ABSTRACT

SHELLABARGER, RACHEL MARIE. Garbage or Godsend?: Contested Meanings Among Conservation and Humanitarian Groups on the United States Border. (Under the direction of Dr. M. Nils Peterson).

Conservation and human rights are threatened by direct and indirect effects of border enforcement practices on the Arizona-Sonora border. Increased border enforcement in urban areas pushed migrants into remote conservation areas, threatening both vulnerable borderland ecosystems and human migrants passing through them. This study examines responses to human and environmental impacts of border policies in the case study region of Altar Valley in southern Arizona, where migrant traffic increased greatly as a result of expanded border enforcement near urban centers. We use ethnographic methods to explore and understand the actions of land-management and humanitarian aid groups attempting to address socio-ecological crises wrought by increased border enforcement, in order to look for ways to reduce the crises through a better understanding of the context. Community partners include Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge, Coronado National Forest, and No More Deaths humanitarian aid group, all located within 25 miles of the Arizona-Sonora border. Results of this study, carried out largely during the summer of 2008, describe how the actions of land-management and humanitarian groups eventually conflicted and resulted in littering citations for humanitarian aid volunteers who left water for migrants along trails on the wildlife refuge. The conflict was branded as an issue of conservation versus human rights. I argue that the conflict between land-management personnel and humanitarian aid volunteers arose not just from differing conservation and humanitarian goals, but from different conceptions of problems associated with border activity and different ideas of the borderlands as a place.
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Introduction

Origin of the Research

During the summer of 2007, I spent two months as a humanitarian aid volunteer with the group No More Deaths, which served as my introduction to border policy and its ramifications. I was drawn to the desert because of the migrants and their distress, but as I spent more time hiking in the desert with humanitarian aid in hand, the ecological degradation occurring in vulnerable ecosystems drew my interest. Local conservation groups and United Nations bodies alike have come to realize the interconnectedness of human rights and conservation, and it became apparent to me that the borderlands were an interconnected human rights and conservation disaster.

Given my previous experience in the Altar Valley, the large proportion of migrant traffic moving through the area, and the close proximity of unique ecosystems set aside as protected areas, I set out to design a research study that looked at the intersecting human rights and conservation crises in the Altar Valley area. Although I had background in the area as a No More Deaths volunteer first, I was trained as a natural resources student, and so I approached the issue accepting both concerns and being open to what both groups had to say.

While planning a study to investigate responses to conservation and human rights impacts in the area surrounding Altar Valley, my timing proved crucial. Several months before my research was to start, one of the land-management agencies targeted for my research issued a littering citation to No More Deaths volunteers. This was an important turn
of events for a study which was directed at understanding responses to conservation and human rights impacts on the border. The scope of the research evolved to include not just the specific responses to conservation and human rights issues (and their financial impacts on the groups), but also the interactions between the land-management and humanitarian groups. I thus set out to investigate the perceptions of and responses to the human and environmental distress occurring in the borderlands, in order to look for ways to improve upon the current situation through a better understanding of the context. This context included two groups who were engaged in a court trial against one another, contending over a littering citation.

**Thesis Roadmap**

This thesis begins with a basic introduction to the political changes along the United States’ southwest border, particularly as they impact human rights and conservation concerns. After this initial introduction, the thesis is formatted as two papers. The first paper is a descriptive piece to illustrate how land-management and humanitarian groups perceived and responded to conservation and human rights impacts of border policy along the border. The second paper looks at the situation in the Altar Valley through the lens of place, to understand the role that ideas of place had in the interactions between conservation and humanitarian groups.

**Significance**

Immigration restrictions across the world invoke emotion and capture attention, from raids on migrant camps in France to expelled workers in Malaysia, and numerous places in
between (see Audi & Brothers, 2009; Flynn & Simpson, 2009; "Malaysian plan to oust foreign workers," 2009). The United States itself is immersed in debate over immigration policies (see Colliver, 2009; Hayes, 2008; Preston, 2009), and this issue is uniquely reflected in Arizona’s Altar Valley region. Since the mid-1990s increased border enforcement at urban population centers pushed undocumented migrants into this remote valley along the Arizona-Sonora (Mexico) border, creating converging conservation and human rights crises of degraded ecosystems and dying human migrants.

The crises came to a head when in February of 2008 a humanitarian aid volunteer was cited for littering by law enforcement officers on a wildlife refuge, after leaving jugs of water intended for migrants crossing through the refuge. The humanitarian left the water jug with the aim of preventing another migrant death along the border, while the law enforcement officer saw the water jug as contributing to the large amount of trash that human and drug smuggling operations have dumped on the refuge (No More Deaths, 2008; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2008).

On the surface this clash between natural resource professionals and humanitarian aid volunteers appears to parallel the national divide over immigration reform, which is often described as a harsh battle between those who either want to exclude or welcome immigrants (see Hayes, 2008). Yet as with the national debate, the local conflict over leaving water in the borderlands is not adequately explained by reference to two ideologically opposing groups (Tichenor, 2008), but more so by exploring and understanding the interacting factors that develop perceptions of distress in the borderlands.
Maintaining protected lands’ viability in the Altar Valley is challenged by border traffic, from both migrants and border enforcement agents. At the same time, individuals are working with minimal resources to try and prevent human deaths in the desert. I investigate the perceptions of and responses to the human and environmental distress occurring in the borderlands in order to look for ways to improve upon the current situation through a better understanding of the context, using the Altar Valley as a case study.

**Political Context**

In late 1993, border control forces concentrated on reducing undocumented migration at urban points-of-entry. Starting with Operation Hold-the-Line in El Paso, TX, operations then spread to San Diego, CA, in 1994 with Operation Gatekeeper, to Nogales, AZ, in 1995 with Operation Safeguard, and to McAllen, TX, in 1997 with Operation Rio Grande (Andreas, 1998-1999; Cornelius, 2005). Officials relied on increased Border Patrol forces, construction of a border fence, and various forms of surveillance technology to reduce unauthorized traffic in these urban areas (Nevins, 2002; U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2003). Declining numbers of undocumented persons apprehended at these locales was initially interpreted as a sign of successful deterrence (Andreas, 1998-1999). However, tighter border enforcement, based on “prevention through deterrence” (Nevins, 2002), was concurrent with increasing North American economic integration (i.e., North American Free Trade Agreement). The northern pull for labor at a time when enforcement diverted border-crossers away from traditional points-of-entry along the border provided for the increase in traffic moving through less-inhabited areas of the borderlands, such as the lands between the
border towns of Nogales, AZ/MX and Sasabe, AZ/MX (Rubio-Goldsmith, McCormick, Martinez, & Duarte, 2006).

This Altar Valley region of southern Arizona holds several characteristics that make it particularly appealing to persons moving north. Altar Valley itself (Figure 1) is a section of generally flat land that is enticing to smugglers who need to move people quickly. Alternatively, the nearby Baboquivari, Tumacácori, and Santa Rita mountains provide cover from border enforcement agents for smugglers who are willing to take on more physical risk by crossing through the mountains. Interstate 19 runs north-south from Nogales, with highways connecting to it from the valley to the west, and provides an ideal means of transporting migrants once they are across the border. Yet as migrants cross the border into these Arizona lands, they are moving through lands characterized by steep mountains and summer temperatures that frequently surpass 38° C (100° F). Traffic through these rough, remote areas means migrants are simultaneously more likely to meet injury or death, and less likely to find aid. It is widely accepted that deaths have increased in recent years as a result of enforcement policies and subsequent shifts in migration (Coalición de Derechos Humanos, 2006; Cornelius, 2001; Jimenez, 2009; Massey, Durand, & Malone, 2002; Nevins, 2002; Rubio-Goldsmith et al., 2006; United States General Accounting Office, 2006). As few as 3,861 and many as 5,607 migrant deaths, attributed largely to dehydration and exposure, have occurred along the entire border since enhanced enforcement at urban areas began in 1994; more than half of these deaths occurred along the Arizona state line (Jimenez, 2009). The Border Patrol’s Tucson Sector, encompassing the middle and eastern portions of Arizona, was home to more than three-fourths of the border-wide increase in migrant deaths.
from 1990 to 2003 (United States General Accounting Office, 2006). Within this sector Pima County, parts of which are included in the research study area, has recorded the numbers of migrant deaths processed by the medical examiner: before 1990 it had processed 9 total deaths attributed to border-crossers, from 1990-1999 it processed an average of 14 per year, and from 2000-2005 an average of 160 migrant deaths were processed each year (Rubio-Goldsmith et al., 2006). In addition, the medical examiner noted a statistically significant increase in deaths due to exposure and dehydration, whereas prior to the early 1990s vehicular deaths were most common for undocumented migrants.

The staggering numbers of migrant deaths across the border, and particularly in the Tucson Sector of Arizona, spurred several reactions. At the governmental level, both the U.S. and Mexico instituted government programs to educate migrants about the risks of crossing the border and intercept them before injury or death. As the number of migrant deaths continued to climb even after the establishment of government groups, some residents along the border decided to take action. The idea of civilian action along the border has been more commonly associated with the armed civilian patrols aimed at keeping migrants out, like the “Minutemen,” but U.S. citizens have also collaborated to form humanitarian aid groups along the border in order to provide basic aid to migrants in distress. For example, in Arizona in 2000 the group Humane Borders was established to construct and maintain what are now 90 water stations at strategic points along the border. In 2002 the Samaritans organized in order to operate vehicle patrols in Southern Arizona, and in 2004 No More Deaths was established in the same region in order to carry out the same humanitarian aid
goals as the others, but this time by operating desert camps from which volunteers hike migrant trails to provide water and other direct aid to migrants crossing the desert.

In addition to the migrant deaths, the new migration patterns also contributed to environmental degradation in vulnerable ecosystems protected by federal parks, refuges, and forests. The U.S.-Mexico border has seen its share of environmental degradation, including maquiladoras (Peterson, Peterson, & Peterson, 2007) and toxic waste dumping (Carruthers, 2008). The remote areas of the border are now subject to a new kind of environmental degradation, from both border-crossers and the enforcement efforts in response to their presence (Ellis, 2006; McIntyre & Weeks, 2002; Schultz, 2008; Terrell, 2006). Trash amounts on protected parks, refuges and forests, including water bottles, cans, food wrappers, backpacks, clothing, hygiene items, and even vehicles. Innumerable footpaths cross agency lands; on BANWR a biologist conducted a GIS study that determined 113 hectares of refuge land (of 48,000 hectares total land) was denuded due to off-system paths. At the same time, border enforcement vehicles in pursuit of migrants create new roads which also increase erosion, particularly when recreational users see the roads and assume they are meant for public use. A number of wildfires are also attributed to migrant presence in the borderlands, as they will light fires for warmth, cooking, distraction, or help-signaling purposes. These can quickly spread out of control in the dry desert ecosystems, meaning fire teams have a larger number of human-caused fires to respond to along the border. These impacts all endanger wildlife and plant-life on the protected lands, and reduce the resources available for other land-management efforts such as habitat restoration.
Study Area

As seen in the study area map (Figure 2), which includes land nearby and west of Nogales, AZ, there are blocks of land managed by the U.S. Forest Service Nogales Ranger District of the Coronado National Forest (CNF) and by the Fish and Wildlife Service’s Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge (BANWR). The humanitarian aid group No More Deaths, which was the third organization participating, works out of desert camps near the town of Arivaca. Personnel from the agencies—on-site and in nearby Tucson—as well as No More Deaths volunteers partnered in this study.

The Nogales Ranger District of CNF encompasses two parcels of land totaling 142,000 hectares at the eastern edge of the study area. CNF first came into existence in 1908, and finally came to represent its current boundaries in 1953, as a collection of old Forest Reserves. It includes many of the “sky islands,” which are collections of mountain ranges surrounded by desert and grasslands at the convergence of the northern end of the Sierra Madre Occidental and the southern end of the Rocky Mountains. This convergence results in starkly contrasting ecological communities with unique combinations of biota in a relatively small area. The southern parcel of this district has 48 kilometers of international boundary, and the district includes land on both sides of Interstate 19 as it heads north from Nogales, AZ. Several kilometers of the forest’s international boundary near Nogales include the border fence, but most of the Nogales Ranger District was un-fenced at the time of fieldwork in 2008. In 2006, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)—which administers the Forest Service—entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Interior (DOI) and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in order to
define the conditions under which Border Patrol may conduct enforcement operations on USDA and DOI lands along the international border (Schultz, 2008). Border Patrol officers continue to patrol Nogales Ranger District land, as this is the district of the Coronado National Forest receiving the greatest number of undocumented migrants.

BANWR is under half the size of the Nogales Ranger District of CNF, covering 48,000 hectares at the western edge of the study area, near Sasabe, AZ. The refuge was established over the site of the Buenos Aires Ranch in 1985 for the rehabilitation of a local endangered species called the Masked Bobwhite Quail (*Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*). The Fish and Wildlife Service, administered under DOI, is also subject to the previously mentioned National Memorandum of Understanding signed in 2006, which means Border Patrol conducts operations on the refuge. Refuge land includes approximately 7 kilometers of international boundary with Mexico, but in October of 2006 virtually all the land along the border, reaching approximately 1.5 kilometers inward, was closed to the public. The refuge manager cited violence against migrants and law enforcement officers, from both border bandits and smugglers, in the closure of these 1415 hectares of land. In light of the high level of border activity, the land around Sasabe was targeted to receive 11 kilometers of border fence in line with the Secure Fence Act of 2006. In 2007, the Department of Homeland Security negotiated a land swap with the refuge and acquired land along the border, enough to complete the fence surrounding Sasabe and abutting the southern edge of the refuge.

The humanitarian aid group involved in this study was No More Deaths/No Más Muertes, which operates out of a base camp near the unincorporated town of Arivaca, AZ, approximately 18 kilometers north of the international boundary. The camp is run on private
land, 30 minutes from Arivaca while driving along bending, rural Arizona road. No More Deaths’ camp near Arivaca is situated at the intersection of BANWR and CNF lands. Volunteers are able to access migrant trails both on and near agency lands, thereby providing aid to persons travelling through and beyond both protected areas. The group was established in 2004 in response to “a morally intolerable situation,” and works towards its mission “to end death and suffering on the U.S.-Mexico border through civil initiative: the conviction that people of conscience must work openly and in community to uphold fundamental human rights” (Field Notes). The desert camps operate with approximately 10-20 volunteers at a time. Volunteers from a variety of backgrounds and geographic origins hike migrant trails twice a day with water, food, and medical supplies. In response to the arrest of two volunteers in 2005 (the charges were later dismissed), No More Deaths adopted the motto “Humanitarian Aid Is Never a Crime,” emphasizing the role of humanitarian aid in the borderlands.
Figure 1. Southern Arizona with Altar Valley
Figure 2. Study area map (Produced by Dr. Heather Cheshire, NCSU)
Responses to Human and Environmental Distress in the Borderlands

Intersections of Human Rights and Conservation

Ecosystem function and human rights are frequently dependent on one another (Sachs, 1995; United Nations Environment Programme, 2004), so understanding their interaction is vital for effective natural resource management (Brennan, 1998; Brockington, Igoe, & Schmidt-Soltau, 2006). For instance, basic human rights to life are threatened when ecosystem services preventing flooding are lost. On the other hand when rights to due process or peaceful assembly are not upheld, persons are not able to oppose measures that could cause environmental harm, such as exploitative resource extraction (Sachs, 1995). The role of natural resources as motivators or financers of war, and the existence of environmental refugees who flee natural disasters or polluted environments, illustrate the sometimes devastating link between natural resources and human rights (Bates, 2002; Le Billon, 2001).

When human rights and conservation goals are pitted against each other, human rights often take precedence over environmental conservation, resulting in greater pressure on already degraded natural resources (Liu et al., 2007). On the other hand, when conservation preempts human rights, human suffering can occur and contribute to ecological degradation. Debate over the existence of millions of ‘conservation refugees’—those who have been expelled from nature reserves, sometimes causing ecological degradation as they take up new livelihoods outside reserve boundaries—has highlighted this concern (Agrawal
Tension between conservation and human rights concerns exists in the remote areas of the United States’ (U.S.) southwest border, from undocumented migrant and border enforcement traffic (Coalición de Derechos Humanos, 2006; Ellis, 2006; Schultz, 2008; Terrell, 2006). Since 1994 federal actions to control migration across the Mexico-U.S. border have concentrated resources at points-of-entry near population centers (Andreas, 1998-1999; Office of Homeland Security, 2002). Declining numbers of undocumented persons apprehended at these locales was initially interpreted as a sign of successful deterrence (Andreas, 1998-1999), but a northern pull for labor simply diverted border-crossers away from traditional points-of-entry along the border and spurred increased traffic through less-inhabited areas of the borderlands, such as the lands between Nogales, AZ/MX and Sasabe, AZ/MX (Cornelius, 2001; Nevins, 2002; Rubio-Goldsmith et al., 2006). From 1994-2009, an estimated 3,861-5,607 migrant deaths took place along the U.S.-Mexico border, the majority taking place in the Arizona borderlands (Jimenez, 2009). In addition to the migrant deaths, ecological degradation also occurred in vulnerable borderland ecosystems protected by federal parks, refuges, and forests.

The Altar Valley region of southern Arizona is now the epicenter of a conflict involving human rights and conservation concerns. In this study we assess how two land-management agencies and one humanitarian aid group perceive the environmental and human rights problems in the borderlands, and how their unique perceptions influence their responses. The high level of migrant traffic and high-profile interactions between land-
management and humanitarian aid groups make it a good location for studying the intersection of conservation and human rights, an understanding which is vital for effective natural resource management (Brennan, 1998; Brockington et al., 2006).

Study Area

The Altar Valley region of Arizona includes an 80-kilometer section of the 3,200-kilometer U.S.-Mexico border that has seen a marked increase in undocumented migrants, and in response it has seen an increase in federal border enforcement operations. This area includes lands managed by the US Forest Service Nogales Ranger District of the Coronado National Forest (CNF), the Fish and Wildlife Service’s Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge (BANWR), and the desert camps of the humanitarian aid group No More Deaths. Personnel from both the agencies, both on-site and in nearby Tucson, and volunteers from No More Deaths partnered in this study. The three groups involved were asked to participate in this research because they were placed close enough geographically so that they all witnessed similar trends in border activity, and their affiliation as natural resource professionals or humanitarian volunteers in this area meant they had the most direct experience with interacting conservation and human rights concerns in the case study area.

The Nogales Ranger District of CNF totals 140,000 hectares at the eastern edge of the study area near Nogales, AZ, with 48 kilometers of international border. This is the district of CNF receiving the greatest number of undocumented migrants. BANWR is around one-third the size of the Nogales Ranger District, covering 48,000 hectares at the western edge of the study area, near Sasabe, AZ. Refuge land includes 7.2 kilometers of international border
with Mexico, but in October of 2006 virtually all the land along the border, reaching approximately 1.5 kilometers inward, was closed to the public due to the threat of violence from both border bandits and smugglers. The border fence abuts the southern edge of the refuge. No More Deaths runs a desert camp near Arivaca, AZ, which is situated at the intersection of BANWR and CNF lands. Around 10 to 20 volunteers typically inhabit the camp, which sends out groups of hikers twice a day to leave water along migrant trails and provide first aid to any migrants in distress. Volunteers are able to access migrant trails both on and near agency lands, thereby providing aid to persons travelling through and beyond both protected areas.

**Methods**

We used an ethnographic approach to assess the dynamic and sometimes conflicting meanings that participants attributed to conservation and human rights concerns in the borderlands (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Mason, 2002). Ethnography allows researchers to directly study the interactions and practices within a place, as the ethnographer is positioned as the student who wishes to learn about the situation. Rachel Shellabarger conducted all fieldwork, and thus became the principal research instrument, whose interactions with each of the community partners were a part of the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In order to engage more fully in the research environment, the researcher lived and volunteered with each of the three community groups. She volunteered with CNF for four weeks in May and June 2008, and with BANWR for the month of July 2008. The researcher volunteered with No More Deaths from June to August during summer 2007, and for three weeks total in June.
and July 2008. The proximity of the three groups also allowed for intermittent travel among all three sites.

We reduced bias by using triangulation of document review, interviews, and participant observation (Silverman, 2001). Using three methods of data collection helps to reveal multiple facets of the people and circumstances under study, creating a more complex, and thus more revealing, depiction of the social context (Fossey, Harvey, McDermott, & Davidson, 2002). Document review was carried out before, during, and after fieldwork, extending into 2009 in order to follow the littering court trials. Reports and press releases from the three groups, as well as literature from similar human rights and conservation groups in the area, were gathered. Local news stories, government reports, and university research were assembled to create a better picture of community responses to migration. Field notes taken during volunteer work with each of the three community groups provided data on the conservation- or human rights-related behaviors that took place.

The researcher conducted semi-structured, open-ended interviews with 27 community members from May-July 2008. Interview notes were taken using pseudonyms to preserve individual volunteer or employee anonymity, in accordance with North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board standards. Employing snow-ball sampling methods, informants within each community were consulted until the possible number of sources had been exhausted or until it was clear that data exhibited saturation within each sector of the community. Within each of the three groups interviews were conducted with 9 individual informants. Interviews lasted from 30 minutes to 3 1/2 hours. Informal conversations and interactions with all 27 informants after the interviews were used to clarify data and evaluate
themes that emerged during the interview. The researcher used an interview guide (Appendix 3), but allowed informants to guide and direct the flow of conversation. In this way, the informant’s view of the situation emerged throughout the interview (McCracken, 1988). During and after interviews, participants were allowed to review individual interview notes and asked to confirm themes, as a means of ensuring the quality of the data (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; McCracken, 1988). Informants were asked to confirm all quoted statements.

Data for this paper was analyzed using a grounded approach, which allowed themes to emerge from interview and field notes through constant review and comparison of data (Draucker, Martsolf, Ross, & Rusk, 2007; Fossey et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1994). Continuously interrogating the data throughout fieldwork allowed us to recognize and pursue emerging themes among informants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As themes emerged throughout data collection they were shared with community partners, who could confirm or elaborate on them and suggest further avenues for research. After fieldwork the full set of data was again analyzed and coded. To extract themes from the data, interview and observation notes were systematically coded by identifying and grouping similar pieces of data in a hierarchical fashion. With the entirety of the data arranged in these hierarchical coding schemes, the perceptions and motivations that framed participants’ behaviors in the borderlands began to emerge (Figure 3).

While analyzing the themes presented by the coded data, informant variation was also taken into account. Informants had differing degrees of access or experience with the interplay of conservation and human rights in the borderlands, and those with the most
immersion were key informants. In the analysis process two types of themes reflected heavily on the conclusions: those that were repeated among key informants, and those that were illuminated by data from multiple sources (interviews, observation, and documents). Themes that emerged as prominent given the multiple data sources and the variation among informants form the foundation of this work.

We utilize a naturalistic approach to report results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This approach reflects our purpose: to understand and explore the meanings and processes as informants lived them. The naturalistic approach aims not to generalize over multiple meanings with numerical representations, but to recognize and explore the multiple realities that inevitably arise from social circumstances (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An analysis built from numerous informant quotes allows the multiple realities to be represented directly, as rich descriptions which together form a detailed picture of the borderlands. This approach also allows the reader to assess the coherency and consistency of the research and its conclusions. When quoted, informants are referenced using a pseudonym, followed by “LM” to identify them as land-management personnel or “H” to identify them as humanitarian volunteers.

**Explanation of Figure**

Figure 3 illustrates the major themes that emerged from data analysis, which illustrated the dominant process land-management and humanitarian informants underwent to conceive of, and respond to, problems associated with border traffic. As the figure
illustrates, the different conceptions of problems led to different responses, which ultimately conflicted.

Figure 3. Major themes from data analysis

Results

*Federal conservation agency workers: Juggling multiple concerns*

Land-management informants felt they were forced to address an array of ecological and social concerns caused by the activities of migrants and enforcement agents. Land-management personnel’s professional responsibilities to conserve natural resources were evident as they expressed concern about various forms of ecological degradation. Informants described erosion as one prominent form of ecological degradation in the borderlands, both from the visible migrant trails and the border enforcement efforts. Dell (LM) noted that border enforcement agents caused erosion problems when they tried to track migrant
footprints, saying “BP use large heavy rubber tires to drag the roads, then they park on the
side of the road, often right by an entrance or turn, and this creates a bald spot. It begins to
look like a parking spot, and then everyday users use it to park because they think it’s
supposed to be there—it turns into a parking lot.” Land-management personnel said that
smugglers often cut fences when they intersected migrant trails, which lead to erosion
problems when animals grazed outside of their designated areas. Informants also discussed
the large amounts of trash piled up in the borderlands, and Leslee (LM) was visibly disturbed
as she explained, “There's a possibility for wildlife to ingest things they shouldn't, and they
can die from that. When two [Student Conservation Association volunteers] were cleaning up
trash, they commonly found lizards or rodents drowned in bottles. Cattle on nearby ranches
have died from swallowing plastic bags.” In addition to erosion and trash, agency personnel
often pointed out an increase in the frequency of human-caused fires, which they attributed to
the increase in migrant traffic in the area. “Before the immigration problem human-caused
fires were rare, now they are prevalent” (Aaren-LM). This was particularly problematic
because of the ability for wildfires to spread quickly during the dry summer months in
Arizona. Informants associated the changing patterns of fires with the changing patterns of
human traffic. “The last two years we’ve had one mountain fire each year, that’s more than
the average. This may become the average because the fence is pushing more traffic into the
mountains” (Tom-LM).

Land-management agency personnel described the overall energy they spent working
with border-related regulations and procedures as taking away from their conservation goals.
As Charlie (LM) stated, “In some areas we’ve had to give up the focus on natural resources
to help Border Patrol meet their tactical needs—we’re hoping to concentrate things near the border and reduce the impact, freeing our Law Enforcement to focus on the ‘other’ segments of ‘Prohibited Acts’ on [National Forest] lands.” They saw law enforcement officers as “spending too much time on immigration issues,” and one officer suggested that as much as 95% of his time was spent on immigration-related work in a given day (Field Notes). Law enforcement officers were also involved in searching for migrants in distress, a task which is the responsibility of the BP unit BORSTAR. Outside of law enforcement, other personnel described being asked to complete various tasks necessary for border enforcement. Some personnel mentioned having “packed” materials for BP. This entailed personnel spending a full day bringing supplies into remote areas of the borderlands, where vehicles were unable to venture, so that BP agents could carry out border enforcement operations in these areas. In addition, extra security precautions were instituted for land-management practices along the border. These safety precautions mostly took place in what were considered ‘high-risk zones’, areas with higher prevalence of drug smugglers and bandits. Personnel largely avoided venturing into these areas alone or at night, and firefighters were prohibited from suppressing fires that broke out in these zones at night (see Appendix 1 for an example of the impact of delaying fire response).

The human suffering that land-managers witnessed in the borderlands extended beyond their professional tasks as land-managers. For many land-management informants, the prospect of migrant deaths became a disturbing factor in their daily jobs. A number of informants recalled finding dead bodies in the borderlands, and many were able to point out the exact spot where they had found the body. One worker languished, “How many dead
bodies do we have to find before there’s a better way for them to get here?” (Field Notes). The deaths seemed to be so prevalent that informants began to expect them. As Lee (LM) said, “I’m surprised I haven’t found a dead body yet. So many people have, there are so many bodies out there.” When a land-management informant learned that the researcher had also worked with No More Deaths, he asked “How many bodies have you found?” and reacted with surprise when she responded with “none” (Field Notes). For land-management informants, discussion of migrant deaths was often considered alongside the ecological degradation in the borderlands. “The tragic human aspect of the immigrant issue is that persons looking for work or a better life can actually lose their lives in that quest. The trashing of the refuge, the impact on habitat quality and our time and finances is an aggravating problem for the refuge and its staff. But there is a sad and human side to this problem” (Leslee-LM).

Land-management personnel’s concern for migrants was tempered by their concerns for the safety of themselves, their families, and their belongings. Land-management informants questioned their safety on the job, due to the number of potentially dangerous persons redirected into their work environments. Some expressed discomfort when wearing their agency uniforms in more remote areas, suggesting that dangerous persons might not recognize a land-manager uniform and try to hurt them with the assumption that they were law enforcement. This was especially a concern with Forest Service personnel, whose dark greens uniforms look similar to the green Border Patrol uniforms. Their discomfort extended beyond professional circumstances, as well. One parent described concern over finding migrants waiting at his children's bus-stop one day. “In the past 21 years, it has changed too
much—two guys were waiting at my kids’ bus-stop for a ride back to Mexico one day. It affects everyone’s lives directly, everyday. It’s a different life than I grew up with. Used to be quiet, rural, communities trusted one another, now we have to lock everything” (Aaren). Another informant stated, “We saw drug runners several times at the house. They didn’t ask for water, but went to the spigot outside the fence… got their water and left within a few seconds. They had obviously been there before, knew where the water was and did not want to be seen. They headed south after getting water. They may have been ‘regular’ illegals, but I don’t think so. Their behavior was so different and sometimes I saw a burlap sling, for hauling drugs” (Lee). Aaren (LM) explained, “We're safety-minded because there’s so much extreme violence and crime associated with traffic. [The manager] often compares the extra precautions here to those in grizzly country—just some things you don’t do.”

**Federal conservation agency workers: Responses**

Land-management informants’ actions were influenced by professional duties, personal ethical obligations, and perceived safety concerns. As a part of their professional responsibilities, personnel attempted to mitigate ecological damage (See Appendix 2 for informant estimates of mitigation costs). Dell (LM) described a fight to contain an invasive species outbreak. “Buffel grass is a huge threat… However, three small spots have started up on the refuge, one right along a [undocumented alien] trail. The refuge has successfully eradicated the buffel grass on these sites but the fear is that new sites will be established from grass seeds coming in on the soles of their shoes, which is a source we have no way to control.” Additionally, though informants did not yet feel they could mitigate many of the
widespread problems like erosion, they focused on repairing fences that were cut frequently by migrants. As Jack (LM) said, “The refuge could handle a 2-man fence crew, would be busy all the time.” They also installed cattle guards where gates were frequently left open. Personnel described attempts to work with Border Patrol agents in order to limit their ecological impacts, and supported community efforts at trash clean-up.

Most informants expressed some sort of ethical obligation to respond to the migrant deaths and distress occurring on agency lands, but were often unsure how to follow through on this, given their professional responsibilities safety concerns. “I think we have some responsibility… I think we have to address it, we don’t like to, but have to face the fact of what these people are dealing with” (Tom-LM). When a humanitarian aid volunteer was cited for littering after leaving gallons of water for migrants on refuge land, a number of personnel found themselves on both sides of the issue. “I flipflop on supporting giving water or not—it’s harsh out there. I’ve felt the impacts of the heat in my situations, can only imagine what it’s like for them. Personally, I feel that if we can help get water, like with Humane Borders stations, that’s good… It’s not just an issue with leaving water, though, but also leaving big bags of food, and we can hardly keep up with the trash” (Cody-LM). Some land-management informants stated that directly aiding migrants in the desert was a detriment to the migrants themselves, and encouraged further illegal activity. Charlie (LM) described this concern: “I don’t mind people giving [the migrants] water, but I think that encourages them to keep going when they should give up for their own safety. I know they’re trying to be helpful, but maybe they cause people to continue when they shouldn’t.” Runar (LM) also said, “On the one hand, I can support the efforts of the humanitarian
groups. On the other hand, I feel their efforts encourage more people to cross. So, I tolerate their work, but don't support it” (Runar). Informants also pointed out that current work by humanitarians put the very volunteers at risk. Referencing stories of violence from smugglers, informants stated that the risk to humanitarian volunteers was too high.

As land-management informants responded to a range of impacts along the border, an emphasis on lawfulness emerged as a means of resolving multiple problems. For land-management personnel, laws and agency regulations were crucial factors in their responses to migrant deaths. Charlie (LM) stated, “… legally, I can’t let them put water on forest land. I have to be able to guarantee that any water given is safe, of certain quality, must meet municipal drinking water standards, and when water is left out and those who left it walk away, I can’t ensure the quality of that water.” Personnel thus responded to migrant distress with both personal and agency concerns in mind. Runar (LM) described his typical protocol for encountering migrants: “During my day to day job, I may encounter people, and will give them water and call Border Patrol.” Similarly, Aaren (LM) described a method of providing basic aid without breaking agency policy. “Forest Service people are not trained to respond to the human element. We will respond to humanitarian situations with the first aid we have training for, generally CPR, some EMTs. We try not to take an active role, leaving that up to the sheriff’s department [and others]. Do best to render first aid and provide info, try to avoid direct contact.” Land-management personnel also used laws to control the actions of humanitarians, by issuing littering citations. They felt the enforcement of these littering citations helped protect their conservation goals by reducing trash left on the refuge.
Lawfulness was a common theme among land-management informants who suggested broad solutions to problems in the borderlands. Referencing the migrant presence in the borderlands, land-management informants would often make a statement similar to, “I don’t put someone down for trying to better themselves, but there’s got to be a legal way to do it” (Jack-LM, emphasis added). Even informants who criticized border policies or regulations described solutions to the current problems in the borderlands in terms of legal solutions such as guest-worker programs. “Make it feasible for workers to come here, and then those crossing the border elsewhere will actually be criminals” (Runar-LM). They supported abstract ideas of new immigration laws because they offered long-term resolution to their problems. Informants also supported existing immigration laws by turning migrants over to Border Patrol. Adhering to these existing immigration laws removed undocumented migrants from the desert and thereby addressed the ecological degradation, migrant deaths, and personnel safety concerns. The emphasis on laws and their enforcement provided theoretical and sometimes practical resolution to the problems land-management personnel wanted to fix.

Personnel suggested that informing persons across the nation might change their current circumstances, which forced them to make choices between addressing ecological degradation, migrant distress, and personal safety. They felt that individuals away from the border needed to understand the range of problems they saw daily as land-managers, since the federal policies formed in D.C. as a response to demand for secure borders shaped their lives in the borderlands. “As you move north away from the border, to Tucson, Phoenix, and beyond people are not as informed about the ongoing illegal activities that occur daily along
the border. …The people responsible for making decisions relative to border issues, must be better informed, along with the people who vote for them” (David-LM). Lee (LM) suggested that “People don’t realize the magnitude of what’s happening here, they can’t accept the reality of finding bodies or having your house broken into repeatedly or the massive trash and the innumerable trails.” Charlie (LM) also saw this separation: “It’s hard for people who do not reside down here to understand the situation… People who don’t work down here don’t understand it, and we—Forest Service, Border Patrol—are directed by people who don’t understand.”

Land-management personnel were mostly unsure as to how people away from the border could be better informed. One informant described how he tried to inform every volunteer he met about the distress in the borderlands. He would then ask the volunteers to tell everyone at home about the problems, so that the news could spread. Personnel said they gave interviews to journalists, and took politicians on guided tours that briefly touched on the problems of the border (Field Notes). They gave educational presentations for schools that included more information about the border, for better or for worse, as Cody (LM) noted. “Now school and other groups all want to know about border issues, less about natural resources issues.” All these endeavors constitute means of informing others about the distress associated with the current method of border enforcement.

*Humanitarian aid volunteers: Addressing a unified concern*

Whereas land-management informants had difficulty juggling a range of concerns in the borderlands, humanitarians saw themselves as responding to unjust national policies.
Many volunteers echoed a feeling of commitment to the migrants because they blamed U.S. policy for the migrants’ suffering. They volunteered as a way of “acting on their responsibility” to the migrants, which stemmed from their roles as U.S. residents or fellow humans. “People in the US benefit from the policies that perpetuate violence in Central and South America and help drive the migrant experience. People in the US benefit from the work of migrants on a daily basis. I know that that is an issue of contention but let's just take it as true. If we benefit from a system of violence we have a responsibility to understand and prevent that violence on moral grounds if nothing else” (Cole-H). Hallie (H) made a similar statement, “The problem is caused by the U.S. government, and it's not separate from the economy. The economy benefits from cheap, undocumented labor. The money put into border enforcement could be put elsewhere, into Latin America or Central America, for instance, and the problem wouldn't exist…”

Humanitarians’ perspectives reflected statements made by No More Deaths publicly, which described migrants as “Driven by economic inequality, thwarted by ill-conceived US border policy” (No More Deaths website), for instance. Informants expressed frustration that the government did not appear to be taking responsibility for the consequences of border enforcement. “If I hurt you through my actions, directly or indirectly, I have a responsibility to make sure you are OK. We teach this idea to all of our children at a very early age. Why is it different in the global community? What is so special about countries and institutions, corporate or otherwise, that they are held to a different standard?” (Cole-H).

The sources volunteers blamed for ecological degradation were identical to the sources for migrant distress; unjust policies. In a statement typical of humanitarian
volunteers, Cole (H) explained, “By forcing migrants into more remote and rugged areas U.S. policy has had an effect on these ecosystems. We should not confuse this issue by saying that migrants are responsible for this reality. What we are talking about is a system of policies that have led to increased human impact on sensitive areas.” Hallie put the policy perspective in different terms, saying “The government is using this desert as a natural deterrent to migrants, based on its remoteness, its harshness. This is an issue of environmental justice” (Hallie-H).

Informants frequently expressed anger or frustration at the total environmental impact on the borderlands, which many viewed as a policy problem. “If the U.S. government were serious about the environment, they would address the root causes of immigration, militarization, and I don't see that happening. I don't see them standing up to the walls being built through the desert, to the policies that cause migration” (Edward-H). Edward continued, “It's all about how the system is set up, how we educate ourselves to be more sustainable, if we destroy the earth all we do is make ourselves more poor.” For volunteers, both the direct humanitarian aid and the endeavors to mitigate ecological damage were all linked to the same sources. "The tensions, conflicts, and integrative aspects of globalization are played out on the human body (fashion, mortality rates, value standards of beauty and success, poverty-aggravated illness, etc.) and the earth's body (ecological devastation, areas of dense population, protected wilderness areas, 'natural disasters,' etc.) The border stories show this... blistered feet and a desert scarred by walls and human traffic, are the marks of the conflict in our changing world" (Carma-H).
Humanitarian aid volunteers’ efforts to address the migrants’ distress were rooted in their egalitarian ideals. Slogans such as "No Human Is Illegal/¡Ningún Ser Humano es Illegal!" and its variations were seen on shirts, posters or buttons around the camp, emphasizing the equality of migrants. The Truman Capote quote prominently placed on a trailer at the desert camp, “Love, having no geography, knows no boundaries,” also illustrated volunteers’ ideas of equality among all persons. Volunteers emphasized this perspective through statements such as “Everything boils down to equality” (Shayna-H) and “No matter of particular characteristics, people deserve respect, medical treatment, opportunities, family, a chance to succeed” (Annina-H). Language was also used to communicate the equality among persons, and among volunteers, migrants were referred to as ‘friend’, ‘amigo/a’, ‘migrant’, or ‘compañero/a’, which were viewed as better terms than the public’s frequently used descriptors of ‘illegal’ or ‘alien’. This egalitarian perspective formed the foundation for their work on the border. As Hallie (H) stated, “The desert of Arizona is how I define who I am, where my home is. It's wrong to let people die in my home, regardless of who they are or why they're here.”

Although No More Deaths clearly prioritized equality and a duty to change the social context, they were also aware of ecological degradation from both migrants and enforcement practices and concerned about its ramifications in the desert. Annina pointed out that “…the wall is a huge symbol of antagonism towards migrants, and a practical inhibitor of migration and disrupter of wildlife systems in the area.” Informants were concerned about the ecological distress stemming from all border activities because many described themselves as environmentalists. Edward (H) pointed to a theme of environmentalism among human rights
advocates, saying “there's a deep respect for the environment, and most humanitarians understand that.” Sol (H) also described a resonance between humanitarian and conservation goals. “The sacredness of life is not just human life—it's all of creation. Rescuing life in the desert does not mean just migrant life, it's all life in the desert.” Volunteers explained that their work increased their appreciation for their ecological surroundings. “People love being out at camp because they love the desert. Maybe they first come out because they're concerned for migrants, then they fall in love with the desert” (Annina-H). Sol stated that “Many volunteers here have a heart for the environment. We throw them into this context, and it's hard for them to decipher since migrants are causing environmental damage. A lot of trash is on the trails, it occurs in dump sites, and it's real. It's hard for volunteers with commitments to the environment to live with this. It's a personal commitment for me, so I have a hard time with it” (Sol-H).

_Humanitarian aid volunteers: Responses_

Since No More Deaths volunteers felt that unjust policies were the cause of human and ecological distress, their actions were undertaken with the purpose of ultimately changing those policies. No More Deaths informants felt their humanitarian aid work would lead to immigration policy reform, so informants focused on humanitarian aid as a means of correcting both human and environmental distress and injustice. Hallie (H) stated the urgency associated with their work, “If your favorite place or your backyard was turned into hell, if people were dying in your garden, backyard, you would have to do something.” Every informant expressed their role as necessary but temporary, with one informant stating
the desire “to work ourselves out of business” (Field Notes). Informants described their work as a response to government deficiency, as Sol (H) stated, “We are doing humanitarian work on the border that should be done by government agencies. They should be giving water, food and medical treatment to migrants. We'll be happy to turn this work over to them when they respond as they should.”

As volunteers responded to a humanitarian problem they felt was caused by their government, they also challenged laws and standards of behavior that they saw as uncompasionate towards the migrants they viewed as equals. This was seen when No More Deaths adopted the slogan “Humanitarian Aid Is Never A Crime” after the arrest of volunteers in 2005 for transporting sick migrants towards medical help. The slogan was reiterated during 2008 and 2009 in the littering trials. A total of 15 volunteers received littering citations for putting jugs of water along migrant trails. The first volunteer received a citation in February 2008 but received no accompanying punishment, while the second volunteer was cited in December 2008 and was handed probation and community service for “knowingly littering.” In an organized event of civil disobedience, 13 volunteers received littering citations for placing water jugs on refuge lands in July of 2009. The willingness to receive citations and go to court to publicize the need for humanitarian aid illustrated the importance volunteers placed on direct aid in the borderlands. In their responses to the littering citations, humanitarians clearly illustrated their emphasis on compassion over legality. In one press release (3/10/2009) there was the statement, “It is hard to listen to the government play down the need for water when people are dying in the desert.” Another press release (3/26/2009) suggested the primacy of humanitarian aid, stating: "These people
haven't had a clean drink of water in days. If they find drinking water, it's a godsend, not trash."

While No More Deaths volunteers addressed the humanitarian problem, they also described some desire to mitigate ecological damage. Since volunteers viewed the ecological damage as policy-driven, much of the desire to mitigate the ecological damage was verbalized in terms of stopping the policies that rerouted migrants into remote areas. Shayna (H) simply stated, “In the larger picture, if we can get just immigration reform passed we won't have people moving through the desert, leaving trash, etc.” A similar sentiment was expressed by Hallie (H), who said “The environmental impact of the whole border deal would end if NMD is able to end the issue.” Environmentally-conscious measures also took place among volunteers, who picked up trash and recyclable plastic jugs as they hiked migrant trails. They also collected usable clothing and backpacks from rest and layover sites along migrant trails, to be washed and donated to shelters in Tucson.

No More Deaths volunteers recognized a need to unveil the distress occurring in the borderlands to persons across the country, who could affect the policies that contribute to distress in the borderlands. (Shayna-H) recognized, “There is a lack of education [about the effects of border policy], and the blind cannot lead the blind.” Though No More Deaths’ provision of direct aid in the borderlands was often acknowledged as being a “band-aid solution” (Field Notes), volunteers also pointed out that it played a valuable role as a means of educating others. This was most clearly illustrated by the parable of the babies, told one night at the desert camp to a group of visiting students (Field Notes). In the parable, a community is situated alongside a river. One day a baby is seen floating down the river, and
a villager goes in to save it. As days go by, babies continue to be seen in the river, with more coming each day. The community organizes a monitoring system to detect and remove any babies in the river. As more babies show up in the river, this system gets more complex. Finally, someone decides to go upriver, find out why the babies are being put in the river, and stop this from happening. The parable-teller explained that No More Deaths constituted the villagers going into the river to save the babies, because this was the most urgent need. He then asked the visiting students to be the villagers who go upriver and stop the forces sending the babies into the river. After the story, Sol (H) described the worth of educating others through this type of direct action, saying “That may be our greatest contribution to the larger issue of immigration reform - making others aware of the suffering and death on the border.” Beyond educating about the problems occurring in the borderlands, volunteers emphasized educating people about their cause. “There's a need for more education on the economic context of migration, understanding and acknowledging that the wall doesn't separate us from the decisions we make that affect people all over the world” (Annina-H).

Discussion

Both land-management agency personnel and humanitarian volunteers in this study were motivated to change the current circumstances along the U.S. Southwest border, which included conservation and human rights problems. Their attempts to address perceived problems stemmed from their different conceptions of border activity. Federal land-management employees juggled multiple concerns which their agency policies were not necessarily designed to handle (such as migrant deaths on agency land). Personnel described
various approaches, but no clear path, to address the interacting concerns of ecological
degradation, lost work time, human suffering, and safety. No More Deaths volunteers faced
less of an internal struggle in their conceptions of and responses to the problem, as they
clearly described opposition to unjust policies that they felt contributed to distress along the
border. Volunteers tied the human and ecological distress in the borderlands to globalization
and free trade markets which they felt drew labor into the U.S. from the South. Their
thoughts resonated with Massey et al.’s (2002) study of Mexican immigration, which
criticized the juxtaposition of increasing economic, communication, social, and cultural ties
with Mexico alongside increasingly stricter border policies as “fundamental contradictions.”

While both groups expressed goals of less environmental and human distress in the
borderlands, their actions towards these goals conflicted. Their chosen actions (placing water
along trails or citing those they catch placing water on the refuge), resulted in costly legal
battles which took time and resources away from the groups reaching their similar end goals
of reduced human and environmental problems. While recognizing that their conceptions of
the problems along the border will continue to conflict on some level, and that they may
never share the same views on border policy or migrants, the groups could improve upon the
current situation by emphasizing and working with their shared goals for the borderlands.
Collaboration between land-management and humanitarian persons in the borderlands might
allow the groups to address their shared concerns, and also better understand the other’s
perspectives and actions (van Breda & Laprade, 2008). Such understanding is currently
lacking in the borderlands, as witnessed by the court trials and surrounding dialogue.
In 2009, after a series of media events criticizing the refuge and a civil disobedience event, No More Deaths appeared to embrace the idea of collaborating with land-management personnel towards shared goals. No More Deaths submitted a proposed memorandum of understanding with specific attempts at compromise—such as agreeing to pick up twice the amount of food and water containers that they left on trails—to Fish and Wildlife Service officials. This follows in line with suggestions that interactions between conservation and human rights concerns with unique perspectives must rely upon dialogue and negotiation, rather than laying out an edict to one another (Agrawal & Redford, 2009; Curran et al., 2009), which is what initially occurred among groups in the borderlands. Focusing dialogue on clear deliverables such as picking up twice the amount of containers left along trails, rather than on broad goals or criticisms, is also a positive step in interactions between conservation and human rights concerns (Redford & Sanderson, 2006). Land-management officials did not accept the agreement proposed by No More Deaths, but the humanitarian aid volunteers’ attempt at negotiation suggests potential for future dialogue and compromise in the borderlands.

Land-management personnel and humanitarian volunteers both expressed the desire to see less environmental and human distress in the borderlands. Informants, and researcher experience, suggested how they could compromise to make their ends more compatible. At the local level, some informants suggested that recognition of the other group’s conception was a necessary starting point. One No More Deaths informant started brainstorming ways that volunteers could ensure that all (instead of just some) plastic water jugs were collected and recycled after use, acknowledging the littering concern that was primary for land-
management personnel. On the refuge in this study, the humanitarian group Humane Borders had previously been given special-use permits to place three semi-permanent water stations along high-traffic migrant trails in the desert, avoiding the concern over trash from water jugs. More solutions like this, which utilize creativity and cooperation on the part of both groups, could create better relationships in the borderlands which properly address both humanitarian and conservation concerns directly.

Beyond their immediate goals to reduce ecological degradation or human suffering in the borderlands, there is potential to collaborate and influence more lasting change. Both groups expressed the desire to link those who demand border enforcement to its social and ecological impacts, and to some degree, the conflicts over littering in the borderlands produced this result. As high-profile conflicts between two emotional concerns (conservation and human rights), the littering citations garnered national interest in border policies and their impacts (see Gandossy, 2009; Powers, 2009; "Water in the desert," 2009). Since the attention brought by the littering citations fulfilled the desire to increase national awareness, a feedback loop may actually reinforce the actions that led to the littering citations. As groups with limited resources, however, they could benefit by seeking new alternatives to achieve their shared goal of stirring up national interest, outside of courtroom and media battles for supremacy (Gregory & Keeney, 1994; Keeney, 1996). Cultivating concern for distress in the borderlands among residents across the U.S., by efforts other than littering citations, could be a fruitful means for all groups concerned.

Informants’ desires to create national awareness resonates with Harvey’s (1989) assertion that although local resistance can serve as a foundation for political action, the
resistance must be broad and expand across space in order to enact change. Political action leading to change requires “an active civil society engaged in real participatory democracy” (Cox, 2004, p. 201), which cannot be isolated to particular places or organizational cultures (Harvey, 1989). At the national level, informants expressed a desire to see policies which did not result in environmental and human distress in the borderlands. This could result from an informed national dialogue on border enforcement. This sort of dialogue must include a range of perspectives, not just the fear of what will happen if the border is not secured (Ivie, 2004), and conflict should be expected and accepted as a means of reaching legitimate policy decisions (Mouffe, 2000; Peterson, Peterson, & Peterson, 2005). In the age of the wars on terror and drugs, both of which are played out on the southern U.S. border, debate and dissent from what is purported as national security is often squashed in light of the perceived crisis. Yet, it is exactly at times of crisis when diverse and dissenting voices must be heard, so that those in power do not abuse their position (Ivie, 2004). Border enforcement in the U.S. is one such circumstance. The voices of those along the border, who may or may not dissent from prevailing thought, must be allowed to inform a national dialogue given their specific knowledge of distress the borderlands. In this way, decisions regarding the current state of border security and provisions for future changes can more fully reflect the reality of the border, including conservation and human rights concerns.

Given today’s global interconnectedness, it's likely that human rights and conservation demands will continue to converge in the U.S. and across the world. Indeed, if immigration and border policies remain the same and undocumented migrants continue to cross the U.S.-Mexico border, the same scenario described here could play out in other areas
of the border, such as the Big Bend National Park in Texas. Such circumstances of interacting conservation and human rights concerns will continue to involve networks of activists, potentially conflicting with other activists or established local groups. In this case a humanitarian group chose to involve itself in a situation in which the land-management agencies had no choice but to be involved. The particular roles could easily be reversed, with an international conservation group engaging with a local social welfare group. Whatever the resulting combination, it will remain crucial to understand that conservation and human rights concerns can work together and mutually benefit one another, but that they will not do so magically. Only by recognizing the multiple meanings embroiled in human rights and conservation conflicts, and negotiating the particular concerns, is there potential to find a suitable resolution. This supports the coexistence of conservation and human rights groups, which must continue to be an important goal for those concerned with natural resources (Brennan, 1998; Brockington et al., 2006).
The Influence of Place Meanings in the Borderlands

“Well, you have to respect that tree or hill or whatever it is you’re with. Take a horned toad for example. If you think you’re better than a horned toad, you’ll never hear its voice—even if you sit there in the sun forever.”

-Byrd Baylor, Altar Valley area author, *The Other Way to Listen*

**Place and Natural Resources**

Place meanings are often at the heart of natural resource politics, and help to explain why natural resource conflicts can become heated and emotional (Bott, Cantrill, & Myers, 2003; Cheng, Kruger, & Daniels, 2003). Attachments to place can help create community support for conserving natural resources that define place, since attachment to particular resources can motivate persons to preserve their quality. At the same time, if a particular place and its characteristics are imbued with memories, values, and social contracts, altering that place through a change in land use can become a challenge to the feelings associated with it (Said, 2000). Place attachments can therefore make natural resource decisions complex, because plans to change resources to which people ascribe meaning may be met with especially strong opposition. Understanding place meanings is therefore a necessity for effective negotiation of natural resource conflicts (Bott et al., 2003; Cheng et al., 2003).

Places have been altered significantly along the United States’ (U.S.) southwest border, due to border enforcement practices first implemented in 1994. To reduce undocumented immigration, the 1990s era border enforcement policies for the U.S.-Mexico
borderlands concentrated enforcement efforts such as patrol agents, fences, and surveillance technology at population centers (e.g., Tijuana-San Diego and Ciudad Juarez-El Paso). The increased pressure on cities coupled with economic opportunities to the north funneled migrants into remote regions of the borderlands with less border enforcement (Andreas, 1998-1999; Cornelius, 2001; Massey et al., 2002; Nevins, 2002). This funnel effect contributed to an estimated 3,861-5,607 migrant deaths along the U.S.-Mexico border, the majority taking place in the Arizona borderlands (Jimenez, 2009). In addition to the migrant deaths, ecological degradation has occurred in vulnerable borderland ecosystems protected by federal parks, refuges, and forests.

Place-changing events led to a high-profile conflict in the Altar Valley region of southern Arizona. In February of 2008 law enforcement officers on Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge, which lies along the U.S.-Mexico border, first cited a humanitarian aid volunteer with littering after he left jugs of water along migrant trails with the aim of preventing migrant deaths. In the year and a half following the first citation, 14 more volunteers were cited with littering for the same action. In the subsequent court trials and press discourse, the conflict was branded as an issue of human rights versus conservation. This paper goes beyond the specific concerns of human rights or conservation, and suggests the groups involved were spending significant time and money on a battle that arose from distinct place meanings. We analyze the perceptions and behaviors of land-management agencies and a humanitarian aid group in the Altar Valley using three fundamental components of place: physical attributes, social processes, and cultural meanings (Agnew, 1987; Canter, 1977; Cheng et al., 2003; Relph, 1976).
Theoretical Framework

Place is broadly defined as physical space in which people invest meaning (Low & Altman, 1992; Williams & Stewart, 1998). This emotional attachment to a space is not limited to local residents, but involves a broad range of groups who have an interest in the place (Cheng et al., 2003; Yung, Freimund, & Belsky, 2003). Understanding place meanings allows insight into the strong attachments that people form with physical spaces, and gives perspective on their actions surrounding that space (Williams, Patterson, & Roggenbuck, 1992). Place meanings stem from multiple interacting factors, and must be understood in light of these influences (Agnew, 1987; Gustafson, 2001).

Components of place are grouped into three basic categories: physical attributes, social processes, and cultural meanings. The ways that people interpret and connect to physical attributes make up one component of place. Places are often most immediately linked to their physical attributes such as rivers, mountain formations, buildings, roads, valleys, grasslands. The diversity and movements of flora, fauna, and people in an area, nutrient availability, and climatic patterns also contribute to place meanings (i.e., Chicago as ‘The Windy City’). Interpretations of social processes form the second component of place. In a globalized society, the political decisions made by individuals across a continent can impact ideas of a place through the creation of a nature preserve, the decision to extract valuable underground resources, or the enforcement of political boundaries. Economic development can also turn an area from a grassy field to a home for 20 isolated families. Culturally expected behaviors influence how people perceive places, and this cultural meaning constitutes the third component of place. Particular social and cultural constructs
arise in different places, and determine the appropriate behaviors in a place. Cheng et al. (2003) give the example of a dinosaur skeleton to illustrate this point: “an artificial dinosaur skeleton in a municipal park invites people to play on it; the same skeleton in a museum of natural history invites people to learn about prehistoric life” (p. 90).

**Study Area**

The Altar Valley region of Arizona includes an 80-kilometer section of the 3,200-kilometer U.S.-Mexico border that has seen a marked increase in undocumented migrants, and in response it has seen an increase in federal border enforcement operations. This area includes lands managed by the US Forest Service Nogales Ranger District of the Coronado National Forest (CNF), the Fish and Wildlife Service’s Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge (BANWR), and the desert camps of the humanitarian aid group No More Deaths. Personnel from both the agencies, both on-site and in nearby Tucson, and volunteers from No More Deaths partnered in this study. The three groups involved were asked to participate in this research because they were placed close enough geographically so that they all witnessed similar trends in border activity, and their affiliation as natural resource professionals or humanitarian volunteers in this area meant they had the most direct experience with interacting conservation and human rights concerns in the case study area.

The Nogales Ranger District of CNF totals 140,000 hectares at the eastern edge of the study area near Nogales, AZ, with 48 kilometers of international border. This is the district of CNF receiving the greatest number of undocumented migrants. BANWR is around one-third the size of the Nogales Ranger District, covering 48,000 hectares at the western edge of
the study area, near Sasabe, AZ. Refuge land includes 7.2 kilometers of international border with Mexico, but in October of 2006 virtually all the land along the border, reaching approximately 1.5 kilometers inward, was closed to the public due to the threat of violence from both border bandits and smugglers. The border fence abuts the southern edge of the refuge. No More Deaths runs a desert camp near Arivaca, AZ, which is situated at the intersection of BANWR and CNF lands. A range of 10-20 volunteers at a time inhabit the camp, which sends out groups of hikers twice a day to leave water along migrant trails and provide first aid to any migrants in distress. Volunteers are able to access migrant trails both on and near agency lands, thereby providing aid to persons travelling through and beyond both protected areas.

Methods

We used an ethnographic approach (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Mason, 2002) to understand place meanings among conservation and humanitarian groups in the study area. Although immigration is shaped by national and global forces, migration is situated in a spatial and temporal place in the borderlands, one which ethnography is well-suited to explore (Englund, 2002; Gille & Ó Riain, 2002; Massey, 1995). Ethnography allows researchers to directly study the interactions and practices within a place, as the ethnographer is positioned as the student who wishes to learn about the situation. Rachel Shellabarger conducted all fieldwork, and thus became the principle research instrument, whose interactions with each of the community partners were a part of the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In order to engage more fully in the research environment, the researcher lived
and volunteered with each of the three community groups. She volunteered with CNF for four weeks in May and June 2008, and with BANWR for the month of July 2008. The researcher volunteered with No More Deaths from June to August during summer 2007, and for three weeks total in June and July 2008. The proximity of the three groups also allowed for intermittent travel among all three sites.

We reduced bias by using triangulation of document review, interviews, and participant observation (Silverman, 2001). Using three methods of data collection helps to reveal multiple facets of the people and circumstances under study, creating a more complex, and thus more revealing, depiction of the social context (Fossey et al., 2002). Document review was carried out before, during, and after fieldwork, extending into 2009 in order to follow the littering court trials. Reports and press releases from the three groups, as well as literature from similar human rights and conservation groups in the area, were gathered. Local news stories, government reports, and university research were assembled to create a better picture of community responses to migration. Field notes taken during volunteer work with each of the three community groups provided data on the conservation- or human rights-related behaviors that took place.

The researcher conducted semi-structured, open-ended interviews with 27 community members from May-July 2008. Interview notes were taken using pseudonyms to preserve individual volunteer or employee anonymity, in accordance with North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board standards. Employing snow-ball sampling methods, informants within each community were consulted until the possible number of sources had been exhausted or until it was clear that data exhibited saturation within each sector of the
community. Within each of the three groups interviews were conducted with 9 individual informants. Interviews lasted from 30 minutes to 3 1/2 hours. Informal conversations and interactions with all 27 informants after the interviews were used to clarify data and evaluate themes that emerged during the interview. The researcher used an interview guide (Appendix 3), but allowed informants to guide and direct the flow of conversation. In this way, the informant’s view of the situation emerged throughout the interview (McCracken, 1988). During and after interviews, participants were allowed to review individual interview notes and asked to confirm themes, as a means of ensuring the quality of the data (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; McCracken, 1988). Informants were asked to confirm all quoted statements.

Data for this paper was analyzed using a grounded approach, which allowed themes to emerge from interview and field notes through constant review and comparison of data (Draucker et al., 2007; Fossey et al., 2002; Peterson et al., 1994). Continuously interrogating the data throughout fieldwork allowed us to recognize and pursue emerging themes among informants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As themes emerged throughout data collection they were shared with community partners, who could confirm or elaborate on them and suggest further avenues for research. After fieldwork the full set of data was again analyzed and coded. To extract themes from the data, interview and observation notes were systematically coded by identifying and grouping similar pieces of data in a hierarchical fashion. With the entirety of the data arranged in these hierarchical coding schemes, the perceptions and motivations that framed participants’ behaviors in the borderlands began to emerge.
While analyzing the themes presented by the coded data, informant variation was also taken into account. Informants had differing degrees of access or experience with the interplay of conservation and human rights in the borderlands, and those with the most immersion were key informants. In the analysis process two types of themes reflected heavily on the conclusions: those that were repeated among key informants, and those that were illuminated by data from multiple sources (interviews, observation, and documents). Themes that emerged as prominent given the multiple data sources and the variation among informants form the foundation of this work.

We utilize a naturalistic approach to report results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This approach reflects our purpose: to understand and explore the meanings and processes as informants lived them. The naturalistic approach aims not to generalize over multiple meanings with numerical representations, but to recognize and explore the multiple realities that inevitably arise from social circumstances (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An analysis built from numerous informant quotes allows the multiple realities to be represented directly, as rich descriptions which together form a detailed picture of the borderlands. This approach also allows the reader to assess the coherency and consistency of the research and its conclusions. When quoted, informants are referenced using a pseudonym, followed by “LM” to identify them as land-management personnel or “H” to identify them as humanitarian volunteers.
Place Meanings in the Borderlands

Physical attributes

When land-management informants spoke about physical attributes in the borderlands, they often described ecological attributes which were being damaged or threatened by border activity. In their daily work, land-management informants saw ecological components of the borderlands harmed by border activity. Of the factors they mentioned, their concerns over erosion best represented informants’ worries over a range of damage in the borderlands. Land-management personnel expressed concern over erosion from migrant trails as they cut across open desert grassland and alongside dry riverbeds. Dell (LM) stated, “Human activity in these riparian areas threaten the animals as well as the vegetation. In some circumstances, people travelling through drainages dominated with seed bearing leguminous shrubs represent a threat to the endangered Masked Bobwhite Quail which depend on these plants for food, cover and nesting” (Dell-LM).

Informants in both agencies cited the GIS study conducted by a BANWR biologist that determined 113 hectares of refuge land (of 48,000 hectares total land) was denuded due to off-system paths. Another informant said migrant trails grew “from cattle trails to super-highways” (Field Notes). Erosion concerns also stemmed from what was viewed as a common side effect of migrant traffic: cattle fences being cut to facilitate human migrant movement. This allowed the abundant open range cattle in southern Arizona to roam and graze in areas they were restricted from, including refuge and forest lands. Land-management personnel pointed to Border Patrol practices as a source of erosion. Dell (LM) gave one example: “BP uses large heavy rubber tires to drag the roads, then they park on the
side of the road, often right by an entrance or turn, and this creates a bald spot. It begins to look like a parking spot, and then everyday users use it to park because they think it’s supposed to be there—it turns into a parking lot.” Informants described another problem with erosion when enforcement agents created new vehicle trails or roads for their patrols, which recreational users then used. “Roads have become more pronounced. Some are entirely new, as in created through enforcement or smuggling efforts. Others are old roads that used to be lightly-used, but are now heavily-used” (Aaren-LM).

In addition to the impacts of erosion on desert lands, personnel connected an increase in wildfires to migrant cooking, warming, distress, or distraction fires that got out of hand. Informants did not have historical data to support this assertion, since it was considered politically taboo to state in the fire report that a fire was started by migrants (Field Notes). Yet statements like Aaren’s (LM), that “Before the immigration problem human-caused fires were rare, now they are prevalent” were common in both agencies. At BANWR the construction of sections of the border fence moved migrants towards more mountainous areas, and refuge informants thought this impacted fires. “The last two years we’ve had one mountain fire each year, that’s more than the average. This may become the average because the fence is pushing more traffic into the mountains” (Tom-LM). Personnel also believed that the trails which created erosion problems also affected the efficacy of prescribed burns. “The amount of traffic on the refuge has broken up the landscape, and that affects the prescribed fires. It’s a break-up in fuel, it changes the natural arrangement of fuel on the ground and so the fire doesn’t spread like it would otherwise in the same landscape. We can’t drop fuel and let it burn anymore, the trails halt the natural spread” (Tim-LM).
Natural resource professionals tried to address some of the damage to physical attributes along the border directly. To mitigate one piece of unauthorized ATV trail heading up a small hill, four personnel spent three hours of a morning placing waterbars of logs and rebar across a trail that posed a serious erosion threat. Personnel said they lacked the resources to do this every place that needed it, citing the prohibitive time investment (Field Notes). Personnel spent time fixing fences cut by smugglers, and as one informant put it, “The refuge could handle a 2-man fence crew, would be busy all the time” (Jack-LM). Fire management personnel stated that a portion of their resources was necessary to address the fires from migrants, with one informant estimating that 20% of program costs went to tackle migrant-related fires. (See Appendix 2 for informant estimates of costs to mitigate damage from border activity.) They were largely unable to stem the flow of migrant traffic that they saw as creating ecological damage, but personnel attempted to influence the actions of people they could control, as in working with Border Patrol agents to make their operations more ecologically friendly.

When humanitarian volunteers spoke about physical attributes of the borderlands, they described a system of interconnected physical components that they felt was disrupted by immigration policies which restricted human movement. Cole (H) described this mindset, saying, “By forcing migrants into more remote and rugged areas US policy has had an effect on these ecosystems. We should not confuse this issue by saying that migrants are responsible for this reality. What we are talking about is a system of policies that have led to increased human impact on sensitive areas. Saying that migrants are causing environmental degradation in sensitive areas is like saying that migrants are responsible for multinational
corporations clear cutting and strip mining their home countries. It is all policy driven. Population mobility has been a critical part of the human experience for thousands of years. Instead of engaging this mobility in a positive and formative way US policy has criminalized this part of the human experience.” Another informant pointed to the border wall specifically, suggesting “…the wall is a huge symbol of antagonism towards migrants, and a practical inhibitor of migration and disrupter of wildlife systems in the area… the well-being of humans and of wildlife and ecosystems is so intertwined, and humans are a part of these systems” (Annina-H). They framed their policy criticisms using environmental terminology, as well. Hallie (H) stated, “The government is using this desert as a natural deterrent to migrants, based on its remoteness, its harshness. This is an issue of environmental justice.” Humanitarian aid volunteers expressed concern for the damage occurring to a broad range of physical attributes in the borderlands. Sol (H) stated, “The sacredness of life is not just human life—it’s all of creation. Rescuing life in the desert does not mean just migrant life, it's all life in the desert.”

Volunteers exhibited a range of opinions regarding how to address the disrupted physical attributes in the borderlands. Most volunteers believed that No More Deaths’ humanitarian aid and advocacy work would eventually lead to a solution for both conservation and immigration concerns. One volunteer stated, “In the larger picture, if we can get just immigration reform passed we won't have people moving through the desert, leaving trash, etc” (Shayna-H). Annina (H) also said, “People in this work agree that we don't want people tracking through the desert, and it's more beneficial to everyone if people enter the country in more safe, less fragile, harsh places.” They expressed various opinions
regarding immediate measures to support physical attributes in the borderlands. Some saw a
direct response to the ecological distress as a positive step, but not as No More Deaths’
primary goal. “Personally, though I'm definitely concerned about environmental issues, I see
a sacrifice of environmental concerns for [No More Death]'s work. We drive SUVs, trucks,
and migrant packs create a lot of trash. The amount we pick up is nothing compared to what
we put out. However, there's a steel wall in the desert—that's a bigger environmental deal”
(Hallie-H). As Marilyn (H) stated, “It's outside the scope of [No More Death]'s objective. If
it can play a part of the work that's great, because it is important. … [No More Deaths] is at
least not contributing to the problem with what we leave, but perhaps we're also not
alleviating it. People pick up water bottles as they hike, and groups do pick up trash at rest
areas.” Others believed that immediate changes were appropriate. “It is missing in the
discourse of [No More Deaths]—to look at environmental factors in immigration causes, also
in how we operate in delivering water, patrolling, etc. I see it in informal discourse between
particular individuals, particularly the younger individuals. Never see it in an official context
…” (Atticus-H). Though informants had varying opinions on the role of environmentally-
friendly actions in their humanitarian work, they accepted efforts to include such actions.
The desert camp brought the materials it used to town for recycling, and collected usable
clothing and backpacks from along the trails to be washed and sent to shelters in Tucson.

Social processes

For land-management informants a defining social process in their conception of
place was the criminal activity around them, which created security concerns and prompted
defensive action. The illegal activity taking place in remote areas of the borderlands created what land-management personnel saw as a security threat. At BANWR in 2005 law enforcement documented the following on the refuge, all related to border crossing activity: 4 homicides, 5 rapes, 5 vehicles stolen (4 government, 1 personal). Though migrant traffic in 2008 did not reflect the intensity of 2005, informants were aware of past events and wary of interactions with migrants. Some told stories of their own homes being broken into by migrants in search of food, water, or money, several informants having to stop and count the number of times their homes had been broken into by undocumented persons (Field Notes). Other informants explained how people would stop at their homes for food, water, or other needs. “We saw drug runners several times at the house. They didn't ask for water, but went to the spigot outside the fence… got their water and left within a few seconds. They had obviously been there before, knew where the water was and did not want to be seen. They headed south after getting water. They may have been ‘regular’ illegals, but I don't think so. Their behavior was so different and sometimes I saw a burlap sling, for hauling drugs” (Lee-LM).

Much of the concern that land-management informants expressed was based on ambiguous identities, making many people unable to differentiate between who was dangerous and who was not. At a BANWR security briefing for volunteers, the presentation distinguished between migrants coming to work and those coming with criminal intent (smuggling, theft, or other crime). The presentation made the point that those coming for work did not present the same risk as those with more violent intentions, but also emphasized that the distinction was not easy to make. Another land-management informant explained
that “[We’re] mostly concerned with the safety issue: who is an endangered person vs. who is a drug trafficker. You never know” (Aaren-LM). David (LM) described the uncertainty that came with their work, “Forest Service employees working in remote areas must have the situational awareness of their surroundings and be on the lookout for something that’s just slightly off, and even when things look right they might not be right. There are a lot of unknowns. It’s a complex issue.” At the same time, a number of personnel expressed concern over wearing their uniforms when working in remote areas, suggesting that smugglers might confuse their government uniforms with border enforcement agents and provoke conflict over a misunderstood identity. This was especially a concern for Forest Service informants, whose dark green uniforms look very similar to the green uniforms of Border Patrol agents.

The human death and distress that occurred in the borderlands were a part of the social process component of place, and contributed to the idea of the borderlands as a place of concern. A number of land-management personnel found migrant bodies during work activities, and while driving in the field some personnel were able to point out the exact spots where they had found bodies. One worker languished, “How many dead bodies do we have to find before there’s a better way for them to get here?” (Field Notes). Finding a migrant body was viewed as a likely event for personnel on the border, and some informants who had not found bodies were puzzled. “I’m surprised I haven’t found a dead body yet. So many people have, there are so many bodies out there, and I go into so many remote areas for surveys” (Lee-LM). When another informant learned that the researcher had also worked with a local humanitarian aid group, his immediate response was, "How many bodies have
you found?" After the researcher explained that she had not found any bodies, he expressed
surprise (Field Notes). In addition to deaths, informants also expressed concern over the high
incidence of rape involving migrant women and girls. Tom (LM) explained another
disturbing incident of migrant distress, saying “One man was shot 5-6 times, and started a
fire to get help. He had packed his bullet wounds with mud in order to keep going.”

Land-management informants’ responses to the social process aspect of place were
rooted in their concern and fear over criminal activity in the borderlands. While the turmoil
around them resulted in feelings of insecurity, land-management informants tried to reduce
the perceived problems. In light of the violent occurrences, refuge land closest to the border
was temporarily closed for safety reasons in 2006, and as of 2008 personnel were still
required to enact extra security precautions when working there. Heavier fencing was placed
around agency buildings, including some personnel homes on the refuge, and bars were put
over windows and doors. The move seemed to make some informants feel safer, as one
informant stated, “When sitting in my yard at night, I used to wonder whether I was being
observed or whether people were hiding in the brush. Now with a 7-foot fence and razor
wire, my yard is secure. I feel pretty safe in general” (Leslee-LM). These specific measures
took place on BANWR, while at CNF the security problems did not escalate to such levels.
When the researcher was with CNF personnel preparing to move over to BANWR, CNF
informants frequently told her she would get even more interesting information from
BANWR, since personnel there were “in the thick of it.”

Land-management agencies also mandated additional security measures specific to
fires along the border. Tim (LM) stated that the “report of a fire after-hours now must be
called in to [law enforcement], where we wouldn’t have to before. It adds another level to any incident on the refuge.” The precautions reflected the widely-accepted perception that violent activities largely took place at night, when most smugglers moved through the desert. Personnel stated that these extra precautions changed the way fire was tackled on the border. Tom (LM) described this process: “If a fire breaks out at night and we don’t have [law enforcement] available, we will pull firefighters from the fire for their own safety. This allows the fire to get bigger overnight, and night is the best time for them to fight and get control of a fire because there’s lower temps, more moisture, no sun. This makes the total fire cost larger, exponentially” (See Appendix 1 for an example).

Informants’ perspectives of social processes in the borderlands also filtered their desire to reduce the migrant deaths on agency lands. Informants expressed concern about what sort of aid might support the criminal activity that was the basis of their concerns. “It is public land… The aid workers have every right to be here, they do lots of community work picking up trash and so on, [but] there is a concern over the line between helping and aiding and abetting” (Cody-LM). As federal employees, potentially aiding and abetting was not an option. “We’re the last people who want deaths out here, but there have to be protocols in place to do it the right way” (Jack-LM). Lee (LM) expressed the view that, “The people crossing the border are doing something illegal, and the humanitarian workers are helping them along.” Agency water provision regulations also played a key role in what was allowed, as Charlie (LM) explained. “Legally, I can’t let them put water on forest land—I have to be able to guarantee that any water given is safe, of certain quality, it must meet
municipal drinking water standards, and when water is left out and those who left it walk away, I can’t ensure the quality of that water.”

Littering regulations also created a line between what was allowed and what was not. “It wouldn’t be an issue if the food and water was handed to them, but to leave it out makes it complicated” (Jack-LM). Another informant put the distinction clearly: “Want to help people get out of the desert? Fine. Want to hand them water and other things? Fine. Want to leave water in the desert and walk away? That’s a problem” (Field Notes). Some informants viewed stationary water tanks as a positive compromise. “Personally, I feel that if we can help get water, like with Humane Borders stations, that’s good. It’s not encouraging more people. It’s not just an issue with leaving water, though, but also leaving big bags of food, and we can hardly keep up with the trash” (Cody-LM). Land-management personnel thus formulated a basic approach to addressing migrant distress, which generally involved calling Border Patrol to get migrants out of the desert. “During my day to day job, I may encounter people, and will give them water and call Border Patrol” (Runar-LM). This allowed for some form of basic aid, while not getting too close to the line between legal and illegal activity. As informants outlined the actions they were comfortable with, they desired to remain uninvolved. “Forest Service people are not trained to respond to the human element. We will respond to humanitarian situations with the first aid we have training for, generally CPR, some EMTs. … Do our best to render first aid and provide info., try to avoid direct contact” (Aaren-LM). The refuge in this study also had several of Border Patrol’s rescue beacons on its land, solar towers with a button that provides a direct link to Border Patrol if a migrant is in distress.
Humanitarian volunteers described the social processes at play in the borderlands as contributing to social injustice, which provoked a sense of responsibility among volunteers. They expressed seeing “clear ties between increased border militarization and deaths” (Atticus-H), referencing the idea that enforcement at urban areas of the border pushed migrants into remote areas and contributed to their deaths from dehydration and exhaustion. “The problem is caused by the U.S. government, and it's not separate from the economy. The economy benefits from cheap, undocumented labor. The money put into border enforcement could be put elsewhere, into Latin America or Central America, for instance, and the problem wouldn't exist” (Hallie-H). Informants pointed at “the growing disparity between the rich and the poor” saying “this is acted out on the border...” (Sol-H). Volunteers also described their work as a response to the broader tensions of globalization. "The tensions, conflicts, and integrative aspects of globalization are played out on the human body (fashion, mortality rates, value standards of beauty and success, poverty-aggravated illness, etc.) and the earth's body (ecological devastation, areas of dense population, protected wilderness areas, 'natural disasters,' etc.) The border stories show this... blistered feet and a desert scarred by walls and human traffic, are the marks of the conflict in our changing world” (Carma-H).

Given the perceived economic and political causes of migrant distress, their positions in these economic and political systems made them feel responsibility towards migrants. For volunteers, this meant first recognizing the impacts of U.S. policies. “The wall doesn't separate us from the decisions we make that affect people all over the world” (Annina-H). In a similar vein Cole (H) said, “We live in a society that demands accountability of individuals
to their community and to other individuals. If I hurt you through my actions, directly or indirectly, I have a responsibility to make sure you are OK. We teach this idea to all of our children at a very early age. Why is it different in the global community? What is so special about countries and institutions (corporate or otherwise) that they are held to a different standard?” U.S. residents described one specific type of responsibility, saying “Everyone has a responsibility to fight against human rights abuses. However, citizens of the governments that are violating human rights have more immediate power” (Shayna-H). Other volunteers described a basic responsibility as humans. “I don't see a separation between fighting for respect for immigrants and fighting for respect for citizens; it's working for us all to be included” (Annina-H). Statements similar to “Everything boils down to equality” (Shayna-H) were common among volunteers.

Social processes that contributed to injustice prompted a sense of responsibility among humanitarians, and direct aid became the primary expression of the responsibility they felt towards migrants. This meant directly providing water, food, or medical aid to migrants in the desert. The priority given to direct aid was most clearly illustrated by the parable of the babies, told one night at the desert camp to a group of visiting students. In the parable, a community is situated alongside a river. One day a baby is seen floating down the river, and a villager goes in to save it. As days go by, babies continue to be seen in the river, with more coming each day. The community organizes a monitoring system to detect and remove any babies in the river. As more babies show up in the river, this system gets more complex. Finally, someone decides to go upriver, find out why the babies are being put in the river, and stop this from happening. The parable-teller explained that No More Deaths
constituted the villagers going into the river to save the babies, because this was the most urgent need. He then asked the visiting students to be the villagers who go upriver and stop the forces sending the babies into the river. Volunteers commonly agreed with this analysis. “Overall, I feel that the work of NMD is crucially important in mitigating migrant deaths and abuses, though recognize also that it is a band-aid solution” (Atticus-H). While they felt their work was vital, informants made it clear that they would be happy to find themselves obsolete. As one volunteer put it, they hoped to "work themselves out of business" (Field Notes).

In addition to direct aid, education became another expression of social responsibility for volunteers. Shayna (H) stated, “There is a lack of education [about the effects of border policy], and the blind cannot lead the blind.” Informants felt that educating persons across the U.S. would motivate them to push for immigration and border policy changes. Carma (H) explained the general vision of this process, saying “People in general have a responsibility to their communities. I see us operating within concentric circles of community, and we are often more likely to feel truly connected to the communities that we are closest to or more centrally within. Since a national border runs through the southwest, communities in the desert feel its impact and have a responsibility to that. That border being a national border, the rest of the country has a responsibility to listen to stories from the border and realize that they, we are also part of that community.” Sol (H) suggested “That may be our greatest contribution to the larger issue of immigration reform - making others aware of the suffering and death on the border.”
Cultural meanings

Amidst the various aspects of border activity, from migrants to border enforcement agents, a dominant cultural meaning of the borderlands that land-management personnel described was an uncertain place. They suggested “It’s like the Florida coast waiting for the next hurricane” (Charlie-LM). This uncertainty stemmed from the presence of migrants and smugglers, and informants often described an unsettling feeling when undocumented persons came to their homes. As Tom (LM) stated, “How do you deal with someone at your door? I know people who would live down here but don’t because of that. It’s a big concern for me.” While life was described as a tense situation, the tension also became commonplace. Lee (LM) explained, “Border issues affect everybody, some more than others. The thing is people just learn to live with it. Border-related concerns just get factored into everyday life.”

Being so close to the border, informants stated that it was common to see migrants on the side of the road — those who had given up moving north to find work, or drug runners who had just dropped a load — trying to get rides south to the border. One parent described concern over finding migrants waiting at his children's bus-stop one day. “In the past 21 years, it has changed too much — two guys were waiting at my kids’ bus-stop for a ride back to Mexico one day. It affects everyone’s lives directly, everyday. It’s a different life than I grew up with. Used to be quiet, rural, communities trusted one another, now we have to lock everything” (Aaren-LM).

With the borderlands viewed as an uncertain environment, informants took on protective behaviors. Land-management personnel warned about the unease associated with migrants by circulating stories about border violence. A commonly referenced icon was that
of mesquite trees decked with women's underwear, found throughout the desert. The researcher was told several interpretations of what this symbolized, but the only interpretation repeated within and across groups was the "rape tree" concept, understanding that the trees with underwear were signs that a migrant woman was raped at that spot (Field Notes). The researcher was also warned repeatedly of an incident in which migrants placed rocks across a local road. In this story, when the passenger of the car got out to remove the rocks, she was attacked and the vehicle taken. Stories with strong elements of violence, regardless of whether or not they could be verified, circulated among land-management personnel and perpetuated security concerns associated with migrants. Some informants also communicated their unease with migrants by describing them as "coming over here" and referred to the U.S. as "absorbing another nation," referring to Mexico (Field Notes). In their references to migrants, land-management informants used acronyms or other terms that clearly described the migrant as an ‘other’. In referring to migrants, these informants most often described them as ‘UDA’s (undocumented aliens), ‘OTM’s (other than Mexicans), ‘illegal’s, ‘alien’s, or ‘illegal alien’s.

Cultural meaning of place for humanitarian volunteers was rooted in equality and inclusiveness for all persons. Everyday behavior among volunteers community reflected this cultural meaning of place. Volunteers would engage in conversation and other friendly activities with migrants while waiting for Border Patrol agents to arrive or while administering first aid. They tried to learn about the individuals, their homes and families, would play around with migrant children, and play music or card games to pass the time. Within the No More Deaths volunteer community, language was used to communicate the
equality among persons that was a key foundation for their action. Among volunteers, migrants were referred to as "friend", "amigo/a", "migrant", or "compañero/a". The slogan "No Human Is Illegal/¡Ningún Ser Humano es Ilegal!" and its variations were seen on shirts, posters or buttons around the camp. The Truman Capote quote “Love, having no geography, knows no boundaries” was placed prominently on a trailer at the desert camp. This use of language illustrated a clear view of the migrants as equals, which was reiterated in informant interviews. “No matter of particular characteristics, people deserve respect, medical treatment, opportunities, family, a chance to succeed” (Annina-H). Though volunteers pulled motivation for volunteering in the borderlands from different backgrounds, all described some form of “a feeling of commitment to alleviating the conditions faced by migrants crossing in the region that [No More Deaths] is based” (Atticus-H). Their motivations and behaviors to aid migrants reflected the vision of equality which permeated their community.

As land-management and humanitarian groups interacted, conflict emerged from the distinct cultural meanings assigned to the borderlands. One land-management informant described a situation that illustrated the two conceptions of migrants. Upon meeting on agency land, some humanitarian volunteers asked the land-management worker if she had seen “any migrants.” The worker quickly responded with a description of several birds that she had spotted with her binoculars earlier that day. While the volunteers were referring to human migrants, the land-management worker assumed they were asking about migrating birds, a misunderstanding which stemmed from differences in culturally accepted language. The language used within and surrounding the court cases also illustrated this difference. At a press event held by No More Deaths outside the courthouse after the first littering trial, a
poster read, “30 jugs, 30 lives,” clearly stating the value that the humanitarians ascribed to each gallon of water. While No More Deaths volunteers described water jugs as “aid,” “life-saving,” or as “a godsend,” land-management personnel described it as “trash” or “litter” (Field Notes). A statement from the refuge said, “The individual cited was attempting to place water in the desert for immigrants who cross refuge lands. His motivations are admirable. Unfortunately, depositing plastic jugs contributes to the overwhelming amount of trash already being left on the Refuge.” Land-management personnel rejected the humanitarians’ means of aid, and instead reiterated a need for more rescue beacons. They described the beacons as superior because they provided “immediate aid” and did not result in trash on the refuge, while humanitarians acknowledged the value of rescue beacons, but did not find them sufficient (KOLD News 13, June 18, 2009). An unspoken factor in this divide was the status of the migrant. In their perspectives on physical, social, political, and cultural elements of place in the borderlands, land-management personnel repeatedly pointed to migrant presence as problematic. Their chosen means of aiding the migrants thus removed migrants from the desert (in each preferred method of aid, Border Patrol is alerted to the migrants’ presence). For the humanitarians, however, their perspectives on physical, social, and cultural components of place in the borderlands repeatedly included the migrant as a member of the borderlands who does not need to be removed. Their chosen means of aiding the migrants with water and first aid shifted the choice of continuing in or leaving the desert entirely to the migrants. While this specific contrast did not surface in formal or informal dialogue, it became an apparent contrast during participant observation.
Future of Place Meanings in the Borderlands

In the Altar Valley, land-management and humanitarian groups constructed two distinct interpretations of place in the borderlands, based on their experience and perspective of physical attributes, social processes, and cultural meanings. Actions by land-management and humanitarian groups in the borderlands that arose from the different place meanings eventually clashed, illustrating that different place meanings can lead to conflict when adversarial behaviors arise from those senses of place (Cheng et al., 2003; Yung et al., 2003). Conflict between land-management and humanitarian aid groups illustrates a powerful collision between the place-based actions of the particular groups, as their conceptions ultimately led to littering citations and court trials.

Though they described different perceptions of physical attributes in the borderlands, land-managers and humanitarians both desired higher levels of ecosystem health. Whether they expressed their concern by describing specific ecological attributes that were damaged and threatened (as with land-managers), or an interconnected system being disrupted by restrictions on human migration (as with humanitarians), both groups described desires to reduce the ecological degradation. An immediate step to this shared goal would be collaborative efforts at trash clean-up and erosion mitigation. Humanitarians could enrich their idea of the borderlands as an interconnected physical system as they work with their neighbors, and land-managers would address the specific ecological damage that dominated their perspectives. A more long-term step to this shared goal would be reformed immigration policy which facilitates migration through legal channels, something that both groups could agree to at least in principle.
Land-management and humanitarian groups’ perspectives on social processes reflected the scale they emphasized for codes of conduct in social systems. For land-management personnel the criminal activity they saw provoked defensive and protective behaviors, and this reflected their desire for communities to adhere to broad codes of conduct, such as immigration and littering regulations. Humanitarians saw social injustices in the borderlands, particularly against migrants, that invoked feelings of social responsibility. Their perspective was focused on codes of conduct that emphasize responsibility to the individual, with their actions determined by desires to reduce the suffering of even a single migrant. Both worked from accepted codes of conduct for social systems, but with different primary foci (community or individual level). It’s difficult for communities to function well if people don’t follow broadly accepted codes of conduct (i.e., traffic or immigration laws), but strictly adhering to certain laws to the point that individuals are suffering and dying does not create a functioning community, either.

Recognizing the need for both codes of conduct—immigration regulations and the basic value of human life—land-management and humanitarian groups can develop cooperative codes of conduct that embrace legalities of the U.S. and basic human rights demands. Finding means of providing water that don’t leave trash, for instance, or pushing for immigration reform that allows more labor migration through legal channels, provides for a functioning community without accumulating dead bodies. This requires some bending in both codes of conduct—land-managers giving or allowing aid to those in the U.S. illegally, and humanitarians adhering to littering regulations that they may find unnecessary—but results in an end product that recognizes the multiple needs of social systems. Integrating the
different codes of conduct is also necessary because land-management agencies manage land for the public, and humanitarians are a part of their public. Even persons outside of the humanitarian community are unlikely to desire dead bodies on protected lands, something land-managers can agree to, as well. Developing a code of conduct for protected lands that reduces deaths, while still requiring humanitarians to follow regulations like other users, is a necessary step forward.

As land-managers and humanitarians interact in the borderlands, they will only be able to work together and improve the status of physical attributes and social processes if they can communicate with each other and understand one another’s cultural meanings. Land-management personnel saw the borderlands as an uncertain and insecure place due to border traffic, while humanitarians saw the place as needing to include everyone, despite legal status. Both land-management and humanitarian aid groups were able to use their own methods of verbal and symbolic communication to express the cultural meanings they assigned to the borderlands, but the groups relied primarily on dissemination, as opposed to dialogue, as a communication strategy. (Note: In 2009, one year after fieldwork, No More Deaths initiated dialogue with the refuge, and has since met with Department of Interior officials regarding the conflict). Through dialogue, informants could begin to understand the borderlands in light of the other’s experiences (Said, 2000). Each group formed their respective views of border activity from experience and personal perspective, illustrating deeply entrenched feelings. Neither group is likely to change their perspective, but understanding where the other is coming from will facilitate communication as they discuss collaboration around physical attributes and social processes. As Adams (2004) stated, they
should not be asked to give up their particular views, but rather “what they have to give up is the assumption of the hegemony of their worldview” (p. 8). Once this occurs, there is a chance for respectful coexistence in the borderlands, but not until this happens (Adams, 2004; Said, 2000).

One way to facilitate communication between the groups is to create a more neutral language with which to communicate. Language was a stumbling block for the two groups, who were clearly opposed to using the other’s language in reference to immigration in general, particularly referring to migrants. In their references to migrants, the language that land-management informants used illustrated their perspective of the migrants as an ‘other.’ In contrast, humanitarian volunteers actively emphasized migrants as equals. The same contrast was present surrounding the littering citations, as humanitarian volunteers and land-management personnel described two distinct views of water jugs. The use of specific terms (“UDA” or “migrant”, “trash” or “life-saving”) had clear meaning for each group, and thus they had no common language with which to discuss the issue of aiding migrants. Neither group is likely to adopt the other’s language in reference to migrants. Researcher experience within each group showed that each group culture clearly accepted their form of language and rejected the other. Yet, language is an important component of a shared place, and worth attending to (Bott et al., 2003; Yung et al., 2003). Therefore, at least for purposes of communication between the groups, the best option would be to create neutral phrases. If the groups could decide upon acceptable language in referring to the migrants, this would facilitate communication.
As these groups clash in the borderlands, the inconvenience of the conflict is problematic, but so is the larger challenge it poses to their own idea of place. They personally suffer when less conservation and humanitarian work is accomplished due to the conflict, and when the conflict creates segregated, even hostile conceptions of place which decrease their ability to collaborate and achieve similar objectives (Ingold, 2005; Young, 2000). Belittling or not recognizing each other’s conceptions of place does not further their objectives. Rather, conflict resolution might be facilitated by encouraging a shared place in the borderlands as described in the previous paragraphs, one that more fully integrates both land-management and humanitarian perspectives (Williams & Stewart, 1998). Their actions have shown significant attachments to the borderlands as a place, and this attachment suggests that informants may be willing to exert the effort needed to negotiate agreement between the presently conflicting place-based actions (Bott et al., 2003; Yung et al., 2003).

Moving towards a shared place in the borderlands involves first recognizing and understanding both the common (i.e., a desire for ecosystem health) and conflicting (i.e., an emphasis on system- or individual-focused codes of conduct) place meanings among informants. Encouraging a shared place, one in which the two groups can coexist without intermittent legal trials, requires that the parties involved invest time and energy to develop emergent solutions (Bott et al., 2003; Yung et al., 2003). Land-management agencies have frequently invoked the adaptive management strategy, which seeks emergent solutions to land-management problems. No More Deaths uses a consensus approach in all its decision-making, in order to respect the views of all members. A shared place depends on unique solutions that respect all parties involved, and resonates with both the adaptive management
style of land-management agencies and the consensus-based decision-making for humanitarian volunteers.

Natural resource management must negotiate the perspectives of numerous stakeholders, including those with conflicting ideologies and those from traditionally ‘local’ and ‘nonlocal’ groups. Approaching management decisions with a focus on place meanings helps to understand the broad range of perspectives that natural resource professionals must integrate (Cheng et al., 2003; Yung et al., 2003). For researchers and land-managers alike, delving into place meanings is a potentially heated and emotional endeavor (Williams & Stewart, 1998). However, by doing so natural resource professionals may engage the energy that people invest in places, resulting in more broad, democratic participation in natural resource politics (Cantrill & Senecah, 2001; Cheng et al., 2003; Williams & Stewart, 1998; Yung et al., 2003).
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1

Example fire depicting escalation of fire costs due to extra security precautions along the international border.

Summer 2008

Initial fire response:
10 p.m. Initial fire size estimated at 5-10 acres. No law enforcement was present to provide security for fire fighters, so suppression had to wait until morning. At this time the only response was to gather information in order to tackle the fire the next day.
Estimated cost to tackle fire now: $1000.00

Next-day fire response:
Approximate size was initially 50 acres, with high winds forecast for the day. Because of the size of the fire and forecasted winds, an additional Type 1 hand crew and an additional fire engine were required. Broadest fire size was 65 acres.
Total cost to tackle fire now: $6000.00

Increase in fire costs due to border security concerns: $5000.00, or 500%
Appendix 2

Estimates of selected labor and equipment costs from border-related activities
Nogales Ranger District of Coronado National Forest, 2007

Table 1. Summary of categorized costs to mitigate border-related activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>$267,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattleguard installation</td>
<td>$14,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing replacement</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water storage replacement</td>
<td>$47,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost grazing fees</td>
<td>$1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion mitigation</td>
<td>$1,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing</td>
<td>$6,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$409,990</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculations of categorized costs, based on informant-provided data:

**Fires:**

TOTAL human-caused fires (not distinguished between smuggling and non-smuggling related): $891,483

Conservative estimate of 30% related to smuggling: $267,444

**Fire total:** $267,444
**Cattleguards:**

7 cattleguards put in during 2007:

Labor per guard: GS 7 for 10 hrs: $176.4; x7 = $1234.8

- GS 4 for 10 hrs: $127.3; x7 = $891.1
- GS 5 for 10 hrs: $142.4; x7 = $996.8

One-time labor: GS 11 for 10 hrs: $261.1

Other items: $4,000 + $17,629.25 + $2,180 + $45 + $2,000

**Cattleguards total: $14,909**

**Fencing:**

7 miles of fencing (new):

- 2.5 @ Aliso Springs
- 2.5 @ Bear Valley
- 2 @ Calabasas

= 7 miles of fence @ approx. $10,000 per mile (conservatively)

**Fences total: $70,000**

**Miscellaneous replaced wells, water storage, pipeline:**

- 2 solar pump wells at ~$15,000 each: $30,000
- 4 storage tanks: $8,000
- 2 miles of pipeline @ $.42 per foot: + 1 mile of pipeline @ $.50 per foot: $7075
- GS 9 for 10 hours: $215

Replaced pump at Coyote Well: $2500

**Water storage replacement total: $47,790**
**Lost grazing fees:**

100 head of cattle not going into the pasture for 31 days costs $142.03

365 days of 2007: $1672

**Lost grazing fees total: $1672**

**Erosion mitigation**

Putting in waterbars to reduce erosion that BP quads played a significant role in causing:

Time spent: 8:30-10:30 a.m., 10 times for the year (on average).

GS 9: $43.16; x10 = $431.6

GS 7: $35.28; x10 = $352.8

GS 6: $31.76; x10 = $317.6

GS 4: $25.46; x10 = $254.6

GS 3: $22.68; x10 = $226.8

**Erosion total: $1583**

**Packing (Agency personnel haul materials into remote areas for Border Patrol):**

GS 9 @ 10 hours: $215.8

+ 5 animals @ $25/animal/10 hours: $125 and 50 miles driving @ $.44/mile: $22

GS 11 @ 20 hours: $522.2,

+ 6 animals @ $25/animal/10 hours: $300 and 100 miles driving @ $.44/mile: $44

GS 11 @ 140 hours: $3655.4

+ 4 animals @ $25/animal/10 hours: $1400 and 700 miles driving @ $.44/mile: $308

**Packing total: $6592**

**Grand total: $409,990**
Appendix 3

Interview Prompt Questions

1. What are the most important causes/issues for you individually?
2. What are the most important issues for borderlands communities today?
3. Whose responsibility is it to address these issues?
4. How should those responsible address these issues?
5. What organizations work with these issues? Which are the most influential/important organizations?
6. Are the goals of these organizations compatible, or do they work against one another?
7. Have any of these organizations worked together on issues in the borderlands?
8. Why might this be the case?
9. Would there be problems or benefits with some organizations working together on issues important in the borderlands?