Doctoral Dissertations   Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects

2008

Imagining just discourse in policy-making : transnational space, identity, and the other

Annette Marie Caneda

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.usfca.edu/diss

 Part of the Education Commons

The University of San Francisco

IMAGINING JUST DISCOURSE IN POLICY-MAKING:
TRANSNATIONAL SPACE, IDENTITY, AND THE OTHER

A Dissertation Presented
to

The Faculty of the School of Education
The Department of Leadership Studies
Organization and Leadership Program

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Annette Marie Cañeda
San Francisco, CA
May 2008

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Annette Marie Cañeda   April 23, 2008
Candidate

Dissertation Committee

Ellen A. Herda   April 23, 2008
Chairperson

Patricia A Mitchell   April 23, 2008

Daniel McPherson   April 23, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER ONE THE RESEARCH STATEMENT: THE PROBLEM OF POLICY

<u>Introduction</u>

The world's population is growing, about one billion new people every 12 years. In fact, the U.S. Census Bureau (2007) reports that today's population of 6.6 billion people is at least double the amount in the 1960s of three billion people, and there does not appear to be any signs of it slowing down.

Policies target problems. Policy sets forth an understanding through rules that govern a situation needing resolution. It is created in both domestic and international realms as public policy, with goals of advancement in target areas such as education, health and welfare, defense, and immigration. While these may be readily accepted as longstanding issues in humanity, with continuing acknowledgement of their existence and ongoing expenditures of monies toward proposed solutions, we must ask why don't our policies ameliorate social ills? This research attempts to address this question by investigating three far-reaching social policies through the lens of a critical hermeneutic orientation.

More specifically, in this document I analyze the following social policies: the United Nations Millenium Development Act (see Appendix A), the United States' National Security Strategy (see Appendix B), and the proposed United States' Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (see Appendix C). To set a topic

and theoretical context for this inquiry, I review pertinent literature in arenas

that address policy formation and implications, and I also review literature in

critical hermeneutics that serves as the basis for the research protocol. To the best

of my ability in researching the literature on policy analyses in the various fields

that speak to formation and practical issues of policy, there seems to be little, if

any, critical or interpretive analyses available of policy design and

implementation. However, there are both scholars and practitioners who bemoan

the inadequacy of our policies to match and mediate the everyday realities faced

by the poor, the marginalized, and the threatened. There is also literature filled

with ideas of how to address policy problems. For the most part, these ideas are

grounded in research paradigms that may be better suited for economic policies,

but perhaps not as appropriate for social policies. Table 1 shows the elements of

each policy that I explore.

Table 1. Description of Policy Elements

Policy Element	Description
Creator	The organization that created the policy.
Polity	The people targeted directly or indirectly in the policy.
Date of Implementation	The target date of the policy.
Past (Mimēsis$_1$)	The history and efforts that led up to the creation of the policy. Describes the context of the discourse.
Present (Mimēsis$_2$)	Today's challenges of the policy presented. Describes the present context and discourse of the policy.

It is my hope that this work will contribute in some way to rethinking our ideas of policy formation and implementation.

The following sections in this Chapter discuss the two opening questions: who defines the problem and who creates policy? This discussion is followed by ideas of language and meaning in our policies and what this looks like in today's world. This Chapter ends with the background and potential significance of this research and a summary.

Chapter Two sets the stage for a look at policy-making. I briefly discuss globalization since all the policies investigated in this research project stem in one way or another from the more recent international fluctuations termed *globalization*. The American identity may be changing somewhat in this global context, but the question can also arise if it is changing enough. Hence, a discussion of identity (more fully discussed in Chapter Three) and a related issue of community are discussed with an example to draw our attention to the point that transnational space houses policy.

Chapter Three provides a review of literature that places questions of policy and policymakers into what Habermas (1979) calls the public sphere. From within this setting, I look at movement of people, the global issue of development and foreign policy. These discussions, while not always in front of

middle-class America, shape our ideas of what policies we need to keep

ourselves moving in the social milieu of world politics.

Also in Chapter 3, I talk about the idea of identity moving from the

individualistic concept to one of narrative identity. This means that we are only

who we are in relationship to someone else and we together with others can

narrate our identity. This is an important concept for this research because the

American ethos has been based for centuries on individualism, which I argue has

been part of the problem of understanding the others in our lives, in our society,

and in the world. I question who the stranger is and how we can arrive at a point

of having an ethical aim toward our public actions, particularly in making and

implementing public policies that are based in an attitude of inclusivity. This

Chapter is marked more by the tone of an essay than a traditional Review of

Literature.

Chapter Four provides the reader a framework and a protocol of

analyzing the date inherent in the three policies. Chapter Five presents the data

with a focus on transnational space, identity, and the other, specifically: (1) What

is transnational space? (2) Who is self and other? (3) What is the story being told?

The space we must imagine is a primary recourse for us to understand the place

of who we are, who the other is. It is only in this space that we can move toward

an ethical aim in policy making. Chapter Six further takes up these concepts and

positions them in an argument that calls for us to see policy actions more related to a social plot than to a concrete plan to solve a problem. Moreover, this Chapter relies on interpretive constructs to move the policy maker from an observer to a responsible participant.

The final Chapter, Chapter Seven, offers an implication summary of the research and the findings in the format of issues at hand, and one way that we can address each of these issues. The transnational space created in the critique holds the identity and ethical aim of each policy arena in a sphere where the individual polity member is both one and the other—in other words, we cannot make just policy without recognizing that self and other exist within a transnational space, and this is the stage on which authentic discourse of policy is held.

I end my work with a conclusion and my own personal reflections.

<u>Who Defines the Problem?</u>

The answer to this question is the crux of the problem of policy. The problem is defined by the policy expert who makes the policy. Thus, interests and the resulting action can be at cross-purposes. Those who have power define the problem. Those who define the problem make the policy that encompasses the solution. Problem definition or the "perceived nature of the problem" in the political arena is performed by institutions towards an ideological hegemony.

How the problem is defined relies on the traditional approach of the natural sciences--the deductive reasoning of what a thing is and is not. The process of defining is most easily performed when it is an object in question. Tangible objects are easiest to observe, measure, and assess.

Yet the same cannot be said for social problems or social issues because there is nothing objective or neutral about the definition of humanity. In the process of defining, meaning is construed based on observations which are interpreted in that given moment in time. We apply our understandings and values to the issue before us to come up with a definition that we find acceptable in relation to our understanding of it. We reconcile our observations with our understanding.

There is an axis of scale in problem definition. Like pointillism in the work of the painter Georges Seurat, we can see differences along a spectrum. These scalar differences stem from the approach of the viewer towards the piece of art (Gadamer 2004). As we get closer to the problem, we begin to see it in a different light.

Problem definition rests on a deconstructivist foundation, revealing hidden variables and measuring them to uncover attributes and causal factors. This bias towards culpability harkens to the rootedness of the issue of human affliction—its historicity. Unfortunately, current thought also extends this same

culpability to those populations targeted by the policy (Rochefort and Cobb 1994:

22). We open ourselves to solicitude towards those we favor or who we might

identify with, but we do not do the same for those who we do not know or

understand. The Other is viewed selectively in relation to oneself.

Thus, defining a sociocultural problem is complex because of the

conflicting interests of those who create it, the fluctuating scope of the problem

along scale, and the trend towards identifying the source of the problem in order

to lay blame. At this stage, a close look at policymakers is necessary.

Who Creates Policy?

At a national level, certain political processes exist to ensure that

democratic participation in policymaking exists and this typically occurs "inside

nation-states" (Stone 2008:23). While critical analysis reveals limitations to the

process, there is no such process in creating international policy. Nanz and

Steffek (2004) comment that "International governance is remote from citizens,

its procedures are opaque, and it is dominated by diplomats, bureaucrats and

functional specialists." Stone (2008:24) further claims that this limitation "has

incapacitated critical thinking."

Functional specialists advise diplomats and bureaucrats as to the scope

and breadth of a given social problem. Horowitz (1979:1) called them, social

scientists, as "bookkeepers of the soul." They collect data, monitor progress, and

evaluate results to propose a theory that supports their research and investigation. They do so in as non-partisan an approach as possible because the strength of their argument is from their intellectual neutrality (Stone 2001) and assumes the translation of the problem is correct (Ricoeur 2006:11-29). This positivistic approach is reinforced by an "operational codebook for doing social science work within a governmental context" (Horowitz 1979:6).

In academia and similar intellectual circles, the traditional disciplines of psychology, sociology, economics, political science, and anthropology might spark controversy amongst each other over certain public policy opinions, which is a necessary debate for the advancement of intellectual thought. However, in government settings, there is no internal disputation that would serve as the cross-check to policy creation. Regardless of their professional discipline, policy experts focus their work on either equality by attempting to equalize the socioeconomic outcomes for all or equity by making sure that everyone has a fair chance at the start (Horowitz 1979:9).

Horowitz further posits that the closeness to the decision-making process of policy experts closes one's ability to critique the process itself. Policy experts are judged based on their contributions to the commonwealth, yet the problem with policy lies in this intimacy of policy experts with the decision-making process. As Horowitz (1979:10) states: "What is lost is the capacity to sharply

criticize that process." Thus, a critical analysis of the process of policy-making is called for.

Policies and its consequences are not neutral and reflect the values of the policy-making institution. The power of might of these policy-making institutions is not through physical force but through the power of language, even in an effort towards politically neutral language.

Language and Meaning in Policy

Communication through language is the means of expressing ideas, sharing understandings, and bringing forward new thought. Most would agree to this general definition, but it is quite common to communicate mistakenly, unclearly, or inadequately, where the sender and receiver understand two different messages. Such a misunderstanding can skew the balance of power that language holds between sender and receiver (Edelman 2001). This dialectic of power touches on the ethical foundation of communication. Without an ethical basis in communication, the consequences can be appalling misunderstandings of detrimental effect (Edelman 2001:78-103).

Policy is an example of a written form of communication that is generally understood as an agreed upon arrangement that affects more than one party (Edelman 1977). The assumption is that the interests of all affected parties are considered. Otherwise, a policy created without recognizing the needs of all

affected parties can raise questions as to its ethical merit. Questions of this nature often trigger one's deeply rooted sense of justice, the distribution of fairness and equality, which can lead to misunderstandings of intent, perceptions, and sometimes the reality of attacks on one's well-being. Language is critical in policy in that it brings forth action through the simple naming of an event. Yet, the understandings through language can vary with each interpretation. In truth, critical interpretation will not allow you the consistency or repeatability of findings.

Moreover, Rochefort and Cobb (1994:12-13) acknowledge the variance in analysis of policy: "No two analysts will approach the task of gauging a social problem's magnitude, rate of change, or distribution in quite the same way." Despite this recognized variance in analysis, quantitative measurements of policy effectiveness continue, where an unfavorable finding is considered a failure to be corrected. Once named in language, the failures becomes action. Bovens and 'tHart (1996: 34) state "…a policy failure…is a creation of the language used to depict it; its identification is a political act, not a recognition of a fact."

Bovens and 'tHart (1996:10) refer to the judgment and values placed on labeling these types of events as "fiascoes." In the political framework, the term *fiascoes* refers to the quantifiable indicators of the policy: levels of wealth, numbers of implemented systems, gross national product, and the like. The term

stems from the thinking that there exists a failure, whether or not fully recognized in its entirety. From that point on, all thinking is filtered through a negative lens. Further efforts are geared towards identifying culpability of the failed event. Blame is the name of the game.

As with problem definition, the challenge of policy-making is spatial. Bovens and 'tHart (1996:27) cite the "spatial bias" of the scope of policy, assuming that policy brings about effect at only one level. However, they do not acknowledge the change in scale when evaluating policies that affect social issues for "space is continuous" (Ricoeur 2004: 210-211). The scope is visible at one level, yet connected to a scope hidden at a level beyond us, one waiting to be discovered—the notion of proportional relations within a dialectical framework. In moving from one scale to another, details and perspective are lost to the other. Thus, what might be considered a successful policy within one scope may actually be a failed event upon closer examination.

Does policy impose one's thinking upon the layers beneath? Force is the method when effecting change at one level without recognition of the dialectical relationship with the others. The effect is more pronounced with policy that has international implications. The Millennium Declaration, the National Security Strategy, and the proposed Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act are examples of these types of policy.

Reconstruction of the history of the policy would reveal the interactions at a micro level, what Ricoeur calls "a tangle of interrelations that need to be deciphered" (Ricoeur 2004: 214). Uncertainty is at the micro level, whereas certainty is at the macro level in the guise of social norms. "Perhaps it invites us simply to compare worldviews arising from different levels of scale, without these worldviews being totalized" (Ricoeur 2004: 216).

Knowledge is based on description, but understanding is based on interpretation of written and spoken text. Ricoeur (1974: 66) refers to the linguistic and nonlinguistic nature of interpretation, that it resides between "language and lived experience…" The double meaning of text gives way to the ontological condition of being. Bovens and t'Hart (1996: 10) refer to policies as being recognized only when they have meaning to others: "…policy events only assume significance when people perceive them and attribute meaning to them. Whenever individuals engage in these perceptions and attributions, they do so by taking into account a variety of cues from their social environment: shared norms, values, and symbols."

Policy Today

Policy created today is often done so in the name of globalization--a marked topic of conversation in civic parlance. From a Western perspective, the actual meaning of globalization is applied to myriad contexts, each with its own

meaning and implications. For example, trade, immigration, and naturalization all exist within the purview of globalization applied in an imagined public space, with significant consequences of multiple understandings. Given the complexity of global interests, policies surrounding these topics can be difficult to design and even more challenging to implement. In light of globalization, the question is raised as to if and how policy can be made within an ethical framework: what is just discourse in policy-making?

This question of just discourse (Ricoeur 2007:58-71) is framed within the philosophical understandings of humanity and the creation of meaning through language. The consequences of many foreign policies set forth by the United States indicates that the assumed preliminary discourse is inadequate. We may ask, "What was the dialogue and understandings that brought forth the policy?"

This research process explores the ontology of policy-making in the global context that acknowledged the concept of identity and Other in transnational space—specifically, how may we, as Americans, come to a more just or ethical understanding of place, culture, and the other? In other words, what can the nature of our constructs be in order for us to create policies that move beyond our own ideas of justice to include others whose space and identity take on different forms?

Background and Significance of the Research Issue

Global leadership has implemented numerous policies that have had questionable benefit for the general population and the targeted countries involved (Chomsky 2003, Rüland et al. 2006). Such policies include, but are not limited to: the United Nations Millennium Declaration which delineates specific development goals within a specified timeframe that address extreme poverty in its many dimensions, while promoting gender equality, education, and environmental sustainability (Appendix A); the United States National Security Strategy 2006, which outlines a preemptive tactic against hostile states and terrorist groups, while expanding development assistance and free trade, promoting democracy, fighting disease, and transforming the U.S. military (Appendix B); and the proposed Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006, intended to secure the southern border of the United States, resolving the legal status of current illegal immigrants, and instituting fines, penalties, and legal ramifications for people involved in illegal immigration, namely migrants (and their families) and employers (Appendix C). The three policies are in various stages of development and implementation, but they all share a similar foundation in their creation.

A close look reveals a unilateral approach of policy-making in which power is used to support the self-proclaimed rights of a sovereign state while the

policies and subsequent actions are made in the name of humanity, democracy, national security, or globalization. For example, the Millennium Development Goals of the Millennium Declaration are primarily developed by economists, as advised by other disciplines. The goals are based on statistics gathered by the United Nations from developing countries. Where no data is available for a country, data from surrounding regions or from other countries considered similar in nature are used. The rationale of this positivistic representation for developing countries denies the validity of the fact that there may be no data that can be statistically collected or considered statistically significant.

Policies are rarely formed from multilateralism or multiple interests. Policies can obscure the clarity of the true agenda. For example, many found the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (under the Clinton Administration) a move to gain American presence in markets not previously open to the United States (Rüland et al. 2006). Most of those countries that are purported to be the beneficiaries of the policy are actually excluded from discourse that sets the policy. Moreover, despite the opposition by many other nations in response to terms of the foreign policy or action, the United States most often continues to act on its own prevarication.

Foreign policy-making has clear implications in globalization. Baumann (2004:82) argues that the framework of American foreign policy is rooted in the

Vietnam War and posits that policy "suffers from a perennial crisis of legitimacy". He further states that the division between domestic and foreign policy is insignificant because foreign policy is a reflection and "an expression of the character of a democratic people" (Baumann 2004:83).

A just policy connotes a set of guidelines created towards an ethical aim in which all involved share an understanding of the issue and of each other. It is easier to set policy and create rules from one's own interests alone and forego the difficult task of understanding the true effect on others. This seems to have become the *modus operandi* of the global North, especially the United States.

Can ethical policy be created? Or, is it an ideal never meant to be reached, where the path is more important than the destination? These questions and the research involved in answering such questions carries significant importance in addressing the social ills of the world. Its meaning can be applied in the domain of education since education, both formal and informal, can serve as the vehicle to foster just discourse in the creation of ethical policies. Education is fundamental to understanding and changing the world in which we live. Through this research, a critical understanding of policy-making that considers transnational space, identity, and Other hopefully has been attained which may lead to improvements in how public policy is created and applied in the global context.

Summary

Issues in global affairs have become increasingly more controversial, as nations such as the United States, continue to set forth foreign policy and global initiatives that are recognized as unilateral propositions of national interests. The research described in this study focused on the text of a controversial policies that affect others in transnational space. The text was critically analyzed against the backdrop of my understanding of global problems today. The next section of this study explores the home of the policy-maker, the United States.

CHAPTER TWO THE STAGE OF POLICY-MAKING

Introduction

The global stage is worth briefly describing as the setting in which policies are made, namely the Millennium Declaration Act, the National Security Strategy, and the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act. Through globalization, several social forces come to the forefront that were not widely recognized before, based on ethnicity, media, technology, economy, and ideology (Appadurai 1996:33). This Chapter explores the progenitor of these forces, globalization and its effect on who we are as we move towards the existential simultaneity of ideology (democracy) and people (community). A closer look at one community exemplifies the presence of these social forces over a given population. We will see that globalization has effects at all levels: international, regional, and local.

Globalization

Globalization carries different meanings of both positive and negative interpretations. On one level, the movement and global flow of people and commerce are welcome. At another level, that same type of movement is detested. Globalization can strip the boundaries of the nation state—a statement that provokes the intellectual community, especially in the United States. Today,

nation states are faced with "the globalization of markets, new kinds of war, increased migration, technological changes, changes in communication and cultural production" (Delanty 2000:2).

Globalization is a world of "knowledge transfer and social mobilization that proceed independently of the actions of corporate capital and the nation-state system" (Appadurai 2000:3). There is a significant disjuncture in discourse regarding globalization. This discordance manifests itself on people's ability towards living a good life: having the means to sustain, maintain, and imagine a life free of strife and hardship.

In a global setting, democracy is not just within the people of a country but also within the people of other countries. Just as the U.S. has their own interests to protect, so too do other countries. Democracy holds a dialectical meaning.

<u>American Identity</u>

Americans see themselves in a light different from others. In common public discourse, we do not have a command of global affairs or understand how we are a member of the global community. It is easier to talk about who we know or converse about popular icons in the media: the celebrities of known glitz, glamour and foibles. We are not so much interested in the heroes and true leaders of today, not in our country, not in the world. We are a passive nation

(Kohut and Stokes 2006: 71-72), both domestically and abroad when it comes to sociocultural knowledge. Can we cite the five top pressing issues for Americans? For the world? What are the salient points in American public discourse today?

The United States is a nation of immigrants, but Americans do not recognize this historical narrative story because the viewpoint is clouded by the individualism we hold so dear, so closely. We are proud to be individuals first and consider community and global relations a distant second. Based on the research of the Pew Research Center, Kohut and Stokes (2006:19) finds that "Americans care more about personal freedom than about government guarantees of social justice." Hence, community may refer to my neighborhood, my city, my profession, but the word *transnationalism* is an abstract concept to Americans.

Identity is comprised of that part of self that stays the same (*idem)* and that which changes through time (*ipse)*. What is the *ipse* and *idem* of the United States? What is our story? Yes, a country born from strife and persecution in other places in the world, whether you emigrated in 1776 or 1976—the reasons are the same: to live a better life. Migration and movement throughout the world has made the United States what it is: a better place than where you once came from. So, the United States stands as a land of opportunity, where personal freedoms are enjoyed that other countries do not like Burma, Indonesia, or North Korea—

places of conflict stemming from government overstepping their boundaries and affecting the personal freedom of the people.

Who we are as Americans today is rooted in our history, our past, as well as the future. Do we know what our history is? Personal history is often kept private, known and experienced but not shared. Many people tend to abide by the rules of being "politically correct" to keep themselves from knowing the person next to them, with whom they could form community. We play with the niceties of everyday life because it safely keeps us at a distance and excuses our choice of not engaging with others. Why don't we ask? Why aren't we concerned for the other? Why don't we care?

The passivity of Americans gives an insincere tone to one's efforts of help. What is the motivating factor? This morning you step over my homeless weathered body on your way to work, to a job that gives you money for food, shelter and clothing and money to write a check of convenience to a non-profit organization focused on helping those in need. We live in irony. We watch pop stars fall from grace, and we do nothing to cushion their fall but gleefully watch in fascination. While we might not be a nation that believes in government welfare, our individualism is both our strength and weakness. The living presence of irony underscores our failure to remember the past and the debt we have to our predecessors.

Lieven and Hulsman (2006:xvii) cite the "American superiority" that we ascribe to. By default, we dominate the global landscape by claiming the virtue of our goodwill and acumen, asserting we are the most capable to lead. Yet, good intentions should never excuse the responsibility for our own actions.

Community Redefined

Globalization redefines communities (Bacon 2006, Castles 2002, M. Kearney 1995). Community conveys a sense of connectedness and kinship. Whether we know the Other by face or simply in a name (even fictitious), the connection is from within and rests on a level of spontaneity that remains open to the Other in a context that brings the two together. We can look at communities online, in our neighborhoods, at work, in school, and professional circles. The commonality is what we may share epistemologically or categorically, which is how positivists may choose to recognize communities, i.e., as groups of people with a common characteristic who share a common interest (Brettell 2003). This stands as only fact of superficial significance. Our outward appearance does not create community. Instead, community is formed from people coming together in a public space, with an openness towards one another (Anderson 2006).

The kinship draws people closer to each other, similar to the attraction of magnetic forces. Where once they may have perceived each other as an anomaly

to be dealt with, now through the random occurrences of life, people come together.

For immigrants, it is a similar story (Brettell 2003). It may be that back in their homeland, they drew clear demarcations with whom to fraternize and when it was okay. Upon emigrating to the United States, the sense of isolation from one another is palpable. We ask questions such as "Where am I?" "Who am I?" "Who are you?" The context we share is one of disorientation. We look to belong because we are social beings (Bellah et al. 1996). People who traditionally regarded the Other as inferior, now find comfort and a sense of self in the friendship with one another.

Transnational communities are not new to the world. They exist wherever migration occurs, usually from developing to developed countries, such as from Algeria to France, Turkey to Germany, Pakistan to the United Kingdom, South Korea to Japan.

One story of community

The story of migrants comes from the juxtaposition of many stories, ranging from the terrorism carried out by U.S.-supported army troops to the voices of activists speaking out against the poor living and working conditions of migrant labor camps (Bacon 2006:xii). Conflict, poverty, and migration are founding events for the indigenous people of Guatemala which become the

introduction to the story of indigenous migrants in Mexico and the United States. Prior to this, these people lived independently in the countryside. But in the early 1980s, the country was filled with brutality carried out by the military, armed with guns supplied by the United States. In an effort to stamp out armed rebels, army troops terrorized indigenous populations in Guatemala believing that anti-military movements were underfoot. The lives of many villagers were senselessly lost. Those who survived fled to the north towards Mexico to become refugees living in a constant state of being betwixt and between, also known as liminality (Turner and Bruner 2001; Van Gennep 1960), without any status. Those who contemplated staying in their decimated hometowns faced little hope of survival in the midst of the overwhelming devastation of life as they once knew it.

The continuous demand for farm labor paved the way for indigenous migrants to move north into Mexico and eventually the United States (Bacon 2006). The road north, from Guatemala to the United States, has been marked with small spontaneous communities of migrants whose lives have dramatically changed and search for a better life. The commonality is the expulsion of these people from a society of which they were or attempted to be contributing members to one where they fell to the lower rungs of the social ladder, looked down on as refugees, farm labors, migrant workers. Within the visceral evolution

of communities, migrants can begin to make sense of their identity once lost. The kinship inherent in community moors the ship lost at sea.

The movement for employment is a phenomenon with which many of us are familiar. For example, many of the workforce in major metropolitan areas are accustomed to the necessary to and fro of commuting from their hometowns to places of employment that can be 50 or more miles away. But the dislocation of community is a different driver to movement. The movement comes about from our own individual needs of belonging. Losing one's means of safety, shelter, and food, and one's sense of identity is not an option people willingly choose. Instead, this path of destitution and inequality is forced upon them.

Community is a mobile concept. It represents the convergence of multiple narratives existing in one public space, embodying a shared narrative of many contingencies (Stone 2008, Nanz and Steffek 2004). The space extends beyond a physical location, but instead, lives within the hearts of those who exist within it. The communities of migrants become transnational communities, rich with the historicity and traditions of the indigenous people. The historicity and traditions of people help keep them connected to their original home and to who they are, their self-identity. There exists both an entrance into and exit out of the community, creating a dynamic flow between the past and present. The past

readily becomes present. Returning home means they bring their present community with them as well.

In addition, men are usually in the position to leave their homes and migrate to these transnational communities, leaving behind their family, thus expanding the boundaries of home, reshaping what and where it exists. This even extends to how migrants are recognized in the eyes of their nation of origin, as noted in this quote from a high school teacher and activist for the Indigenous Front of Binational Organizations:

> The money brought in by immigrants is Mexico's number-
> one source of income, but the state government only
> recognizes the immigrant community when it is convenient.
> [Bacon 2006:xvi]

The weight of economics on the side of migrants in their home of origin has pivoted the suffrage movement in their favor, allowing for movement up the scale of political rights.

The Indigenous Front of Binational Organizations, started in California, represents the interests of all indigenous people of Mexico, in communities in both Mexico and the United States. These communities experience first-hand the struggles of marginalization by society, suffering the stigma of social segregation and all that it entails (Smith and Guarnizo 1998:203). However, within these communities, women, a traditionally marginalized group, have begun to find their voice, received by others--a positive effect of migration.

The ability to keep their respective indigenous cultures alive relies heavily on the ability to keep the healthy use of the language of origin alive—this holds for Mixtecs, Zapotecs, other Oaxacan indigenous groups, and all peoples (Bacon 2006). Being and identity live within our language of discourse—a discourse that contains the narratives of our lived past, being present, and imagined future (Ricoeur 1992). The challenge remains within the generational preservation of culture and identity. For children born in the United States of indigenous parents and engaging in the traditional monolingual educational system, as is the case in the United States, losing their sense of culture, identity, and tradition is guaranteed.

The current discussions surrounding U.S. immigration reform once again threaten to decimate existing communities--transnational communities formed albeit from a history of peremptory upheavals (Levine 2005; Delanty 2000). U.S. immigration policy is not immune from the legitimacy and effects of transnational communities. Remembering the true past of the United States recalls the fact that the most popular states to where today's migrants from Mexico journey to (California, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Texas, Colorado, Utah) were once part of Mexico.

While there is an element of exclusivity in transnational communities, they do not exist in isolation. Transnational communities are affixed within a

delicate social network or web (Stone 2008, Nanz and Steffek 2004). Individually, the relationship is parasitic, where the host nation actually serves as the parasite, reaping benefits from the host (migrant). Collectively, as an organized community, the relationship turns towards a rudimentary form of symbiosis, where mutual benefits come from the interdependent relationship.

Transnationalism embodies a pluralistic viewpoint of multiple identities (Smith and Guarnizo 1998:212). Transnational migrant communities also have an element of illegality to it (Smith and Guarnizo 1998:202): migrating to another country requires violating laws and boundaries of nation-states.

Conclusion

Globalization has its effects at the international, regional, and local level. It sparks the movement of people from their homes to perceived places of opportunity, where a transnational space is created. This movement of people can be unsettling for all involved. Migration invites us as Americans to ask who we are at each of these levels and understand our own identity. Community and kinship allow us to redefine ourselves in this fluid state of affairs and to engage in authentic public discourse surrounding global issues today, recognizing that the Other is as much a part of that essential discourse.

In an effort to reach a deeper understanding of the context of public discourse, the next Chapter reviews the current literature surrounding migration, development, and policy.

CHAPTER THREE REVIEW OF LITERATURE: THE CONTEXT OF POLICY

<u>Introduction</u>

The context of the policies of the Millennium Declaration Act, the National Security Strategy, and the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act warrant an exploration of a variety of literature. The research itself is grounded in the contemporary philosophical work of Paul Ricoeur, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Martin Heidegger, Richard Kearney, Jürgen Habermas, and Ellen Herda, specifically in critical hermeneutics, narrative identity, memory, imagination, and public space. Readings of sociocultural anthropologists such as Arjun Appadurai (1996, 2001), political scientists such as Benedict Anderson (2006), and other scholars such as Noam Chomsky (2003) were reviewed, including additional research in public policy, the public sphere, migration and transnationalism, narrative identity, other, and ethical aim.

<u>Public Policy</u>

Policies are agreed upon rules intended to guide social interaction within and amongst groups of people, guiding them towards a common interest for the greater good (Wildavsky 1987). Setting legitimate policies is a complex process involving multiple perspectives of both benefactors and beneficiaries. However, this commonly accepted oversimplification pales in comparison to the actual

process of making policies. Policymakers often lack the understanding of the true

interests of the benefactors, who the real and intended beneficiaries are, and how

to engage in authentic discourse to do what is right for the greater good (Stone

2008, Nanz and Steffek 2004). Several American foreign policies are excellent

examples of how inauthentic discourse, or discussion where the truth is

obscured, leads to one-sided dictums where physical force becomes the prime

means of enacting and enforcing policy.

In a global context, one can easily lose sight of what is right for the greater

good. For example, the connection between democracy and development, where

the call to nationalism becomes a call to democracy (Sen 1999:146-159; Guéhenno

1995:2), can extend to globalization. Hence, these forces are not mutually

exclusive. However, Maull (2006:34-39) argues that American foreign policy

often carries an essence of "exceptionalism," with roots that go beyond the

current government administration. He cites that history reveals strong

inclinations of a "missionary" impulse based on a domestic model of the political

system of freedom, democracy, and individual rights. This inclination and

capitalist economic expansion are considered to reign supreme. The beliefs are

embedded within the fabric of the American culture, against a backdrop of

Americans who generally are not interested in international relations and foreign

affairs.

McCormick (2006:55) cites the precedence set forth by American foreign policy, noting that it has been primarily driven by the Executive branch of the U.S. government, namely the President and his selected advisors, as witnessed by the preemptive actions of President Harry Truman in Korea in 1950 and President John F. Kennedy in the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. In the eyes of the American public, the assumed threat of communism during the Cold War years translated to a critical security issue and justified the exclusive unilateral actions of the President. Congress and interest groups could offer only minimal contributions: the channels of communication to challenge this Executive power were either non-existent or ineffective. The Executive Branch was given *carte blanche* in implementation of its decisions. Those invited to discussions that influenced foreign policies were often those who "favored a strong defense, the promotion of capitalism, and a dominant role for the United States in global affairs" (McCormick 2006:56).

Conversely, Rothstein (1977) refers to the elite of target nations as those who have the most to gain from successful implementation of foreign aid programs. The elite choose to maintain a stable political order in the other country "over a concern for economic development" (Rothstein 1977:183), often with the influence of military repression. This type of economic development undermines the domestic growth of a developing country and increases reliance

on foreign aid, producing a relationship that became "more and more inextricable and thus more and more prone to tensions and conflicts" (Rothstein 1977:6).

Eventually, policy-makers do begin to see the effects of their work. For example, public outcry over U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War opened more involvement by Congress, paving the way for a more pluralistic framework of foreign policy-making. Although not completely overriding the presidential dominance of foreign policy-making, it did help to slow down the executive actions. With Congressional reform, the actors changed and a more definitive polarity was struck along political party lines: Republican and Democratic. McCormick (2006:58) refers to the American debate over foreign policies in the 1970s to 1990s such as the Panama Canal, foreign aid, trade, and security defense as one along Republican-Democratic political party lines. The debate spilled over to the American public which effectively divided the public at-large into groups along an "isolationism-to-internationalism continuum" and "militant-to-cooperative action continuum" (McCormick 2006:59). In effect, the paradigm shifted from an exclusive unilateral decision-making process to one of pluralistic consideration. Both Congress and interest groups were now evolving into viable actors in the complex process of policy-making. During this period, policies such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the World Trade

Organization (WTO) were approved and enacted. This pluralistic dynamic continued until September 11, 2001.

The terrorist attacks of the World Trade Center and U.S. Pentagon on September 11, 2001 shocked the world and pushed America back into the executive-dominated mindset of foreign policy-making. With the vulnerability of national security now revealed worldwide, President Bush unilaterally declared a war on terrorism to protect national interests. Policies and initiatives such as the UN Millennium Declaration (Appendix A), the U.S. National Security Council National Security Strategy (Appendix B) and the proposed Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (Appendix C) are rooted in the tragic event of September 11, 2001. The effectiveness of these recent policies remains to be seen.

Whether a given policy is created on unilateral or multilateral interests, the effectiveness of the policy must be considered. By and large, policies are often created and evaluated within a positivistic framework. For example, Bruland, Hanf, and Manske (2006) refer to the continued reliance on objective measures of successful influence of interest groups. Qualitative methods of evaluation are recognized but assumed to have inherent weaknesses in methodology because the belief is that data is reserved for the numerical, scientific or objective realm.

However, this limited definition and the positivistic philosophy it embraces has been critiqued thoroughly (Kuhn 1996; Geertz 2000; Escobar 1995).

Unfortunately, in the United States the scientific philosophy often prevails where critical analysis of public policy frequently occurs, if at all, within the specific interests of economic development, political science, or social systems, despite current thinking emerging in Europe, Canada, Australia and several other countries about policy, development, and assessment and the value of interpretive data (Munck and O'Hearn 1999; Hobart 1993). Regardless of the nationality of who is thinking beyond the objective realm, analyzing the effectiveness of public policies such as the Millennium Declaration, National Security Strategy, and Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, must go beyond the boundaries of economic, political, and social systems to consider the public sphere within which it exists. Without recognizing the public sphere as the stage on which the policy is performed, the depth and breadth of the true intent and purpose of the policy is potentially lost or misunderstood. In the next section, public sphere is reviewed in terms of its fluid structure and what can be suspended in it.

Policymakers

Policy experts (analysts or advisers) are a growing profession. Tong (1986:1) writes "policy analysis is the largest industry in the nation's capital."

In the 1960s, the world of U.S. politics and policymaking opened their arms to the scientists who offered research and analysis in support of politically-driven rhetoric and platitudes. Political interests now had a more solid, objective footing to stand on. For scientists, a schism developed, moving from a *modus operandi* of "the evidence speaks for itself" to (the science) "what do you want the evidence to say?" or "What do you want the answer to be?" (the art), as Tong (1986:4) states: "…policy analyzing, advising, and consulting is frequently anything but neutral, rational, and efficient."

How policy expertise is provided affects the distribution of political power and inadvertently creating a technocracy and eroding democracy, or expanding democracy. Tong claims "…designing policies that facilitate intelligent and effective citizen participation must be an essential task of policy experts" (Tong 1986:6), although policy experts may feel removed form the responsibilities of making decisions.

The positivists debate is alive and well in the world of policymaking (Roe 1994), where policies are considered strong if based on technical data and scientific fact, as opposed to interpretation.

Public Sphere

The public sphere houses a public space that is the "contact zone" where "disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other and establish

ongoing relations" as noted by Mary Louise Pratt (Coldiron 2004:208). The literal meaning of *Öffentlichkeit* (Coldiron 2004:210) describes this public sphere: "a state of openness, implicitly an availability to scrutiny and intervention." Habermas (1998:360) refers to the public sphere as a social space created through communication with one another.

Public space is what allows us to assemble and come together in what can be a safe yet risky environment, where the risk is in the uncertainty or the legitimacy of the understanding. Within this understanding is the capacity we all have for doing what is right: the ethical aim of our being.

Public policy is created in a public sphere, accessible by all, yet not as commonly recognized but for only a minority of individuals such as scholars and policymakers (Habermas 1998:367). Each of the policies already mentioned embodies the concept of a nation, namely the United States, in a public space; for example, the Millennium Declaration involves the United States and their role in global development in other countries; the National Security Strategy involves how the United States will preemptively maintain and defend democracy with and for others globally; and the proposed Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act involves the legality of migrants in the United States. These policies relate to the identity of the United States in a public space, both nationally and globally.

If the nation is a "political space in which democracy can be constructed" (Guéhenno 1995:3) and there is no longer a strict association of space with geography, then what are the implications for national leaders? The foundations of national politics and economy no longer apply. Within every nation then is the capacity of building democracy, developing socioeconomically, and participating on the global scale (Sen 1999:146-159). These keystones of democracy, development, and globalization reside in an amorphous public sphere, tethered by the concept of transnationalism, which is a state of being. This fluid and dynamic state is also influenced by the movement of people in and out of this public sphere (migration) and encompasses the fluidity of movement and thought (M. Kearney 1995). The next section highlights salient points surrounding migration and transnationalism. Understanding migration and its association with transnationalism brings forth a deeper understanding of nationhood and identity.

Migration and Transnationalism

Migration refers to the movement of people around the world. Often, people moved out of necessity, with economic factors weighing in significantly. In fact, migration is a natural part of sociocultural events such as war, colonization, economic expansion, nation-building, as well as with conflict, persecution, drought or famine. The context of migration is inseparable from

global concerns such as development, poverty, and human rights (Sen 1981).

Migration refers to the movement of people around the world and represents a

natural flow from areas of paucity to areas of abundance or ampleness.

Migration is traditionally recognized in terms of time: permanent and temporary.

Castles (2002) projects that migration will continue at increasing rates to

accommodate the demands of globalization and the declining population in

some countries.

According to Koser (2007:3-6), the number of migrants in the developed

world has surpassed the number in the developing world and continues to

increase, yet still only represents three percent of the world's population:

> In 2000 there were about 60 million migrants in Europe, 44
> million in Asia, 41 million in North America, 16 million in
> Africa, and 6 million in both Latin American and Australia.
> Almost 20 percent of the world's migrants in 2000—lived in
> the USA. The Russian Federation …about 13 million,
> …Germany, the Ukraine, and India…between 6 and 7
> million migrants.

Indeed, migration affects every part of the world today and, despite the

hazardous journey that many endure, it has become a more common way of life

for many. Migration was once viewed as a one-time only event, returning home

afterwards. Now, many migrants constantly move to other countries, with

periodic visits back to their country of origin, which describes a circular pattern

of concentric circles with the country of origin in the center.

The World Bank estimates that migrants worldwide have earned 20 trillion U.S. dollars (Koser 2007: 10). While most of the money is put back into the economy of the host country, the country of origin has also benefited economically. In practice, migrants typically send a fraction of the money earned home to benefit families and the local community. Collectively, this represents a substantial amount of influx of money to keep the respective economy afloat. Hence, the pattern of circulatory migration affects the migrant, the host country, and the country of origin.

Migration at today's level results in more widespread diversity in culture, language, and human interaction, yet movement of people also provokes national security, especially in light of 9/11. This stir has funneled discussions solely on the domestic impact to society of migrants, with minimal openness to the effect on countries of origin and the families and local community of migrants. While the economic benefits can be positively described, the sociocultural consequences for migrants are mostly negative. The topic of migration has garnered enough attention in the minds of many to become one of the key issues to address in a political agenda.

Research on Mexico-U.S. transnational migration has mostly been viewed through an economic-sociological lens. The identity of transnational migrants are defined by both the geographical borders of Mexican and U.S. nation-states, yet

there is a transcendent quality in the identity formed. Most explanations of why

transmigration occurs has largely been economic and some cultural. A foray into

a political explanation is still underdeveloped, but the premise is that

governments also play a large part in explaining the *whys* of transmigration. For

example, Smith (2003:468) explains how certain political parties seek to boost the

local economy by looking at transmigrants as a viable source of income for the

locality. Such influence redefines the constructs of *nation, region,* and *citizen.* In

general, on either side of the national border, transmigrants are taken advantage

of in terms of their status in society. Both political societies reap the benefits of

the soil tilled by the transmigrant. One nation views these migrants as heroes, the

other nation views them as criminals—a beautiful case of liminality.

In response to global demand, Saldívar (1999:218) points to global markets

and transnational labor forces as the source of tension around immigrants,

especially Asian and Latino. Illegal immigrants live in a world where they cannot

be acknowledged—their identity and past is lost to them. If they were to connect

with their identity and past, their current legal status would invalidate them

immediately because the connotation of the word *illegal* is "illegitimate" or "not

belonging." Saldívar (1999) cites the poetic language of song that captures "…the

subjective experience of marginality, of the periphery and the border."

Despite the tension amongst immigrants, more and more people are becoming transmigrants, where they may live in the host country while staying connected to the country of origin; they are neither here nor there—a case of liminality. Snel et al. (2006:25) and Koser (2007:27) recognize the transmigrant as constantly crossing borders in sociocultural, political, and economic frameworks. They have "one foot in and one foot out" (Falicov 2005:401) where the transmigrant is "reconstituted" in identity, space, and society (Ley (2004:156). The community created by this diaspora, as is nation, is an imagined community (Anderson 2006), specifically an "imagined transnational community" (Sökefeld 2006:267). Struggles and conflict occupy this space, as does destiny—the home within shared imaginaries. Indeed, transnational space contains fragments of multiple identities (Ley 2004:155).

There is approximately a one-to-one ratio of legal to illegal immigrants. The Migration Policy Institute (2006:19-20) reports there are 11.8 million Lawful Permanent Residents and 11.1 million Unauthorized Migrants.

The earlier immigration law of 1986 did not account for economic and social change, so with globalization, the law stood as an outdated and ineffective form of law. Recently the U.S. Congress began to move on the issue: in late 2005, the House of Representatives passed a bill calling for stronger enforcement measures, whereas, in the following year, the Senate passed legislation that both

increased enforcement and expanded legal immigration. Neither passed as Congress was not able to reach agreement. Given the delay in reaching an acceptable reform method, President George W. Bush believed it best to increase enforcement of existing law. However, the question remains as to how to address most effectively the quagmire of immigration.

A heavy component of discourse surrounding immigration policy focuses on the economic implications, extending it to the level of national security (Hanson 2005). Immigration is an issue divisive enough to create inaction. The only consensus amongst people and government officials is that current immigration is a system that needs to be fixed. Several factors compete against each other such as the demand for cheap low-skilled labor and stronger border control.

Migration often occurs towards countries where friends and family already exist to help lessen the astringency that comes with new beginnings in a foreign land. With friends and family marking the edge of the migration portal, a transnational migrant network is formed. Their role embodies one that is not only familial, but serves also as guide in providing information about the new country, lending money to get started, and helping the migrant get settled in the new land. These networks tend to withstand any economic or political turbulence of the host country (Koser 2007, Bacon 2006, Castles 2002).

Opting for migration is not an easy decision for anyone rooted in their country of origin. Yet, this option gives one the hope of survival from the harsh encumbrances of a weak economy, volatile market, political crisis, or armed conflict and the like. This describes the huge disparity between developing and developed countries.

Crossing national borders threatens the lives of those seeking a better life. Often taking risks in terms of environmental hazards or the supposed generosity of others who turn out to be coyotes or human traffickers, the threat to one's life is evident. Moreover, many people of the host country view the influx of migrants as a threat to national security, although this is too simply stating a very complex issue.

Fear from migration or immigration also extends to the potential economic impact to the host society. Lower wages can pull down market labor costs, thus impacting those who are in the same competitive workforce as migrants such as in the construction and agricultural industries. However, this is not extended to an impact on public finances, where migrants tend not to impact social services (Koser 2007:95). Despite this fact, general public opinion still associates immigration with high unemployment levels.

Migration follows the wave of economic and social change. The controversy of immigration reform in the United States stems from heated

debates surrounding border control, workforce demands, and family unification (Migration Policy Institute 2006: xiii). In the United States, there have been four recognized waves of economic and social change: (1) European settlement in the Americas (2) moving from colonial to an agrarian society (3) moving from an agrarian to manufacturing society through the industrial revolution and finally (4) moving from a manufacturing to knowledge-based society through globalization (Migration Policy Institute 2006:1).

The borders of transnationalism are not only physical. The borders exist in the mind and heart. They are created from national forces and governments that act to move people in the name of socioeconomic and sociopolitical expertise. People exist on both sides of the border and the offspring of transnationalism comes about from an exertion by one over the other (Kearney, M. 1995; Brettell 2003).

There is a plurality that exists in this space (Ley 2004; Habermas 1998:329-387), namely in identity, power, and belongingness. Belonging brings legitimacy to the space, in which one's identity is defined. If identity is who we are as a person, as a community, as a nation, how can we understand identity within transnational space against the backdrop of policies that impact that space such as the Millennium Declaration, the National Security Strategy, or the proposed

Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act? A closer look at the focus of the

policies is warranted.

Immigration Reform

Since the founding of the United States in 1776, immigration has been an

issue for legislators (Koser 2007). The first law enacted in 1875 was a qualitative

limitation on immigration, specifically prohibiting criminals and prostitutes. The

Supreme Court later declared that the federal government was solely responsible

for the regulation of immigrants. Congress eventually established the

Immigration Service in 1891 to process all immigrants seeking admission to the

United States (Congressional Budget Office 2006).

Since the 1920s, immigration grew rapidly after World War I, and

Congress responded by setting quantitative restrictions using a national-origins

quota system. Immigration was restricted by assigning each nationality a quota

based on its representation in past U.S. census figures, with the exception of

family reunification. If a family member was already a citizen of the United

States, then he or she could petition for family members to emigrate to the

United States.

The number of immigrants to the United States, regardless of

documentation, has been increasing since the 1960s (Hanson 2005:11). Many

consider this increase the result of immigration policy, yet this explanation does

not account for the social forces that provoke migration of people seeking a safe

and secure life. To cite policy as the cause oversimplifies a complex social issue.

As is true of the attenuating effects of statistics, the same is true of statements

regarding immigration and wages such as that made by Hanson (2005:41):

> Since poor countries tend to have populations with low
> educational attainment, it comes as little surprise that a
> large fraction of recent immigrants arrive with relatively
> little schooling. The influx of immigrants appears to have
> depressed average wages in the United States, and the
> largest wage losses have been borne by low-skilled native
> workers.

In 1965, Congress modified the national-origins quota system, establishing

a categorical preference system with the Immigration and Nationality Act

Amendments. Quantitative restrictions continued for countries of the Eastern

Hemisphere (Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia), although preference was

given to cases of family reunification and for job skills deemed useful to the U.S.

provided the numbers per country were still within the quota. While there was

an overall cap on immigration from the Western Hemisphere, no additional

restrictions were imposed, as on the Eastern half.

This policy continues today, with only slight modifications. In the 1970s,

the categorical preference system was applied to the Western Hemisphere and an

annual cap of 290,000 immigrants worldwide was established. In 1990, diversity

was added to the categorical preference system and the cap was increased to a

rolling quota of 675,000 immigrants. So if immigration was less than the quota in the previous year, the difference could be added to the quota for the current year (Koser 2007).

Two additional policies also affected immigration to the United States. The Refugee Act of 1980 allowed the President, in consultation with Congress, to determine the annual quota of refugees and those seeking asylum (Koser 2007). The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 addressed the issue of unauthorized immigration, citing sanctions for anyone knowingly hiring undocumented workers. The Seasonal Agricultural worker amnesty program allowed people who had worked for at least 90 days in certain agricultural jobs to apply for permanent resident status. The Legally Authorized Workers amnesty program allowed current unauthorized aliens who had lived in the United States since 1972 to legalize their status.

Continued concern over illegal immigration prompted the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, which addressed border enforcement and social services used by immigrants.

Fixing a broken immigration system falls into two categories: skills-based (Hanson 2005:56) and rights-based immigration policy. Skills-based policy would minimize the financial effect on public funds assumed by low-skilled immigrants by giving preference to highly-skilled workers. In addition, it limits the number

of immigrants resulting from family reunification. Yet, high-skilled emigrants tend less to remit income to their country of origin, thereby diminishing the well-being of their home countries which are often in a developing state.

A rights-based policy moderates the access to public funds based on time in the host country. Each phase is graduated to allow more rights to public support.

In either type of immigration reform, the driving factor of need is neglected. Life in the United States can carry demands that can be hard to meet. Even U.S. citizens with fixed or little income look to ways to increase their income "under the table" to maximize their benefits. They live in a catch-22 society. The current immigration reform movement is towards restricting people on both sides of the border; however, this is something that will never be. There is no recognition of the fact that our shift from a manufacturing to knowledge-based global society requires us to consider the hopes and aspirations of people in their own different and cultural ways. Discourse is not the same nor should it be.

The guest worker program of the U.S. immigration policy fastens the yoke of indentureship on those searching for a means of financial sustainability. Guest workers in the U.S. have no individual freedom or rights beyond those of being employed (and that is if someone wants to employ them). Regardless of

employment, they are not welcome to stay in the United States. Bacon states

(2006:xiv):

> They have no right to settle in communities, send their
> children to school, practice their culture and religion, or
> speak their language. They can't vote or exercise
> fundamental political or labor rights.

The Homeland Security Act of 2002 created the Department of Homeland

Security (DHS), which restructured the Immigration and Naturalization Service

(INS). The DHS now manages immigration services, border enforcement, and

border inspections through three separate Bureaus, namely: the Bureau of

Citizenship and Immigration Services, the Bureau of Customs and Border

Protection, and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. The

system of immigration to control the movement of people into a country can only

be viewed in the global context of conditions in the world. A closer look at

development may help us come to understand why, for some, migration is the

only solution.

Development

Development started in the mid-1940s with the end of World War II and

the start of the Cold War. This era also introduced international organizations

such as the United Nations (1942), the World Bank (1944), and the International

Monetary Fund (1944). Attention fixated on poverty throughout the world

through the lens of the wealthy, defined as the have's and have not's (Herda 2007, 2002; Sen 1999, 1981). During this period, other countries were categorized as poor or impoverished and without means, based on definitions of poverty based on the World Bank statistic of annual capita per income. The definition separated the rich and poor countries and practically overnight, approximately 70% of the world's people were classified as poor (Escobar 1999:382).

The power of the speaker to make such a claim and distribute the understanding so readily and easily is an abuse of power, especially when the Other is not involved in the discourse at all.

Escobar (1999) posits that development is a historical construct, destructive to any target population, namely "third world" countries.

> Development was—and continues to be for the most part—a top-down, ethnocentric, and technocratic approach that treats people and cultures as abstract concepts, statistical figures to be moved up and down in the charts of "progress" … (yet) it has succeeded in creating a type of underdevelopment that has been, for the most part, politically and technically manageable. [Escobar 1999:384-385]

Hence, development has continued in this context, where poverty, illiteracy, and hunger are terms defined by the rich country, those in power.

Easterly (2007) is just as critical of development, stating that "Developmentalism is a dangerous and deadly failure." His prime criticism stems from the fact that the people who are to reap the costs and benefits of

development are not involved in the discourse. Instead, experts within aid

organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank,

and the United Nations are self-appointed as the appropriate voice box for the

people. These experts view the problem of poverty as a purely technological

problem that does not warrant the contributions of the social sciences. As an

economist, he would approach the problem of poverty with an eye towards:

> time-tested economic ideas—the benefits of specialization,
> comparative advantage, gains from trade, market-clearing
> prices, trade-offs, budget constraints—by individuals, firms,
> governments, and societies as they find their own success.
> [Easterly 2007]

Developing countries that can demonstrate progress are usually favored

in assistance over those states that are failing or weak (Herda 2007, 2002). The

latter nation states are the ones believed to pose the greatest threats to U.S.

national security. In these failing nation states such as Afghanistan and Sudan,

there is a lack of focus on a cohesive strategy towards peace and democracy.

The U.S. considers itself excluded from the international requirements of

engagement and tends to operate unilaterally (Lieven and Hulsmal 2006). Their

own refusal to work with other nations or organizations in a multilateral fashion

conveys a sense of moral righteousness and that actions must follow the

sentiment of the U.S. before they choose to take action. Dissension or

disagreement results in their refusal to participate, revealing an extremely myopic vision of global leadership.

There was little hope of President George W. Bush's supporting international development when he took office in 2000. Surprisingly, he has shown support in examples of re-building Afghanistan and Iraq and providing assistance to Haiti, Liberia and Sudan. The amount of financial aid to Africa has doubled and new initiatives such as the Millennium Challenge Account and the efforts to minimize the spread of HIV/AIDS have been implemented. Granted, some of these may have been longstanding promises by the United States, so the ideas may not be new, but the actions are certainly welcome.

Birdsall, Patrick and Vaishnav (2006:7-11) cite four weaknesses of U.S. development policy: (1) very little is spent on development assistance (16 cents per $100 GDP), (2) forcing poor countries to buy U.S. goods regardless of the value towards development, (3) a plethora of development projects and their reporting requirements causing a nightmare of bureaucratic paperwork that are not integrated, and (4) too many people in charge of U.S. development programs.

A closer look reveals the need for more efforts towards development by the United States, using a different approach. For example, development aid offered to Africa actually has a few terms and conditions, where dollars are earmarked for "humanitarian relief, technical assistance, debt forgiveness, and

the shoring up of strategic allies" (Birdsall, Patrick, Vaishnav 2006:3). The criteria for use of monies detracts from the transformational development towards ending poverty that could and should take place.

In addition, the United States tends to focus on monetary assistance as opposed to offering assistance in other viable development programs such as trade, migration, technology, the environment, investment, and security.

Collier (2007) further criticizes current development efforts, noting that certain nation states such as Haiti, Laos, Burma and other Central Asian countries have shown no change since development has taken place in the last 40 years. Hence the claim that the "one-size-fits-all" approach to development does not work for one-sixth of the world's population or what Collier refers to as the "bottom billion."

As such, Collier (2007; Collier and Dollar 2001) is critical of the Millennium Development Goals established by the United Nations and of which Jeffrey Sachs (2005) is in full support. Sachs puts forth the moral argument for village-level interventions in education, nutrition, sanitation, road paving, and malaria prevention, supported by annual funding of $195 billion.

In contrast, Easterly (2006), skeptical of aid's potential, brazenly contends that development efforts have failed and cites several interventions in developing countries that have failed, producing more harm than good. Easterly

also echoes the lack of voice of poverty: "The problem with aid is that the poor are mostly invisible" (Easterly 2006:171). The bureaucracy that Easterly describes follows a one-to-many ratio in that for every dollar towards aid that exists, multiple hands are holding on to it with keen interest. For any given aid organization, there are multiple layers of reporting and accountability structures.

Success in development is based on numbers, specifically on the volume of aid available or the amount of population served (Collier and Dollar 2001). Monies are discussed in whole numbers of multiples of 10; people are discussed in terms of fractions. Easterly, a former research economist at the World Bank, observes:

> Advocates for the world's poor throughout the decades
> have focused on increasing the *volume* of foreign aid. The
> recommended increase displays a strange fixation on
> *double"* [Easterly 2006:182]

To listen to the voice of the poor recognizes the dialectic relationship between those who help and those who are helped. Easterly posits a type of development reform where "…aid agency specialists spend time learning about a particular sector in a particular region" (Easterly 2006:198) where through the talent of "searchers," innovative ideas are started and followed through.

Despite the tremendous efforts towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Africa may not meet them (Easterly 2007:23) because of the inherent bias in setting the goals in the first place. As objective as

numerical goals can be, numbers, like any value, are set within a specific context to give it true meaning. For example, for Africa to achieve a 50 percent reduction in poverty is beyond conception because Africa has the lowest per capita income, associated with the smallest percentage reduction in poverty for the same rate of growth. The choice of setting up the MDGs is arbitrary.

In the world of development, there are many players who participate with their own interests at stake, in spite of the true interests of the poor. The checks and balances of agencies to ensure a steady pace towards progress is conflicted with the mechanism of self-evaluations. Most agencies approach development in trying to tackle the broad spectrum of issues as opposed to specializing in areas of their own strength. This wide stroke of the brush results in very little progress in any one category and the developing country continues to stay in more or less the same status.

Each of the policies divulges a narrative that is at once tradition, but lacking in historical effective consciousness. Remembering the past is limited to the narrator or policymaker but the historicity remains to be described. There are only hints of what the historical context was, which is presented in a mono-dimensional, self-justifying fashion. In each story, the only character that speaks is the dominant one, the policymaker. Given this, the possibilities of a shared understanding are minimal, but explored in the next section.

Foreign Policy

The current situation in the United States escapes partisan attribution. Neither Republicans or Democrats have adequately addressed foreign policy and international relations with an ounce of diplomacy grounded in respect for the other. Lieven and Hulsman (2006) cite several examples of the inadequacy of today's foreign policies such as the failure of the U.S. in Iraq, the continued suspicious thinking towards Russia and China, and the challenges in North Korea. The United States has quickly reached the boiling point in its narrow view of the world, despite the loss of lives and the growing deeper conflict that continues. The U.S. refuses to look to a new diplomatic approach. Instead, a continued retreat to the mundane chanting of the platitudes of the values and virtue of democracy itself.

The question is who is democracy for—the United States or the other country? If force is used to institute democracy, is it really democracy? The success of containment as a doctrine of foreign policy has proven itself over time. With the concept initiated under President Harry Truman and carried forward by President Dwight Eishenhower, the resulting Cold War showed that a powerful nation could exercise restraint in the face of a serious Soviet threat. To address such a threat required time.

American identity contains a toxic "mixture of militarization and messianic belief in American superiority" (Lieven and Hulsman 2006:xvi-xvii).

> [Great Capitalist Peace] denotes a global order tacitly agreed to by all the major states of the world, an order that guarantees their true vital interests…In international affairs, it is essential that we try to see ourselves as others do. We cannot demand that the rest of the world simply trust in our benevolence and intelligence. We cannot expect other nations to believe it is in their best interest to allow us to exercise unconstrained power.

The National Security Act of 1947 established the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Air Force, and procedures and protocol as to interagency and intra-agency operations. The Department of Homeland Security was established in response to the 9/11 terrorist attack on the U.S. but "described by insiders as a bureaucratic nightmare" (Lieven and Hulsman 2006:29).

Donald Rumsfeld is of the school of preventive war, or as stated in the National Security Strategy (2006), "preemptive war." The assumption is the imminent threat of an attack, not the possibility or potential for attack. It refers to America's mission to democratize the world, spoken through the bullhorn of arrogance, pulled in the direction of national interests. We speak to suit our advantage.

The National Security Strategy (2006) claims to make a universal tenet: "These values of freedom are right and true for every person, in every society."

People want to be like us: democratic. In this sense, democracy is a defining

characteristic of self. The next section explores the duality of identity.

Narrative Identity

Identity is exteriorized in time in which two temporal facets exist in self:

idem or sameness stays constant or permanent in time, whereas *ipse* or selfhood

changes over time. Narrative identity exists as the mediator in the dialectic of *ipse*

and *idem* (Ricoeur 1992:140, 148). Through emplotment, sense is made of the

random events over the course of time: once disparate moments in time, now

bound together by a plot (the plot) in one's story. Ley (2004:154) also refers to the

sameness of globalization and the selfhood of localization.

Ricoeur states that our identity, who we are today, comes from our past

and our imagined future. The past is reconfigured in the present through

temporal distanciation to allow for "an identification with what once was"

(Ricoeur 1988:144). This is the nature of a trace. As Ricoeur states, a trace "is left

by the past, it stands for it" (1988:143). So one's past can never be completely

erased; some vestige will always exist as a reminder that we are held in debt to

the past. In following the trace back to its genesis, the past becomes present. The

reality of the past is revealed through metaphor: the past is in the narratives told.

We all have a debt to the past that "…makes the master of the plot a

servant of the memory of past human beings" (Ricoeur 1988:156) and as such, we

have a duty never to forget the past (Ricoeur 1992:164). Our differences may prompt others to ask "Where are you from?" in recognizing the traces in us. Unfortunately, the intentional erasure of our past invalidates the trace that exists today and that we carry forward. This trace is part of who we are.

Narratives contain the context of these traces. Narratives are mimetic: through the act of telling, the past is re-created and the future of action is imagined. In mimēsis is the "union of contingency and consecution, of chronology and configuration, of sequence and consequence" (Ricoeur 1981:292). Mimēsis is in the fictional narrative of human action in that it calls forward "productive imagination" to "prescribe a new reading." Through mimēsis, we see "what is essential in reality" (Ricoeur 1981:296).

The importance of understanding one's own identity is crucial before you can begin to know and understand others, especially in the areas of aid and development. There always exists a dialectic between self and Other when aiming for the greater good, as is the premise in public policy and globalization. Having explored the facets of self and identity, we now further the exploration to the stranger as other.

The Stranger as Other

In general, Other is that person(s) who we do not consider as part of self, on a personal, community, or national level. For example, transmigrants may be

viewed as strangers in the eyes of many Americans. That a stranger has this power to define another's self, community and nationhood speaks to the limitations and boundaries of self as Americans. As Richard Kearney states: "Strangers are almost always other to each other" (Kearney 2003:3). A stranger is the Other with whom we do not share an understanding. If the Other is within ourselves, so too then is the stranger, yet "we refuse to acknowledge ourselves as others" (Kearney 2003:5). As stranger, we compare what we observe to rules within our subconscious and allow invalid imaginative claims to take over when observations do not match up with our expectations. For example, when we only recognize people from other countries of origin as immigrants (of permanent migration) and assume a past of marginality and inferiority, we see Other in only one dimension and framed in a specific direction. In this framework, the term *global* is only of rhetorical value.

We recognize each other through a critique of self as Other to reach an understanding and see others as ourselves. The concept of strangers is present in postmodernism and still misunderstood. Through narrative, Kearney seeks to increase and improve our "readiness to welcome strangers, respect gods and acknowledge monsters" (Kearney 2003:10) through "mindful acknowledgement" (2003:8). All of us have the potential to be as stranger to others, but we do not recognize it. Different voices, looks and lifestyles incite paranoia which validates

the Other as stranger. How can we call another a stranger without looking at ourselves first? As Kearney states, we need to "become more ready to acknowledge strangers in ourselves and ourselves in strangers" (Kearney 2003:20). By understanding the dialectic of who we are as self and other, the ethical component springs forth, for we all have the capacity to do what is right. There is an ethical component in all our action, commonly referred to as the ethical aim.

Ethical Aim

There is an ethical component to the action of being a transnational. Ethics is the search for the "good life," as Ricoeur calls "the ethical aim" (Ricoeur 1992:172) in praxis. Ethical aim is not a practice in a vacuum but rather an act of solicitude, serving "with and for others" (1992:180) beyond interpersonal relations. He cites that the ethical aim is extended "to the life of institutions" based on a "requirement of equality" (1992:194), where institution refers to a group of people living together as part of a historical community (society or nation).

Ricoeur posits that an individual as a member of society has an ethical responsibility in which one aims "at the good life with and for others in just institutions" (1992:180). In transnational migration, the ethical perspective is a

complex one involving the transnational migrant, the country of origin, and the host country.

For transnationals, an imagined future is always present. For the family and friends of transnationals who left for the United States, they want to believe that there will be a better life. A new world is imagined. The intentions are certainly towards the good life, however, "with and for others in just institutions" is not as clear in many cases of transnationals.

Summary

The literature review is based on contemporary readings in the areas of foreign policy, migration, and transnationalism, coupled with contemporary philosophical reason of narrative identity, the dialectical self and other, the public sphere, and the ethical aim. Three policies provided the data that I analyzed for the dissertation, namely: the Millennium Declaration 2002 (Appendix A), the National Security Strategy (Appendix B), and the proposed Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (Appendix C).

CHAPTER FOUR RESEARCH PROTOCOL: CRITICAL POLICY ANALYSIS

<u>**Introduction**</u>

Traditionally, the scientific method of investigation was the prime framework used in social sciences. However, postmodernism opened the door to an approach to social inquiry that is inherently a biased endeavor, calling forth a research protocol that allows for the presence and acknowledgement of the researcher in the context of a chaotic environment. Bentz and Shapiro (1998:xiv) refer to this as a values-based paradigm of "mindful inquiry." This purposeful approach allows for the researcher to be present within a research context that is connected with the global environment of reality, an environment filled with values, beliefs, promises, and discourse. Mindful inquiry recognizes the relationship we have to each other and the world around us. Mindful inquiry is used to study the discursive context and implications of the Millennium Declaration Act on development, the National Security Strategy on defense, and the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act on immigration. Specifically, the text of and about these policies was critically analyzed.

The rationale for this research is based on critical hermeneutics and philosophical anthropology in which the two indoctrinations are entwined to develop a deeper understanding of human action. Critical hermeneutics offers the interpretations necessary to understand the complexities of self and Other

and the context of such interactions. The interpretations allow for the meanings

embedded within discourse to be revealed. This is related to philosophical

anthropology, which explores the environment and the values of the individuals

and its society. Based on this grounding, a theoretical framework used in this

research study is described next.

Theoretical Framework

This research study is a review of literature in various disciplines such as

sociocultural anthropology, political science, international relations, foreign

policy, and critical hermeneutics. The methodology is based primarily on the

critical hermeneutic research approach (Herda 1999, Jervolino 1990, Geertz 2000).

Information was collected and analyzed in a critical hermeneutic orientation. The

research focused on identity and other, and just discourse as the research

constructs of fusion of horizons, mimēsis, and emplotment. The validity of

critical hermeneutical research lies in the text and the dialectic established with

the reader.

Verstehen

The German word *verstehen* refers to a deep or critical understanding of

the humanities brought forth through interpretation. In the world today,

technology has served as the catalyst to our rapid epistemological development,

yet the ontological development stays the same, if not decreased in proportion.

Inquiry of the humanities started even before the philosopher Aristotle, though

he is recognized as the progenitor of inquiry. However, the effects of the

Enlightenment continue to cast a shadow in the realm of humanities, favoring

objectivity, proofs and explanations over subjectivity, description, interpretation-

-*verstehen*.

The positivistic framework as applied to humans foregoes the condition

that humans are social beings who interact with one another through language.

Ludwig Wittgenstein's work (1973) in linguistics supported this premise and

attempted to model language in its purest form, without the metadiscourse that

brings about meaning. While Peter Winch followed in his footsteps, Winch (2007)

developed the argument that meaning gives way to understanding.

Fusion of Horizons

Gadamer (2004) extends the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt. He

introduced the concept of fusion of horizons as one stemming from our own

understanding based on the language in which we live. Through language and

acculturation, we acquire an outlook on the world, a horizon (Lawn 2006:66).

Language offers both enlightenment and concealment. Embedded within this

understanding is the past that we bring forward into the present, which effects

the vision we see before us, the horizon. As Gadamer (2004:305) states: "the

horizon of the present is continually in the process of being formed because we

are continually having to test all our prejudices", hence, a fusion of horizons represents a longing never completely fulfilled. Through hermeneutic reflection, the "effective historical consciousness" is revealed (Herda 1999:63). Exploring existing or potential fusions of horizons in the development of policy may unfold a deeper insight into policy-making.

Mimēsis

Mimēsis is the imitation of human action. Ricoeur refers to mimēsis as having three domains: past (Mimēsis1), present (Mimēsis2), and future (Mimēsis3). Mimēsis1 refers to the prefiguration of the world we live in. Mimēsis2 is the world configured, based on a dialectic with the imagined world, a world refigured (Mimēsis3) (Herda 1999:78).

Narratives contain the personification and hardship of an event (Ricoeur 1984:56) in a discursive, diachronic posture. Hence, what is spoken, written, and told of an event, inherently contains our temporal identity. Language is the symbolic mediator of the event, where symbolism refers to the social meaning of action. With a narrative understanding, we gain the authentic implication of a narrated event.

The temporal component of our narrative identity is three-fold: "a present of future things, a present of past things, and a present of present things" (Ricoeur 1984:60). This three-fold temporal component is made manifest through

common ordinary praxis and its description calls forward the things about which

we care.

Mimēsis₁ is the "…preunderstand[ing of] what human acting is, in its

semantics, its symbolic system, its temporality" (Ricoeur 1984:64). Emplotment

allows us to move from mimēsis₁ to mimēsis₂.

Emplotment

The roots of emplotment in critical hermeneutics stem from the

framework set forth in Aristotle's *Poetics* but extend beyond the schema of epic

and tragedy. Emplotment describes the mélange of random, disparate

"intentions, causes, and contingencies" along temporal aspects (Ricoeur

2005:100) by offering a possible theme towards understanding or making sense

of these events. A plot balances the dynamic tension of difference between the

similar and dissimilar qualities of characters and actions, where the character is

the person performing the action.

The plot represents a form of configuration in which the characters and

actions are portrayed in a narrative account of events and experiences over time.

The plot is an overlay of a melody heard along the temporal backdrop of the

harmonious sounds of events in life, complete with crescendos and diminuendos

that give the song (the narrative) its richness and depth. In fact, a song tells a

story of life, replete with the joy, sorrow, pain, suffering, and hope that we may

experience. As such, the familiar feelings allow us to connect to the character(s) who evoke these feelings through their actions. We appropriate the story for ourselves, even though it may not be the same circumstances of the event. There exists a distance between the story of events and who we are (our identity). This distanciation allows us to identify with the story as if it were our own. Emplotment can conduce the narrative identities of the people involved.

Emplotment serves as the progenitor of the legitimation required in just discourse and policy-making. Ricoeur posits that the "plot is grounded in a pre-understanding of the world of action, its meaningful structures, its symbolic resources, and its temporal character" (1984:54). The depth of his pre-understanding rests in the practical understanding of the concepts that enmesh action, namely goals, motives, and agents who are responsible for the action WITH others (Ricoeur 1984:55). Hence, emplotment mediates mimēsis.

> To understand the story is to understand how and why the successive episodes led to this conclusion, which, far from being foreseeable, must finally be acceptable, as congruent with the episodes brought together by the story. [Ricoeur 1984:67]

Research Questions

Based on these research categories, I developed questions intended to initiate the research process of critically reviewing policies in search of answers. The research questions included:

- Who created the policy?

- Who are the polity members?

- What is the transnational space?

- Who is self and other?

- What is the story being told?

These questions served as guidelines to structure the research process that

examined the policies listed in Table 2 on the next page.

TABLE 2. OVERVIEW OF POLICIES

	Millenium Development Act	National Security Strategy	Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act
Creator	United Nations	United States National Security Council	United States Congress
Polity	Developing countries	Countries deemed a risk to U.S. national security	Countries other than the United States; people who currently reside illegally in the United States
Date of implementation	2002	2006	2006
Past (Mimēsis1) History	The intent of the Act was to set goals for the 21st century and act in consensus towards attaining global peace and security, development and poverty eradication, human rights, democracy and good governance. The United Nations was originally created in 1945 to promote international cooperation and achieve peace and security.	The National Security Council is the President's principal forum for considering national security and foreign policy matters with his senior national security advisors and cabinet officials. Since its inception under President Truman, the function of the Council has been to advise and assist the President on national security and foreign policies. The Council also serves as the President's principal arm for coordinating these policies among various government agencies.	Immigration is a part of America's foundation. Migration today coincides with the transformation from a manufacturing economy to a knowledge-based economy. The goals of immigration policy have been family unity, meeting labor market needs, and humanitarian protection. What has since evolved is a complex and ineffective system, allowing a large and growing number of illegal immigrants.
Present (Mimēsis2) Today's Challenges	The eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) range from halving extreme poverty to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education by the target date of 2015	On September 11, 2001, the United States was attacked by a terrorist organization. This tragic event set the bar for what the national security strategy must prevent. The challenges of today include defeating the terrorist enemy, denying support and safehaven to terrorists, combating violent extremist ideology,	The issue of immigration is a highly charged debate, especially against the backdrop of post-9/11. Reform was proposed by the House of Representatives who called for tough new enforcement measures at the border and in the country, based on national sovereignty and rule of law. Proposed Senate legislation expanded

		protecting the homeland, securing weapons of mass destruction, and building partnership capacity.	enforcement and legal immigration, citing market demand as a driver for immigration. Both address reform through classification such as adding new visa categories and new programs to an existing system.

Data Collection and Text Creation

Data were collected from the text of the policies and related readings from professional journals, literature, publications, memorandums, speeches, and press releases. My personal journal also offered some data serving as an accurate record of my own understanding and appropriation that evolved through the research process. Published information presented the distanciation of text essential for the subsequent text creation. Through these readings, text was created that was viewed through the lens of the critical hermeneutic constructs: fusion of horizons, mimēsis, and emplotment.

Data Analysis

A critical analysis of the text was conducted to reveal "new possible worlds in which to live" (Herda 1999:87). Analysis was based on the philosophical foundations set forth by Ricoeur, Heidegger, Gadamer, Kearney, and Habermas. The text was studied for insight into transnationalistic context for policy-making, as well as the self and Other and how narrative identity manifests itself in transnational relations. Further constructs revealed themselves within the world created by the text and reader. Data analysis followed the critical hermeneutic guidelines for analysis defined by Herda (1999:99) such as identifying key statements and the associated themes and categories. Personal

journals, critical essays, and other related materials were reviewed to substantiate the themes, which were examined using critical hermeneutic principles. From here, written discussion was provided to offer insight into the issue under investigation.

There are numerous American foreign policies that can be studied, but I gathered the text of key foreign policies since 2000, namely the United Nations Millennium Declaration (2000), the United States National Security Council National Security Strategy (2002 and 2006), and current written discourse surrounding immigration reform in the United States (Migration Policy Institute 2006). I reviewed the collected text through the lens of transnational space (the space inhabited by two nations and the borders created to define it). I also examined the text through critical hermeneutic concepts such as identity and Other (who is in relation as nation-states) and just discourse (the narrative that contains the shared imagination of nations striving towards an ethical aim and how that is communicated). New themes and subcategories surfaced. Evidence of these constructs within the text are provided as examples.

Additional readings from other data sources were analyzed in light of these themes. These readings included writings from watchdog groups such as the Center for Global Justice, the International Relations Center, and the Global Policy Forum—essentially, non-profit organizations that regularly monitor

institutions like the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank or who may be in communications with foreign ministers of developing countries. Readings included critical essays by key experts in the fields of foreign policy and globalization. Excerpts from my personal journal were reviewed as a document that records the appropriation of new understandings as the researcher.

The intensive review of these data sources using a critical hermeneutic orientation allowed me to be immersed in the dynamics of policy-making so that the forces that shape international relations between the United States and developing countries were revealed.

The question "What would policy-making look like if made in transcultural space?" becomes a less formidable one. With an understanding of just discourse in policymaking, guidelines of ethical policies grounded in the contemporary philosophical works of Ricoeur, Kearney, Gadamer, Heidegger, and Habermas are conceived and suggested.

Background of Researcher

Undertaking a critical hermeneutical approach requires an underlying sense of who I am as the person conducting the research and where I am in my own life and my role in the intellectual and social context of today. So, I offer a snapshot of my own story thus far.

I am a Filipino-American, born in 1963 in Brooklyn, New York. My mother was a recent immigrant from the Philippines; my father returned to the Philippines before I was born. During this time, assimilation into the American "melting pot" was key for all immigrants. Starting school, I soon learned to read, speak, and write English, eventually losing the ability to speak my first language, Tagalog, while retaining my cultural understanding.

As I look back, I recall that my favorite pastime was playing a school teacher, perhaps a prescience of a life in learning and development. But, the first years of my adult professional life were centered around the life sciences--a road that was satisfying but not fulfilling. In 1989, guided by many life-changing events, the direction of my professional life moved towards the learning and development arena, specifically towards adults. I found a greater personal fulfillment in working with adults to effect change.

My second career focused on the written word to effect change. It has been through the many years of working in written communications that I have come to realize the power of the written word. As a result, my relationship with words has changed: words moved from an objective representation of knowledge to containers of meaning revealed through interpretation.

This is the context of where I have been, as I opened the door to participatory inquiry at the University of San Francisco. Today I work in learning

and development for a mental healthcare company. I teach writing and communications at San Francisco State University. And, at the University of San Francisco, I study critical hermeneutics as an approach to organization and leadership. Thus far, it has been a fulfilling juncture that makes me ready for the next step in my calling.

<u>Summary</u>

The research protocol is a critical hermeneutic approach that is based on contemporary philosophical understandings. The analysis of policies and critical essays brought about new understandings of transnationalism, narrative identity, self and Other and how they may be applied in international affairs and foreign policy-making.

CHAPTER FIVE DATA PRESENTATION: THE POLICY DISCOURSE

<u>Introduction</u>

The data were collected from three very different, but related, sources of public discourse: the United Nations, the United States National Security Council, and the United States Congress. Each of these organizations serves as an institution that focuses on the governance of issues that eventually affect all nations.

The text presented in this Chapter is from the following: United Nations Millennium Declaration, the U.S. National Security Strategy, and the proposed immigration reform from the U.S. Senate. The common ground that pulls these policies or initiatives together is the collective concern for and of people of other nations by one or more nations. Given the international implications of text put forward, these documents warrant a deeper exploration of the concepts of transnational space, identity, and other.

Table 3 provides an overview of each policy through the research questions exploring transnational space, identity, and emplotment.

TABLE 3. DATA PRESENTATION

POLICY SUMMARY	POLITY	What is the transnational space?	Who is self and other?	What is the story being told?
Millenium Declaration Act	Developing countries	The shared public space of interconnections and interdependencies between nations and peoples.	Self is the United Nations; Other embodies developing countries	The rescuer of those to be saved: the UN deems itself as the rescuer of developing countries who suffer from poverty, hunger, and disease.
National Security Strategy	Countries deemed a risk to U.S. security	A space where national threats or potential conflict arise.	Self is the nation as sovereign state; Other is the enemy: terrorists and those who do not adhere to democratic principles as defined by the U.S.	The hero who protects all that is good against the villain who commits evil deeds: the U.S. is the hero who protects the nation's sovereignty against global threats such as terrorism and conflict.
Comprehensive Immigration Reform	Countries other than the United States; people who currently reside illegally in the United States	A space of illegal activity such as drug trafficking,	Self is the United States government; Other is the non-U.S. citizen	Outsiders are not welcome unless you have something to offer in math and science: the U.S. offers a home or haven that is considered fit only for those who offer something in return.

Transnational Space

In the public discourse of the sovereignty of nation states, there exists an imagined space in which the nation state exists. The space is public, created by the people both within and outside the space, but the nation state claims primacy over it, declaring ownership over that which the nation state defines. Transnational space exists in this larger public space, as a permeable capsule in which multiple nations exist. If transnational space is a part of the public space, is it recognized in public discourse and policy? The document review conveys some acknowledgement of transnational space but little understanding of its true meaning.

Transnational space is described in categorical ways with a negative tone towards the Other who exists in the space (Ley 2004, M. Kearney 1995). It is used to label groups of individuals deemed unacceptable and not belonging in the space by describing illegal activity which are contained within. For example, the United Nations cites "transnational crime in all its dimensions." The National Security Council refers to the "transnational threats" in Africa from regional war zones (National Security Strategy 2002:11) and "transnational terrorists confronting us today (National Security Strategy 2006:9).

The proposed Senate legislation (S 2611) cited the "transnational threat of illegal drug trafficking." The positioning of these phrases alone conveys an

inappropriateness to be in such a context of public space; only illegal activity is recognized in transnational space. With reference to such unwanted activities, the public meaning of the term *transnational space* changes from an open sphere of potential discourse to one bounded by crime and war—an illegitimate space, created by policymakers and defined as a place riddled with criminals, terrorists, warlords, and militias.

Furthermore, the various proposals of immigration reform recommend a temporary guest worker program in which the undocumented worker would be matched with an employer and allowed to stay in the United States for a few years. In addition, their families may visit the U.S. under an H-4 visa. This presents a period of time of legitimate transnationalism.

Despite the negative implications, there is recognition of the potential of transnational space. For example, the United Nations hints to the bridging elements of a shared public sphere, commenting: "…nations and peoples have become increasingly interconnected and interdependent" (2000:1). Moreover, the United Nations (2000:7) calls out citizens and refugees as peoples who exist in a unique space:

> [t]o work collectively for more inclusive political processes, allowing genuine participation by all citizens in all our countries.

and

> [t]o strengthen international cooperation, … to, countries hosting refugees and to help all refugees and displaced persons to return voluntarily to their homes, in safety and dignity and to be smoothly reintegrated into their societies.

And

> only through broad and sustained efforts to create a shared future (2000:2).

Given the movement of people and information throughout the world, one can consider transnational space to be a commonplace setting. The final words of the United Nations Millennium Declaration capture the essence of this universal space: "the United Nations is the indispensable common house of the entire human family" (2000:9).

The universality of the space is non-referential because transnational space is a concept created by its members. Transnationalism applies to any and every nation; however, the reciprocal nature of transnational space is often overlooked. For example, the National Security Strategy refers to "work with others to defuse regional conflicts" (2006:1), "to walk alongside governments and their people as they make the difficult transition to effective democracies" (2006:7), and "The global coalition against terror has grown and deepened…" (2006:35). These words invoke a shared space that does not necessarily exist in the "land of the free" and those in a powerful nation such as the United States unilaterally define the multilateral term of *transnationalism*.

However, the universal characteristics of transnational space are barely recognized by policymakers. The current reference of the term is based within a negative context, despite the bridging effect of this space. Likewise, the reciprocal nature of the common public space is ignored, in favor of a unilateral determination of acceptable transnationalism. Given the limited awareness of the legitimacy of the shared space, the question arises as to who the policymakers are? Identity of the policymaker via their documents is disclosed in the next section.

Identity

Identity in public discourse is described as a collective identity by a group of righteous individuals. Those who write the policy stand on moral justification that what is put forward is the right, and only, course of action. The United Nations writes that "faith" and "fundamental values" such as "freedom, equality, solidarity, and tolerance" are the drivers for a rightful and just policy. The U.S. National Security Council refers to the freedom or "liberty" harkening to the beliefs promulgated in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The reference to faith and history calls forth a connection to tradition, affirming that current policy is infused by heritage, namely, *our* heritage (Roe 1994), exemplified in the U.S. NSC comments such as "…following tradition of

Harry Truman and Ronald Reagan." Likewise, faith conveys a connection in history to God.

Laying a foundation grounded in history allows for the justification that these rights and values must be protected and by those who recognize it first. The UN cites that they are the "most representative" body to implement the policy because they play a "central role." The U.S. NSC refers to the U.S. as "defenders of liberty and justice" and being the "most responsible" nation of the world. They further their argument by claiming they are the best leaders because "the international community is most engaged when the U.S. leads." Thus, by default, they are the chosen ones.

By claiming the role of leader, they also promote a sense of authority in their role. Within this authority is the weighty task of deliberating and judging the actions of others. For example, the United Nations refers to themselves as the "chief deliberative" organization in world matters, connoting a right of judgment. Likewise, the U.S. Congress identifies several roles of authority in the proposed reform legislation. These roles are given the responsibility of deliberating and taking immediate action in the immigration system. The U.S. NSC decides that existing institutions need reform or new ones need to be created, or both.

The Other

Public discourse is replete with incongruities when describing the other. Policymakers refer to the grand "we" and "all" when discussing implications for people, "without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion" (UN 2000), yet the same text underscores the vulnerabilities of or threats from the other, specifically certain nations such as Africa (UN 2000, U.S. NSC 2006), Mexico, Guatemala, Belize (U.S. S2611), the Middle East, and China (U.S. NSC 2006).

The people of prime focus are defined by the policymakers who decide what and who is most important to focus on. The description is based on either the vulnerability of the Other or the threat to the policymakers' identity. For example, the United Nations focuses on those they define as the people of weak nation states—in particular, those who are innocent, poor, hungry, and people from Africa. The U.S. Congress follows a course of legal definition for the people they target—those who have the proper documentation to reside in the United States, with the exception of highly educated people in math and sciences. Others will be considered acceptable if sponsored by an employer. Likewise, people from Mexico, Guatemala, and Belize would be looked at very carefully. The U.S. NSC defines the target audience as anyone who is associated with crime and terrorism. These are criminals and terrorists who exploit, brutalize, oppress, and are intolerant of other people.

There are three personas that exist in the text of policy: we, all, and they. In policy, the closeness of the relationship serves as the foundation for the text. For example, the United Nations posits a familial persona, commonly referring to women and children as those who need help, and the United Nations is the paternalistic image that has the duty to provide. Descriptions of the Other are often used in a descriptive, advocacy-based form such as "developing countries," "least developed countries," or "previously under colonial domination and foreign occupation." Whereas the United States government agencies describe the Other as names of countries in the same breath as illegal and unwanted, unless they offer a perceived benefit to the United States, such as foreign students accepted to graduate programs in math and science.

These descriptive terms change from adjectives modifying nouns to compound nouns, so that in the name alone they are condemned to becoming one with the derogatory identity of the other. The question is, "How would the Other describe themselves in the same situation? Would they use the same words?"

Democracy serves as the common base for the United States and United Nations, where actions are acceptable if in the name of democratic values, implied more than spoken. There seems to be a distinction between whose democratic values, often siding with the more dominant entity. The United

Nations supports countries that "practice democracy." The United States views the upholding of immigration law as an act of democracy, regardless of any benefits provided by migrants to the United States. The U.S. NSC holds democracy as the only legitimate principle that justifies preemptive acts of aggression on suspects and nations. Their view of democracy is bounded by the belief that we are "fighting a new enemy with global reach," describing them as "transnational terrorists." The commonly held view of the U.S. NSC is that these nations have "no legitimate way to promote change in their own country." Hence, the circumstances demand our military engagement to make right what is surmised as wrong.

These three organizations provide ground rules for action that cancels each other out. In the following fictitious example, one can see how a person is caught betwixt and between the legalities and rules of the United Nations and United States. I explored the legitimacy of the other, entangled in the web of public policy, reflecting in my journal the following fictional scenario:

> A poor woman tries to migrate to the United States and finds she is not welcome. She is turned back to her home country of Guatemala where "she belongs." She returns to her small town in the country destroyed in the Guatemalan civil war, which has yet to recover. She barely earns one dollar a day and her family is hungry and malnourished. The United Nations helped build the only primary school in the locale but she needs her young children to stay and help work the land. Her brother has joined a group of revolutionaries to fight the injustice he sees.

This plausible story shows how these policies and initiatives could imprison one to an unassailable fate.

Democracy is defined unilaterally by the United States, based on respecting human rights, responding to its citizens, maintaining sovereignty and order within its borders, and protecting the institutions of civil society. Yet, the principles of democracy are applied and judged inconsistently. For example, the National Security Strategy of 2006 cites the example of the recent Palestinian elections based on a "free, fair, and inclusive" process but insists that they renounce their "terrorist roots and change its relationship with Israel." The comparison to what the United States considers ideal will always trump the efforts towards democracy, no matter how small a nation-state makes. As clearly stated in the National Security Strategy of 2006, "The form that freedom and democracy take in any land will reflect the history, culture, and habits unique to its people." Hence, there cannot be a uniform application of democracy.

By labeling one a *developing* country, members of the other country are regarded as having less than ourselves, requiring assistance that we (as the United States) deem appropriate. In the National Security Strategy of 2006, financial reform is described as necessary, with the United States working:

> with these countries to develop and strengthen local capital
> markets and reduce the black market. This will provide
> more resources to helping the public sector govern
> effectively and the private sector grow and prosper.

There is a division of and between markets and sectors, as defined by the United States. Again, the Other is not involved in any of these conversations.

The National Security Strategy of 2002 acknowledges both the past of the United States and the past of Other nations:

> America's constitution has served us well. Many other nations, with different histories and cultures, facing different circumstances, have successfully incorporated these core principles into their own systems of governance.

While it is recognized that the past was fraught with an aged national security institution, it is not clear as to what was actually wrong with the existing offices and where the new Department of Homeland Security competes.

Terrorism is an abhorrent act of senselessness using power and force to dominate and kill others. There is no justification for terrorism and the National Security Strategy plays on this universal belief. The terrorism described in the early 21st century is one of the unknown. Some names and faces are recognized, but others are purported to be out in the unidentifiable ranks. The continuous reference to terrorists to justify preemptive actions on any nation-state that may hint of threatening our national security (which is everything) is similar to the biblical scapegoating practiced to appease the gods (Kearney 2003:26-27).

Democracy as defined by the United States is regarded as the realm of the sacred. Fight the terrorists in the name of democracy, where democracy stands as a container of all that is right: freedom, liberty, justice. Anything or anyone

contrary to these infallibilities is akin to being a monster or alien. We don't

actually have to see the monster to be scared of it; our fear is what lives within,

not the monster itself. What if we defined ourselves in terms of Otherness? What

would other nation-states say? What do they already say?

When President George W. Bush referred to North Korea, Iran, and Iraq

as comprising the *axis of evil* in his state of the union address in 2002, the

unspoken message is that we, the United States, are hence the good to the

opposing evil. Kearney (2003:65) explains:

> Ever since early Western thought equated the good with
> notions of self-identity and sameness, the experience of evil
> has often been linked with notions of exteriority.

You never hear the statement: "I am evil." Instead, paranoia and fear set

in against the Other who is evil. "Any threat to National Security is met with

hostility" (Kearney 2003:65). The National Security Strategy reads as the binary

result of a one-question survey: "Are you with us or against us?"

> Rather than acknowledge that we are deep down
> answerable to an alterity which unsettles us, we devise all
> kinds of evasion strategies. Primary amongst these is the
> attempt to simplify our existence by scapegoating others as
> 'alien'. So doing we contrive to transmute the sacrificial
> alien into a monster, or into a fetish-god. But either way, we
> refuse to recognize the stranger before us as a singular other
> who responds, in turn, to the singular otherness in each of
> us. We refuse to acknowledge ourselves-as-others. [Kearney
> 2003:5]

In summary, the data from the three policies indicates that public discourse does contain elements of transnational space, identity, and other, without the backdrop of legitimate action. Emplotment sets the characters along a common story line: rescuer/saved, good/evil, protector/outsider and stands within the transnational space. Policy text forms our understandings of identity and other, identifying self in a position of power and other in a position of inferiority. The concepts of narrative identity, other, and emplotment are further explored in the next chapter on data analysis.

CHAPTER SIX DATA ANALYSIS: A CLOSER LOOK AT THE TEXT

<u>Introduction</u>

The policies examined in this study (the Millennium Declaration, the National Security Strategy, and the proposed Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act) are intended to protect and serve people. Yet, the controversy that surrounds these three efforts shows that the cohesion of support within and between these public policies is lacking. Simply stated, the intentions differ from the actions.

This difference can be explained in terms of the policy language used, the incentives towards cooperation, poor organizational design, and miscommunication between the different government levels (Yanow 1996:3). This would presume that there is one solution for the problem and the failed results suggest that the best solution has not yet been found—a true statement from a positivistic perspective. However, human interaction, of which public policy governs, is not a formulaic reciprocal action of people. The "human" part inherently negates such a prescriptive representation. This type of policy analysis contradicts the very nature of that which it tries to effect. Yanow (1996:3) refutes this dichotomic association of a problem-solution type of human interaction in favor of interpretation of the human perception:

the human sciences, including policy analysis, yield an interpretation of their subject matter rather than an exact replica of it. From this point of view there is no single, correct solution to a policy problem any more than there is a single correct perception of what that problem is.

Humans are social and cultural beings whose interactions are rooted in who they are and can best be understood through analysis of human action and meaning, specifically through its interpretation. Interpretive analysis of policy offers the discernment needed towards a deeper understanding of humans so that true "solutions" are grounded in legitimacy.

A deeper understanding may be drawn from critical hermeneutic inquiry, which helps us go beyond the traditional positivistic framework towards the ontology of a given topic or issue. The meanings gained from the questions that emerge from a critical hermeneutic perspective may serve as a light that brings out the totality of the given subject, much the same way lighting can enhance the poetic brilliance of a work of art.

There is an emergence, a somewhat confrontational one, of hermeneutic inquiry because it challenges the reader to recognize the historically effected consciousness (Gadamer 2004: 336-341) of our actions. In this study, the text that unfolds from written policy was viewed through the critical hermeneutic lens of narrative identity, emplotment, and fusion of horizons.

Narrative Identity

To explore the narrative identity evoked within the policies, we must first ask who is involved in the discourse of policy-making? The assumption is that those who make policy are in relationship with those who are affected by such policy. The question "who?" hypostatizes selfhood in the speech, the act, the narrative, and the moral attribution (Ricoeur 1992:169). "Who?" is a multidimensional perspective to self.

The recognition of the dialectic between those who serve and those who are served is capricious. The U.S. NSC refers to "working with others" in their efforts towards democracy or deterring conflict, yet the intent lacks the legitimation of the actions or exchange. The prime reason is that in this type of serving, those who are to be truly served are actually not a part of the policy discourse.

Indeed, those involved in policymaking put forth a tripodal nature about their own identity. The reference to "we" is spoken in relation to "all" and "they." "We" is held in a benevolent light, where the very idea of choosing to develop policy on anyone's behalf must implicitly be an act of goodwill. Since the goodwill is intended for the greater good (all), the refutation of such an aim would be nil or difficult to debate. Yet, the persona also changes from "all" to "they" when referring to both impoverished regions and tyrants of the world.

This fluctuation between "all" and "they" across the different organizations (UN, U.S. NSC, and U.S. Congress) demonstrates the malleability of the definition of the Other in public discourse. For example, the Other represents one who may be impoverished, could be considered a threat, and is not welcome in a nation that would label them illegal. The three identities applied to the Other hold them in a limbic state of opposing forces. This marginalization of the Other sets the boundary of self in narrative identity, where the dialectic relationship is skewed towards the dominant self from the inferior other.

Upon reflection of the public policy discourse explored in this study, the actions of self towards an ethical aim are apocryphal. Selfhood is expressed in the form of agency, building on what is as opposed to what ought to be. To further the ethical aim of human action, one must recognize the dialectic relationship one has to the other. Since Other is actually not a part of intended discourse, the path towards legitimate action is restricted by self-impositions.

Narrative affords us the mediation between description and prescription of human action (Ricoeur 1992:170). Description opens the three-fold nature of mimēsis, illuminating the complexity of our identity. At any given moment in time, we are the past, present, and future as one embodiment. Hence, the actions of today (present) reflect our historicity as well as the hopes and dreams of the

future. The present embodies the dialectic of the exchanges between the past and the future (Ricoeur 1988:207).

However, policy conveys a prescriptive concept of identity and self in conflict and this is evident in development, security, and immigration policy. For example, the sense of who we are as a nation carries arrogant overtones, as in the National Security Strategy (2002):

> Where governments find the fight against terrorism beyond their capacities, we will match their willpower and their resources with whatever help we and our allies can provide.

Yet, as a nation, we succumb to the same actions that we detest of terrorists—that of physical force. We claim our right to military might "to kill or capture the terrorists." The preemptive force of the claim to do so erases the right to human dignity that we so readily uphold. Is this how we win "the battle of ideas?"

Furthermore, the United States views itself as the global problem-solver, a more aggressive tact outlined in the National Security Strategy of 2006 and markedly different from that presented in the 2002 strategy. In it, the U.S. specifically outlines the progression of steps to take in terms of conflict prevention and resolution, whereas, prior to, the U.S. cited that ultimately prevention would be up to the two differing nation-states. By citing that ultimately all global activity impacts the United States, they have self-declared

free reign to intervene in any situation they deem appropriate. A very thin line separates the notion of preemptive war or conflict intervention and peacekeeping missions. Oddly enough, they extend their identity by naming an office for reconstruction and stabilization, yet nowhere is there mention of the need for the effected countries to be involved, except at the government level. In these instances, identity is regarded as "not the other" and one to be feared.

The Other to be Feared

Fear of the Other is growing and is described in current policy in security and immigration. The dramatic change in tone from the 2002 to 2006 version of the National Security Strategy and the existing to proposed immigration reform is striking. The distanciation of self and Other (Kearney 2003, Ricoeur 1992) are more pronounced in the later version, whereas the earlier version referred to a sense of nation in a global sense, the NSC refers to the 2002 strategy as "America's International Strategy." In the 2006 National Security Strategy, several nation-states were blacklisted as under rule of tyrants such as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Iran, Syria, Cuba, Belarus, Burma, and Zimbabwe. Here, the policy calls out the Other and explains why they are as such, whereas, the 2002 strategy makes no mention of tyrants. Such tyrannical nation-states endure the stigma until they embrace the principles of democracy, as deemed appropriate and acceptable by the U.S.

The word *democracy* can change Other to "almost" self. When nation-states are able to replace tyranny with the seeds of democracy, they go from a bad judgment to good by the U.S. such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Lebanon, to name a few. In 2002, democracy was not touted as the all-encompassing solution as it is in 2006.

The concept of the "Other to be feared" is perpetuated as a rogue state or terrorist with a hatred for the United States--an oversimplification that tries to cover the illegitimate justification of taking aggressive action first (Kearney 2003). However, uncertainty underscores the identity of the Other, fueling the paranoia towards strangers and aliens--we know not who they are! The uncertainty and unknown is even acknowledged in policy, "…even if uncertainty remains as to the time and place of the enemy's attack" (National Security Strategy 2006:18).

Terrorism is the story of the other. It portrays a disgruntled, radical group of people who attack first, negotiate later—an image continuously distributed throughout American media. In response to this fear, the United States wages a war against them: those who go faceless and nameless. We know terrorists from pure speculation alone. Our fear of the other feeds from the seeds of paranoia that we plant in our own backyard.

Uncovering the multifaceted nature of identity through mimēsis, public discourse reveals the connection to the past of policymakers (mimēsis1). For

example, the U.S. points to the progenitor of today's actions as stemming from a

historical base: the Declaration of Independence and recent history such as the

traditions attributed to Harry Truman and Ronald Reagan. The argument is

adduced that democracy was a guiding principle since the United States was

founded. The assumption that the longstanding historical presence of democracy

makes it the right choice for all peoples narrows the path of human interaction.

Consequently, this prefiguration obscures the principle of legitimate action in

what ought to be.

Ought is redeemed in mimēsis₃, the path of hope and an imagined future.

In public discourse, policy is meant to describe the ought, of what should be.

However, being written from a prescriptive approach, the reach towards the

ethical aim is minimal because the policy dwells within what is. The language of

policy is written in what is to be. To reach an ethical aim requires the recognition

and engagement with the other, disclosed in language that describes desires,

hopes, and dreams--language that illuminates reconfiguration and legitimate

action.

In light of the past and future of selfhood and narrative identity, they then

turn back to the present and the course of our actions today. In public discourse,

we describe ourselves as the one (and only one) best capable of leading people

and solving the world's problems and the social ills. The vacuum we draw on

sociocultural space using public policy falsely buoys ourselves to a dominant position, in which we serve as both judge and jury. Despite the controversies raised in any of the public policy issues, the commonality of self-justification of actions to drown out the voice of dissension negates the supposed openness of discourse within a public space.

The narrative identity of our present-selves mediates our past and future. As the past is narrowly defined within our selfhood, so too is the future scarcely opened. Our narrative identity today reveals an imperviousness to our actions, a void of authentic discourse with the other. Our sense of self is limited to personal identity versus narrative identity, in which we have not yet reached the shared plain of recognizing oneself as another (Ricoeur 1992).

Emplotment

The story told in public policy is one of two types of characters following the themes of the rescuer and saved, the protector and weak, those who belong and those who do not. The backdrop of the story is one of strife, hardship, and wrongdoing, with an added element of faith and values (democratic) mixed within the set. The global stage of the story is set with lights focused on one nation (the home of the hero). The story is a classic tale that first draws the reader into accessible social text, allowing him to become one with the storyteller and envision himself as actually a part of the story. Current media ploys and

100

techniques accomplish the finesse of the story quite well. Once the story is appropriated, the reader finds they can be swept away by the platitudes and righteousness of the self-designated hero and his actions, and also rally to the well-intended actions of the hero, believing the hero must win—he must prevail.

The current model of development is the story of such a hero. The hero (a body of some 192 members states called the United Nations) calls out those who are deemed worth saving, labeling them as the weak and feeble, transcending the human values of mutual recognition and respect, summoning a declaration that claims the one right answer to fighting the conditions of the weak and feeble. The hero goes further to objectify the claims through metrics called the Millennium Development Goals, using time and volume (amount decreased/increased) as indicators of people saved. The UN Millennium Declaration is the story of saving peoples of the world that a select group of heroes have identified as warranting emancipation from the shackles of poverty, lack of education, ravages of disease, and lack of empowerment. The laudatory story offers the attributes that all enjoy: a happy ending or at least the notion towards a projected gratifying conclusion. The perpetuation of the hero and his action thus continues.

Another story is told by the U.S. NSC—a story of conflict, where human action results in a stalemate in that no action can be legitimately taken or any progress made. The cast of characters are two: the United States and the Other.

The Other is prescribed as an evildoer, faceless and nameless, a terrorist who wishes to inflict harm on all people. The policy and story portray a disgruntled, radical group of people who attack first, negotiate later—an image continuously distributed throughout American media. In response to this fear, the United States, as self-designated protector of all that is good, wages a war against the Other. The story strikes fear in the audience: we don't need to see the enemy to know they exist, fueling our paranoia of the other.

Thus, this story paves the way for a course of human action that is justified as morally right. The theme of the story is one of defense strategy and tactic. The tact is simply put as such: "we recognize that our best defense is a good offense" opening the gateway to preemptive assailment towards a people defined as deserving of it.

The story of fear of the Other is extended to that told by the U.S. Congress in the efforts toward reforming immigration. The story offers the most disturbing perspective when considered in the historical context of migration and the natural movement of people around the world because such a movement resulted in a nation called the United States.

Fusion of Horizons

The United Nations hints at the potential fusion of horizons existing within a multilateral public space, that is defined by transnational and

transcultural boundaries. This space holds the existence of two nations in one space (Habermas 1998:329-387). Given the movement of people and information throughout the world, one can consider transnational space to be a commonplace setting; however, only illegal migrants, conflict and terrorism are acknowledged as occurring in a transnational setting. To that which we do not understand, we attribute only negative connotations, hence the negative reference to transnationalism.

In summary, the critical hermeneutic analysis reveals that identity as revealed in policy text is focused on the selfhood of the creator, without sharing consideration for the other. This identity shapes how policy is made and implemented, which interrupts any possibility of a fusion of horizons. This has clear implications for the creation of text in policy. The next chapter reviews the implications and the meaning of policy.

CHAPTER SEVEN FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS: THE MEANING OF POLICY

<u>Introduction</u>

The final Chapter of this study provides an overview of the research and its findings and implications. The implications are directly applicable to any group or organization involved in setting policies. The final pages conclude my understandings of policymaking and what I have learned from this critical hermeneutic inquiry.

<u>Summary of Research</u>

This critical hermeneutic inquiry studied three public policies created by preeminent organizations affecting sociocultural text, namely the United Nations' Millennium Declaration, the United States National Security Council's National Security Strategy, and the United States Congress' (House of Representatives and Senate) proposed version of comprehensive immigration reform. These policies were chosen as representing current public thinking.

The text of the policies were studied to gain a deeper understanding of policymaking, specifically who is involved in policymaking, what is the actual narrative of the policies, and where might there be room for a shared understanding of policy and action? The analysis of text was set against the backdrop of the United States government and the United Nations—two

organizational entities that adamantly claim their right to calling them**se**lves

global leaders. Their dominant position opens the door to creating policies that

affect others who they define as needing help or not belonging.

Data was collected from the text, categorized into implications for

transnational settings, identity, and other. The data was then critically analyzed

through the critical hermeneutic lens of narrative identity, emplotment, and

fusion of horizons.

In trying to identify the narrative identity contained within public policy,

it was clear that the narrator was that of self. Emplotment of the narrative itself

did not include the other. The three-fold nature of narrative identity through

mimēsis helped to describe the past, future, and resulting presence of the

narrator. The past is described without historical effective consciousness to the

historical events as they may have happened. The resulting written policy

reflects a predicted, not imagined, outcome. Consequently, public policy contains

within it a sense of moral judgment that drives the human interaction directed

under the specific policy.

Overall, the findings show that policies may compound the problem being

addressed. Policies emplot a narrative of one's identity; however, current policy

is a narrative of self and does not include the other. Policy shows that the

meaning of action is not understood and instead attempts to rationalize moral judgment.

Given these findings, the implications stem from a change in the paradigm of policymaking. If policies can emplot a narrative, then policies can describe a narrative of self and other. Policies are social text in transnational space that offer descriptions towards a shared understanding of an ethical aim. The next section further describes the findings and implications for practice.

Findings and Implications for Practice

Interpretive analysis of policy text alone reveals findings and implications that directly apply to sociocultural interaction. The following findings can be used to further the development of policymaking and analysis towards an ethical aim.

1. **FINDING:** Policy can compound the current problem. **IMPLICATION:** Change the paradigm of policymaking.

Measurements move policymakers to predict outcomes. Policymakers and analysts create policies using a positivistic approach. Policymakers work within a dominant scientific paradigm in which they seek to provide an accepted model of a problem(s) and the solution(s) to be implemented by a community (Bernstein 1983:21). However, in the search for a perfect fit or explanation, anomalies and discrepancies will surface. Rather than generalizing the model or

its effect, policymakers should recognize the validity of such findings and the need to change the paradigm within which they work.

Policymakers and analysts follow a specific track of education and training that ensures they stay true to a traditional paradigm. For example, development policies are created by economists, military policies are created by psychologists, and social welfare policies are created by sociologists. The pedagogy these three disciplines offer sit within an objectivistic paradigm that offers a rarified viewpoint of social science.

Such professionals would be more equipped to handle the difficult task of making policy if they were also open to critical inquiry of social text. Unfortunately, this type of education is still difficult to find in the United States. Upon closer examination of the educational programs at the top 10 universities in the United States, a course or program in applied hermeneutics is nil. To its credit, the University of San Francisco is the only educational institution of its kind that offers such a program. Other universities offer philosophy courses that focus on theory; however, extending the theory to its praxis is not available.

More programs such as that offered by the Department of Leadership Studies at the University of San Francisco needs to be developed through these higher education institutions. Shifting the paradigm in current academic circles offers the most viable way of effecting sociocultural thinking.

2. FINDING: Policies reflect an explanation of self and other. **IMPLICATION:** Policies should be based on descriptions that lead towards a deeper understanding.

The text that comes from public policy is based on efforts to explain actions already underway towards a perceived solution. Policymakers strive to justify and rationalize their beliefs about a sociocultural issue that they judge as inappropriate, carrying the force of a moral argument. In the explanation, reference is constantly made to the strong, the weak, and the evil. The search for an explanation presumes a right solution for the problem identified.

However, if policies were based on description instead of explanation, policymakers and analysts might come to comprehend more of the complexity of the issue at hand and go beyond the metrics of indicating improvement of a situation over a given period of time. For example, public discourse with the other may reveal the limitations of one solution and unveil the possibilities of a more ethical solution. The distance of policymakers and analysts from the experience of poverty, hunger, disease, and conflict does not allow them the insight into what life must actually be like for the other. Thus, they are far from qualified to even suggest that they can measure improvement over something they initially deemed as inappropriate or wrong. Policymakers must realize that in policy, we are, in truth, in relation to the other.

3. FINDING: Policies emplot a narrative told only by the self. **IMPLICATION:** Only from authentic narrative of self and Other can legitimate policy be made.

As part of the explanation of a social ill and its projected cure, policies hold the narrative of the characters involved, but told only from the view of the narrator, the self. While Other is recognized, their character is inferred to be those needing our help, because we deem it so. The policies have global implications but the historicity of the text comes locally, from representatives of a governing body. Certainly, myopic views of a story are much easier to tell than one with a full cast of characters, making the manufacture of consent towards policy a viable task.

Yet, an authentic narrative is told through the eyes of the self, the other, and the reader. Without this authenticity, the actions are illegitimate because they are skewed to the desires of the storyteller. For policymakers to effect a change through policy, they must open the floor of discourse to listening to the voice of the other. They must go beyond the existing channels of communication to hear a story told through the experiences that the Other lives. Likewise, the reader of public text must find their voice to become an active part of the public discourse, otherwise, their silence implies consent.

4. FINDING: The meaning of policy is not understood by policymakers.

IMPLICATION: Policy is a social text that exists within a transnational public space.

Policymakers and analysts use objective data to develop policy. It is based on a positivistic approach, scientific in rigor, and validated as a sound argument. It is the context of social sciences and applied research today. Policy is written as rules or edicts to confer that the proof is in the data. Failure of effecting change infers that implementation was not fully followed.

Yet policy is more than just a set of rules to follow and it is clear that the true meaning of policy escapes those who make policies. Policy represents a social text that defines a bridge of engagement with the Other to do what ought to be done. Public policy opens the gateway of transnational and transcultural settings to allow for a more open dialogue. Rather than looking at variance in social discourse as an anomaly, it should be embraced by policymakers who seek to make a change.

5. FINDING: Policies rationalize moral judgment. **IMPLICATION:** Discourse surrounding policy should focus on the ethical aim.

Policies serve as judgment of people who are not a part of the conversation. The language used stems from roots in good and evil so that the behavior of others is judged as acceptable or inappropriate. Policies mislead the

public into believing that there are issues that we can morally act on because of our own immanent domain.

But there is no room for us to serve as judge and jury to people with whom we have no relationship. The arrogance of this type of policy slaps the Other in the face as we play on the world's stage. Rather than react to other's behavior, we must stop to ask if we understand the distinction between one's behavior and action. Reaction rest on judgments and there is no room for morality in the discourse of public policy—only the ethical aim of the actions of self and other.

<u>Suggestions for Further Research</u>

Although I reach the end of this part of the journey, there is still much traveling to do. Equipped with the appropriate travel gear, the next leg of the journey should explore text from the perspective of the policymaker and other. Conversations with policymakers, policy analysts, and the Other are crucial in developing a deeper meaning of policy discourse to answer the question: how does a policy mean?

Another worthwhile endeavor is to look for the signs of silence in public discourse today, especially as set against a backdrop of implied consent. Exploring the silence in public discourse may reveal insight into where authentic narrative lives and who is the narrator of the story.

Conclusion

In efforts to set forth policy, rules, and guidelines that affect people, we must be cognizant of the meaning they imbue if we are to be effective in any way. Policy is not meant to be measured but experienced as it manifests itself in our lives.

We are invited to engage in public discourse, a global stage that holds self, other, and reader of text all at once. Public policy must represent our shared understanding for our just actions to surpass the reaction to immoral behavior. If we can open ourselves to this interchange, we can begin to imagine just discourse in policymaking.

This study offers insight into public discourse as it pertains to policymaking. The findings and implications can be applied to any type of public discourse. Governing bodies, private organizations, educational institutions can benefit from a more open and comprehensive approach to policymaking using a critical hermeneutic approach.

Personal Reflections

I realize that the written word can hold a deeper meaning of the actual text if I open myself to its interpretation. In fact, I was caught by surprise at the level of engagement in text that held me in suspension, as I began to realize the

full consequence of embarking on participatory research using critical hermeneutic inquiry. I did not realize how immediate and complex the transformation would be of myself as researcher. There were moments when I felt overwhelmed by the understanding before me, experiencing both wonderment and vulnerability as I stood at the portal of what would become a fusion of horizons with the discourse laid before me. I thought that human interaction rested solely on our actions in a face-to-face manner. I realize now that text itself moves humans towards action. In that regard, I would hope that the action is authentic and towards an ethical aim and it's clear to me now, more than ever before, that our actions come from our own understandings of a situation. If we do not come to recognize this part of our selfhood, then we risk stagnation towards a void in human interaction and the eventual demise of the human race.

I feel my eyes, ears, heart, and mind have been opened to experiencing what could be, a recalibration of my own selfhood and identity. I can now imagine a better world having opened myself to a shared understanding and all that it holds. For the first time, I can conceive authentic actions that I myself can instigate. With a new sense of curiosity as to how we can be more meaningful towards each other, I know there is no turning back now. This is what we ought to do.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Benedict
    2006 Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of
        Nationalism. London: Verso, (Original 1983).

Appadurai, Arjun
    2000 Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination. Public Culture
        12(1):1-19.
    1996 Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis:
        University of Minnesota Press.

Bacon, David
    2006 Communities Without Borders: Images and Voices from the World of
        Migration. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Baumann, Fred
    2004 Our Fractious Foreign Policy Debate. Public Interest 157:67-84.

Bellah, Robert N., Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and
Steven M. Tipton
    1996 Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life.
        Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bentz, Valerie M. and Jeremy J. Shapiro
    1998 Mindful Inquiry in Social Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications,
        Inc.

Birdsall, Nancy, Patrick Steward, and Milan Vaishnav
    2006 Reforming U.S. Development Policy: Four Critical Fixes. Electronic
        document, http://www.cgddev.org/content/opinion/detail/5692, accessed
        December 28, 2007.

Bovens, Mark and Paul 'tHart
    1996 Understanding Policy Fiascoes. New Brunswick: Transaction
        Publishers.

Brettell, Caroline
    2003 Anthropology and Migration: Essays on Transnationalism, Ethnicity and Identity. Lanham: Alta Mira Press.

Bruland, J., T. Hanf, and E. Manske, eds.
    2006 U.S. Foreign Policy Toward the Third World: A Post-Cold War Assessment, J. Bruland, T. Hanf, and E. Manske, eds. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Castles, Stephen
    2004 Why Migration Policies Fail. Ethnic and Racial Studies 27(2):205-227.
    2002 Migration and Community Formation under Conditions of Globalization. The International Migration Review 36(4):1143-1168.

Chomsky, Noam
    2003 Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Coldiron, A.E.B.
    2004 Public Sphere/Contact Zone: Habermas, Early Print, and Verse Translation. Criticism 46(2):207-222.

Collier, Paul
    2007 The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest countries are Failing and What can be Done About it. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Collier, Paul and David Dollar
    2001 Can the World Cut Poverty in Half? How Policy Reform and Effective Aid Can Meet International Development Goals. World Development 29(11):1787-1802.

Congressional Budget Office
    2006 Immigration Policy in the United States. A CBO Paper: A Series on Immigration. February 2006.

Delanty, Gerard
    2000 Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Easterly, William
   2007 How the Millennium Development Goals are Unfair to Africa. The
        Brookings Institution.
   2006 The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest have
        Done So much Ill and So Little Good. New York: Penguin Press.

Edelman, Murray J.
   2001 The Politics of Misinformation (Communication, Society, and Politics).
        Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
   1977 Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail. New
        York: Academic Press.

Escobar, Arturo
   1999 The Invention of Development. Current History 98(631):382-386.
   1995 Encountering Development: the Making and Unmaking of the Third
        World. Princeton: University of Princeton Press.

Falicov, Celia J.
   2005 Emotional Transnationalism and Family Identities. Family Process
        44(4):399-406.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg
   2004 Truth and Method. Second, Revised Edition. New York: Continuum,
        (Original 1975, 1989).

Geertz, Clifford
   2000 The Interpretation of Cultures. Second Edition. New York: Continuum,
        (Original 1973).

Guéhenno, Jean-Marie
   1995 The End of the Nation-State. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota
        Press.

Habermas, Jürgen
   1998 Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law
        and Democracy. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
   1979 Communication and the Evolution of Society. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hanson, Gordon H.
    2005 Why Does Immigration Divide America? Public Finance and Political
        Opposition to Open Borders. Washington, DC: Institute for International
        Economics.

Herda, Ellen A.
    2007 Identity and Development. Theme issue, "Identity and Development,"
        The Applied Anthropologist 27(1):4-21.

    2002 Power and Place: A Hermeneutic Orientation in Development and
        Education among the Mlabri of Northeast Thailand. High Plains Applied
        Anthropologist 22(1):91-99.

    1999 Research Conversation and Narrative: A Critical Hermeneutic
        Orientation in Participatory Inquiry. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Hobart, Mark, ed.
    1993 An Anthropological Critique of Development: the Growth of Ignorance.
        Abingdon:Routledge.

Horowitz, Irving L.
    1979 Constructing Policy: Dialogues with Social Scientists in the National
        Political Arena. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Jervolino, Domenico
    1996 Gadamer and Ricoeur on the Hermeneutics of Praxis. *In* Paul Ricoeur:
        The Hermeneutics of Action, Richard Kearney, ed. London: Sage.

Kearney, M.
    1995 The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and
        Transnationalism. Annual Review of Anthropology 24:547-65.

Kearney, Richard
    2003 Strangers, Gods, and Monsters: Interpreting Otherness. Abingdon:
        Routledge.

Kohut, Andrew and Bruce Stokes
    2006 American Against the World. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Koser, Khalid
    2007 International Migration: a Very Short Introduction. New York: Oxford
        University Press Inc.

Kuhn, Thomas S.
    1996 The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Third Edition. Chicago: The
        University of Chicago Press. (Original 1962).

Levine, Robert A.
    2005 Assimilation, Past and Present. Public Interest 159:93-176.

Ley, David
    2004 Transnational Spaces and Everyday Lives. Transactions of the Institute
        of British Geographers 29(2):151-64.

Lieven, Anatol and John Hulsmal
    2006 Ethical Realism: A Vision for America's Role in the World. New York:
        Vintage Books.

Maull, Hanns W.
    2006 American Foreign Policy: Between Isolationism and Internationlism,
        Unilateralism and Multilateralism. *In* U.S. Foreign Policy Toward the
        Third World: A Post-Cold War Assessment, J. Bruland, T. Hanf, and E.
        Manske, eds. Pp. 33-51. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

McCormick, James M.
    2006 Decision-Making Processes and Actors in American Foreign Policy
        Formulation: Ist There a Third World Lobby? *In* U.S. Foreign Policy
        Toward the Third World: A Post-Cold War Assessment, J. Bruland, T.
        Hanf, and E. Manske, eds. Pp. 52-84. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Migration Policy Institute
    2006 Immigration and America's Future: A New Chapter. Report of the
        Independent Task Force on Immigration and America's Future.
        Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Munck, Ronaldo and Denis O'Hearn, eds.
    1999 Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm.
        London: Zed Books.

Nanz, Patrizia and Jens Steffek
    2004 Global Governance, Participation and the Public Sphere. Government
        and Opposition 39(2):314-335.

Ricoeur, Paul
    2007 Reflections on The Just. Chicago: The University Chicago Press.
    2006 On Translation. Abingdon: Routledge.
    2005 The Course of Recognition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
    2004 Memory, History, Forgetting. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
    1992 Oneself as Another. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
    1988 Time and Narrative, Vol. 3. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
    1984 Time and Narrative, Vol. 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
    1981 Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. John B. Thompson, ed.
        Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
    1974 The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics. Evanston:
        Northwestern University Press.

Rochefort, David A. and Roger W. Cobb
    1994 Problem Definition: An Emerging Perspective. *In* The Politics of
        Problem Definition: Shaping the Policy Agenda. David A. Rochefort and
        Roger W. Cobb, eds. Pp. 1-31. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Roe, Emery
    1994 Narrative Policy Analysis: Theory and Practice. Durham: Duke
        University Press.

Rothstein, Robert L.
    1977 The Weak in the World of the Strong: the Developing Countries in the
        International System. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rüland, Jürgen, Theodor Hauf, and Eva Manske, eds.
    2006 U.S. Foreign Policy Toward the Third World: A Post-Cold War
        Assessment. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Sachs, Jeffrey
    2005 The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time. New York:
        The Penguin Press.

Saldívar, Ramón
   1999 Transnational migrations and border identities: immigration and
       postmodern culture. The South Atlantic Quarterly 98(1/2):217-230.

Sen, Amartya
   1999 Development as Freedom. New York: Anchor Books.
   1981 Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation.
       Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Michael P.
   2003 Transnationalism, the States, and the Extraterritorial Citizen. Politics
       and Society 31(4):467-502.

Smith, Michael P. and Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, eds.
   1998 Transnationalism from Below. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Snel, Erik, Godfried Engbersen and Arjen Leerkes
   2006 Transnational Involvement and Social Integration. Global Networks
       6(3): 285-308.

Sökefeld, Martin
   2006 Mobilizing in Transnational Space: a Social Movement Approach to the
       Formation of Diaspora. Global Networks 6(3):265-284.

Stone, Deborah
   2001 Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision-Making. New York: W. W.
       Norton.

Stone, Diane
   2008 Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their
       Networks. Policy Studies Journal 36(1):19-38.

Tong, Rosemarie
   1986 Ethics in Policy Analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Turner, Victor and Edward M. Bruner, eds.
   2001 The Anthropology of Experience. Chicago: University of Illinois Press
       (Original 1986).

U.S. Census Bureau
    2007 World Population Information. Website,
        http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb/worldpopinfo.html, accessed
        January 14, 2008.

Van Gennep, Arnold
    1960 The Rites of Passage. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wildavsky, Aaron
    1987 Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis. New
        Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Winch, Peter
    2007[1958] The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy.
        Abingdon: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig
    2001[1973] Philosophical Investigations. G.E.M. Ascombe, trans. Oxford:
        Blackwell Publishers.

Yanow, Dvora
    1996 How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational
        Actions. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A--UN Millennium Declaration 2002

At the Millennium Summit in September 2000 the largest gathering of world leaders in history adopted the UN Millennium Declaration, committing their nations to a new global partnership to reduce extreme poverty and setting out a series of time-bound targets, with a deadline of 2015, that have become known as the Millennium Development Goals.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are the world's time-bound and quantified targets for addressing extreme poverty in its many dimensions-income poverty, hunger, disease, lack of adequate shelter, and exclusion-while promoting gender equality, education, and environmental sustainability. They are also basic human rights-the rights of each person on the planet to health, education, shelter, and security.

For each of the following goals, there are specific quantitative targets and measurable indicators defined. For the purposes of this dissertation, only the goals are listed.

(1) Eradicate extreme hunger and poverty.

(2) Achieve universal primary education.

(3) Promote gender equality and empower women.

(4) Reduce child mortality.

(5) Improve maternal health.

(6) Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases.

(7) Ensure environmental sustainability.

(8) Develop a global partnership for development.

The world has made significant progress in achieving many of the Goals. Between 1990 and 2002 average overall incomes increased by approximately 21 percent. The number of people in extreme poverty declined by an estimated 130 million. Child mortality rates fell from 103 deaths per 1,000 live births a year to 88. Life expectancy rose from 63 years to nearly 65 years. An additional 8 percent of the developing world's people received access to water. And an additional 15 percent acquired access to improved sanitation services.

But progress has been far from uniform across the world-or across the Goals. There are huge disparities across and within countries. Within countries, poverty is greatest for rural areas, though urban poverty is also extensive, growing, and underreported by traditional indicators.

Sub-Saharan Africa is the epicenter of crisis, with continuing food insecurity, a rise of extreme poverty, stunningly high child and maternal mortality, and large numbers of people living in slums, and a widespread shortfall for most of the MDGs. Asia is the region with the fastest progress, but even there hundreds of millions of people remain in extreme poverty, and even fast-growing countries fail to achieve some of the non-income Goals. Other regions have mixed records, notably Latin America, the transition economies, and the Middle East and North Africa, often with slow or no progress on some of the Goals and persistent inequalities undermining progress on others.

Source: http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/goals/index.htm

Appendix B--National Security Strategy 2002

The following information provides a brief overview of the National Security Strategy. This text was published in an official press release from the White House on March 16, 2006 and is presented in this Appendix for reference only.

On March 16, 2006, the White House released President Bush's second term National Security Strategy, which reflects the President's most solemn obligation: to protect the security of the American people.

The National Security Strategy explains how we are working to protect the American people, advance American interests, enhance global security, and expand global liberty and prosperity. The strategy is founded upon two pillars:

1. The first pillar is *promoting freedom, justice, and human dignity – working to end tyranny, to promote effective democracies, and to extend prosperity through free and fair trade and wise development policies.*

   o The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.

   o In the world today, the fundamental character of regimes matters as much as the distribution of power among them. Free governments are accountable to their people, govern their territory effectively, and pursue economic and political policies that benefit their citizens. Free governments do not oppress their people or attack other free nations. Peace and international stability are most reliably built on a foundation of freedom.

2. The second pillar of the strategy is confronting the challenges of our time by leading a growing community of democracies.

   o Many of the problems we face – from the threat of pandemic disease, to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to terrorism, to human trafficking, to natural disasters – reach across borders. Effective multinational efforts are essential to solve these problems. Yet history has shown that only when we do our part will others do theirs. America will continue to lead.

The President's National Security Strategy specifically focuses on the following areas:

Champion Aspirations for Human Dignity

- The United States champions freedom because doing so reflects our values and advances our interests.

    o Championing freedom advances our interests because the survival of liberty at home increasingly depends on the success of liberty abroad.

    o Because democracies are the most responsible members of the international system, promoting democracy is the most effective long-term measure for strengthening international stability, reducing regional conflicts, countering terrorism and terror-supporting extremism, and extending peace and prosperity.

- To protect our Nation and honor our values, the United States seeks to extend freedom across the globe by leading an international effort to end tyranny and to promote effective democracy. We will employ the full array of political, economic, diplomatic, and other tools at our disposal. Effective democracies:

    o Honor and uphold basic human rights, including freedom of religion, conscience, speech, assembly, association, and press;

    o Are responsive to their citizens, submitting to the will of the people, especially when people vote to change their government;

    o Exercise effective sovereignty and maintain order within their own borders, protect independent and impartial systems of justice, punish crime, embrace the rule of law, and resist corruption; and

    o Limit the reach of government, protecting the institutions of civil society, including the family, religious communities, voluntary associations, private property, independent business, and a market economy.

- Elections are the most visible sign of a free society and can play a critical role in advancing effective democracy. But elections alone are not enough – they must be reinforced by other values, rights, and institutions to bring

about lasting freedom. Our goal is human liberty protected by democratic institutions.

- We have a responsibility to promote human freedom. Yet freedom cannot be imposed; it must be chosen. The form that freedom and democracy take in any land will reflect the history, culture, and habits unique to its people.

Strengthen Alliances to Defeat Global Terrorism and Work to Prevent Attacks Against Us and Our Friends

- We are a nation at war. We have made progress in the war against terror, but we are in a long struggle. America is safer, but not yet safe.

- In the short run, the fight involves using military force and other instruments of national power to kill or capture the terrorists, deny them safe haven or control of any nation, prevent them from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and cut off their sources of support.

- In the long run, winning the war on terror means winning the battle of ideas, for it is ideas that can turn the disenchanted into murderers willing to kill innocent victims.

  - Terrorists exploit political alienation. Democracy gives people an ownership stake in society.

  - Terrorists exploit grievances that can be blamed on others. Democracy offers the rule of law, the peaceful resolution of disputes, and the habits of advancing interests through compromise.

  - Terrorists exploit sub-cultures of conspiracy and misinformation. Democracy offers freedom of speech, independent media, and the marketplace of ideas.

  - Terrorists exploit an ideology that justifies murder. Democracy offers respect for human dignity.

- The advance of freedom and human dignity through democracy is the long-term solution to the transnational terrorism of today. To create the space and time for that long-term solution to take root, there are four steps we will take in the short term: We will 1) prevent attacks by terrorist networks before they occur; 2) deny WMD to rogue states and to terrorist

allies who would use them without hesitation; 3) deny terrorist groups the support and sanctuary of rogue states; and 4) deny the terrorists control of any nation that they would use as a base and launching pad for terror.

Work with Others to Defuse Regional Conflicts

- If left unaddressed, regional conflicts can lead to failed states, humanitarian disasters, and ungoverned areas that can become safe havens for terrorists. We will work to address regional conflicts at three levels of engagement: conflict prevention and resolution; conflict intervention; and post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction.

- Patient efforts to end conflicts should not be mistaken for tolerance of the intolerable.

- Genocide must not be tolerated.

Prevent Our Enemies from Threatening Us, Our Allies, and Our Friends with Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)

- We are committed to keeping the world's most dangerous weapons out of the hands of the world's most dangerous people.

    o The best way to block aspiring nuclear states or nuclear terrorists is to deny them access to the essential ingredient of fissile material.

    o We are countering the spread of biological weapons by improving our capacity to detect and respond to biological attacks, securing dangerous pathogens, and limiting the spread of materials useful for biological weapons.

    o We are working to identify and disrupt terrorist networks that seek chemical weapons capabilities, and we are seeking to deny them access to materials needed to make these weapons.

- If necessary, under long-standing principles of self defense, we do not rule out the use of force before attacks occur. When the consequences of an attack with WMD are potentially so devastating, we cannot afford to stand idly by as grave dangers materialize.

Ignite a New Era of Global Economic Growth through Free Markets and Free Trade

- We are working to open markets and integrate the global economy through the Doha Development Agenda of the World Trade Organization and through regional and bilateral Free Trade Agreements. To promote energy independence, we are working to open, integrate, and diversify energy markets.

- To ensure stability and growth in the international financial system, we will work to promote growth-oriented economic policies worldwide; encourage adoption of flexible exchange rates and open markets for financial services; strengthen international financial institutions; build local capital markets and the formal economy in the developing world; and create a more transparent, accountable, and secure international financial system.

Expand the Circle of Development by Opening Societies and Building the Infrastructure of Democracy

- Development reinforces diplomacy and defense, reducing long-term threats to our national security by helping to build stable, prosperous, and peaceful societies. Improving the way we use foreign assistance will make it more effective in strengthening responsible governments, responding to suffering, and improving people's lives.

- Long-term development must include encouraging governments to make wise choices and assisting them in implementing those choices. We will encourage and reward good behavior rather than reinforce negative behavior.

Develop Agendas for Cooperative Action with the Other Centers of Global Power

- The struggle against militant Islamic radicalism is the great ideological conflict of the early years of the 21st century and finds the great powers all on the same side – opposing the terrorists. This circumstance differs profoundly from the ideological struggles of the 20th century, which saw the great powers divided by ideology as well as by national interest.

- We enjoy unprecedented levels of cooperation with other nations on many of our highest national security priorities.

- Going forward, the National Security Strategy describes our strategy for cooperating with partners in critical regions of the world and discusses the freedom agenda as it relates to different regional contexts.

Transform America's National Security Institutions to Meet the Challenges and Opportunities of the 21st Century

- We have taken a number of steps in the last four years to transform our key national security institutions, including establishing the Department of Homeland Security; launching the most significant reorganization of the Intelligence Community since the 1947 National Security Act; and completing the Department of Defense's 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review. We must extend and enhance the transformation of key institutions, both domestically and abroad.

  o At home, we will sustain the transformation already under way in the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, and Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Intelligence Community.

  o We will continue to reorient the Department of State toward transformational diplomacy, which promotes effective democracy and responsible sovereignty. And we will improve the capacity of agencies to plan, prepare, coordinate, integrate, and execute responses covering the full range of crisis contingencies and long-term challenges.

  o Abroad, we will promote meaningful reform of the United Nations to improve its accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness. We will enhance the role of democracies and democracy promotion through international and multilateral institutions. And we will establish results-oriented partnerships to meet new challenges and opportunities.

Engage the Opportunities and Confront the Challenges of Globalization

- Globalization presents many opportunities. Much of the world's prosperity and improved living standards in recent years derives from the expansion of global trade, investment, information, and technology.

- Globalization has also exposed us to new challenges and changed the way old challenges touch our interests and values, while also greatly enhancing our ability to respond. Examples include public health challenges like pandemics that recognize no borders; illicit trade, whether in drugs, human beings, or sex, that exploits the modern era's greater ease of transport and exchange; and environmental destruction, whether

caused by human behavior or cataclysmic mega-disasters such as floods, earthquakes, or tsunamis.

- Effective democracies are better able to deal with these challenges than are repressive or poorly governed states. These challenges require effective democracies to come together in innovative ways.

- The United States will lead the effort to reform existing institutions and create new ones – including forging new partnerships between governmental and nongovernmental actors, and with transnational and international organizations.

Source: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/03/print/20060316/html

Appendix C--Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act 2006

The following excerpt is taken from a recent official press release from the White House. It provides a brief overview of the objectives of the proposed Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act.

1. Securing The Border

Securing The Border Is A Critical Part Of Our Strategy For Comprehensive Immigration Reform, And We Are Increasing Manpower And Improving Infrastructure And Technology At The Border. Since the President took office in 2001, we have more than doubled funding for border security – from $4.6 billion in 2001 to $10.4 billion in 2007. We have expanded the Border Patrol from about 9,000 agents in 2001 to about 13,000 agents today. By the end of 2008, we will have a total of more than 18,000 agents, doubling the size of the Border Patrol under the President's leadership.

Under Operation Jump Start, National Guard Members Are Supporting The Border Patrol In Texas, California, Arizona, And New Mexico. As we work to complete upgrades at the border, Operation Jump Start is providing the Border Patrol with immediate reinforcements. National Guard Troops deployed under Operation Jump Start are assisting the Border Patrol with surveillance, intelligence, construction, and logistics.

Operation Jump Start Has Put More Manpower On The Border And Allowed The Border Patrol To Move 563 Agents Into Front-Line Positions. The number of people apprehended for illegally crossing our Southern border is down by nearly 30 percent in 2007 from this point in 2006.

We Have Effectively Ended The Practice Of "Catch And Release" For Every Non-Mexican Apprehended At The Southern Border. More than 85 percent of the illegal immigrants caught crossing the Southern border are Mexicans, and virtually all are sent back home within 24 hours. For years, however, most apprehended non-Mexican illegal immigrants were released back into society on this side of the border – with a notice to appear at a future court date – because the government did not have enough detention space to hold them. The President believes this practice is unacceptable, and we have effectively ended it for every non-Mexican apprehended at the Southern border.

We Have Added Thousands Of New Beds At Detention Centers Across The Country. Since the President took office, we have provided funding for 7,798

new beds to accommodate apprehended illegal immigrants – a 40 percent increase over 2001.

We Have Expedited The Legal Process To Cut The Average Deportation Time. We are also making it clear to foreign governments that they must accept back their citizens who violate U.S. immigration laws.

2. Creating a Temporary Worker Program

We Cannot Fully Secure The Border Unless We Take Pressure Off The Border – And That Requires A Temporary Worker Program. By creating a lawful and orderly channel for foreign workers to come to America on a temporary basis, a temporary worker program would help reduce the number of people trying to sneak past the Border Patrol, freeing agents to focus on apprehending violent criminals and terrorists who pose a threat to our security.

3. Holding Employers Accountable for the Workers They Hire

Enforcing Immigration Laws At The Worksite Is A Vital Part Of Any Successful Reform. We are cracking down on employers who knowingly violate the law. To make worksite enforcement practical on a large scale, the President has called for the creation of a tamper-proof identification card for legal foreign workers and a better system for businesses to verify the legal status of their workers. By taking these steps, we will make it easier for businesses to obey the law – and leave them no excuse for violating it.

4. Resolving The Status Of The Millions Of Illegal Immigrants Already In The Country

The Administration Is Working With Democrats And Republicans To Find A Practical Answer That Lies Between Granting Automatic American Citizenship To Every Illegal Immigrant And Deporting Every Illegal Immigrant.

The President Opposes Amnesty. Amnesty is the forgiveness of an offense without penalty. It should not be given to people who entered our country illegally.

Illegal Immigrants Who Have Roots In Our Country And Want To Stay Should Have To Pay A Meaningful Penalty For Breaking The Law, Pay Their Taxes, Learn English, And Work In A Job For A Number Of Years. People who meet a reasonable number of conditions and pay a penalty of time and money should be able to apply for citizenship, but approval would not be automatic, and they will have to wait in line behind those who played by the rules and followed the law.

5. Finding New Ways To Help Newcomers Assimilate Into Our Society

We Will Honor The American Tradition Of The Melting Pot And Help Immigrants Assimilate By Learning Our History, Our Values, And The English Language.

Last June, The President Created The Task Force On New Americans To Look For Ways To Help Newcomers Assimilate And Succeed In Our Country. Many organizations, from churches to businesses to civic associations, are already working to answer this call.

Source: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/04/20070409-13.html