

inSocialWork Podcast Series

Episode 195 - Dr. Deb Ortega, Dr. Ashley Hanna, and Dr. Badiah Haffejee: Lessons from the Immigrant Experience: Where the Erosion of Social Justice Begins (part 1 of 2)

[00:00:08] Welcome to in social work the podcast series of the University of Buffalo School of Social Work at W W W dot. In social work. Dot org. We're glad you could join us today. The purpose of social work is to engage practitioners and researchers and lifelong learning and to promote research to practice and practice research. We educate we connect. We care. We are in social work hi again from Buffalo. Another of our Local Treasures is the Allbright Knox art gallery. In addition to its world class collection of modern and contemporary art the building constructed in 1890 is an architectural gem. This treasured space is enhanced even more with summertime monthly Sunday afternoon jazz concerts on the rear steps of the gallery. I'm Peter Sobota any quick listen to the current political dialogue related to immigration is a gateway into the complexity of this issue. What is the reality for the people most directly affected by this debate and our policies. In the first of a two episode podcast our guests Dr Deb Ortega Dr Ashley Hannah and Dr. Badiah Haffejee discussed their work chronicling the experiences of immigrants refugees and asylum seekers while examining the history of U.S. policies addressing the needs of immigrants citing concerns related to human rights and social justice. They observed that changes in U.S. policy historically have mostly address the needs of the dominant culture. Coping with dehumanizing and generalizing language jails euphemistically referred to as detention centers and other examples. It's not surprising that many immigrants perceive our policies as primarily focused on keeping people out Deb Ortega Ph.D. is professor at the University of Denver Graduate School of Social Work.

[00:02:12] There she is the founding director of the Latino Center for Community Engagement and scholarship a consortium of interdisciplinary faculty dedicated to creating and advancing knowledge that gives voice to the history politics culture and legacies of Latino communities. She teaches courses on issues of social inequality and her work focuses on the consequences of structural inequality across different systems client groups and diverse communities. She is the past president of the Association of Latino social work educators and the co editor in chief of Ophelia journal of women and social work. She is proud to be a first generation Latino college student. Ashley Hanna Ph.D. is assistant professor at the School of Social Work at the University of Nevada Reno. Her primary areas of expertise are behavioral and mental health clinical social work practice school based interventions racial and ethnic disparities and the impact of immigration policies and practices on Latino individuals families and the community. Dr. Hannas research has concentrated on structural inequalities in the United States. In addition to continued research in the area of immigration her present research interests also include disproportionality and disparities in the education system related to discipline academic success and social emotional well-being as well as effective practices to increase equitable outcomes. Badiah Haffejee recently completed her Ph.D. from the Graduate School of Social Work at the University of Denver. Her research examines the enduring impact of trauma self-sufficiency and resiliency including the ways that refugee policy institutional cultures and individual attitudes combined to negatively impact women refugees. Our guests were interviewed by our own Dr Wooksoo Kim associate professor and Khoder rector of immigrant and refugee research institute here at the School of Social Work.

[00:04:20] They spoke in March of 2016. Immigration has featured prominently in the media and in the political discourse. Can you discuss the realities of modern immigration into the United States. This is dead. Immigration has been a fabric of our country historically and currently and I think it's really important to think about what is immigrant and what does immigration mean. So as of 2015 about 40 one million people in the United States are foreign born. So therefore they're immigrants about 41 percent of these are U.S. citizens. About 27 percent are legal permanent residents. The five are temporary residents and about 26 percent are folks who are unauthorized to be in the United States. Mexicans constitute about 26 percent of the foreign born population. They are also more than half of the Latino immigrant population in the United States which makes them about eleven point six million people here in the United States. Of this eleven point six million people about five point six million are not authorized to be in the United States and don't have access to citizenship. This number includes children who migrated to a very young age with their families and have been raised and educated in the United States have you know at times never returned back to Mexico since they were under 1 years old potentially or have immigrated here even as young as 1 2 3 years old and so their entire educational experience and cultural experience has been really rooted in the United States of the unauthorized immigrant population. Eleven point three million folks Mexicans are reported. Like I said to be about five point six million two point six million immigrants from other parts of Latin America.

[00:06:22] And we've seen a greater rise. Folks coming from countries like Honduras Guatemala and El Salvador. And that increase has really been a result of the increase of violence happening in those countries. These countries have large rates of femicide and violence against women. There are also lots of gang violence in those countries. Some of that has happened as a result of civil wars wars that we've been involved with in their countries. And so the government is not strong and or has an ability to protect women and children from the gang violence that's happening there. So they've come to the United States seeking safety of these unauthorized people about one point three million or 11 percent are Asian immigrants. About 4 percent are European and Canadian immigrants and about 400000 are African immigrants. It's interesting because in 2013 about sixty five point five percent of people who were deported from the United States were Mexican business. The higher rate them with they're represented in the overall population. People who are unauthorized to be here. That's just for Mexicans. When you start to look at all Latin Americans you can see that it's an increase rate. And I think this is really a reaction to the narrative that Latinos are the largest growing group in the United States so that it is somewhat fear based. And as immigration policy tends to be historically that it has become sort of a reaction to this fear sort of a brown threat actually. Dean from the UC Davis law school Kevin Johnson actually described it as a Latino removal system. Thanks for the overview.

[00:08:19] I understand that each one of you brings unique approaches to understanding of immigration. Can you just describe your approach to understanding the complex dynamics of immigration and also how your approach is view immigration in relationship to. SCHUMER Right. Yeah I can share this is Ashley. So I'm primarily guided by critical race theory also known as CRT and Latino Critical Race Theory which applies the tenants of CRT to issues facing Latinos. As a white scholar who investigates issues of structural oppression often specific to immigration key and Latino critical race theory are necessary frameworks for me to keep issues of race language country of origin and structural oppression in the forefront of my mind both in social work practice and in research. There really are a lot of tenants found NCERT but there are few that I find to be secularly helpful in understanding the complexities of immigration policy today so I can speak to a few of

those critical race theory places issues within historical context. So for immigration CRT considers the influence of historical and contemporary racist nativist U.S. culture and policies that includes policies specific to immigration critical race theory also acknowledges the permanence of racism and that racism has been and continues to be a lasting fixture of U.S. society and critical race theory also demands that issues of power privilege and oppression play a prominent role in the investigation of any research topic. It requires that structural forces that maintain the oppressive system are addressed so unlike most research today critical race theory acknowledges that research is not neutral and it also acknowledges that research is very much influenced by the researchers.

[00:10:33] This is particularly important for me as I represent the dominant group of the US in many ways as a white US citizen critical race theory helps me to recognize my difference from the communities with which I work and within which I research as well and not only recognizing the differences but also my privileged identities and how they can work as blinders to the experience of Latinos who are regularly confronted by racism and nativism that I don't need to confront as a white person a white U.S. citizen and finally a really important aspect of critical race theory. Is it social justice aims and every critical race research project and scholarship really concludes with a call for action and outline steps to advance social justice. So this is very important in terms of human rights. It's also a really great fit for the field of social work as social justice is one of our core values. From my perspective this is dead my perspective that I use if I do this work is around liberation and I think as I thought about how to describe this it be important to know that this really comes from a personal experience for me. My undergraduate degree is in religious studies and as part of my growing up and cultural perspective I was raised in a Mexican Catholic family and liberation theology really comes out of that religious perspective. I think oftentimes we don't talk about religion in social work very much because at times people have experienced oppression and exclusion based on some religious perspective.

[00:12:22] For me when we think about liberation which really grows out of a free area in perspective it's about adding this kind of cultural perspective that comes from it's connected to critical theory but adds this idea that there's a connection between the person who is consciously and unconsciously part of the oppressive group and that person who is part of the group that's being dominated so that the perspective is that to deny anyone's humanity is also to deny your own humanity and that the goal is for every person to have the opportunity to be fully developed as a person and to access what it means to be absolutely human sort of in this process of standing with each other and love and support and injustice. The journey for humanization is both not just for myself but it's a collective endeavor that I engage other people in moving toward a more critical consciousness around what does it mean to dominate others. And what does it mean to participate in the liberation of not only myself as I do this work but of participating in changing the landscape so that it's more equitable so everyone has the opportunity to have access to the same structures. It also requires a lot of critical reflection and action as we think about how do we transform these structural inequities and how do they impede other people from developing who they are to their fullest ability. So that's kind of how I approach not just this work but I would say all my work is really about thinking about how it is structural inequality and inequity affect not only those who find themselves that the disadvantaged as the target of inequity but also those who find themselves on the other side of that so this is Badia. So my research addresses oppression specifically the ways that refugee policy institutional cultures and individual attitudes combined to negatively impact recent refugees from Africa that have resettled in the United States.

[00:14:56] Therefore I use the womanism to eliminate the experiences of group invisibility and feelings of marginality and powerlessness that African women refugees experience while integrating into life in the US. Much of this stems from my personal experiences as a woman of color. Born and raised in apartheid South Africa and really experience in U.S. society as an outsider for more than a decade these experiences of oppression marginalization and oftentimes invisibility influence my perception of the struggles of refugees that I work with for example. As an international student I am impacted on a daily basis by several racialize and oppressive policies. To that end I draw from womanism which originated in feminist theory and in a broad sense it is defined as a form of consciousness that incorporates intersections of race economics language culture politics and nationalism. While womanism has five tenets which it is anti oppressive and is constantly engaged in working to dismantle and fight all sorts of oppressive social structures that restrict and circumscribe the agency of African women refugees it is communitarian and views common weal or the state of collective well-being as the goal of social change. It is not ideological that is womanism was rigid lines of demarcation and is inclined to function in a decentralized manner. It is also the Naqibullah that means engage in everyday experiences and language to define those experiences. And it is spiritualized honoring the spiritual practices and beliefs of all citizens specifically three ways that I use in my work that I apply womanism Lee womanism and anti oppressive practices illuminates women of African descent living in the US as having voice as well as activists in their communities.

[00:17:27] Expanding on this perspective womanism offers explanations and a deeper understanding as well as responses to the complexity of experiences that constitute the social identities of African women refugees living in the US a womanist lens on gendered experiences of African women refugees begins by exposing these experiences with African womans bodies are treated as part of the battlefield often traumatic and silenced. In fact womanism Fuz such gross disparities in power as highly problematic as it interferes with collective and individual well-being of African refugees. And then finally womanism is rooted in an understanding of how the experiences of African women refugees living in the US are embedded in precolonial colonial and post-colonial experiences notably the relegation and subjugation of African women during colonialism imperialism has continued during the post-colonial unrest as dictatorships wars and cultural practices that continue to oppress African women. And as with many balls and as social work increases its presence in cultural response of international work. There is much to be gained from a global social justice agenda that integrates African women refugees into the fight for basic human rights for all women of African descent. The language used to describe people who did not have access to citizenship has changed considerably over the years. Can you describe these changes and the meaning behind the changes. Yeah this is actually I cant speak to get out of bed. So generally speaking the language used in the United States particularly and public and political discourse has always been and continues to be very dehumanizing when it comes to immigrants particularly when we're speaking about immigrants without the required visa to reside in the United States. So immigrants have been called aliens illegal aliens or simply illegals as if they're not even human being.

[00:19:43] This type of language characterizes immigrants as just one dimensional figures by reflecting only one aspect of their identity. The fact that the U.S. law doesn't provide them with the necessary visa to live and work in the United States and recently there has been a bit of a push from newspapers and reporters to stop using this dehumanizing language like calling immigrants illegal immigrants. But this language still persists anyway. A Mexican immigrant who participated in a research study that Dr. Ortega and I worked on a few years back stated that Mexican immigrants are treated as instruments to become

rich and to generate wealth not as human beings. So language that we use in the US like aliens or illegals reflects this treatment and this view of immigrants in our work what we've really tried to do is we're what we do is use the term unauthorized immigrant which is a term used by the Department of Homeland Security. Some might be more familiar with the term undocumented immigrant and really they can be used interchangeably. The reason why we choose to use the term unauthorized immigrant is that it really is reflective of an immigrant's current immigration status. And that's important because immigration status is very much fluid as it changes with U.S. immigration policies and practices. So somebody who is an unauthorized immigrant now might have come to the U.S. with the appropriate visa. So maybe a student visa a work visa or a visitor's visa but has since fallen out of status.

[00:21:30] And as policies change that unauthorized immigrant might gain legal permanent status or a different form of immigrant status in the U.S. I think something also that's very interesting that tends to happen is we often characterize entire families or name entire families after the immigrant status of just one family member particularly when the nuclear family has an unauthorized immigrant family member. So people tend to generalize and use generalizing language like saying immigrant families or undocumented families. But really that's not reflective of immigrant families in the U.S.. So for example there might be a case where every single member of a nuclear family is undocumented but generally if a nuclear family has an unauthorized immigrant in the family there might also be a U.S. citizen family member or a legal permanent resident family member. And so the term we use for that is a mixed citizenship status family or a mixed status family. And so by definition in the literature a mixed status family is a family where there is an unauthorized immigrant parents at least one U.S. citizen child. I tend to broaden that term a bit more and apply that in such a way where there is at least one unauthorized immigrant family member and then one family member who has a different status whether that be a U.S. citizen or a permanent legal resident. One of those statuses as well. So those are some different ways that both the language and the way that we speak about immigrants has changed but has also remained very much the same and political and public discourse. This is Deb I'd like to add you this issue of how we talk about people and the language we use is really important to social workers because it's where the erosion of justice begins. So oftentimes are these coded ways to use racial coding that were not sometimes even aware of.

[00:23:48] So for instance in my class I asked students how many of you drank alcohol before you were 21 years of age and of course about 90 percent of the class raises its hand. I've done this for years and then I asked them Did they consider themselves illegal Americans. The question really is about who gets to determine what aspect of your life to find you and what does that definition mean. So as Ashley really described I thought beautifully is the way that we start to define people as criminals instead of people who are trying to access a process some of which they have to actually come here to the United States to ask for something like asylum. So that makes them automatically unauthorized to be here in violation of a law by suing. Please let me be here because I am experienced terrible violence in my own country. And yet we use the same language for everybody right. In a way that is dehumanizing the audio's to who may not be familiar with the immigration technology. Can you talk about the differences and similarities between immigrants refugees and asylum seekers. This is Deb I can start with third continuing that conversation about asylum the asylum process asylum seekers are part of immigrants to receive asylum actually have to be present on the U.S. soil. To say that you're seeking asylum to be granted asylum you have to have experience or have a serious threat of harm and be protected in your country of origin. You have to show evidence that you're

being harm and that harm comes in four areas political beliefs religious beliefs race or a membership in a social group.

[00:25:47] Right now with an influx of women and children from what the Mullah own Buddhists in El Salvador what's happening is actually women are being considered part of a social group because of the high number of femicide that's happening there. The killing of women and the violence both sexual and physical violence that they're experiencing. So there have been made cases in immigration court that being a woman is part of the social group that's under threat and in danger. And some women are being granted asylum in this way as part of this process you have to have supporting evidence like police reports birth certificates medical records photographs newspaper articles and even human rights reports can actually help support an asylum case. Everything has to be submitted in English. So it all has to be officially translated and then submitted to the court as part of the process. This is Badia and I will speak about the refugees so refugees persons that have been forced from their homes often due to political instability and persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race religion nationality political opinion or membership in a particular social group. On average the U.S. resettles about 70000 to 80000 refugees per annum but recently that's been reduced to about 70000. And I think the Indignados do similarities I think with the immigrants refugees suddenly come you know the identity that the difference is at least I'm sorry. Unlike undocumented immigrants refugees come here and they stay present. Is legitimated through the definition of refugee. And they also have access to resettlement support and other social services and then they also automatically get a Social Security card.

[00:27:57] So while it's the expedience intersections of both identities they do at least come here with sort of legitimate identity and some of the similarities that think they experienced the same trauma and the refugee experience as well as the intensity of the identities. And obviously the experiences precolonial ongoing patriotism. And then they experience white supremacy like immigration. But the question that we're talking about today can you describe the ways that the United States policies have historically addressed to immigration. Yeah this is actually again. So immigration is tied to the very foundation of what it means to be citizens of the United States. Even so the U.S. government has always and continues to marginalize immigrant groups defined as either by the dominant group in the U.S. white middle class the upper class U.S. citizens. So the reality is that U.S. immigration policies and practices have always and continue to reflect a xenophobic racist and nativist culture that we have in the United States immigration laws policies and practices are also tied to capitalism and meeting the needs of white middle class upper class U.S. citizens. So historically when we see a shift in immigration policies and practices that shift generally has been made to meet the needs of the dominant group of the U.S. What provides minimal to no protection to immigrants particularly immigrants of color. So we see this if you look historically back into the 80s hundreds during Western expansion there was a great need for laborers to build the railroads and so Chinese immigrants fill this gap. However when there was no longer that need we saw the change in immigration policy and the Chinese exclusion of pretty much ended immigration from China for a long period of time.

[00:30:03] So these same practices are present today just in more subtle ways. So it might not be so obvious to someone who's not paying attention to immigration policy or aware of these changes and why they're happening. So we could look at for example maffia the North American Free Trade Agreement which opened the border to goods so that people in the U.S. could benefit from low cost products at the same time as NAFTA while the borders were being opened to these cheap products to serve the U.S. citizen and

our consumerism needs. There was immigration policies and changes that really close off the border to people making it more difficult for immigrants for example from Latin America to come into the U.S.. And so really since then the U.S. has continued to militarize the border making it more dangerous and more expensive for immigrants to come to the U.S.. All the while bringing inexpensive products to serve the purposes of the dominant society here that might appear more obvious to some but you can really see this in every immigration policy. We have a great example of this is even more subtle to many. And that's the policy of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or DACA. So really DACA has been touted as this wonderful policy that is providing protections to immigrants who came to the U.S. as children. But the reality is DACA also benefits the dominant group of the U.S. and have little long term impact for the unauthorized immigrant population. So DACA benefits middle class and upper class Americans by diversifying the workforce with educated and oftentimes bilingual young professionals.

[00:32:01] However due to the temporary nature of the protection through DACA these immigrants really don't create a long lasting threat to white workers in the labor force. In addition so few unauthorized immigrants are actually able to be protected through DACA that there's no real large impact to the number of unauthorized immigrants who are in the U.S.. So unauthorized immigrants are still marginalized and taken advantage of and used for cheap inexpensive labor that allows for middle class and upper class us Americans to maintain the lifestyle that they really want. And I want to point out of course. Yes it is true that DACA does protect a limited number of young immigrants from detention and deportation and allows for them to work legally in the United States and even provides an increased access to higher education. The problem with this though is that this is time limited immigrants need to reapply for DACA every two years and even with DACA status there is no real pathway to legal permanent residence status or U.S. citizenship. So in essence immigrants who are protected through DACA remain in a state of limbo and they don't have any long term protection. This is so important to point out given the current social and political context right now with the presidential primaries for example. I have to ask myself what would happen to these young professionals who are currently protected through DACA if one of the Republican presidential candidates was to win the presidency. I really shudder to think. And it's a dangerous time for these immigrants and all immigrants to be in the United States. And we've gone so far in some of the Republican primaries we've heard the candidates discussed taking away birthright citizenship.

[00:34:03] So this no longer becomes just an issue for immigrants or unauthorized immigrants but in fact anyone born to an immigrant parents or an unauthorized immigrant parents might be in danger. And these are all very dehumanizing and oppressive ways that we treat immigrants in the United States. And when you really look over time it does not appear that immigrants are any better off now than they were 200 years ago. This is Deb I think this issue of policies both historic and modern are current policies is really important to think about in terms of what is the policy process like and what does it mean. And for instance if we think about the way lobby works lobbying is really about the way people with power organizations with power have access. To legislation to benefit themselves. Let me give you an example that works in the area that we're talking about the privatization of jails and immigration detention centers. And I'd like to say that that word immigration detention makes it sound like it's not a jail. It absolutely is incarceration. So privatization in jails has happened for a long time like historically for a very long time in our country. But the private prison industry really began to take hold in the 1980s with what's now become the largest private jail corporation called the Corrections Corporation of America. And later the second largest GEO Group both of these organizations are very involved in private detention jails. Basically they make the claim that by privatizing prison

and detention centers that they provide a cost savings to taxpayers. In 2011 the Corrections Corporation of America had a net income of 162 million dollars.

[00:36:11] And these private prison industries use a lot of that money to not just only lobby our government or government officials but also to develop bills that influence immigration legislation so that they can increase their profit. The idea of having for profit industry is to enhance profit. So theoretically they're supposed to do this balance between safety and security while maximizing their profit as a result or maybe inappropriately the focus on profit creates a strange tension right about how can I do what I need to do at the cheapest cost by charging the most. That's what profits about and many of these private immigration detention companies have a number of complaints against them they have complaints against them for medical care for people not providing medical care. We've seen questions about the quality of education that's happening for people detained for children especially detained in these jails. We have seen hunger strikes happen. There's questions about the quality of food the way that people were being treated because there's not a strong oversight of what's actually happening in these private facilities. There's been a recent class action lawsuit that is pending against Jeo because of the way that they have used people that they have detained to clean and provide maintenance in buildings with either pay them a dollar a day or not paying them at all. So that essentially that's one way right but you can increase profit is to use the people who have no other option. And actually there have been reports that if you refuse to work in the laundry or or participate in the cleaning of the facility that then you're isolated. These facilities are also really interesting because one of the strategies is to put them in communities that are economically depressed.

[00:38:15] And so the local government is very interested in having these companies come in to create these facilities because it promotes jobs for the people theoretically in their community but they're also then often in remote areas. So people who are incarcerated in these facilities have limited access to things like legal services both paid for and pro bono legal services. So the amount of money that these private prisons get paid especially around immigration and family immigration has been reported to be about 300 dollars a day per person. And unlike a prison system we're talking about the incarceration of women and children who are fairly docile who are highly invested in not disrupting their asylum proceedings and really are treated as if they're in a jail. Children have to be lined up to be counted several times a day with their parents as if they wear name tags in the facility they are told which times in which they can meet with their lawyers. They have to sign up ahead of time. I saw this for myself when I was part of the short faculty and the Law Faculty at the University of Denver took social work students and law students to Dilley Texas where we helped women prepare for their asylum hearing. And you can read about this and I can tell you all these things about private prison industry. But until you see the way that people are treated dehumanised way people are treated. It's really hard to believe when we took the students there.

[00:40:00] The social work well Bloss students first really struggled because they heard the horrible stories that the women told about the physical and sexual violence they experienced in their countries at the hands of sometimes their spouses who may have been connected to the police or the gangs the ways that their children were used as pawns around their sexual violence so that if they reported to the police their children were threatened with being killed or had been killed. So these are the kind of people who are seeking asylum. At the same time they're not allowed really to have or don't have access to pro bono services in Dili specifically is really about in part the geographic location of where it is. What's also interesting is that the policies changed so for a while for women

who were seeking asylum with their children. There was a no bond approach to their cases so in other words they couldn't post a bond. Once it was determined that they may have a viable asylum case they could post a bond to leave the facility. But the US government attorneys had a no bond order and at some point this was determined to be not constitutional. So then they had to have a bond. And so what the U.S. government attorneys did then was to place a bond of fourteen thousand dollars on a person who was determined had a case to move forward in their asylum hearing. So unlike in the prison system for people who've committed crimes in the United States who can actually get a bond by putting a portion of that amount down. Women who are here who have crossed the border with their children have been horribly abused have to actually provide 100 percent of that money so they can't just do a 10 percent bond or an amount they have to come up with 100 percent of the money.

[00:42:07] And in the end you have to ask yourself right what's the difference between a no bond and a bond of fourteen thousand dollars to a 19 year old mother with her nursing baby. I mean this is actually a case that I saw when we were working with families and when asked this is actually I saw this happen in court. The judge asked the U.S. attorney why the bond was so high and her response was There are no notes in the file about why the bond is so high. I trust my colleague who did the evaluation. So I stand by the bond. The 19 year old woman mother had no prior offenses in her country. She had been like I said sexually assaulted. The police wouldn't even bother to take a report and she was afraid for her own life and her baby's life. And at what point do we say you know when we determine that no bond is against a person's rights or the rights that we've established in the United States to put an excessively high bond when we know it's actually the same thing. That's the kind of political shenanigans and policy shenanigans that happen to not facilitate the laws that we have in place but actually prohibit people from fairly accessing policies that I think most U.S. citizens believe should be in place or believe that are in place the things that startle the social work since the most was how the legal system did not work for the immigrants. How unfair it was how it was manipulated to keep people who by other rights had a right to a process. It kept them from being able to access the process.

[00:43:56] And this is what you see when you look historically over these policies we see the ways that the policy is manipulated to keep a certain group of people out. And we did it in the 1700 we did it in the 80s and we're doing it in new and different ways. In 2000 15 16. So I think when Ashley and body and I come together and we look at these things that are happening the question for us is who are benefiting from these policies. Well the people who are benefiting from these policies are the people who are the lobbyists who are working for people who are making millions of dollars off the tragedies and dehumanization of a whole group of people who frankly are not white. Easy to detect easy to pick up who are overrepresented in deportation hearings and detention. And so thinking about as social workers as people who believe that we live in a country which is about the rights of others we have to really start to question what are the effects of these policies. Who's being kept out. Why are they being kept out. And what does this mean in this very racialized context that we live in in the United States. You've been listening to doctors Deb Ortega Ashley Hanah and Badiah Haffejee discuss the experiences of immigrants on social work. Be sure to look for part 2 of this podcast on August 1st. Hi I'm Nancy Smyth professor and dean of the University of Buffalo School of Social Work. Thanks for listening to our podcast. We look forward to your continued support of the series.

[00:45:50] For more information about who we are as a school our history our online and on ground degree and continuing education programs we invite you to visit our website at

W W W dot social work dot Buffalo edu. And while you're there check out our technology and social work Research Center. You'll find it under the Community Resources menu.