

“Are ‘New Immigrants’ to the United States Assimilating?”

Debate 1

Friday, February 7, 2003

Victor Nee, Cornell University vs. **Roger Waldinger**, UCLA

Special Guest and Co-moderator, **Janet Reno**

Sponsored by the Center for the Study of Inequality and the Atlantic Foundation

Moderator: David Grusky

David Grusky

I'd like to welcome all of you to the first in a series of five debates sponsored by the Center for the Study of Inequality and funded, in part, by the Atlantic Foundation. This series of debates brings together leading scholars to address some of the crucial questions of our time, questions that increasingly turn on issues of inequality, and how much inequality we're prepared, as a society, to tolerate. So the debate takes on then such questions as: "Why are some forms of inequality increasing and others are not?" "What types of responsibility do individuals and nation states have to reduce the most extreme forms of inequality?" and "Does inequality, in some cases at least, increase economic output and should for that reason alone be maintained or perhaps even increased?" Today, we'll be focusing on the question of whether new immigrants to the United States are assimilating in ways that are similar to or different than ways that prevailed in past immigrant streams.

Let me begin with a few introductions, starting with myself. I'm David Grusky, Director of the Center for the Study of Inequality and Professor of Sociology here at Cornell University. And it's my task today to serve as one of the moderators for this debate.

On the far left of this table sits Roger Waldinger, Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. He is author of numerous highly acclaimed publications including most recently, Stranger at the Gate, published by University of California Press. In 1998, he won the *Robert E. Park Award* for his book titled, Still the Promised City; and his other books are also highly acclaimed and, in many cases, have won yet other awards. It is truly an honor to have him with us today.

At the center of the table is Victor Nee, Goldwin Smith Professor of Sociology, former Chair of the Department of Sociology here at Cornell University, and Director of the Center for Study of Economy and Society. He recently won the *James Coleman Best Book Award* for a book that he co-edited with Mary Briton titled, New Institutionalism in Sociology. And his forthcoming book with Richard Alda, titled Remaking the American Mainstream, is destined, by all accounts, to become a classic. In many ways Victor Nee has the academic "Midas Touch," as virtually everything that he has written has profoundly shaped the way that we think about inequality and how systems of inequality change.

And finally, it's my great honor and pleasure to introduce Janet Reno, former Attorney General of the United States. As many of you know, she is a 1960 graduate of

Cornell University and has a distinguished career as State Attorney General for Dade County, where she was re-elected by voters for four consecutive terms. And then subsequently then, as you all know, she was sworn in as the first women Attorney General in 1993, was re-appointed in 1997 by President Clinton, making her the longest serving Attorney General in the 20th century. Last year, she sought the Democratic nomination for the Governor of Florida, and she is now serving as the Frank H. T. Rhodes Class of '56 University Professor. We are obviously very fortunate that she has agreed to serve today as a co-moderator. And also, she is going to be delivering some opening comments, to which I think we should turn now.

Janet Reno

Thank you very much and may I commend you on the debates. The more we can debate in a thoughtful civil way the critical issues of our time, particularly with respect to inequality, the better this nation will be, and I think that this is an excellent undertaking. I once was asked by the Queen of the Condominiums in Northeast Dade County, Florida, political power house in her own right, to arrange a breakfast with a prominent mayor who is Hispanic. Annie Acromyn was an astute politician and I brought the mayor to Essence Delicatessen. He had his variation on Cuban bread and they had a conversation and she told him how important it was that English be spoken and then she wagged her finger at him and she said, "But lest you think that I'm anti-immigrant, I will never worry about this country until this country is no longer a nation of immigrants." And I think we have to look at the strength that immigration has brought to this nation. Understand that it comes in different forms and different ways. I have seen it so much in the community I love, a Cuban population that has made so many magnificent contributions that is so strong. A Haitian population that has disadvantages and has seen the results of inequality, but has been turned around and become public officials, mayors, judges, state legislators, taking an active part in bringing the African American community along with it, in terms of strengthened relationships and strengthened undertakings on the part of children. So I think this debate will be an extraordinary opportunity to learn how immigration can deal with the issue of inequality while at the same time giving to each the opportunity to be their best.

David Grusky

Thanks. Let me just lay out briefly the structure of the debate that now will take place. We'll lead off with an opening statement by Victor Nee, a 20-minute statement, followed then by an equivalent 20-minute statement by Roger Waldinger, and then each will have an opportunity for a 5-minute rebuttal. After that, we'll open up for questions from the audience.

Victor Nee

I'm honored and privileged this afternoon to be able to be here to speak with a distinguished company of Cornell's students, faculty and graduate students and also with a very distinguished group of panelists here. And I'm grateful that I have this opportunity to share with you ideas that I have about assimilation of new immigrants.

The United States, entering into the new millennium, is a society that has more racial diversity than at any other period in American history. Over the course of the past 35 years, the United States has experienced its largest immigration since the late 19th & early 20th century. Immigrant metropolises like Los Angeles & New York City have emerged as cosmopolitan centers in which practically every ethnic group in the world is represented in significant numbers. Recent immigrants come, overwhelmingly, from Latin America and Asia, altering the traditional sources of the peopling of the United States. The percentage of foreign-born people in America is approaching the level of the earlier high tide of mass immigration. Today, 20% of Americans are immigrants and their children.

New ethnic groups' identities have enlarged the lexicon that resulted from the earlier European immigration. We find diversity, not only in the new ethnic neighborhoods, but also in classrooms like this and in the work place. Virtually every institution of American life has been affected by the enormous expansion of ethnic and racial diversity stemming from the post 1965 immigration. Assimilation was the dominant trend for earlier European immigrants and their descendants. But some critics today would assert that the large concentration of non-white ethnic groups in American central cities render assimilation not only unattainable, but a misguided expectation. They argue that because racism is an incorrigible feature of American society, non-white immigrants would never be accepted as equals.

Today, I want to ask how valid this prognosis is. By contrast to Professor Waldinger, in my remarks today I want to emphasize that the experience of immigrants is shaped by institutions and that the legal context within which immigrants start their lives in America today is far more favorable than it was in the past. I define institutions as webs of formal and informal rules governing social relationships. Formal rules are the laws and regulations produced by the state and enforced by it. Monitoring and enforcement of these rules encompasses one of the most powerful mechanisms by which any contact society reproduces, organizes and regulates itself. Informal rules include customs, conventions and social norms, produced and enforced within close-knit groups. It is difficult to imagine social life, in the absence of informal rules. Every social transaction would otherwise be negotiated anew.

In multi-cultural societies, such as the United States, institutions enable members of diverse ethnic and racial groups to conduct communal life with a modicum of civility. And without necessity of resorting to violence as a means to settle differences. The dismantling of the formal rules of racial separatism, after WWII and especially during the Civil Rights Era of the 1960's, created a new institutional environment for immigrants. One in which for the first time was extended the principal of formal equality to immigrants not of European ancestry. This watershed change in the legal system governing immigration opened a way for assimilation of non-white immigrants, in a way that formally was not possible. The mainstream institutions, such as Cornell, and opportunities that were not available to racial minorities became available to them, more so than in any period in American past.

I maintain that in the post Civil Rights Era, mainstream corporations and public organizations had, on the whole, sought to make a good faith effort in observing the guidelines of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This was the act that for the first

time explicitly outlawed racial discrimination. Despite the infrequency of successful class action suits, the personnel departments of public corporations and organizations now must monitor compliance to the formal rules of Title VII. Even if some corporations largely demonstrate symbolic conformity, by offering diversity and multi-cultural training workshops, they do seek to comply. Moreover, many mainstream corporations and organizations now take into account the increased cost of discrimination. The concern is not simply the risk of expensive class action suits if firms fail to conform, as experienced recently by Texaco and Coca Cola, but potential loss of legitimacy and damage to reputations and the firm's brand name. To be described as a racist business in a multi-cultural society is a costly label for any firm to bear, or for that matter, for politicians and professors as well.

It is also true that as the American workforce has become more heterogeneous, corporations have a positive incentive to foster an atmosphere of racial tolerance and fair play. This stems, in fact, from self-interest. In the institutional context following the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, firms wish to avoid the higher transaction costs stemming from ethnic conflict and tension. This effect is especially manifest in firms that depend on a high level of cooperation among workers as the basis to achieve productivity gains at competitive advantage, such as high technology firms. For example, Microsoft maintains the policy of zero tolerance with respect to racism. This is not simply to avoid costly litigation, but also because 24% of Microsoft's employees are non-white. Many of Microsoft's leading engineers and staff come from immigrant background. Title VII and other legislative initiatives of the Civil Rights era originally intended to lower the barriers of entry for racial minorities and women into firms and public organizations have benefited legal immigrants.

Moreover, affirmative action programs have benefited immigrants and their children from the Caribbean basin, Latin America, Africa, although they have not suffered from the cultural legacy of slavery and past discrimination in the United States. In sum, Civil Rights Era legislative changes altered the institutional environment of immigration in a profound manner. Not only have they opened the doors for legal immigration from non-traditional sources, such as Asia, but the extension of formal rules of equality to non-whites have lowered barriers of entry into mainstream institutions and organizations. This has enabled legal immigrants with skills suitable and useful in a high technology society to experience rapid economic assimilation, more so than in the American past.

Now, I will shift my focus from the role of the state in monitoring and enforcing equal rights rules to focus on the economy that promotes economic assimilation. It is very costly, if not impossible, for modern capitalist economy to maintain a partial system especially in a society as diverse as the U.S. Such a system would require separate rules and their enforcement for whites and non-whites. It would result in massive inefficiencies in allocation of human capital as far as talented non-whites would be barred from positions where their capabilities could be most productively utilized. It would result in incompetence being structured into managerial and professional positions by limiting recruitment to preferred ethnic groups. Apart from the obvious moral and political objections, the outcome of a segregationist institutional order in a multi-cultural post-industrial democracy would lead to such an enormous increase in transaction costs,

the costs from dealing with social relationships and conflict, that it would greatly reduce the competitiveness of the American economy. Adam Smith and Karl Marx both emphasized the free mobility of labor as a requirement for the development of capitalism as an economic order. This theme was picked out by Max Weber, who argues that the market operates as an integrative mechanism because the dynamics of market exchange work to break down segmented boundaries. Admittedly, finding a job is only one dimension of assimilation, but it is the important first step that sets the stage for subsequent social and cultural forms of assimilation.

During the sustained economic expansion of the 1990's, the U.S. economy generated 24 million jobs. The decade of the 1990's witnessed the greatest volume of mass immigration in the history of the United States, with 14 million new immigrants arriving to find employment and residence. In the west coast, new immigrants contributed to 72% of the growth of the civilian labor force. In the northeast, it's a surprising 100% in the decade of the 90's. Testifying to the openness of U.S. labor markets, new immigrants arriving in the 1990's quickly dispersed into every sector of the American economy. Early analysis of the 2000 census confirms descriptively that recent immigrants are assimilating rapidly in labor markets. There is little evidence in early analysis of the 2000 census to support the view of a fundamental dichotomy between the jobs of immigrants and the jobs of native-born Americans, which is the position of Professor Waldinger. This a remarkable social fact attributed to the effectiveness of the legal and regulatory environment opening access to mainstream opportunities for legal immigrants.

In closing, I want to call attention to another profound institutional change that has altered the American context of late 20th century immigration. During the late 19th and early 20th century, the formal roles of racial separatism that evolved in the Jim Crow era of white-black relations in the American south were extended to Asian immigrants in the western states. Racial separatism was enforced by a series of federal and Supreme Court rulings. First the Chinese Exclusion Act curtailed immigration from China on racial grounds in 1882. After this, successive waves of Asian immigrants were met by racial hostility. White workers mobilized to end the migration stream and forced immigrants who did not return to their homeland into racialized ghettos. Prior to WWII, while second generation southern and eastern Europeans were quietly assimilating, second generation Asians were barred institutionally from entering into the mainstream. The barriers to assimilation were impermeable due not only to informal racism against Asians, but also laws that reinforced and combined with informal racism, giving rise to what some called *segmented assimilation*. That is, while immigrants and their descendents were welcomed into the mainstream, segments of non-white immigrants were segregated in racialized ghettos.

For immigrant minorities and their descendents, segmented assimilation ended with the institutional changes that followed WWII and especially the Civil Rights Era. For the first time, formal equality and enforcement was extended to non-whites. With this dismantling of racism by formal rules, what remains of the legacy of institutionalized racism is manifest in informal rules, social norms and conventions of the color line. To be sure, informal racism is a mechanism that gives rise to racial inequality. Discrimination achieved by close networks can effectively exclude racial minorities from

opportunity structures in the mainstream economy. As research shows, many good jobs are allocated by networks. But as I argued earlier, the legal system matters. Civil Rights Era legislation outlawing racial discrimination has increased the cost of discrimination. Moreover, because the law fundamentally is expressed through normative ideas, legal change alters ideology and attitudes.

In conclusion, institutional change, dismantling the formal rules of racial separatism, has led to crucial differences, I argue, between the contemporary period and the American past. These changes have made assimilation less segmented than before WWII. Institutional change has opened up predictable chances for success and made accessible mainstream institutions and opportunities for immigrants and their children, more so today than any other period of US history. Informal racism is not powerful enough as a social force to give rise to insurmountable barriers to social mobility either in higher education or in labor markets. This is the case with prejudice directed against white ethnics, anti-Semitism for instance. Although prejudice remains entrenched in our culture in an informal sense, legal equality has helped white ethnics to overcome obstacles stemming from this informal racism. I maintain that there is today in the U.S. a bipartisan consensus supporting the formal equality of rights of citizens where they are naturalized or native-born white or non-white. Although these rules are imperfectly realized, in a market democracy governed by the rule of law they do make a difference. This is manifest in the new diversity accomplished through the assimilation of immigrants and their children. And it is very clear that we see this diversity here at Cornell on our campus and today in this classroom. Thank you very much.

Roger Waldinger

As a member of the administrative caste, or should I say ethnic group, it's a pleasure to spend the afternoon talking about ideas as opposed to the hopelessly boring trivia with which we paper processors clutter our lives. From my pathetic perspective, the attraction of this event lies not just in the possibility of reengaging with the issues that concern me in an earlier inclination, but also escaping from the disciplines with which we miserable University bureaucrats have to inflict on ourselves. After all, the departmental chair's interest is in maintaining sanity, and the only way to do so is by maintaining departmental harmony, which is why he concentrates on massaging faculty egos as opposed to pondering the delusions of self-importance, which his colleagues entertain. And as the task also entails the constant rattling of the tin cup to be accompanied by all the appropriate gestures of deference before the administrative leaders, there are no limits to the depths to which one can sink.

But an afternoon like this offers the opportunity, if only very temporarily, for the reemergence of my prior self at mid-age. I realize that I'm, in fact, a graduate of the New York Subway school of Sociology, An institution that not only chooses a particular brand of conflict sociology but also promotes its own orientation to the conduct of intellectual life. That is to say, one that takes the form of the sharp elbowing and pushing needed to enter a crowded subway car on 42nd Street. Under normal circumstances, I try to remind myself that better manners are usually required; read the book reviews of our journals where I see that the academic world prefers tedium of bourgeois hypocrisy to the excitement that might come about if one actually tried to speak one's mind. Fortunately

for me, the organizers of this event have indicated that a different etiquette applies. After all, the framing of the question, “are immigrants still assimilating?” indicates that subtlety and norms have been thrown aside. What we haven’t said is a type of simplistic forced dichotomy that gets thrown up as red meat to excite the junior high school debate squad. Of course, why should we do business any differently? Academic, not junior high school careers are built on the forced dichotomy. And what else, but an excess of frenzy could keep you awake on this very wintry Friday afternoon? So with all due apologies and many thanks to David for providing this wonderful occasion, allow me to offend your sensibilities.

While the question we have been imposed is surely motivated by the desire to bring out the vicious beast lurking beneath the scholar’s robes, it nonetheless betrays something more. It tells us that the prevailing discourse about international migration and its impact on the self proclaimed nation-state society, known as the United States, is nothing other but the dominant, un-self-consciously nationalist, national ideology parading around in social scientific clothes. What type of honest debate would begin by presuming most, if not all of the answer? One would never ask whether immigrants are still assimilating if it weren’t beyond question that they previously had. Nor would one throw in the temporal reference in so casual style as if we all know the contours of that event when immigrants were so surely assimilating and then now when perhaps are not. Moreover, asking whether the immigrants were assimilating rather than the United States that might be assimilating the immigrants pushes the issues most troublesome for the dominating ideology right off the table.

As we repeatedly read in the New York Times, one can master English, abandon one’s foreign ways, marry a descendent of the Mayflower, buy a suburban house, hold a managerial job, but if one’s papers are out of order, out the door you go. And in the process, one doesn’t exactly get white glove treatment. After all, we’re talking about foreigners, not Americans, which is why the rights taken for granted by those of holding the U.S. passports (and how many of us did anything to deserve that great good luck) simply don’t apply. Let’s not kid ourselves. Sorting, sifting, identifying, restricting, detaining, deporting, involve the organized use of coercive power, not the voluntary changes in identity or affiliation of which our beloved assimilation story speaks. Of course, only an imp-like ethnic like me, several generations removed from the swamp, and still not assimilated would speak so rudely to his help. So without further ado, I will now attend to the business at hand.

As Victor Nee has argued, in his eloquent recent defense of assimilation as having continued relevance, assimilation entails a reduction in ethnic difference. While that definition accurately describes the way which social scientists have generally understood assimilation, it begs the question of how an intellectual problematic should be defined and why. Surely a reduction in difference is a curious way to define the problem, such as in the very formulation that ethnic difference is somehow a phenomenon of an anomalous sort. Moreover the scholarship on migration tells us exactly the opposite. The advent of international migration is the normal recurrent social outcome. Networks of information, goods and services regularly extend beyond the limits of state institutions, which is why foreigners, those ethnically different people, keep on showing up. In part, this is simply a story of capitalist economies relentlessly expanding beyond the ambient of any national

society. In part, it's a story of the problem solving strategies of the migrants who used their most important resource, that is to say each other, to consolidate networks linking here and there. And which in turn makes it easier for the poor to try to exploit the rich for the purpose of their own. Whatever it's causes, international migration is a native, not alien phenomenon. Even though nation states like the United States would like to pretend otherwise.

If the sociology of immigrations, let's just summarize, nicely illuminates the origins and persistence of international migration, it can't explain its disruptive potential, since the conflicts and dilemmas generated by international migration escape the terms constructed by the conventional attempts. Knowing why immigrants are welcomed as workers, doesn't explain why they turn out to be unwanted as people, or at least less popular once they are perceived as people. The strangest one aboard turn out to be so unpopular, because their arrival collides with the efforts of nation state societies to keep themselves separate from the world. We need remind ourselves that the very word immigration is a euphemism of an inherently obstinate sort. What we mean is international migration, which explicitly signals a process whereby outsiders move in to a territorially defined delimited nation state, exclusion therefore so there are distinguishing characteristic of liberal nationalism. Universalism reins among those lucky enough to be born within the boundaries of the nation state or to have somehow become its legitimate members. As for the outsiders, however, it's just their tough luck. Though it should be obvious, the brand of liberalism which United States currently professes in theory, even though contradicting it in practice, it is just another particularism, a fact largely unremarked by our literature. As you just heard, who we are as a people is a relational matter defined in contrast to alien and external states and people because international migrations takes aliens from outside the states territory and brings them inside. The aliens' arrival triggers reactions aimed at bounding the nation and cutting off those extra territorial linkages that international migration inevitably puts in place. If the modern democratic state is a state of and for the people, the range of outsiders against home closes itself off, demonstrates the boundaries of the nation it encloses.

From 1880 through 1943, the history of American immigration and citizenship policy tells a single story, not just of advertising restriction but also of a state increasingly active in shaping national boundaries and the power with instruments to do so. Once begun, restriction developed a momentum and logic of its own. The exclusion of a single category, the Chinese, providing the vocabulary, motives and organizational capacity required for the subsequent exclusion of panoply of others. By severing those forms of association and activity that we now call transnational communities, restriction yields an alignment of state and society, which was then unprecedented, but through sociological theories as you've just heard have come to be regarded as normal. In retrospect, it is hard to overlook the organized state efforts at compulsory assimilation. The school provided the means by which the state turned the children of peasants into Americans. Of course, that effort entailed other objectives consistent with Americanization. Most notably, ensuring the peasants' children would absorb the dispositions required by good, that's to say disciplined factory workers, but as contemporary records also tell us, it convinced the immigrant children that they were Americans of a decidedly second class. All the more

reason for yesterday's second generation to distant themselves from their parents' stigmatized worlds.

The immigration of the 1880 to 1920 period, and its long time absorption, also took place in a period of rising American nationalism in which the United States projected itself as an increasingly self-conscious and important act or on the world stage, even as it saw itself as more vulnerable to the threats from overseas. That development didn't just induce a higher, more intense level of national solidarity, as shown by the demise of German-American during WWI and the dissemination of its cultural institutions. The widening scope of the U.S.'s international engagements also entailed a popular state sponsored rearrangement of the range of acceptable affiliations.

The refugee crises of the late 30's offered a further case in restriction's small Democratic underpinnings. The paper walls erected by a Roosevelt administration eager to appease an anti-Semitic public effectively kept the German and western quotas under-subscribed right up through the eve of WWII. Thereafter, the door shut tight and with no fuss. The ardently assimilationist but dearly fearful American Jews preferred to close their ears to the dreadful news from abroad, opting for private ineffectual pleadings with their beloved Roosevelt. Perhaps, their timidity was not eternally misplaced, as suggested by the fate of the Japanese Americans. After all, the internment had all the marks of ethnic cleansing, absent the irrevocable act of expelling the outsider from the national body. First, the purging of the ethnic leadership, next the identification of the population, third it's ghetto-ization and separation. Perhaps we should remind ourselves that it all happened without protest. The ordinariness of the internment testified to the "taken for granted distinction" between an ethnic sized American people and the outsiders who had been admitted into the territory of the United States but never accepted into its people.

Now surely you'll object, this story of compulsory assimilation can't possibly explain the avidity with which the immigrants of yours sought to don the American garb. And what type of immigrant's son would I be if I didn't agree? But it also seems fair to argue that the earlier immigrants were particularly well suited to accept the humiliation rituals that entry into the American people previously entailed. After all, the peasant migrants of the turn of the 20th century didn't need a sociology professor to tell them they were expected to act as inferiors, as that was a lesson they had absorbed in the old world where the peasants' stigmatized status relative to women or aristocrats was beyond question. Moreover, the peculiar internally contrasted nature of the American "ethnocracy" gave the migrants and their descendents special additional reason to put distance between themselves and their disreputable origins. Race and racial difference were part of the warp and woof of America for the turn-of-the-last-century immigrants. Though it was bewildering to the greenhorn who stepped off the boat as a racial naive, the pressures of American society made one quickly pick up a new tone. The struggle for place in a contested ethnic order provided ample motivations for the newcomers to resolve any ambiguity over how their racial identity was to be defined. Labor competitions furnished additional incentives. Though, as the Italians often found themselves paired against the Irish and the Irish against the Germans, the conflict over jobs does not suffice to explain why they all became white.

Today's literature concludes that the answer lies in the quote "wages of whiteness" above and beyond the material with a physical benefits generated by distance from America's most stigmatized grouping and the reassurance that whiteness provided to immigrants was migration to the new world otherwise entailed a succession of indignities. Thus, they once were the immigrants of the southern eastern and even northern Europe who eventually became one. Which is another way of saying that race is an achieved, not an ascribed status, one can try to reconcile this observation with the assimilation story that my colleague is trying to tell. Contending that racial perceptions change as the Irish poles, Italians and Jews moved ahead and were then able to move among the same people that had previously held them in contempt. But this formulation leaves out the contrast of element in becoming white. The immigrants and their descendents also became party to strategies of social closure that maintained black exclusion and ensured more stable employment and better wages for others of their own kind. Consequently, the survival strategies have produced Italian or Eastern European concentration from steel, auto, construction and other industries were soon turned into something else, mechanisms for preventing African Americans from getting into the door.

Consequently, what this debate takes for granted that the immigrants of Europe assimilated, simply obscures the much uglier reality, that the American Nation they joined was thoroughly racialized, incomplete, and in fundamental contradiction with the democratic principles it about. If the children of the southern and eastern European immigrants joined a highly imperfect American nation, it was nonetheless a better, more democratic nation than the one their parents had originally encountered. Moreover, it is the immigrants, and in particular their descendents, who deserve much of the credit for that change. Whereas the immigrants may have been willing to settle for honkey work and dego jobs, their children wanted more, though not fully self-respected, they had, nonetheless, been effectively acculturated unlike their parents. The immigrant's offspring had absorbed the American creed. Which is why they resented the everyday ethnocentrism they encountered, not to speak of the ethnocentric and autocratic regimes of the factories in which they worked. Resentment bred revolt in the form of the mass union organizing drives and support for the deformed American welfare state that took shape precisely when the last second generation grew up.

Most importantly, the tumultuous times of the 1930's changed the structure of the world, reducing the economic disparities between higher and lower skilled workers in ways that profoundly facilitated the ethnic factory worker's search for a better life. Thus the success that this debate pretends to celebrate had little to do with the diffusionary processes highlighted by the sociology of assimilation. Contrary to received wisdom, the children of the immigrants didn't join the mainstream; they engaged in collective revolt against it. The results of their efforts produced a more equal America, now sadly departed. For a period that coincided with our economy's golden age, that more equal America gave the immigrants' grandchildren access to the middle class. Of course, the **fusty and bargain** by which the American's system of social provision was built, its dependent on employment to provide social provision, and it's failure to recover precisely those sectors in which African American workers where most people concentrated meant that the price of ethnic progress was black exclusion.

Let me now briefly say to the turn of the 21st century. It shouldn't take a pseudo Californian like me to tell you New Yorker's that in a golden state and not just there it's foreignness, not assimilation that so many sectors of the American economy want. After all, somebody has to mow the lawns, clean the dishes, sew the clothes, wash the floors, water the cows, pluck the chickens, clean the fish and the best somebody to do those jobs we treat so un-respectfully is someone who's alien characteristics qualify them as not fully a person, and therefore, someone who can be peacefully ignored. As that fringe benefit, the immigrant some bodies possess a status less entitled that of natives and operate with a dual frame of reference, evaluating conditions, here in light of the much inferior standards that prevail back there. In the process, ethnic differences made in the United States, are not simply that the immigrants don't hire themselves or that it's American employers who make the discriminations between natives and foreigners, concluding that the latter are the right people for the wrong jobs. Rather, the people who take immigrant jobs subsequently find themselves defined by the characteristics of the things they do, which is why it was called **dego** work in the early 20th century or honkey work early 20th century is Mexican work in the 21st. That unacceptable work that is acceptable to the immigrants is just a further sign of their disrespectability. The stigma attached to low-level occupations and significantly to the disrepute immigrants, suffers on grounds of ethnic and national origins alone. The second generation may move above the bottom-level positions occupied by the migrant generation, but it is hard for them to fully escape the shadow cast by the stigma associated with the lowly pursuits of their parents. If not welcome, immigrants are somebody wanted as long as they think their long-term future, and most important that of their dependents, lies somewhere else.

But whoa the tide be sold immigrants when they decide that they suddenly want to assimilate into the United States, at which point it certainly turned out that they are not wanted after all. It's not enough for immigrants on American soil to simply contribute to the public good. The cost of providing all those foreigners with public goods is just too much, which is why we create "made in the USA" distinctions between hard working, law-abiding residents who deserve to be treated like Americans and those who don't. And even those foreigners, shall we call them immigrants, deemed worthy to fall back on the public safety net, don't thereby qualify for full membership in the national club. Citizenship, after all, is too precious a commodity to provide to all those on American soil that play by the rules. When the non-citizen residents insist that they really do want membership in the club, no small number of true blue Americans gets offended at the nerve of these outsiders who think that they are entitled to be one of "us". But just a moment before, the very same immigrants were indicted for their eagerness to live in America without wanting to be Americans. In any case, one can always narrow the door by refusing the funda-bureaucrats needed to process immigrant's efforts at naturalization. Though as I'm claiming to be a social scientist, I need to insist that it's nationalization, not naturalization that is the topic on the table.

Let me also note that the barriers to citizenship yield an additional convenience, namely that of having a class of persons that has no affective say, a fringe benefit that would be too unremarkable to deserve much comment were it not for the fact that it tells us that the society and polity of the United States increasing diverge; not a good thing for any democratic state. All of which is to say, that in a contemporary world internal

boundaries aren't simply defined by ethnicity as sociology of assimilation insists. Instead, the crucial categorical memberships also derived from the political organization of the contemporary migration regime. After all, when we say an undocumented immigrants or non-citizens or alias or refugees, we would further a purely administrative and can only be understood within the context of the state system. These are not the properties of persons; no one is born a refugee and therefore, bears no relationship to either race or ethnicity conventionally defined. They are rather the results of the action of a state deliberately and self-consciously seeking to delaminate a nation that is significantly smaller than the people who are resident within its territory. And can the American state do any differently than it does? Well, during the last year of mass migration, it could. The rules regarding membership could be relatively lax. After all, why bother about the procedures under which foreigners become citizens if citizens don't get much from the state. Likewise, the spectacle of foreign nationals voting in state and local elections as they did in the 19th century was no reason to protest since state and local governments main job was to get out of the way. But the situation is different when membership actually yields privileges, whether in the form of access to public votes or concrete benefits distributed to those deemed either needy or meritorious.

But somewhat differently, the mass migrations of the turn of the 21st century belong to the welfare state era which is why the national collectively has be clearly defined and distinguished form of those who don't belong regardless of whether they are found on the territory of the United States or not. Thus, the coercive power of the American state is kept busily working, affecting dissimilation by keeping the world out and creating distinctions among residents of different types to be sure the United States is also accepting lots of foreigners and turning them into Americans. To put it that way however, makes it clear that we are not talking about assimilation into a so-called mainstream, but rather the substitution of one particular community for another. I don't mean to impute particularism as such. After all, the importance of belonging is one of the few sociological maxims that we possess. But by defining our topic as a construction of an American nation, separate and distinct from the world that would like to join us, we are departing from the realm of euphemism and describing things as they truly are. Thanks.

Victor Nee

Professor Waldinger offers no positive argument as an alternative to assimilation and no new conceptions for what immigrants do after they come to the United States. Clearly, Professor Waldinger has a strong aversion for the concept and experience of assimilation which he views entirely negatively as fostered by American state, driven by distaste for immigrants as foreigners despite it's appetite for foreign labor. Professor Waldinger opposes the use of assimilation as a social science concept. He appears to be troubled by the idea that immigrants may be assimilating. Professor Waldinger is certainly entitled to his opinions. Suffice it to say, that almost all serious work on immigration uses assimilation as the core concept, including the work by critiques of the concept; economists who study labor markets write about economic assimilation of immigrants; demographers organize the studies of internal migration of immigrants in terms of their spatial assimilation; field linguistics study the cultural adaptation of

immigrants and their children write about linguistic assimilation; sociologists who worry about the persistence of racism on the children of poor immigrants pose the problem of segmented assimilation. Virtually all the empirical work on contemporary immigration agrees that immigrants are assimilating. And the debate is over the uneven rate at which assimilation is occurring. Professor Waldinger seems to place himself in opposition to the concept of assimilation without offering even a clue of an alternative concept. I find this less than satisfactory. With the absence of an alternative concept or theory, Professor Waldinger has reduced expressing elusive cursive manner entertaining, what sounds to me to be personal objections one, which is not likely to influence how scholars organize their research.

What troubles me most about Professor Waldinger's statement is disparagement of the idea of assimilation, not only for social scientists but also for immigrants. Assimilation is a multi-generation social process that emerges often from the unintended consequences of immigrants' everyday choices as they and their descendents adapt to life in American society. Let me outline an important state in this process. Immigrants, like native-born Americans, aspire to a better life for themselves and their children. Otherwise they would not voluntarily endure the sacrifices and hardships of international migration. Their hopes and aspirations are often focused on very practical matters. They want to have a good job, to live in a safe neighborhood, to have access to good schools, and, above all, they hope for a better future for their children. These aspirations cannot be realized under the conditions of racial segregation. One of the most consistent findings of the social sciences is that racial segregation and isolation invariably imposes harmful affects. Not surprising, many immigrants exhibit stable preference for assimilation. Unfortunately, Professor Waldinger's deconstruction of assimilation is an exercise that is not concerned about what immigrants want. It is instead, a critique based on the views of a thoroughly assimilated American who argues before this assembly that assimilation for the new immigrants from Asia and Africa Latin America is somehow negative.

Recently, I met a new assistant professor at Cornell University. She was born in Cambodia, her parents were 3rd generation descendents of immigrants to that country. In wartime Cambodia, the Kemarouge arrested her parents as she found herself shifted from one labor camp to another during the years 10 to 13, alone without parents and siblings. When the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia, she escaped from the labor camp during the Kemarouge retreat. Her scattered family, one by one, returned to her home, which had been taken over by the Kemarouge for use as a factory. The family then migrated to Thailand, and, then from there immigrated to the United States when she was 15 years old. After arriving in southern California, her parents decided they did not want to live in a ghetto with fellow Southeast Asian refugees. They moved to Minnesota to a community south of Minneapolis. She won a scholarship to Notre Dame and after graduating entered the PHD program at the Sloan School of Management at MIT. To be sure that this is a memorable story, but stories such as this one of the new Cornell professor, is not that uncommon. In fact, it's quite common in a post Civil Rights Era America. The institution changes are significant which are not acknowledged by Professor Waldinger's remarks. Professor Waldinger's implicit framework disparages such stories. Instead he emphasizes the view of immigrants as degraded, unskilled laborers and illegal migrants

not protected by the rule of law. He ignores the much more positive experience of so many legal immigrants such as our assistant professor.

A careful reading of Professor Waldinger's written remarks reveals errors of facts and interpretation. For example, the US is not the only society that has engaged in reinforcing ethnic distinctions within its own boundaries. Professor Waldinger conveniently forgets the British, the Germans, and the French who stripped Jews of their citizenship during WWII as well as the Japanese.

The main problem I see in the statement from Professor Waldinger is that it stems from an unwillingness to consider seriously what immigrants and their children really want. They want what other Americans want: opportunities to secure social status, personal fulfillment and material well-being. These opportunities are most abundantly found in the mainstream of American society. This is why immigrants of all races show a stable preference for assimilation. That is not state imposed, but based on self-interest and therefore, entirely voluntary.

Roger Waldinger

Argumentative fellow that I am, I'm still sensible enough to find merit in much of what my distinguished colleague has just said. The United States encountered by the international migrants in the turn of the 21st century is a nation state society far more liberal than the one that greeted their predecessors of a century ago. To be sure, the American nation retains the ethnicratic input with which it was born. While we understand that one can be arrested for driving while black, it seems preposterous to imagine that one can be arrested for driving while white. Proof that the American people remains incomplete with advantage so embedded in the life of the privileged group that they take it for granted, unaware that their acceptance alludes other Americans even if acceptance is a goal to which they keenly aspire. But it is certainly true that the importance of that ascribed characteristic we label race or ethnicity has significantly declined for Americans Africans, Asian, or Latin American descent, the probability of discrimination, that is to say unequal treatment is significantly lower today than in the bad old pre-civil rights days. Which is not to say that Americans are treated equally regardless of ethnic stripes, or as my colleague seems to assert, that the happier outcome today derives from the natural evolution of the liberal social order, as opposed to the contention results of hard thought historical struggles still not complete. But yes dear colleague, we have surely come a long way.

Still the image of the civilly civil society that you have drawn is largely a matter of perspective in which the less civil world of states, which is what makes it migration into immigration, simply disappears. Talking about the freedom of mobility, in so doing you have forgotten about the border that separates the United States from the world. You have also forgotten that membership in the American people is no less an ascribed characteristic than race, ethnicity, gender or anything else. For the most part, one is born an American, an extraordinary advantage, really a blessing in which no one I've encountered ever seems so fully meritoriously have to justify our exclusion of the campus outsider who also wants in. But discriminate against non-Americans we do, which is why moving from Taiwan to San Diego is so much harder than the longer move from New York to LA.

Moreover, we discriminate through the institutional mechanisms of the American state. Doing so in the most illiberal way, mainly by camping as much of a militarized force on our border as we can. The consequences are damped. The rising toll of mortality of the U.S.-Mexico border, not to speak of the toll exacted on our behalf at the border that separates Mexico from its neighbors on the south tells us just how intent we are on maintaining a separate distinctive American people and how illiberal those efforts are. Rather than recognizing the humanity of those who aren't quite like us, it's their humanity that we prefer to extinguish. If you think that I exaggerate, take a look at the annual reports of the immigration service in which it boasts of its growing efficiency, not just at turning away people at the border but of deporting persons in the interior of the United States as well. And though immigration officials have shown no similar interests in controlling or monitoring employers who avidly recruit immigrants who don't legally belong; our policy makers have been very keen to build legal walls between foreigners and nationals, to significantly complicate passage from one status to the other. As a far better Californian needless to say, my friend over there, the imposter who contly stands before you, he can surely tell you that the typical grower in California Central Valley never met an illegal immigrant he didn't like or know how to use. But what the presentation we just heard didn't tell us is that illegality is an enduring "made in America" source of distigma adding to the injuries of quest and expanding to all those associated with what could be descendent from or could be mistaken for the very illegals who the Americans want but would prefer not to accept.

Now let me make a different point. Though my colleague has told a story about the disappearance of ethnic difference, I have to remind him that his story is set in a society in which class differences have grown precisely during the period during which the foreign born population is expanded. It's not simply that the United States that greets the turn of the 21st Century immigrants is a far more unequal society than the one in which the descendents of the turn of the 20th century immigrants gained acceptance. The immigrants of contemporary America have also been converging on those places, New York, Los Angeles, the bay area of Chicago, in which inequality takes it's most severe form. While a large portion of today's immigrants come equipped with the skills capital and related traits needed to prosper in America's divided cities, a portion no less large, if not larger, falls into the ranks of the very least skills. Low skills, that is to say, schooling well below the high school level, spell more than low wages at the very start. They spell low wages of the long term, thanks to circumstances that will keep them depressed or at least growing at a pace far slower than those with higher skills with a foreign native born. After all, now is a bad time to be a low skilled worker regardless of ethnic stripes. Moreover, that condition gets surly aggravated among less skilled immigrants precisely because their tendency to converge on America's larger cities, leads them to compete with one another for the same set of lousy jobs. And as the wage structure is systematically different in the places of high concentration, such that the returns to low skills is even more depressed, New York, LA than in the places to which immigrants generally don't go, the situation still gets more severe. Struggling at the bottom, less skilled immigrants are also stuck in the city, where transit-housing markets do them no good. Whether it's LA or New York the basic story is the same: what America did for the descendants of the last immigrant wave, it's not doing today, and namely building

housing that can be obtained at a relatively low cost. And so population's densities are building up in our immigrant cities where the low earning immigrants are competing for ever more expensive housing of diminished quality even as their children are confined to failing inner city schools.

But if the road to membership in the America Nation is impeded, and that's what I'm talking about, a nation building process that the alternative conceptualization to assimilation, I do have hope the low-skilled immigrants of today may comprise a class of willing hellups but not forever and their children will surely be raised to fight for their piece of the American dream, not to speak of that particular vision of the good life to which their fellow New Yorkers or Californians have long aspired. Attaining that dream may not be easy, but as I argued earlier, the children of the last great migration showed that it could be done. And in California, if not some of New York, there were stirrings of change propelled by an immigrant and ethnic electric that are impatient to enjoy the American dream. Let us await exciting times.

David Grusky

We can now open up to questions from the audience to be directed to any of our debaters or, of course, Janet Reno as well.

Question:

I have more like a comment; most of you are debating two different things. Throughout the argument in a way you (directed to Dr. Waldinger) you had at first redefined what the question was originally. It's sort of different from what your counterpart had begun to explain. The difference in what racism and what, it seems that the first argument was more about how race is and assimilation is more about the work place and the way in which an individual can now obtain a certain level of social maturation within the community whereas your argument is more towards well there are no racial differences today, people consider other members of the community of races to be at different levels with that because they're low skill workers or not because they just needed two different arguments in a way and having difficulty really understanding what the question is. So I wonder if anyone could explain what the initial question is, how you are supposed to find that question.

Victor Nee

I understood the question, which David Grusky gave me, was the debate over the question of assimilation and are immigrants assimilating into American society today. And the point of difference really, is that I have emphasized that we are a different society from the society that used to legally sanction racial discrimination, morally sanctioned it, and ideologically supported it. And that this has made a difference in the sense that for the first time we do have an immigration regime which has opened the boundaries of legal immigration to include countries that used to be excluded and that the legal immigrants who have come here have rights as permanent residents, they have rights that they can exercise to naturalize; and that they as citizens and their children as American born citizens, though they may be discriminated against informally, have rights that allow them predictable chances to move into the mainstream of the American culture

and society. Not simply through the labor market, I just talked about that, but also in every sense. One of the students I met recently, a Korean-American, second generation, but she developed a tremendous interest in Tango and Latin American culture and identified with this Latin American culture as an assimilated second generation American. And she lived to Tango, eventually was going to Argentina to study the Tango. Well, in a way, that's what it is all about that we are able to leave the- and certainly we have our ethnic identities and they are important, and that we are members of ethnic groups, but if that is all that we are, all that matters, we would be worse off as a society. And so that's what it's about, the basic constitution of American society as we entered into a new millennium, more diverse racially and ethnically, that we are happily governed by rules that are universalistic rules. This provides a framework for which we can work together, cooperate and compete as a society, diverse and finding strength in that diversity rather than murderous division and conflict. Now I think that this is a very important debate because for a long time sociologists have been sort of negative about the prospects for the society. They have emphasized negative aspects of race, to be sure it's there, but this is something needs to be done by an acknowledgment of the achievements that this society has made in remaking itself into a society that doesn't pride itself in racism and has made it illegal and a society that has sought peacefully without the lynching of whites we used to have in the late 19th and early 20th century to incorporate large numbers of people who are different from the mainstream and provide them with opportunities to either stay in their ethnic communities or to join the mainstream that are predictable. Not everybody does and there is a great deal of inequality, but we have gone a long ways from the society that used to be when I was a young person growing up in southern California before the Civil Rights movement, that society was an apartheid society, a society that had legal rules that reinforced racial separatism. And I think that this is the nature of the debate. Assimilation has been given a bad name, I think that it's undeserved because in fact when we listen to what people actually want, the immigrants and their children, they want what sociologists say they don't want, the shouldn't want, but in fact they want it and the sociologists are dispiriting the aspirations in a way of not being fair to the people we study.

Roger Waldinger

Well, I mean, I think that there are a variety of reasons why one might be confused as to what the question is and in part I think what I suggested right in the beginning was posed to start away. So what you heard was excessively polarized discussion of alternative points of view. We need to distinguish between a concept that is some way understanding the world and then the description of the world as it is. I mean what I'm proposing is rather than thinking in terms of assimilation that we think of this in terms of the process of the building of an American nation that is distinct and separate from the world that joins it. That is why if someone is favor of assimilation of American society, why shouldn't we be in favor of assimilation to global society I mean after all the world is coming to us. That's precisely what the process of immigration is about and it is the diffusion of said cultural norms from the United States but which the United States shares increasingly with the rest of the world. So what is hidden in the assimilation talk is the underlying nationalism that is behind this project of the building of the American people.

I don't think there is such a thing as an American society. It presumes precisely what I think of reality of immigration implies. That is to say the ten percent of the people living in the United States have significant ties to other places so that immigration is a process where by social boundaries are blurred. What we want to understand is I think is how the two aspects of this process. One having to do whereby the world comes to the United States and the other whereby there is a reaction to the advent of the world and something separate and distinct from the world is created and maintained and reproduced. And I think that immigrants have an aspiration to membership in the American people, there isn't any question about that. But on the other hand the American people simply institutionally is an entity that significantly smaller than the number of people resident in the United States and it's set up in such a way so as to exclude people. Why don't we grant citizenship to anybody who is here for five years? Why do we make it difficult? Why is it that, I mean we have a large undocumented population and we know from the previous experience with amnesty that the undocumented population by and large consist of people working hard, obeying the law, operating the precise frame work that they choose to stay. But we exclude them deliberately, that process of exclusion can be understood within the frame work of a nation building point of view but not, I think, from the notion of assimilation in which doesn't see the nation, simply operates from within the boundaries of a country and doesn't see those boundaries and the efforts to keep that country to stand.

Victor Nee

I think an important difference is that I acknowledged that we live in a world of nation states. That the United States, there's China, there's Japan, there's Europe and that nation states whether we like it or not exist. And that I think Roger isn't being fair to the United States because if you compared the immigration policy that we have with that of Japan, which excludes entirely does not allow immigrants to come to Japan. China doesn't allow immigrants. In Europe they do allow immigrants but they do not give them the same type of citizenship, which we offer to immigrants, a legal process that is universal. Indeed you can say that the United States is emerging at the first universal society in which we acknowledge equality of rights for all who are citizens and we set out procedures that are fair to all people by which they become citizens. Now I think that that is an achievement and certainly one that is imperfect, that is subject to abuse, that may be unfair to those who want to enter illegally, but on the other hand there are those who apply for legal admission are being dealt with unfairly by those who ignore the law and ignore the procedures. So this is pretty basic difference. I'm a realist; I understand that the world is made up of nation states that this nation state has in my view a fair immigration policy better than those of other nation states that we are involved with that provide more fundamental rights than the French, the German and the Japanese nation states. And so with that said, I don't think Roger is being entirely fair in portraying American immigration policies in such a negative light.

Question

(Too much interference to get all)..And I was interested in what everyone thought about the idea of being American. Sometimes when I think about it, I think its part of the

times. After we lived increasingly in a multicultural society where a part of the very difficult. (incomplete)

Victor Nee

I think that is a really good question and this is what makes me in a way optimistic for this country in the future is that we, within the framework of the rules of the law we allow for multiple identities, multiple sub-cultures. You can get into any one of these sub-cultures on a voluntary free basis. And so there is not a monolithic assimilation into a monolithic culture, that's not against the rules in all respected and we've expect the fundamental dignity as of rights of the people of color or who are white not white that we can exist in a civil society with many, many different identities even one person can maintain in different sub-cultures and so it's not a homogenous culture that we are part of but a culture that has tremendous diversity that, nearing the diversity of the society ethnically. I think that is a very healthy aspect of the new millennium in which the United States exist as a culture which has a certainly we have many short comings, but one reason why all the people over the world are interested in American culture is partly because there is this vitality that you just pointed to.

Question

I think also I never personally considered what being American really meant until I'd been abroad. I've been to Venezuela and I think it's interesting view not that separation and knowledge can identify how other people view Americans but how you consider yourself, what it means to be American. And even if it may involve modern of identities of cultures and what not, it still I think statistics kind of could be a little more unified if not monolithic view of what American society is.

Question

Professor Waldinger seemed to think that the experience would get better through improved enforcement and other forms of equality improving laws. What do you feel of steps either at the grass roots level that would improve the experience of being American?

Professor Waldinger

Well I think implicitly what I've argued is that what we describe as the assimilation of the sentiments of the last great migration involved the creation of a more equal society, in which incomes were re-distributed from richer to poorer Americans in terms of which, an array of government programs whether direct or indirect such as the VA mortgages that were made available after WWII, could be accessed by persons of relatively modest means and relatively low school, relatively modest school. My argument is that migrations in the United States in the turn of the 21st century has occurred at a very different time in which inequality is rising rather than diminishing The impact of that is greatest upon that very significant portion of the immigrant population that lacks the skills to effectively compete. Clearly there are lots of employers who want to hire low skilled immigrants. The problem is what is that immigrants with eight, nine, ten years of schooling or less and little English proficiency have very limited opportunity to move

ahead. And so the crucial means of the way I think to produce acceptance and full membership in the American people is to affect some type of redistribution of resources that would facilitate life and work for immigrants and other Americans who have lower skill and who are particularly hurt in this type of labor market.

David Grusky

I'm going to turn over the floor to Janet Reno now for some closing comments.

Janet Reno

I found the debate very interesting but I think it should have been how do we address the question of inequality with respect to immigrants, first legal, and then undocumented. And I think one of the problems we face in America today, is that one of the debaters said that housing was a problem. Well housing is a problem for people who were born here and it is one of the major problems we face. Education is a problem. Education is a problem in almost every state in this nation as we face critical budget shortages that are making our schools more burdened than ever before. We watch jobs go to other countries because the labor can be provided much more inexpensively and we watch cities' crime rise accordingly. What we face here is a country that needs to address both for our immigrants and for those that came before them because we all came at one time or another, how we build a community and a nation that makes an investment in it's people both immigrant and non-immigrant, to give them the best shot at self-sufficiency, independence and a quality of life worth living. And I think that that applies to both immigrants and citizens. I think we can do it but we're going to have to realize that one of the restraints is our immigrants and we have got to bring them along as part of the issue. I look at assimilation and I see a community that has in many respects not assimilated in south Florida, the Cuban community, a very strong community, a community that has affected a city but as one Cornell student told me yesterday, or day before yesterday, it is a community that I feel like when I go home to it I'm going to another country. Well, I don't feel that way, but that's an extreme statement of why I think assimilation is not the issue. The issue is how we provide equality for all Americans including those who have come to our shore to live and to become permanent residents, and ultimately citizens.

David Grusky

I would like to thank Victor Nee and Roger Waldinger, our two debaters, and Janet Reno our moderator.