SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF JONATHAN HISKEY

I, Jonathan Hiskey, declare as follows:

I make this declaration based on my own personal knowledge and if called to testify I could and would do so competently as follows:

I. Qualifications

1. I am currently an Associate Professor of Political Science at Vanderbilt University. I also serve as Associate Chair of the department and Director of Graduate Studies for the Political Science graduate program. In addition, I have a courtesy appointment as Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology at Vanderbilt University.

2. I received my Ph.D. from the University of Pittsburgh in 1999, winning the 2001 American Political Science Association’s Gabriel A. Almond award for best dissertation in comparative politics. After spending five years on the faculty of the political science department the University of California-Riverside, I joined Vanderbilt University in 2005.

3. My research interests center on migration and local development in Latin America. I have engaged in extensive research and published a number of articles in leading academic journals on these topics. I was a contributor and co-editor of a special volume of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science entitled “Continental Divides: International Migration in the Americas” (July 2010) as well as co-author of a 2014 article in Studies in Comparative International Development entitled “Democracy, Governance, and Emigration Intentions in Latin American and the Caribbean.”

4. As a basis for this opinion, I rely upon three decades of research and fieldwork on issues of local development and migration across Latin America. In preparing this declaration, I have also reviewed three declarations: those of Tae D. Johnson, Thomas Homan, and Ronald Vitiello.
II. Opinions

5. I previously reviewed the declarations of Philip T. Miller and Traci A. Lembke, which cite my work as co-author of the 2014 Americas Barometer Report as justification for detention practices towards women and children who have recently arrived from Central America and are seeking asylum in the United States. I found that their conclusion that detention would deter the migration of this population was not supported by my work, its underlying research, or theoretical framework; further, no empirical research supported their position.

6. The Johnson, Homan, and Vitiello declarations similarly offer no valid or reliable empirical justification for the detention practices at issue. After reviewing these declarations, my prior opinion remains unchanged.

7. The three new declarations largely reiterate claims made in the Miller and Lembke declarations regarding the imputed motivations of family migrants. The only additional piece of evidence is a theorized causal link between family detention policies and a short-term decrease in the number of Central American families apprehended inside the border. Vitiello Dec. ¶ 14.

8. There is no basis for the claim that a short-term decrease in the number of apprehensions demonstrates a deterrent effect of any sort. As a matter of simple social science methodology, the claim falls short, as it does not test any alternative causes for the short decline. There may be several causes for the decline, including seasonal variations in migration, which tends to decrease in colder months.

9. Moreover, in my estimation, one likely cause of the decline in individuals reaching the U.S. border is the Mexican government’s recent crackdown on Central American immigration. Mexican government statistics, both released in reports and to journalists, reflect a dramatic increase in deportation efforts as a result of the “Southern Border Plan,”
which was announced in the summer of 2014. For example, in the first two months of 2015, Mexico deported 25,069 Central Americans, as opposed to 12,830 in the corresponding months of 2014. Mexican deportations of children reflected a similarly dramatic increase across the same time period: 3,289 minors were deported in January and February, as opposed to 1,605 in January and February of 2014. Other figures released by the Mexican government to journalists reflect the deportation of 24,000 women and 23,000 children in 2014 – which is a 200% increase in the numbers deported in 2013. Ceteris paribus, such increased enforcement efforts on the part of the Mexican government should result in a lower number of Central American migrants arriving at the U.S. border.

10. Given the steep escalation in Mexico’s deportation efforts, the detention of women and children seeking asylum in the United States seems further unlikely to exert a deterrent effect. If the declarations are correct, and efforts are being made to publicize the risks of migration, then the families who are choosing to travel do so with knowledge of not only the prior risks but the new Mexican deportation efforts. Homan Dec. ¶ 6. Detention of those asylum seeking families who still continue to migrate across Mexico and into the United States despite this knowledge of increased risk would then represent a choice to detain those
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individuals who likely have the strongest reasons to flee their homes because of violence and persecution.

III. Conclusion

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the District of Columbia that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 15th day of April, 2015, at Nashville, TN.

Jonathan Hiskey, Ph.D.