments spreading across the country.

Part 4 revisits the topics of Part 1. It is suggested that, historically, U.S. immigration policy has been shaped by the ethnocentrism and xenophobia of Anglo-American elites. It is then asserted that the current restrictionist campaign against illegal immigrants from Mexico is yet another phase of a cycle in which Mexican workers are lured across the border by U.S. employers but later expelled when their labor is no longer needed. The campaign against undocumented Mexicans is further examined in an essay that interprets the effort to restrict access to U.S. citizenship as an attempt to develop a race-based formulation of who is "American."

Part 5 explores how borders are defined. National boundaries, it is proposed, are socially-defined constructs, not fixed, geopolitical lines. The symbolic meanings of borders, it is argued, are revealed in the metaphors used to describe them and in popular images of those who live beyond them. National boundaries are also, of course, defined by law; yet, according to one essay, recent restrictionist proposals, such as Proposition 187, violate international law and thus may be challenged on legal grounds.

Part 6 concludes the book with analyses of the contemporary discourse on immigration and citizenship. It is noted that the ill-defined term "nativist" is often used by admissionists as a label to discredit the views of restrictionists. In this manner, the term delimits the boundaries of the immigration debate. Next, a manifesto of the restrictionist movement, Peter Brimelow's *Alien Nation*, is examined. The themes of this book, it is claimed, resemble those of Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West*, a book which supposedly inspired the rise of Nazi Germany. The last two essays lambaste recent calls for more restrictive requirements for U.S. citizenship, placing such calls in the historical context of legal attempts by Anglo-Americans to subordinate people of color.

The views expressed in the essays of *Immigrants Out*, by and large, exemplify the opinions of those pro-immigration academics and activists who, for ideological reasons, believe the U.S. *must* become more ethnically and culturally diverse than it is today. With few exceptions, the essays inaccurately portray the restrictionist movement as a haven for racial bigots and ignore or downplay the widespread support for immigration policy reform. Most of the essays, furthermore, dismiss or avoid many legitimate concerns of the restrictionists. Among these are the economic costs of immigration, conflicts between immigrants and Blacks, and the cultural unity of American society.

In sum, *Immigrants Out* is, as a whole, a decidedly partisan book. Yet, it would be very useful to readers who wish to learn more about the views of those admissionists who subscribe to the ideology of cultural pluralism. As the book forcefully shows, these views cannot be ignored by restrictionists or by anybody

who seeks to understand both sides of the immigration policy debate.

Robert L. Boyd
Mississippi State University

Diane Burton and Ann Withorn (Eds.), *For Crying Out Loud: Women's Poverty in the United States*. Boston, MA: Southend Press, 1997. \$ 22.00 papercover.

Pleasantries first. This book is a compilation of first-person and other narratives by women whose lives have been affected by poverty. As such, this volume is sorely needed in the era of welfare-reform and post-War on Poverty politics. Too often, poverty is studied in isolation from other variables or is presented in research that is murky and impersonal. The richness of this text lay in the breadth and diverseness of its contributors and in the intimacy with which most of the contributors discuss the reality of being poor and female in America.

There are many women in this book who have grown up poor and there are just as many who became poor after an ugly, life-changing catastrophe beyond that, hardly any other generalizations can be made. In this book, we learn that not all poor women are African-American and not all of the activists are European-American. And while many poverty activists break the mold of social expectations, there are still too many women who continue to work to maintain tradition and, by extension, poverty. There is great attention paid in this book to the dynamics of race and class in the fight against poverty. The most thought-provoking essay in the text was written by one of the editors, Ann Withorn, on the conundrum of women who work in the system that oppresses women (even though one of her premises, which women who oppress other women may be reacting to a homophobic fear of same-sex intimacy, appears overly-dramatic, even trite). Together, that essay and the bibliography about the political right make the book worth buying.

As a text, this book belongs on the shelves of those interested in social policy, economics, and multi-cultural practice. It