A Radical Journal of Geography
ANTIPODE

Interview Series: "Global Deportation and Detention Regimes"

Organized by Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin

Interview with Alicia Schmidt Camacho and Stephen Pitti

In this part of the interview series, we turn our focus to the United States. Together with Alicia Schmidt Camacho and Stephen Pitti, we began by tracing the historical conditions that made today's deportation regime in the United States possible. From there, our conversation moved to the political economy of undocumentedness and carcerality, exploring not only the control of human mobility but also of space, the central role of migrant organizing movements over the past 140 years of US history, and, finally, the prospects for hope today.

Alicia Schmidt Camacho is a scholar of migration and Latinx studies, whose research focuses on the Mexican and Central American diasporas, migrant politics, and transborder social movements. She is the author of *Migrant Imaginaries: Latino Cultural Politics in the US–Mexico Borderlands* (NYU Press, 2008) and articles about immigration law enforcement, feminicide in Mexico, and migrant labor. She directs the Migrant Justice Initiative, a collaborative research project that brings together scholars and migrant-led organizations to develop innovative frameworks for understanding human mobility in the Americas, informed by migrant testimony. She teaches in the Ethnicity, Race, and Migration program at Yale University.

A scholar of Latinx communities in the United States, Stephen Pitti is a Professor of History; American Studies; and Ethnicity, Race, and Migration at Yale University. He is the author of *The Devil in Silicon Valley: Race, Mexican Americans, and Northern California* (Princeton University Press, 2003), *American Latinos and the Making of the United States* (Eastern National, 2012), and articles on Latinx history and historiography. He directs Yale's Center for the Study of Race, Indigeneity, and Transnational Migration, and he co-edits the "Politics and Culture in Modern America" series for the University of Pennsylvania Press. He is currently writing a history of migrant organizing.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Thank you so much Alicia and Stephen for agreeing to be part of this interview series. To set the stage for today's discussion around deportation, we wanted to start with the history of it. Although deportations are widely discussed today, they are not new in the history of US migration governance. From a historical perspective, how should we understand the border enforcement we are witnessing today within the broader history of US migration governance?

Stephen Pitti: We should remember how the Obama administration shaped the contemporary landscape. But at the same time, it's critical that we understand how more recent developments have developed from a much longer regime of detention and deportation that's over a century old. If we only focus on the last 15 or 20 years, we risk missing the foundations of what's happening now. If we only say "ICE out" or "abolish ICE"—which I think we should be saying—we run the risk of not understanding that there are other manifestations of detention and deportation which predated ICE (US Immigration and Customs Enforcement) and could easily come back.

The detention and deportation regime in the United States is fundamentally based on racial thinking and racist practices extending back into the 19th century, first developing in their modern form as a response to anti-Chinese sentiment in the late 1800s. Importantly, the calls for the detention and deportation of Chinese immigrants were not only a top-down effort—they also emerged from working-class white communities who saw the Chinese as a racial, sexual, and class threat. It would be easy to see the detention and deportation regime as something imposed upon the US public, but in fact there are aspects of this that have been demanded by various segments of the public. We need to reckon with that if we're going to undo the system we're living with today. The 19th century past established some of the racial underpinnings of what we now live with, but it's also a reminder that we have a lot to do in the arenas of culture and society—not just in the formal political system—to address the situation surrounding detention and deportation.

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: Thinking historically, we should also remember that non-citizens—and people who had no hope of ever being naturalized, who were systematically barred from attaining citizenship—have been a foundational presence in the population of North America. After the establishment of the US republic, the first immigration laws were explicitly racialized. The US hung on as long as it could to a system of forced, coerced labor by migrants and enslaved people. And once slavery ended, new populations were deliberately introduced into the US polity—either by conquest, by imperial dominance, or recruited as a low-wage workforce—in ways that again made the regulation of immigration part of a labor system as well as part of a racial project.

What we are seeing in the 21st century is very similar. ICE's targets—the most visibly criminalized population, primarily people of Mexican and Central American and Latin American descent—constitute the largest percentage of both the unauthorized and legalized population. The ones being targeted for expulsion are mostly low-wage workers who fulfill extraordinarily important roles in the US economy and labor system. They've been recruited over generations for work in numerous sectors but have been barred from attaining legal status, and there has been no effort on the part of regional governments to establish an authorized entry system that would recognize and protect their rights. By race, they've been framed as representing a threat to the culture and social welfare of the country. But in fact, there is no economy without these folks.

Stephen Pitti: And during the 20th century we saw detention and deportation rise during periods of both relative economic prosperity and economic hard times. Detention and deportation have sometimes been explained as fundamentally a response to class competition and economic hardship. There's probably some truth in that. But it's important to understand that detention and deportation regimes also advanced when there was a lot of economic opportunity and many jobs to be had for citizens. That's important to remember.

History reminds us that detention and deportation have always been political matters. Over the last 140 years, politicians and political candidates have called for harsher policies against migrants to galvanize their constituents, to win political points. That was true for anti-Chinese movements, for racist calls to ban Filipinos and Mexicans and others. All of this

developed before the Obama years. We need to remember the deep-seeded racism at the heart of immigration policies, the ways in which society as a whole has invested in detention and deportation, and why and how this played out in the political arena for many decades.

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: Criminalization creates a caste system. It's not only been about expulsion—it's been about holding people in a condition of secondary status so they cannot exercise full rights as workers or attain full civil rights protections for themselves or their US citizen children. Immigration enforcement has fueled an economic system that requires people for whom the state takes no responsibility—people who don't receive social welfare benefits, don't receive care, and who can be expelled and treated as disposable.

Stephen Pitti: Alicia's comments remind us that so much of this is actually about the "control of space"—detention and deportation regimes restrict mobility and residency, moving people away from where they're not desired. This connects detention and deportation to other efforts to regulate migrants and workers. I'm thinking here about guest worker programs that control where migrants live and under what conditions they work, whether they can move freely and associate freely. A key question we have to ask is: How have detention and deportation related to other forms of control of migrant people over time?

When we think about the history, let's also remind ourselves that people have always struggled against detention and deportation. Were it not for those efforts, these systems would be a whole lot worse than they are. Migrants have taken a lead in these struggles. That was as true 140 years ago as it is today. Their responses have drawn in lawyers and legal teams, engaged faith communities, and involved unions and other kinds of organizations. They have changed education. We can look to this history for new ideas and to remind ourselves of strong thinking that's been lost. We can find inspiration. In other dark times, people have found ways forward. This moment requires persistence and hope, and looking to the past helps with the important work that needs doing today.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: You're absolutely right, and we definitely want to come back to resistance and talk about that in more depth later. But first, we'd like to stay with the current moment of intensifying oppression. Beyond the fact that places like Minnesota, Portland, and Los Angeles have large migrant populations and tend to vote Democratic, why do you think ICE presence has been increasing in these specific locations? This also goes back to what you were saying about the control of space and the control of certain populations.

Stephen Pitti: I'm not sure we know yet why particular places in the United States have been the focus for the new regimes of migrant enforcement we've seen in recent months. I'm sure we're going to learn more about the logic and decision-making as time goes on and more documents are revealed, or as people who are in the federal administration or who work for DHS (the US Department of Homeland Security) speak out. But we do know that it's political—that the decisions to move into different places and focus on enforcement efforts there are deeply tied to political decision-making and political priorities.

I think it's fair, although we don't have all the evidence, to come to some conclusions about why these places have been targeted. Ultimately it is about politics, and the political calculations that have led the Trump administration to focus on these places probably circle around a few key considerations. One is certainly a spirit of retribution—an effort to punish particular places that did not vote for Trump in the national elections. Minnesota is a clear example: there seems to be an effort to punish local communities and politicians there for their failure to fall in line and support the Trump platform.

Another is certainly an effort to punish and criminalize communities that may be highly represented in these places. An important example is the Somali community in Minnesota—one of the largest Somali populations in the world, and the largest in the United States. Focusing on Somalis in the Minneapolis–St. Paul area was clearly an effort to make political use of Islamophobic and anti-Black racism, to mark the boundaries between citizens and non-citizens, between the welcomed and the not welcomed, in racialized terms.

Other things that probably matter are the ways in which these particular places have done work that doesn't tie directly into migration per se. For example, the ways in which places like

Minnesota and California have taken a lead in passing legislation and arguing for gender equality and trans rights—programs that are deeply politicized nationally—have induced the anger of many national officials and many people on the right, even within those states. The attention paid to migrant communities is also about attacking the visions of equality and freedom and liberty that these communities have led in creating.

And there are probably economic and class issues driving the geographic focus as well. We know there's been some hesitation by anti-migrant forces in the Republican Party to go after large rural industries like agriculture and meatpacking that employ large numbers of unauthorized workers. There have been major raids at meatpacking sites and large agribusiness operations, but at the same time, those employers—often conservative supporters of the Republican Party—have pushed back against the detention and harassment of their immigrant workforces. The focus on cities is also a decision not to focus on those economic sectors that have been quite supportive of the Republican Party and that depend heavily on immigrants. There are also probably connections to economic agendas around control of raw materials in different parts of the country—in Texas with water policy, and in Minnesota, which has lots of water as well as rare materials used in technology development like lithium batteries. I think these efforts are political, but they also have something to do with taking political control in places seen as pivotal for various reasons.

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: DHS announced that it will reduce its presence in Minnesota if certain conditions are met. This is likely meant to encourage Democrats to approve a DHS appropriations bill that provides unprecedented levels of funding to ICE and immigrant detention. The commitment to withdraw may really be a matter of ending a state of siege. In other cities that have been under ICE occupation, the withdrawal of large-scale military forces hasn't ended deportation drives. They take a different form. ICE has filled the Whipple detention center to overflowing and is in the process of moving hundreds of people to Texas and Louisiana and elsewhere. DHS charged protestors with criminal charges of obstruction. DHS is going to be entangled with Minnesota for quite a while. So, the details of exactly what is ending really matter here.

The vast majority of removals are not actually happening through big, sweeping raids. They're occurring in the seizure of individuals at multiple sites: residences, courts, schools, traffic stops. DHS also tends to withdraw from one city and move to another location. Before ICE agents entered Minnesota in large numbers, they went into Charlotte; they were in other places. And it's important to know that even before this particular operation—"Metro Surge"—began, there were hundreds of agents already involved in the arrest and detention of people in Minnesota and the upper Midwest.

One of the important dimensions that hasn't come to the fore in the "ICE out" debate is that the Fifth Circuit Court and higher courts have given DHS a lot more latitude for the indefinite detention of migrants, and have loosened the restrictions on racial profiling, which will continue to allow ICE to operate in ways that will produce mass expulsion. It's always good news to know that people dressed for combat and carrying military-grade weapons are no longer occupying city streets, and let's hope that lasts beyond the decision on the DHS funding package. But the majority of operations to remove people remain possible even without the show of extreme force. Migrant defenders will be asking for greater protection from their local government even in the wake of any kind of drawdown of military operations.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Alicia, you have mentioned how difficult it is to get reliable data on these processes—and that this difficulty is itself as a form of violence. Could you say a bit more about what you mean by that?

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: From the earliest efforts at Chinese removal, or the mass deportations of Mexicans in the 1930s and 1950s, the Border Patrol—and what became ICE—has relied on different kinds of informal policing, surveillance, and coercion to create a climate in which migrants feel they have to leave or that they have to go into hiding. The vast majority of immigrant removals are not formal deportations. They are actions taken in response to heightened police surveillance and the threat of detention and deportation. Thousands of people who have left the US—longtime residents, many with US citizen relatives or children, many with some kind of authorized status, temporary or otherwise. Many would have been eligible for

asylum, legal residency, or humanitarian relief. Those are the so-called "self-deportations". What the Trump administration has done is codify this as policy. Since the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security in 2003, immigration enforcement has moved toward an "enforcement through deterrence" framework—preventing people from ever entering the US but also eroding the autonomy of migrants already here, making social conditions so difficult that they would leave on their own. That's a number of people we can't possibly track. It's also a kind of violence that is very much obscured. It's the unseen side of big military raids: denying people access to basic protections, denying them free mobility, making them feel removable, withholding due process.

Another issue is that deportation is categorized as an administrative procedure and "voluntary departure" is the form that ICE wants people to take because it's the least expensive and least contested route. This constitutes the vast majority of removals. How those removals are produced and how many people are affected, and under what conditions they leave, we can't entirely know. But there is ample evidence that border patrol agents, police departments, and ICE use threats and coercion. The treatment of non-citizens as people for whom basic protections should not exist—whether as workers or as bearers of civil rights—has created conditions in which different kinds of expulsion occur that may not result in a legal deportation but still take people out of the public sphere. All the people in Los Angeles and Minneapolis who've gone into hiding, whose kids are no longer going to school, who are no longer participating in public life, who won't stand up for their rights as workers when they're being exploited or injured—all of those people are, as a result of their criminalized status, subject to forms of social and extralegal violence alongside this state-sponsored program of expulsion.

The lack of data is important because we don't have a sense of the scope of operations in the present moment. The Department of Homeland Security dismantled its already small and weak internal monitoring offices—the offices that take complaints about abusive practices. The Department of Labor—already very weak—scaled back or cut programs devoted to the protection of civil and labor rights. The Department of Justice has cut them back too. Many federal authorities no longer publish records of violations. There's no longer any point of direct

accountability. DHS officials can just stand up and lie because there's no official accounting and record.

We're also seeing efforts to close jails and detention sites to observers and monitors—journalists, academics, lawmakers, as well as international bodies that are supposed to be there monitoring conditions. We've seen AI used to distort images and recordings of ICE operations and protests against ICE operations to serve the political interests of this administration. Federal authorities also rescinded protections that were established—minimal as they were—to protect vulnerable populations. The policies governing family separations that were posted on DHS and ICE websites are gone. Protocols for the protection of trans people in custody have been canceled without our knowing how many people these affect or where they are. In that context, the main source of information we have now comes from interviews with migrants on their return to their home countries and that's where we're getting a fuller account of what's happening. What little documentation we've seen reveals a coordinated and systemic effort at family separation, disregard for the rights of minors, detention of minors in conditions where children should never be held, and the deliberate movement of people to prevent contact with family or legal representation. One person interviewed in El Salvador had been moved five times before his deportation, with the specific aim of disallowing him any contact with family or lawyers.

In that context, the lack of information is a cover for violence, but it's also a violence in itself—it corrodes constraints on police power and the use of terror. We can confidently say that this is a regime bent on disappearing people, not simply removing them: exposing them to the worst forms of risk and removing them in conditions such that it will be difficult for them to ever recover their ties to the United States. It's a banishment of a much greater order than we've ever seen before.

Stephen Pitti: Alicia is in part describing the violent weaponization of space, how the control of space has been critical to the operationalization of detention and deportation over time. Some of this has been tied to the militarization of the US–Mexico border. Beginning in the late 20th century, especially in the 1990s, the US government developed a conscious policy to push

migrants out of what so-called "traditional corridors"— places like San Diego and El Paso—into the desert regions. That governmental effort pushed migrants into far more dangerous circumstances where deaths rose and understanding of their experiences was harder for the public to see and understand.

Another development worth mentioning is the establishment of migrant carceral spaces far from larger population centers and public scrutiny. Detention sites in rural areas within the United States are not new. Putting people in prison sites in El Salvador and Rwanda and elsewhere certainly is. It's long been clear that when migrants are far away from their lawyers, migrants have less protection and less ability to communicate with others. It's been difficult for concerned advocates or family members to access those spaces at all. This has become increasingly true even for congressional officials who want to visit. The last thing I'll say on this theme is that we should remember that the expedited removal of people from the United States—to a home country or a third country as quickly as possible—has also been part of a strategy of using space to make the system more invisible and more harsh. In these situations, getting data about numbers and experiences becomes harder and harder.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: So maybe we can shift our focus to forms of resistance. We're seeing this extraordinary wave of solidarity across the country. What has made this possible? How do you see the solidarity between citizens and non-citizens? Might it evolve into a longer-term political structure, one that brings people together around other issues, including labor, and gender?

Stephen Pitti: Despite all the calamities of this moment—the tremendous violations of the law and human dignity—the current situation has also given us some reasons to be hopeful. We hear stories everyday of great sacrifice, great creativity, and great energy related to people who are trying to correct the horrors of the system. That's exciting and cause for real hope.

As to why it's developing, let's remember that many leaders of this organizing work are not brand new to this in 2025 or 2026. Some are veterans of past struggles who first got involved 20 or 30 years ago. Others were doing work during the first Trump administration. This is not the

first time we've seen people respond to militarization and violations of basic rights. Some folks did this work in Arizona around 2010. Others participated in the 2006 migrant mobilizations, which were the largest mass movements in the history of the United States and examples of tremendous courage, energy, and sacrifice. So, while we have to think hard about the people who are getting involved now for the first time, we also have to understand that lots of folks didn't start as blank slates. Many had past commitments, past wisdom, earlier work that they brought to this moment.

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: One of the impressive stories of the 21st century is that it's the people who were seen as unorganizable, the people who were seen as rightless, who have really set an agenda from below for social change that exceeds any kind of liberal platform. The migrant mobilization and the movement for Black lives and against police terror represent a very different kind of organizing than traditional interest-based organizing in US formal politics. In the 21st century, the labor movement has been driven by people in the service sector who are not eligible for full protections as workers because of their legal status, or who are working in areas that have very low union rates. But they've built worker centers; they've built institutions within the communities in which they live that promote mutual aid, that share information about how the police is operating in their community, that shield people from surveillance, that produce community defense strategies that make life livable under conditions of criminalization. That kind of grassroots, solidarity-based organizing has given us a lot of the tools you see operating now that are being mobilized against authoritarianism and an explicitly authoritarian use of police violence.

Stephen Pitti: And I think it's worth reiterating that this kind of organizing has been building for a long time—it has deep roots. If you look back at earlier periods of migrant struggle, you see similar formations: mutual aid societies, community defense networks, coalitions with labor and faith communities. The revitalization of labor in the 1990s was important. What's different now is the scale and the urgency, and also the degree to which these organizations have developed a sophisticated political vocabulary that connects local conditions to a much broader critique.

That's something that took generations to build, and it didn't happen in spite of the repression migrants faced—in many ways it happened because of it. Organizing under conditions of criminalization, without the protections most workers take for granted, forces a kind of political creativity that more established movements sometimes lose.

Similarly, incarcerated people and their kin drove an abolitionist movement—and what they've been arguing for is a repair to damages produced by systems that deny people their full livelihoods, put them in precarity, and make them more likely to experience early, preventable deaths. Indigenous communities in the upper Midwest, movements to protect water and land rights—these are the places where challenges to the kind of economic system we live in, the commodification of land, the extractive economies that have been imposed, the different forms of ongoing colonialism, have resonated in a period of upward wealth transfer and eroding social safety nets.

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: In a place like Minnesota, we also see an articulation of trans rights and sanctuary—not only for migrants or non-citizens, but for people who are being made vulnerable—that has brought people together to think about precisely what incites this Christian right-wing assault on basic democratic principles and on community life. One significant aspect is that the language of fighting ICE, of "ICE out", is about neighbors—it tries to obliterate the distinction between citizen and non-citizen. This is not a discourse about "we are a nation of immigrants". It's really arguing for shared fate, interdependence, and the dignity and autonomy of these communities that have been under siege.

Migrants are offering a way of understanding this economic regime as well as the political regime—and the way they work together—that we don't get from anybody else. Before anyone enters the US without authorization, or on a visa as a temporary farm worker, they've effectively been expelled already—forcibly displaced from their home communities by economic need, political repression or instability, or climate change and natural disasters. They've already experienced displacement, and they are reckoning with migration as a key strategy, not just for survival, but for collective advancement. The necessity of being able to cross the most fortified boundaries in the world means that this is a population that has to know how to think

strategically, needs to know how to create solidarity, needs to know how to organize, and needs to be able to operate safely in a country where basic protections are denied and rights violations are fully expected. That condition makes them particularly adept at answering a government that has sought—without any pretext whatsoever—to move wealth into the upper echelons and destroy the protections of the environment, of land, of people, of basic gender and sexual rights, and rights of expression. There are many kinds of immigrants who have other kinds of status in the US and are more protected by class status, by papers, who are suddenly finding themselves vulnerable and alert to their own deportability—and they're having to turn toward the model set by poor people and undocumented people before them.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Building on that, what do you think other movements can learn from the experiences and practices of migrant organizing? In your words, from those who were seen as "rightless" and "unorganizable"?

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: The traditional framework for immigrant rights in the US was a path to citizenship—and the price of that was the criminalization of border crossers and unauthorized migrants. That was the bargain the legislators were willing to make. It's really since the early 2000s, and especially 2006, that the grassroots migrant justice movement rejected those frameworks and refused distinctions between the deserving, non-threatening migrant and the one who was criminalized as a threat. Because they're kin. As a result, they've articulated a kind of ethics of solidarity, a basis for making claims based on residency, on being good social actors, on shared need. They've emphasized both what are the drivers of migration and what their role is in sustaining an economy that doesn't serve them.

One of the really important principles of the migrant worker movement is: if you accept my labor, then you have to accept my rights, my full personhood. You don't get my services without respect for my full person. And that caused problems not just for the right—which was obviously threatened by the demographic growth and power of an empowered population—but also for a left that wasn't prepared to give up the monopoly of rights attached to citizenship and that is itself invested in criminalization. There's also much greater attention now to the economic

logic of criminalization coming from migrant organizations and from their ties to the abolitionist movement—shifting us back to a class-based struggle in which race is not relegated outside the conversation but is integral to it. And that is often anti-imperial in the sense that it's saying: "We're here because you were there." Not a new articulation, but one that has come back to the fore of migrant justice movements and was somewhat muted under Democratic administrations.

Stephen Pitti: That's a really important point, and it connects to something historians have been grappling with—which is that the periods when immigrant rights rhetoric was most domesticated, most focused on the "deserving immigrant", were often periods when enforcement was quietly expanding. The 2006 mobilizations were a rupture in that, a refusal of that bargain. And what's striking is that the framework that emerged from those movements—rooted in shared fate rather than earned belonging—has proven much more durable and much harder to co-opt.

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: I guess what I've been really struck by is that after a long period of theorizing social death and precarity, we're being challenged as scholars to think about dignity, about solidarity—terms that sort of disappeared from social thought for quite a while. I find it remarkable that for those of us who are relatively safe and comfortable, we're being guided back to joy, to abundance, to shared knowledges by people who have lost so much and who have so much more at stake. I find that humbling.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Lately, we've been seeing a lot more discussion around justice, about ways to struggle toward justice, rather than only focusing on pain and precarity itself, which is exciting to see!

Alicia Schmidt Camacho: You know, that is really something I've been impressed by, and I think it's in part because a rights-based framework has often failed to fully account for the ways in which communities experience violations. Often, it is less able to produce shared wins than a justice framework in that sense. The horizon is bigger than redress—it's saying, well, what's the

world we want? And then there's something really important about people who have never expected to attain prosperity or safety, whose lives are conditioned on the sense that life is a struggle, having a lot to teach people who are having to adjust to the existential challenges that the current world order and climate disasters are putting in front of us.

I think about this a lot: just as Trump was taking office, there were these devastating fires in California, and the day laborers were out there helping people and providing relief. And so, by June, when mass resistance to the ICE occupation in Los Angeles happened, people were standing at the day labor job sites to protect them—because those people had come to their aid. The day laborers always say at the start of the meetings I've attended: "We love you because you showed up." It's a principle. The horizon of justice is a never-ending struggle to get there because there's always going to be something that requires our attention, always threats, always risk. So, the emphasis isn't on attaining a state of full protection, or fixing it with papers, or whatever. The horizon is always committing to show up. That's where the struggle is centered—getting as many people to show up as possible. And they've been doing it. Hopefully we'll continue to do it and keep holding ICE accountable even when it steps away from our streets, when they're not visibly patrolling. Abolition means more than just "ICE out". This is the first phase.

Stephen Pitti: What Alicia is describing also makes me think of something that movements in other parts of the world have been grappling with for a long time. There's a concept in Andean traditions called *buen vivir*—"good living"—rooted in Indigenous Quechua thought, and it actually got written into Ecuador's constitution in 2008, which is remarkable. It's a vision of well-being that's fundamentally collective and relational—not about individual accumulation, not even about rights in the liberal sense, but about harmony with community, with the natural world, with future generations. And when I hear the ethics coming out of day labor centers in Los Angeles, or from the abolitionist movement, I hear some of that: a refusal to define justice as just getting your piece of the existing order, and an insistence on asking much bigger questions about how we actually want to live together. That conversation extends well beyond the borders

of the United States. But I think that's the conversation this moment is cracking open, and that feels important to me.