

Table of Contents

<i>Forward</i> by David Horowitz	5
<i>Introduction: Open Borders in a Time of Terror</i>	9
The Ford Foundation Creates A Movement	14
MALDEF: Mainstreaming The Radical Agenda	22
Major Open Borders Activist Groups	28
National Immigration Forum	34
American Immigration Lawyers Association	38
The Center for Constitutional Rights	42
American Bar Association Commission on Immigration Policy, Practice and Pro Bono	44
American Friends Service Committee	47
National Network for Immigration and Refugee Rights	49
Immigration Defense Project	53
Immigrant Legal Resource Center	54
Migration Policy Institute	57
National Council of La Raza	62
National Immigration Law Center	66
The Open Society Institute	69
Southern Poverty Law Center	70
The Movement At The Grassroots	73
Conclusion	77
Notes	79

Forward

by David Horowitz

There are few issues so important to the life of a nation as the integrity of its borders and the nature of its citizenship. These are issues that define its identity and shape its future. When a nation is at war, moreover, its ability to regulate and control its borders is a security matter of paramount importance.

The following text by William Hawkins and Erin Anderson describes how America's borders have been under assault for forty years with consequences that are measurable and disturbing. The assault has been led by an open borders lobby that is sophisticated and powerful. Many of its components, moreover, have a history of antagonism to American purposes and a record of active support for America's enemies. Its funders are multi-billion dollar entities, who are unaccountable and unscrutinized. They have more discretionary incomes at their disposal to influence these issues than is possessed by either political party, or any business group, or even the federal government itself.

As Hawkins and Anderson show, the open borders campaign was already instrumental in damaging the nation's ability to defend itself before 9/11. Yet not even this terrible event has caused its activists to have second thoughts, or tempered their reckless attacks. Instead, the open borders lobby has expanded its efforts to eliminate America's border controls to include the active defense of terrorists and terrorist organizations and a continuing assault on the very policies the federal government has adopted to defend its citizens from terrorist attacks.

A Ford Foundation newsletter the authors cite features an interview with Georgetown law professor David Cole, a leading academic figure in the open borders campaign, who has written a

book attacking America's immigration laws and their protections against terrorist groups. In the interview, Cole denounces "the criminalization of what the government calls material support for terrorist organizations. This is a practice that was introduced ... through the immigration law,... it criminalizes any support of any blacklisted terrorist organization without regard to whether one's support actually had any connection whatsoever to terrorist activity that the group undertakes."

The Ford Foundation interview with Cole was published with hindsight in September 2003, ten years after the first World Trade Center bombing and two years after the September 11 attack. As Hawkins and Anderson point out, the anti-terrorist law which Professor Cole is denouncing was introduced as legislation and passed during the Clinton Administration in response to the first World Trade Center bombing and other terrorist plots. It was a bipartisan effort to put a check on terrorist support groups that were using the liberties afforded by the American legal system to aid and abet terrorist activities. Shortly after the interview with Cole appeared, it was revealed that the Ford Foundation had granted millions of tax-exempt dollars to terrorist support groups and other radical organizations in the Middle East.¹

The Ford Foundation's sponsorship of Professor Cole in underwriting his book and promoting his conclusions is but a reflection of Ford's larger role as the central funder of the open borders lobby, and the architect of many of its radical agendas. Elsewhere in their text Hawkins and Anderson describe how this \$11 billion leviathan took a small civil rights group called the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund which was based in San Antonio Texas, poured more than \$30 million into its treasury, revamped its political agendas, moved its offices to Washington and turned it into one of the largest and most powerful proponents of radical immigration change in the nation.

Forty years ago, as Hawkins and Anderson observe, the most prominent Hispanic civil rights organization—the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)—supported English as the common national language and assimilation as a citizenship goal. Membership in LULAC was limited to American citizens and its code stated: "Respect your citizenship; honor your country, maintain its traditions in the minds of your children; incorporate yourself in the culture and civilization." Today, as a result in part of the huge financial investment Ford has made in the immigration lobby, no major Hispanic civil rights organization subscribes to these views.

Finally, Hawkins and Anderson show how thoroughly the Ford-funded open borders network is integrated with the traditional American left, including its factions from the old Communist movement. Most prominent among these organizations and a strategic player in the open borders network is the National Lawyers Guild, which began as a Soviet front and has continued its "revolutionary" allegiances since the fall of the Berlin Wall. Today its most celebrated and admired member—as well as one of its chief causes—is attorney Lynne Stewart, who is under federal indictment for aiding and abetting the terrorist activities of Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, the leader of group that bombed the World Trade Center in 1993.

William Hawkins and Erin Anderson have performed an essential public service by tying together the threads of this network and putting its agendas into perspective. The picture they paint is as detailed as it is disturbing and should open a national debate and perhaps congressional hearings on the uses to which taxpayer funds are being directed as the nation faces its post-9/11 threats.

Introduction: Open Borders in a Time of Terror

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, which killed 3,000 Americans, have brought the question of border security to the forefront of the nation's agenda. Even among Hispanics, a U.S. subgroup thought to favor liberal immigration policies, a majority of 56% wanted "tougher immigration [controls] in light of security concerns," according to a national poll commissioned by a Hispanic business magazine in late 2003.

All the terrorists who flew the hijacked airliners into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon had come into the United States from the other side of the world with the intent of carrying out their premeditated plot. America's natural barriers, the great oceans which traditionally have protected America from foreign attacks, failed to provide security in this case because the enemy did not use ballistic missiles or a naval armada. The traditional safety afforded to the United States by the vast oceans separating the country from foreign powers and foreign strife was not breached by ballistic missiles or an invading armada. Our enemies used normal commercial methods of transportation and exploited America's laxity about possible threats from strangers in its midst. The terrorists' visa applications had been rubber-stamped by U.S. consular officials despite flagrant errors and suspicious answers to security-inspired questions. On arrival, the terrorists simply blended in the general population—which already accommodates more than 8 million illegal immigrants—and went about their business of planning mass murder. Half of the 19 hijackers made their deadly 9/11 airline reservations on an Internet travel site.

Since the first World Trade Center bombing by Arab-Muslim fanatics in 1993, forty-eight foreign-born Islamic radicals have been charged, convicted, pled guilty or admitted involvement in terrorism within the United States since 1993. According to a report by the Center for Immigration Studies, 16 of the 48 terrorists were on temporary visas (primarily tourists); 17 were legal permanent residents or naturalized U.S. citizens; 12 were illegal aliens; and 3 had applications for asylum pending (including Ramzi Yousef, the Iraqi mastermind of the 1993 World Trade Center Attack). In addition to the dozen who had entered the country illegally, ten of those who had entered by legal means had subsequently violated the terms of their admission by overstaying their visas. All the 9/11 hijackers entered the U.S. on temporary visas, except Ali Mohammed, a leading member of al Qaeda, who was a naturalized U.S. citizen.

The United States has at sea the largest navy in the world and is developing a national missile defense system to frustrate overt military attacks on the country. But the day-to-day security of its borders is a broken system that has been unable to stop small groups of terrorists, let alone a mass migration that outnumbers the largest armies of history. It is estimated that 700,000 illegal immigrants simply walked across the U.S.-Mexican border last year and moved inland without interception by the thinly deployed Border Patrol. The demographic shifts caused by unregulated mass immigration can have adverse impacts on national stability that rival or surpass the effects of war.

Despite these widely known and universally accepted facts, every major reform of the immigration laws over the last forty years has served to systematically undermine existing protections and controls, to open America's borders wider and to call forth a larger flow of legal and illegal migration.²

The most notable changes came in 1965 and 1986. In the first instance, quotas for people from South America, the Caribbean,

Africa and Asia were lifted, radically altering the composition and rate of legal and illegal immigration, the latter in part because of the geographical proximity of South America to the United States. The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 granted a general amnesty for millions of illegal aliens who had entered the United States prior to 1982. Rather than establish controls over immigration—something considered routine by every other nation in the world—these reforms stimulated a new massive migration and created a vast underground network of illegal aliens and institutional supports for them.

The United States has also experienced explosive growth in the number of foreigners admitted to the country on a "temporarily" basis using "non-immigrant" visas—from seven million admitted in 1980 to nearly 33 million in 2001. There is no set limit to the number of non-immigrant visas that can be issued; it is purely a demand-driven system. Most of these visas go to tourists, visiting relatives or business travelers who do return home. However, many of these temporary immigrants overstay their visas and join the illegal alien population. Like the September 11 terrorists, about 40 percent of the 8-12 million illegal aliens in the United States entered by this initially legal method.

Since the 2001 attacks, there has been a concerted effort to perform better background checks on those applying for visas and to track the movement of foreigners in and out of the country. But as in the case of other reasonable concerns about the porous nature of American borders, there has also been a steady barrage of criticism against reasonable new screening and monitoring programs from well-funded and powerful political interests who promote the idea of "open borders," and other forms internationalism. These radicals dismiss domestic political or security considerations in favor of an alleged higher "human right" to untrammelled migration and the fulfillment of individual agendas over community concerns.

The concept of "open borders" has long been an agenda of the ideological left. Since the 1960s, a vast network—including hundreds of organizations and tens of thousands of grassroots activists, backed by hundreds of millions of dollars from leftwing foundations—has waged a sustained campaign to open America's borders to a mass migration from the Third World. Though these groups talk in terms of "human rights," the rights they demand are not the restrictions on government enshrined in the American Bill of Rights, but the claims on society for "equity" and "welfare" and special treatment for designated groups that are the familiar menu of the left and would, if enacted, amount to a revolution in America's existing social order. Which is precisely their intent.

The "open borders" movement emerged from the radicalism of the 1960s and matured in the fight over amnesty for illegal aliens in the 1980s. It gained a certain mainstream status in the 1990s as the "globalization" and "multilateralism" fads of the decade encouraged talk of a "world without borders" and the decline (even the demise) of the nation-state. At the center of the movement was the Ford Foundation—the largest tax-exempt foundation in the world, and one increasingly guided by the political left.

Under the leadership of McGeorge Bundy (1966-1979), a dissident liberal who broke with President Lyndon Johnson over the war in Vietnam, the Ford Foundation embraced aspects of the New Left assault on American society, for example on the issue of race, funding a radical secession from the New York City School system. Ford bankrolled the creation of new groups like the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) and the National Council of La Raza, expanded the role of established leftwing groups like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and promoted radical Marxist organizations—overtly hostile to American values and purposes—like the National Lawyers Guild. It also was the prime funder of "multiculturalism" in college and university programs, whose effect

was to undermine the concept of a national identity, as Arthur Schlesinger pointed out in a celebrated essay, *The Disuniting of America: Reflections On A Multicultural Society*.³

In the radical perspective, America is an oppressor nation, which significantly depreciates any value that American citizenship might have and justifies a less than solicitous view towards the preservation of American culture and America's borders. One of the more prolific academics promoting the radical viewpoint has been James D. Cockcroft, a New Left radical who has received much of the funding for his work from the Ford Foundation. A characteristic Cockcroft work is *Outlaws in the Promised Land: Mexican Immigrant Workers and America's Future*.⁴ This is a frontal attack on American society, in which Cockcroft argues, "the U.S. working class can *realistically* strengthen its position only when it adds to its fight-back strategy a commitment to the defense of the unorganized and the undocumented." This Ford-sponsored effort also claims that, "since Vietnam, this [U.S.] society has displayed a deepening 'anti-communist, racist, nativist, and class-biased character in its treatment of immigrants and in its immigration policy....it has also experienced a wave of legislative, administrative, and court decisions that may curtail the basic civil rights of not only immigrants but of all U.S. citizens."

The campaign to radically change American values and culture through mass immigration and the political mobilization of the alienated presents a danger to the country that parallels the anti-American agendas of the Islamic *jihad*. Moreover, politically engineered demographic shifts and terrorism are not unrelated. The same communities of recently arrived immigrants (whether legal or not) help create networks used by illegal aliens that provide jobs, housing, and routes of entry into America for other illegals, including criminals and terrorists. Immigrants from strife-torn lands often provide funds for movements engaged in conflict in their homelands, while factions competing for power overseas

frequently have their struggles mirrored within immigrant communities here.

The concerted leftist attempt to radicalize immigrant communities runs the risk that, at the periphery, home-grown terrorist cells will form that will work in conjunction with foreign movements while finding a base of support within the United States. At which time, it will be too late to close the borders. There is already a growing problem with ethnic criminal gangs fighting for turf in major U.S. cities, a form of low-level conflict that could escalate into a form of insurgency as it has in so many other countries.

THE FORD FOUNDATION CREATES A MOVEMENT

The Ford Foundation, which has assets of more than \$11 billion, has focused on immigrants and refugees as a priority since the 1950's. The two groups that have figured most prominently in Ford's strategy to create a large, active pro-open borders movement are the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). Virtually all the funding for MALDEF in its first three decades has come from the Ford Foundation, which has shaped its leadership and its agendas. Far from being the grassroots organization it pretends to be, it is more like a wholly owned subsidiary of Ford.

Hispanic political activity escalated in the turbulent 1960s as it did for blacks and college students. MALDEF, formed in 1967, was among the many new groups. The organization was the idea of attorney Peter Tijerina, an official with the League of United Latin American Citizens chapter in San Antonio. LULAC was a middle class organization of Hispanic professionals and businessman interested in civil rights within the context of American society. Membership was limited to American citizens and

English was its official language, though LULAC's code encouraged the retention of Spanish as one of "the two most essential languages." The LULAC code also stated: "Respect your citizenship; honor your country, maintain its traditions in the minds of your children; incorporate yourself in the culture and civilization."

Looking for a more radical direction, Tijerina sent a member of LULAC to the Chicago convention of the NAACP's Legal Defense Fund (NAACP-LDF) in 1966. Jack Greenberg, head of the NAACP-LDF, set up a meeting for Tijerina with the Ford Foundation. In February, 1968 Tijerina announced he was asking Ford for one million dollars. Ford doubled the request, giving MALDEF \$2.2 million over a five year period to fund civil rights legal services for Mexican Americans.

Peter Tijerina became Executive Director of MALDEF, headquartered in San Antonio. Recent law school graduates and VISTA volunteers joined the staff and a small office was opened in Los Angeles. A network of corresponding attorneys filed suits in MALDEF's name (usually without compensation) and had grown to number approximately 150 by the middle of 1969. Cases across the spectrum from job discrimination to police brutality, school desegregation to voting rights were channeled to MALDEF. MALDEF worked to protect dissidents from legal action, loss of jobs or expulsion from school. The Los Angeles office gave legal advice to hundreds of Chicanos arrested during anti-war marches. MALDEF also worked on draft counseling and on placing Hispanics on local draft boards. By 1973, many Texas cities had draft boards that were half Hispanic.

Flexing its monetary muscle, the Ford Foundation pressured MALDEF to move out of San Antonio and to a city like Washington so it could function as a national force. In 1970, it made San Francisco its headquarters, and opened a Washington office three years later. MALDEF had already acquired a militant

image and had begun advocating bilingual education as a "right" due the Hispanic community. The battle over bilingual education (which has become multilingual as other minority groups joined the fray) has been part of the larger struggle over whether the goal the schools were to support was one of helping minorities and immigrants assimilate into American society or helping them live outside the mainstream American society in their own enclaves. MALDEF's many legal efforts to preserve the monolingual use of Spanish in housing, business and community makes its agenda clear.

At about the same time as MALDEF was relocating its headquarters under Ford pressure, the Foundation was also working to raise the profile of the illegal alien issue within the ACLU. Fair treatment for legal aliens and concern over the deportation process of illegal aliens had always been among the ACLU's concerns. The organization claims that when it was founded in 1920 "civil liberties were in a sorry state and activists were languishing in jail for distributing anti-war literature. Foreign-born people suspected of political radicalism were subject to summary deportation." However, as time went on, these concerns assumed a lower priority and the ACLU did not come out against the use of employer sanctions for the hiring of illegal immigrants until 1977.

Ford Foundation Trustee and political leftist, Harriet Schaffer Rabb, had served on the Board of the New York Civil Liberties Union from 1972 to 1983. Rabb later joined the board of another of Ford's favorite immigration groups, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Rabb had cut her eye teeth as an apprentice to radical attorney William Kunstler, famous for his defense of the Chicago 8 and other violent New Left radicals during the Vietnam War era and the equally leftist Arthur Kinoy at the Center for Constitutional Rights. Rabb then became an assistant dean at the Columbia Law School where she ran the immigration law center. Ford's first grant to protect the civil liberties

of illegal aliens went to the New York Civil Liberties Union in 1982. The National Office of the ACLU was then persuaded by Ford to undertake an Immigration and Alien Rights Project in 1983 with a grant of \$300,000.

The ACLU's opening position on immigration is set forth in an essay by Steven R. Shapiro of the New York Civil Liberties Union and Wade Henderson of the ACLU's D.C. office entitled "Justice for Aliens." According to this document, the desire to limit immigration can only be attributed to "hostility, motivated by nativism, racism and red-scare." The authors argue, "use of the word alien is both precise and powerful. In almost a primitive sense, it draws a line between members of the community and those on the outside . . . they can be treated unequally . . . the Supreme Court has concluded that certain classes of aliens may not even claim the right to constitutional protection . . . illegal aliens are not entitled to government benefits . . . The rationale for this limitation is not an economic one . . . the refusal to grant these often life-sustaining benefits can be explained only by a desire to punish illegal aliens for breaking the law."

Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the ACLU has redoubled its efforts to blur any distinction between citizens and non-citizens, and between legal and illegal immigrants. In Rhode Island, the ACLU protested the decision by the state government not to accept Individual Tax Identification Numbers (ITINs) in place of Social Security Numbers when applying for a driver's license. Anyone can get an ITIN, but only citizens have a Social Security card. The ACLU argument ran, "As long as there is a substantial population of undocumented immigrants in the state, it makes little sense to deprive them of a license solely because of their immigration status." There is no mention that a state driver's license is the most widely accepted identity document in America, and once gained becomes the method for completely blurring one's alien status.

The American Civil Liberties Union of Florida has urged officials to enact an ordinance opposing a Justice Department initiative that would give local and state police the power to enforce immigration laws. "While we expect local police to cooperate with federal authorities in apprehending anyone, including non-citizens, who is suspected of criminal activity," said Howard Simon, Executive Director of the ACLU of Florida, "local police should not be in the business of detaining or arresting law-abiding aliens based on their immigration status." Apparently entering the United States illegally is not breaking a law that the ACLU cares about, as an alien can still be considered "law abiding" having done so.

The ACLU has opposed any Department of Justice plan to fingerprint and track immigrants and foreign visitors to the United States. "The ACLU has long opposed immigrant registration laws, saying that they treat immigrant populations as a separate and quasi-criminal element of society and that they create an easy avenue for surveillance of those who may hold unpopular beliefs," read a press release, "The fingerprinting and tracking proposal is only the latest Bush Administration action targeted at Muslims and people of Middle Eastern descent since September 11. Other discriminatory measures have included round-ups, dragnet questioning, the detention of more than a thousand young men and the targeting of Middle Eastern communities for heightened enforcement of minor immigration law violations." The ACLU also opposes the use of immigration law violations as the means for holding or deporting suspects with ties to terrorism, and the use of secret or classified evidence in deportation hearings.

Headquartered in New York City, the ACLU has 53 staffed affiliates in major cities, more than 300 chapters nationwide, and a legislative office in Washington, D.C. The ACLU Foundation (ACLUF) is the national tax-deductible, 501(c)(3) arm of the ACLU. Its combined annual budget is approximately \$45 million. The bulk of the annual budget is raised by contributions

from individual members—275,000 strong—plus grants from foundations. Eighty percent of the budget directly supports litigation, legislation and public education programs.

In 1999, the ACLU set up an endowment fund with an initial target of \$25 million. A Ford Foundation grant of \$7 million put the ACLU over the top in this fund-raising endeavor. "The ACLU has had no better partner and friend than the Ford Foundation," said Ira Glasser, Executive Director of the national ACLU at the time, "It is fitting that the largest single gift to this effort, and in fact the largest gift ever to the ACLU, should come from Ford." The ACLU's Immigrants Rights Project got \$465,000 in 2001 and \$335,000 in 2003 from Ford.⁵

For the second anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks, Ford's newsletter chose to highlight a new book by Georgetown University Law Professor David Cole, *Enemy Aliens: Double Standards and Constitutional Freedoms in the War on Terrorism*. The book was written with a Ford grant meant to "safeguard human rights and civil liberties of non-U.S. citizens and to inform policy makers and the public about these issues."

The Ford-published review of the book warns that "Cole's fight has taken on new urgency, as the government has detained thousands of Arab-American and Muslim men, held hundreds of 'enemy combatants' without trial, charges or access to legal representation, and endorsed racial profiling in terrorism cases." In the interview with Cole accompanying the review, he denounces "the criminalization of what the government calls material support for terrorist organizations. This is a practice that was introduced, again through the immigration law, against foreign nationals, but has now become part of the criminal law, and applies to both U.S. citizens and foreign nationals. It criminalizes any support of any blacklisted terrorist organization without regard to whether one's support actually had any connection whatsoever to terrorist activity that the group undertakes."

The law to which Cole is objecting was not enacted by the Bush Administration after September 11, 2001, but during the Clinton administration in 1996. The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 came in the wake of the deadly 1993 World Trade Center bombing, a second plot later that year to bomb New York City landmarks, a 1995 conspiracy to blow American airliners out of the sky and the Oklahoma City bombing of a the Murtha Federal building. The case Cole was working on involved financial supporters of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) operating in Sir Lanka and the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) operating in Turkey, both formally designated foreign terrorist organizations. The PKK is responsible for some 22,000 deaths, primarily through bombing civilian targets in support of an independent Kurdistan.

Ford's lack of interest in safeguarding America's national security stems from its distrust in the idea of the nation itself. In 1998, the Ford Foundation made a six-year, \$25 million commitment to a project called "Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies" which focused on supporting international programs at major universities. In announcing the new initiative, Ford emphasized, "the theme of interconnections rather than fixed identities underlies many Crossing Borders projects."

In a speech to the Federation for Community Planning's Human Services Institute in Cleveland, Ohio, April 5, 2002, Ford Foundation President Susan V. Berresford noted how "we soon turned our attention to the 9/11-related national and international problems best suited to Ford's grant making operations....Immediately after the events, Ford and its grantees felt it was important for multiple perspectives to be heard through the media.....It was important to help experts explore the issues behind the headlines and broaden understanding about the countries from which the attacks came." According to Berresford "with other large foundations, notably MacArthur and Hewlett, Ford began to ask how we could help improve public understanding in the US about foreign affairs." The resulting programs

conformed to the standard left-wing response to the attacks, which was that Americans shouldn't overreact, as they had only themselves to blame.

As part of the Ford Foundation response to 9/11, the radical Center for Constitutional Rights was given \$150,000 in 2002, "for racial justice litigation, advocacy, and educational outreach activities related to the detention and racial profiling of Arab Americans and Muslims following the World Trade Center attack." The CCR was a prominent force at the UN's "Anti-Racism" conference in Durban which demanded reparations for slavery from America and Britain—but not the Sudan or any Arab state involved in the slave trade—and which was boycotted by the United for its anti-American and anti-Israel agendas. The Center has filed seven suits against various anti-terrorist measures, including the detention of captured terrorists at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The CCR also opposed the invasion of Iraq, arguing "Blood for Oil is not a reasonable or equitable equation for the majority of Americans. Nor is Bush's quest for world domination an acceptable ambition."

Another \$100,000 was given to the National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers' Guild as "core support for activities to ensure the human rights of noncitizens detained in the United States in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001." At the center of left-wing activism for decades, the National Lawyers' Guild has spear-headed attacks on the Patriot Act and American security measures affecting immigration since 9/11. In 2003 the Guild honored its celebrated member Lynne Stewart who has been indicted by the federal government for aiding terrorists and who toasted her "modern heroes...Ho and Mao, and Lenin" an approving audience at its National Convention.

The left's long-running effort to transform American society from below through an influx of what is hoped will

be unassimilated immigrants from dissimilar cultures has since 9/11 become closely entwined with protests against homeland security measures and the global war on terrorism. As the first anniversary of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks was coming up, the radical teachers group *Rethinking Schools* put out a special report, "War, Terrorism, and America's Classroom," which offered the views of scholars, journalists, poets, and activists opposed to American actions. It also offered teaching suggestions, writing topics and role-playing exercises to promote the leftist interpretation of events. The Ford Foundation paid to have 30,000 copies of the *Rethinking Schools* report sent to middle school and high school teachers across the country. The report was favorably reviewed in a Fall 2002 "Ford Foundation Report" by Neil F. Carlson, editor for the National Committee for Responsible Philanthropy which seeks to set the agenda for funding political causes. Carlson found the *Rethinking Schools* report important because of its "disposition to question the official story, to view with skepticism the stark us-against-them (or us good, them bad) portrait of the world."

MALDEF: MAINSTREAMING THE RADICAL AGENDA

MALDEF today boasts it is the leading Hispanic civil rights organization with regional offices in Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Antonio, Chicago, and Washington, D.C., with a satellite office in Sacramento and program offices in Phoenix, Albuquerque, and Houston. MALDEF has a budget of \$6.2 million annually and a staff of 75 employees which includes 22 attorneys. MALDEF has been headed by Antonia Hernández since 1985. She came to the group after serving on the Democratic staff of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. She is a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation and sits on the Senior Advisory Committee of the John F. Kennedy Institute of Politics at Harvard

University, the Pacific Council for International Policy, and the Commission on Presidential Debates.

After its Ford-induced transformation into a radical vanguard, MALDEF no longer draws a distinction between legal and illegal immigrants. Its Immigrant's Rights Program lists as its greatest success the agreement with then Governor Gray Davis in which California officially agreed in 1999 to drop its appeal of the U.S. District 9th Circuit Court decision which struck down virtually every section of Proposition 187. This measure, which was passed in 1994 with the support of 59% of voters, would have denied government-funded education, health care and social services to illegal immigrants. It was immediately challenged in the courts and the results of the election were overturned by judicial fiat and liberal politics. The Ford-transformed MALDEF's commitment to "basic human and civil rights" is not constrained by borders or citizenship.

Another example of MALDEF's effort to drain American citizenship of its meaning is its campaign in Georgia "to expand access to driver's licenses without regard to immigration status." MALDEF temporarily got what it wanted on this issue in California, thanks again to Governor Davis who, just before he was removed from office in a recall election, signed into law a bill to allow illegals (or as MALDEF termed them "residents whose immigration status is in flux") to obtain licenses and thus "lawfully participate in society." This measure was rescinded by incoming Republican Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger.

A driver's license does more than enable an illegal alien to operate a vehicle; it is also the widely accepted identity document for Americans. Granting illegals the right to a driver's license is thus an effective method of blurring one's illegal alien status. Seven of the 19 airline hijackers who committed the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks held Virginia drivers licenses. In 2003, the Republican legislature in Virginia enacted the Legal Presence

Law to prevent illegal aliens from again obtaining driver's licenses which could then be used as identification documents.

MALDEF is also part of the campaign to gain official U.S. acceptance of ID cards issued by the Mexican government - consular cards or "matrículas"—which are frequently used by illegal immigrants as a substitute for American identification documents. MALDEF was able to issue a press release in late September, 2003 saying that it was "extremely pleased with the Treasury Department's announcement that it will not change the rules about the acceptance of matrículas by banks." Matrículas are also used in the process of applying for American documents, including driver's licenses. Having a valid driver's license gives an illegal immigrant a much better chance of getting a job or a ballot.

In fact, putting more ballots in the hands of immigrants is MALDEF's top public policy priority. "The overall objective of the political access program is to enhance Latino influence in the political process by ensuring meaningful participation." says MALDEF. This program encompasses ease of access to voter registration, the methods for electing governing bodies and the counting of populations for reapportionment. Though MALDEF couches its position in terms of protecting the Hispanic vote from being diluted, the actual result of their work with the Census Bureau has been to leverage the concentration of illegal aliens in certain states to magnify their political clout.

The apportionment of U.S. House seats by the Census is based on each state's total population—including illegal aliens and other non-citizens—relative to the rest of the country. Almost seven million illegal aliens were counted in the 2000 Census. California, a state in which one in seven residents is a non-citizen, gained six House seats. New York, Texas, and Florida also each gained a seat due to non-citizen residents. These nine seats came at the expense of Indiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Oklahoma,

Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Kentucky, and Utah. Since the electoral votes which determine the winner in national presidential elections are based on the number of House and Senate seats each state has, the use of illegal aliens and other non-citizens in apportionment can also affect who occupies the White House.

The basis for counting non-citizens and illegals in the Census is that they are simply people living in a particular place and thus should have the same status as anyone else, questions of assimilation and allegiance are irrelevant. The same argument is being made in regard to allowing non-citizens to vote. One complicating factor in maximizing Latino political power is that so many are not U.S. citizens. "In some districts, you have a 65 percent Latino population but less than 35 percent with citizenship who are of voting age," says Denise Hulett, a redistricting specialist at MALDEF.

The obvious answer for MALDEF and its allies is to allow non-citizens to vote. American University law professor Jamin Raskin has proclaimed "non-citizen voting is the suffrage movement of the decade" citing agitation for the granting of such rights by immigrants and their lobbyists in New York, Los Angeles and Washington, DC. In September, 2002, Washington mayor Anthony Williams said that non-citizens in the nation's capital should be allowed to vote in local elections, explaining, "I'm committed to expanding the franchise." In September 2003, Michele Wucker, a senior fellow at the World Policy Institute (which has received grant money from the Ford Foundation), advocated letting non-citizens vote in New York as a way to "update our democracy for global times." The same result can be reached without public debate or legislative change simply by lax enforcement of voter registration and the acceptance of false identification by political activists and politicians who feel they will benefit from expanding the franchise in this manner.

On December 11, 2003, Joaquin Avila, a former MALDEF president and chief counsel, published an issue paper under the auspices of the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Institute calling for granting the right to vote to non-citizen immigrants. Avila argued, "the main reason to support non-citizen voting is self-preservation. A society's interests are not furthered when a substantial number of its inhabitants are excluded from the body politic and have no meaningful way to petition for a redress of grievances through the electoral process." He set forth the standard leftist program for advancing this idea. "Conferences and symposiums should be convened to formulate strategies for empowering this politically excluded community" and then activists should go to court to challenge the constitutionality of current law. "Perhaps the right to petition for grievances incorporates a right to vote. For assistance, legal scholars can review the historical transition from the separate but equal doctrine formulated by the United States Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* to its abandonment in *Brown v. Board of Education*. Such a transition can serve as a model for the development of legal strategies seeking to remove the citizenship requirement as a qualification for voting." Avila also likes to use the term "non-citizen disenfranchisement" to imply a prior right that has been taken away.

Avila is teaching at the UCLA School of Law during the 2003-2004 academic year and is a fellow of the John D. and Catherine R. MacArthur Foundation.

MALDEF strongly favors any proposal that would grant amnesty to those who are in the United States illegally. A major legislative initiative for which MALDEF has worked is S. 1645, a bill introduced by Idaho Republican Sen. Larry Craig with 46 bipartisan co-sponsors (its House version, H.R. 3142, was introduced by Utah Republican Rep. Chris Cannon with 76 co-sponsors). This act would apply to anyone currently in agricultural employment who had worked 575 hours or 100 work days during any 12 consecutive months in the 18 months preceding August

31, 2003. About 500,000—900,000 currently "undocumented" agricultural workers could apply for a permanent visa if they commit to continue working in agriculture for three of the next six years. Having been converted from illegal alien to legal immigrant instantly by this bill, they would gain the right to bring their immediate family members into the United States to join them, thus swelling the number of immigrants by millions.

MALDEF's transformation into a force for radicalism in the Hispanic community has pulled other groups to the left as well. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the transformation of LULAC. Once a constructive movement for integrating Hispanics into American society, a new generation of militant leaders has turned LULAC 180-degrees away from assimilation.

During the 1980s when the Reagan Administration was striving to combat the spread of communism from Cuba and Nicaragua into other parts of Central America, LULAC questioned whether American soldiers of Hispanic descent could remain loyal if ordered to fight in the region. As one LULAC official declared, "We cannot assimilate. We will not assimilate." Yet, LULAC has continued to receive funding during its journey to the far left from major corporations including Bristol-Meyers Squibb, Chemical Bank, Chevron, Chrysler, General Motors, Ford Motor, General Electric, Lockheed, Rockwell, Southwestern Bell and Quaker Oats. The LULAC Institute, a non-profit organization based in Washington, oversees community-based programs operating at 700 councils nationwide. In 2002, it reported revenues of \$1,568,315, expenses of \$1,440,315 and held assets worth \$994,561.

MALDEF still relies heavily on the Ford Foundation for funding. The current Ford Foundation website lists eight separate grants to MALDEF totaling \$11,085,000. When the U. S. Supreme Court upheld the University of Michigan Law School's "affirmative action" racial preference admissions system, Ford

was quick to claim credit because of the support it had given to two of the litigants, MALDEF and the NAACP-LDF.

MALDEF has also received funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Open Society Institute, the Joyce Foundation, the Rosenberg Foundation, the Joyce Metz-Gilmore Foundation, the Nathan Cummings Foundation and the North Star Fund. About half of MALDEF's budget is devoted to litigation, the rest to political activism.

MAJOR OPEN BORDERS ACTIVIST GROUPS

MALDEF and the ACLU are but part of a larger network of radical groups that champion "open borders" in the current debate over immigration policy and the legitimacy of the nation-state. Among the most active:

National Lawyers Guild

The National Lawyers Guild (NLG) is a politically-oriented law group of some 8,000 members and 83 lawyers' chapters first established in 1937. As the major U.S. section of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL) during the Cold War, the NLG was considered to be a Soviet front group. In 1950, the House Un-American Activities Committee published a document called "Report on the National Lawyers Guild: Legal Bulwark of the Communist Party." And as late as the NLG's 1987 convention, the group was still pushing Moscow's line. According to a favorable article in the Marxist-Leninist weekly *Frontline*, "a decade-by-decade assessment of the Guild's first 50 years was presented [at the convention]. Guild founder and current activist Marty Popper began...with an analysis that underscored the importance of the struggles against racism and anti-communism in creating the Guild....Popper also recalled the consistent internationalist role the Guild has played over the years....Although

the particular role of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) in initiating the Guild and shaping its activities in the '30s was not highlighted in the presentation, Popper did salute the political diversity that is characteristic of the Guild—from liberals to social democrats to Communists—as one of its important strengths."

The end of the Cold War did not change the NLG's ideology. At its 2003 convention, it passed a resolution calling for the impeachment of President George W. Bush on the grounds that he "led the United States into aggressive war against the nation of Afghanistan and against the nation of Iraq in violation of the United Nations Charter Art. 24, the Nuremberg Charter, and other international instruments and treaties, without a declaration of war as required by the Constitution of the United States."

One of the NLG's top priorities is its National Immigration Project (NIP-NLG). When the Immigration Project was initiated in 1972, it had two stated goals: prevent the deportation of foreign political activists (especially those opposed to U.S. foreign policy and allied governments) and exploit the U.S.-Mexico border crisis. In support of this first objective, the NLG was heavily involved in the Sanctuary movement during the 1980s during the civil wars in Central America and also worked to lift visa restrictions on Third World radicals so they could freely travel to the United States.

This concern has been carried over in their objections to the tighter visa security measures and use of immigration laws against those deemed a terrorist threat in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attacks. The NLG 2003 convention was held in concert with a conference on "activism, organizing and civil liberties after 9/11." It featured Guild member Lynne Stewart, indicted for aiding and abetting terrorist Omar Abdel Rahman, the leader of the terrorist group that bombed the World Trade

Center in 1993. In her keynote speech, Stewart toasted her "modern heroes...Lenin and Ho, and Mao." The event attracted the participation of a bewildering collection of radical left groups which vividly demonstrated the interrelationship of causes and groups. Others include:

Alliance for Democracy-Minnesota
Alliant Action
Anti-War Committee
Arise! Collective
Code for Corporate Responsibility
Code Pink Minnesota
Communities United Against Police Brutality
Counter Propaganda Coalition
Fifth District Green Party
Friends for a Nonviolent World
Growing Communities for Peace
Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Local 17 and
Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride
Human Rights Center - University of Minnesota, Humanists of
Minnesota
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Jewish Community Action
KFAI Radio (part of the Pacifica Radio network)
Lynnhurst Neighbors for Peace
Macalester Peace and Justice Committee
ME3 Just Energy Program
Merriam Park Neighbors for Peace
Middle East Peace Now of Minnesota
Minneapolis Bill of Rights Defense Committee
Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights
Minnesota Alliance of Peacemakers (MAP)
Minnesota Anarchist Collective
Minnesota Civil Liberties Union
Minnesota Cuba Committee
Minnesota Film Arts/U Film Society

Minnesota School of Americas Watch
Minnesotans for a United Ireland
Nonviolent Peaceforce, USA
Nukewatch
Pax Christi Twin Cities Area
Peace Coffee
Philip Berrigan Depleted Uranium Coalition
Professional Librarians Union of Minneapolis
Queers United for Radical Action (QURA)
Saint Paul Bill of Rights Defense Committee
Socialist Alternative
Somali Justice Advocacy Center
Speak Out Sisters!
Students Against War
Twin Cities Palestine Solidarity Network
UTNE Reader
The Urban Coalition
Twin Cities Peace Campaign
Veterans for Peace, Minnesota Chapter 27
Women Against Military Madness (WAMM)
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Women's Prison Book Project
World Federalist Association

The NIP-NLG believes it was a violation of the fundamental rights for some 1,200 Arab and Muslims to be detained during the investigation of the September 11 attacks, and for most of these people to be deported for being in violation of the immigration laws. The NIP-NLG has also denounced the interviewing of several thousand other Arab and Muslims by Department of Justice agents as an example of profiling and targeting certain communities. There are, however, some 11 million Muslims in the United States, so the actions of Federal investigators can hardly be considered massive or indiscriminate, especially given the scale and nature of the crimes.

The NIP-NLG opposed the passage of the USA Patriot Act which expanded the ability of the Federal government to monitor, target and apprehend immigrants and U.S. citizens suspected of terrorist activity. It is lobbying to have part of the act repealed and filing test cases in the courts to shield suspects and to have the act overturned. The NIP-NLG received a grant of \$100,000 from the Ford Foundation as "core support for activities to ensure that the human rights of noncitizens detained in the United States in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001 are respected."

On a broader scale, the NIP-NLG strongly opposes H.R. 2671, the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal (CLEAR) Act, introduced by Rep. Charlie Norwood (R-GA) with 112 co-sponsors. The proposed bill would expand the ability of state and local police to enforce civil immigration laws in order to overcome the shortage of Border Patrol personnel and to enhance the ability to capture illegal aliens once they have moved inland from the border. Immigration violators would be listed in the National Crime Information Center Database. This legislation would also allow police officers to check the legal status of anyone they "suspect" might be an illegal alien.

The NIP-NLG provides legal advice, resource materials and training for attorneys involved in the defense of noncitizens either for violations of immigration laws or for criminal behavior that could lead to deportation. Because the law defines certain offenses as aggravated felonies for which an alien can be deported only if the defendant receives a sentence to imprisonment or confinement of a year or more, keeping an alien out of jail can also keep him in the country. It also lobbies for a grant of amnesty for illegal aliens so they can stay in the country. NIP-NLG Director Dan Kesselbrenner has argued that a legalization program "should be more than just a 'one shot deal', but should allow for flexible deadlines so that new arrivals can become eligible for legal status after a period of time."

For the past eight years, the NIP-NLG has sent law students to South Florida or to the U.S.-Mexico border to volunteer in agencies that "are at the forefront in the fight for immigrants' rights." These students have worked during winter and spring breaks with asylum seekers, detainees, and other noncitizens seeking legal immigration status. The NIP-NLG also works with the American Bar Association's Immigration Pro Bono Development, the Catholic Legal Immigration Network and the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service to create the Detention Watch Network which lists of over 25 organizations around the country where students can work directly with detained immigrants and refugees.

In late November, a federal grand jury handed up terrorism-related charges against NLG attorney Lynne Stewart and two others for their roles in an alleged conspiracy involving imprisoned Egyptian cleric Omar Abdel Rahman in a plot to kill and kidnap people overseas as a means of winning his release. The allegations are the result of the government's secret taping of Rahman's conversations in a Minnesota prison after his 1995 conviction on charges he conspired to blow up New York landmarks, including involvement in the attack on the World Trade Center in 1993 and later plots to destroy the Lincoln and Holland tunnels. Stewart and an Arabic translator are accused of helping Rahman communicate with his terrorist followers by smuggling messages out of prison and giving them to one of his agents, Ahmed Abdel Sattar, a Staten Island postal worker, for further circulation. Prosecutors claimed that during a May 2000 prison visit, translator Mohammed Yousry told Rahman and defense attorney Stewart about kidnappings by the Abu Sayyaf terrorist organization in the Philippines that were intended to force Rahman's release. Stewart replied, "Good for them."

In 2002, the NIP-NLG: had revenues of \$486,614 and expenses of \$457,456.

NATIONAL IMMIGRATION FORUM

The Washington, DC based National Immigration Forum (NIF) claims that its objective is "to embrace and uphold America's tradition as a nation of immigrants. The Forum advocates and builds public support for public policies that welcome immigrants and refugees and that are fair and supportive to newcomers in our country." It claims to head a coalition of more than 250 national organizations and several thousand local groups. The NIF was founded in 1982 by Dale Frederick "Rick" Swartz, who had directed the immigrant rights project at the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and who had worked closely with the National Lawyers' Guild. Harriet Schaffer Rabb, Ford Foundation Trustee and Co-Director of the Immigration Law Clinic at Columbia School of Law, played a major role in helping Swartz found the new group. Swartz continued his work to secure asylum for Haitian and Central American refugees, to legalize the status of millions of other immigrants and to battle the English Only movement, which seeks to make English the official language of the United States.

The NIF website is festooned with American flags and the Statue of Liberty. However, its political agenda and funding run parallel to those left-wing "open borders" groups whose ideology is hostile to the flag and the nation for which it stands. Frank Sharry is the current Executive Director of the NIF. Prior to taking over this position from the retiring Swartz in 1990, Sharry had been executive director of Centro Presente, a local agency involved in the Central American sanctuary movement in the greater Boston area that was tied to opposition to the Reagan Administration policy of combating the spread of communism in the region. In 1994, Sharry took a leave of absence from the Forum to serve as Deputy Campaign Manager of Taxpayers Against Proposition 187.

The NIF view of the immigration problem runs as follows: "Updated, the number of immigrant visas available has remained

static, while the number of would-be immigrants wanting to join family members here, or get a job here, has grown. There are now perhaps three million persons in a backlog for immigrant visas in the family preference system, and waits can be as long as 20 years for some categories. There are very few visas available for immigrants to come here and work, if they don't have particular skills....legal immigration to this country is an extraordinarily difficult, time-consuming, and expensive process. Faced with years or decades of waiting to reunite with family members, too many immigrants attempt to enter the U.S. illegally, use temporary visas for permanent immigration, or turn to smugglers." The United States already has the most liberal immigration policy of any major country in the world. Each year, the U. S. grants permanent resident status to between 700,000 and 900,000 legal immigrants each year. But this is not enough for the NIF.

The NIF solution is to "legalize"—grant amnesty to—all illegal aliens currently in the United States who have clean criminal records, and to substantially increase the number of visas available for those who want to come into America either to rejoin family members or to work. Essentially, the idea is to make legal immigration to America so easy that no one will have to resort to illegal means to enter the country. The NIF is particularly keen on opening the borders to unskilled, low-income workers and then making them eligible for welfare and social service programs. Under this scheme, the country would be importing a new underclass living in poverty. The NIF does not project the number of new immigrants this "comprehensive reform" would generate. The NIF believes there are eight million illegal immigrants in the country eligible for amnesty, and it would not be unreasonable to expect the annual number of "legal" immigrants to at least double under their relaxed process.

Once legalized, this expanded wave of immigrants is to be encouraged to vote. As the NIF's study of the 2000 elections argues, "Their conclusion: as the political clout of immigrant voters rises,

the harsh anti-immigrant climate of the recent past seems to be on the wane."

While advancing its own plan of reform, the NIF is also working to undo the reforms enacted in 1996. The NIF considers the 1996 reforms "the harshest crackdown on the rights and opportunities of immigrants in 70 years." It particularly cites the attempt to expedite deportations of illegal aliens (who have no right to be in the country in the first place), the deportation of non-citizens who commit "minor" crimes, the denial of welfare and social service programs to illegal immigrants and attempts to track the arrival and departure of every person crossing our land borders and develop an identification system.

The NIF's opposition to tracking those who enter the United States extends even to those arriving from countries with known terrorist links. The NIF strongly objected to the creation of a National Security Entry-Exit Registration System. The plan as proposed by Attorney General John Ashcroft would apply only to nationals of Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, and Syria who are here on non-immigrant visas; certain non-immigrant visa-holders from other countries that are determined to pose an "elevated national security risk" by the State Department and the INS; and certain foreign national non-immigrant visa-holders in whom the Justice Department has a special interest. Fingerprints and photos will be taken from these individuals, along with other personal data, when they present themselves for admission to the U.S. The fingerprints will be run through intelligence and criminal records databases to identify people who are wanted criminals or suspected terrorists and keep them from entering the country. After 30 days in the United States and then on an annual basis, certain non-immigrant aliens will be required to present themselves at an INS office. The INS will conduct a review of the alien to ensure that he is complying with the terms of his visa. To Frank Sharry, "these heavy-handed tactics seem more like the old Soviet Union and South Africa."

This objection is interesting because one of the arguments the NIF uses in support of its plan to legalize the illegals and expand legal immigration is that "by providing more legal channels for persons who want to come in the future, so that immigrants who now come outside of legal channels can be properly identified and screened." So which is their real concern? In the past, the NIF has objected to burdensome questioning of those seeking to become naturalized citizens, including requiring that applicants account for their residences in the U.S. and travel outside of the U.S. in the last five years, and what organizations the applicant was a member.

The National Security Entry-Exit Registration System registered a total of 83,519 people before it was ended on December 2, 2003. Some of those registered were deported, usually for overstaying visas.

NIF also opposes the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal (CLEAR) Act, H.R. 2671 which would empower state and local police to enforce federal immigration laws. And the NIF has voiced the same litany of complaints about tighter security and broader investigations pertaining to immigrants since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks as other left-wing groups.

The NIF received \$200,000 in 1999 and \$175,000 in 2001 from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, a funding source known for its left-wing leanings. The NIF was given \$50,000 for "supporting on-going advocacy for the fair treatment of immigrants and refugees" in the aftermath of September 11 by the Open Society Institute. The Ford Foundation website lists three grants to the NIF totaling \$1,889,000, mainly for general support, advocacy and alliance building.

In 2001, the National Immigration Forum reported revenues of \$2,046,357, expenses of \$1,726,885 and held assets worth: \$1,826,047.

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION LAWYERS ASSOCIATION

The American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of over 8,000 attorneys and law professors that provides its members with continuing legal education, information, professional services, and expertise through its 35 chapters and over 75 national committees. It was founded in 1946 and is an "affiliated organization" of the American Bar Association and is represented in the ABA House of Delegates. It is headquartered in Washington, DC.

AILA has joined with other left-wing groups to denounce in its entirety the security measures taken in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks which killed some 3,000 people at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, claiming that the measures "have infringed on the civil liberties of immigrants and have created a climate of fear and distrust in immigrant communities around the country." AILA likes to claim that the new security procedures "fail to enhance our security" but in the absence of any more terrorist attacks, it is impossible to substantiate such a claim.

AILA's attitude towards anti-terrorist measures reflects the radical views of its Executive Director Jeanne Butterworth. Before she was elected to head AILA, she was executive director of the Palestine Solidarity Committee. The PSC had acted as the political arm of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine terrorist organization in much the same way that Sinn Fein acted as a representative of the Irish Republican Army. Besides excusing PFLP terrorist attacks and campaigning against U.S. aid to Israel, the PSC under Butterworth also supported Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 and was active in the antiwar movement opposing American intervention to liberate Kuwait. The PSC and PFLP are avowedly Marxist in philosophy.

AILA claims its member attorneys represent tens of thousands of U.S. families who have applied for permanent residence for their spouses, children, and other close relatives to lawfully enter and reside in the United States. AILA Members also represent thousands of U.S. businesses and industries who sponsor highly skilled foreign workers seeking to enter the United States in a temporary or permanent basis. AILA members also represent foreign students, entertainers, athletes, and asylum seekers, often on a *pro bono* basis. It holds several major conferences each year to bring attorneys and activists in the field up to speed on new developments in immigration law and pending legislation. The group also engages in lobbying and offers expert testimony at Congressional hearings.

The public emphasis of the group is on its role in the process of legal immigration. However, when one looks at specific issues, AILA embraces illegal entry into the United States as well.

The AILA "solution" to the illegal immigrant problem is to legalize everyone. "People who work hard, pay taxes, and contribute to the U.S. should be allowed to obtain permanent residence. This reform would stabilize the workforce of U.S. employers, encourage people to come out of the shadows to be scrutinized by our government, and allow immigrants to work and travel legally and be treated equally." says an AILA issue paper. The paper never uses the term "illegal" for those living in the "shadows" or even "undocumented." The AILA term is "people in the U.S. without authorization." The idea is to authorize anyone who wants to cross the border. Illegal aliens already in the United States would be given amnesty, and a "new temporary program would give workers the opportunity to work where they are needed and employers experiencing these shortages the workforce they need to remain competitive.

Such a program would provide legal visas, family unity, full labor rights, labor mobility and a path to permanent residence and

citizenship over time. Such a program would diminish significantly future illegal immigration by providing people with a legal avenue to enter the U.S. It is hard to take at face value AILA's claim that such a program would only be "temporary." And while there is lip-service paid to the notion that immigration limits should be set in accordance with the needs of the country, the sub-text is clearly about opening the borders to meet the desires of an unlimited number of immigrants, the vast bulk of whom would be poor and unskilled.

The AILA argument that legalizing current illegal aliens will allow them "to be scrutinized by our government" also rings false when one considers AILA's attitude towards the National Security Entry/Exit Registration System (NSEERS). Under NSEERS, specified groups of foreigners have been required to be photographed, fingerprinted, and questioned upon their arrival at a U.S. port of entry and, for those already in this country, at a designated immigration office. Under this program, these individuals (most of them males from Middle Eastern countries) have been obligated to follow re-registration requirements after one year, or, in some cases, thirty days.

These requirements were relaxed on December 2. Under the new guidelines, the one year and thirty day re-registration requirements will be suspended. However, the guidelines maintain registration at the border, departure requirements and a "case-by-case" imposition of other registration requirements when the DHS has a particular security concern. AILA has opposed the entire NSEERS program and wants all aspects of it terminated. "What have they done? They have left immigrant communities feeling besieged, harmed our relations with foreign governments, and wasted precious resources." said Judith Golub, AILA's Senior Director of Advocacy and Public Affairs.

On October 2, 2003, under the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended, the U.S. Secretary of State, in consultation with

the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, reconfirmed the designation of the PFLP as a foreign terrorist organization.

After the September 11 attacks, AILA started a new public relations campaign which includes a selection of shirts, mugs, stickers and tote bags with the message "Immigration Works. It's Who We Are." The items can be purchased from AILA, but at prices which are hardly bargains.

U.S. Senator Jon Kyl, who represents the border state of Arizona, has expressed concern about programs for disguised amnesty and increased visas. "I approach the notion of 'guest worker' legislation very cautiously. If we are not enforcing current immigration laws, the question naturally arises: Why would we be any more likely to enforce new laws? Without a clear, firm intent to enforce existing laws, what would discourage more illegal immigrants from entering the country in hopes of yet another 'guest worker' or amnesty bill in the future? Will we be sending the signal to others that, if they can get into the United States and lay low for a few years, they too could gain legal status (even citizenship) in the United States?"

"These are the sorts of questions and concerns policymakers must be prepared to address at the beginning of debate on new immigration proposals." writes Sen. Kyl, who understands "many Americans' frustration, particularly those living right on the border, about our government's acquiescence in lawbreaking." Given the amount of effort that the AILA spends on trying to subvert the enforcement of current immigration law, their credibility as a proponent of new laws must be suspect.

THE CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The Center for Constitutional Rights was founded in 1966 by Arthur Kinoy and the late William Kunstler. In his student days at Harvard, Kinoy was on the executive committee of the Communist-front American Student Union, went on to become a representative of the International Workers Order, and then became attorney for the United Electrical Workers, one of the few unions expelled from the CIO because of its Communist leadership.

The vain and histrionic William M. Kunstler was best known as the chief defendants' counsel at the trial of the "Chicago 8" who organized a riot at the 1968 Democratic Convention. He was cited for contempt of court for his disruptive tactics. Kunstler also defended the "Catonsville 9" a group of anti-war protesters led by the Berrigan brothers (Daniel and Philip, both Catholic priests) who pioneered the practice of breaking into government offices to destroy local draft records. Kunstler considered himself an activist lawyer and proclaimed his support for the radical agendas of his clients.

Both men were tireless organizers of radical groups and protests with a decided bent for making common cause with foreign enemies of the United States. As Kinoy put it, "the theory [that] shaped the strategy of as diverse movements as the Soviet, the Chinese, the Vietnamese and the Cuban struggles must remain central in the thinking of all who would attempt to chart out a strategy to take power in this last powerful stronghold of world capitalism."

Today, the CCR claims it has "remained dedicated to defending and advancing the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights," while "committed to the creative use of law as a positive force for

social change." Among this creative use of the law is an attempt by the CCR, in league with Greenpeace International and other groups, to cite the United States, Great Britain and other allies for "war crimes against the Iraqi people."

On May 27, 2003, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review a decision of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in *North Jersey Media Group v. Creppy and Ashcroft*, a case that CCR has been litigating with the ACLU on behalf of several newspapers. This move left intact the decision of the Third Circuit upholding the right of the Federal government to conduct secret immigration hearings. Issued by Chief Immigration Judge Michael Creppy ten days after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the "Creppy memo" requires immigration judges to close all immigration hearings at the request of the Justice Department where detainees are of "special interest" to its terrorism investigation. The CCR had better luck in the Sixth Circuit in another case *Detroit Free Press v. Ashcroft*, in which federal judge Nancy Edmunds decided that closing the hearings was a violation of the right to freedom of the press.

How far CCR activists are willing to take the supposed rights of foreigners was demonstrated in an article by David Cole, a professor of constitutional law at Georgetown University Law Center, a volunteer attorney with the CCR, and a legal affairs correspondent for the leftwing's flagship publication, *The Nation*. Writing an essay in the Winter 2002 issue of *Human Rights*, a journal of the American Bar Association, Cole argued: "The Patriot Act also resurrects ideological exclusion, the practice of denying entry to aliens for pure speech. It excludes aliens who 'endorse or espouse terrorist activity,' or who 'persuade others to support terrorist activity or a terrorist organization,' in ways that the secretary of state determines undermine U.S. efforts to combat terrorism. It also excludes aliens who are representatives of groups that 'endorse acts of terrorist activity' in ways that similarly undermine U.S. efforts to combat terrorism. Excluding people

for their ideas is flatly contrary to the spirit of freedom for which the United States stands."

Under Cole's system of values, the "rights" of a known member of al-Qaeda to enter the United States is more important than the sovereign right of the United States to determine on the basis of its own needs and security, who can and cannot cross its borders. Cole's research has received funding from the Ford Foundation.

In 2001, the CCR showed revenue of \$2,846,099, expenses of \$1,876,820 and assets of \$2,603,827.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION POLICY, PRACTICE AND PRO BONO

Once a bulwark of social conservatism and the rule of law, the American Bar Association has been lurching leftward for many years. It currently supports a moratorium on the death penalty, gun control measures, the Legal Services Corporation and an International Criminal Court, so it is not surprising that it has taken the standard left-wing positions on immigration.

The ABA Commission on Immigration Policy, Practice and Pro Bono consists of thirteen (13) individuals appointed by the ABA President. The Commission directs ABA efforts to ensure fair and unbiased treatment, and full due process rights, for immigrants and refugees within the United States. The Commission was formed in 2002 by the merger of two existing ABA entities: the Coordinating Committee on Immigration Law and the Advisory Committee to the Immigration Pro Bono Development and Bar activation Project. The Commission provides continuing education about trends and court decisions, and develops pro bono programs that encourage volunteer lawyers to provide "high

quality, effective legal representation for individuals in immigration courts, with special emphasis on the needs of the most vulnerable immigrant and refugee populations." The Commission also advocates changes in immigration laws and procedures.

According to the ABA's 2003 Legislative and Governmental Priorities regarding immigration, one of the group's top ten issues: "The ABA supports legal immigration based on family reunification and employment skills, due process safeguards in immigration and asylum adjudications, and judicial review of such decisions....the restoration of public benefits to legal immigrants and refugees, and improving the wages, working conditions and legal status of farm workers in the United States. The ABA opposes laws that require employers and persons providing education, health care, or other social services to verify citizenship or immigration status." Stated under a separate heading dealing with anti-terrorism, the "The ABA opposes the incommunicado detention of foreign nationals in undisclosed locations by the INS or the Department of Homeland Security. The ABA supports disclosure including the names of the detainees, the nature of the charges involved, and public removal hearings except in extraordinary circumstances."

Immigration issues are also a concern of the ABA Section on Individual Rights and Responsibilities (IRR) which publishes the quarterly journal *Human Rights*. Each issue of *Human Rights* focuses on a single topic. Immigration was the topic of the Winter 2001 issue and its theme was set out by section chair Michael S. Greco as "the deplorable condition of immigrants' rights in twenty-first century America and what needs to be done to correct it." In his essay, Greco related how "in 1997, the ABA approved a statement of principle that federal, state, territorial, and local governments should permit the use of languages in addition to English to improve communication with government, promote understanding of duties and responsibilities under the law, and provide access to the justice system. Most recently, IRR joined

with other ABA entities and national minority bars in opposing any diminution of legal permanent residents' rights to contribute to political campaigns in the same way that the law permits other citizens to contribute." Of course, even "legal permanent residents" are not "other" citizens as they are not citizens at all. For them to play any role in selecting government officials or crafting legislation (and the two cannot be separated) should raise serious questions about whose interests national policy is to properly serve.

Greco also recounted how his IRR and the then Coordinating Committee on Immigration worked to defeat the 1996 immigration reform legislation because it sought "to create a special court to receive secret evidence against aliens in deportation proceedings, impose new and onerous financial obligations on immigrants' sponsors, and restrict legal immigrants' and refugees' access to public benefits."

In his introduction to the Winter 2001 issue, Daniel Kanstroom, professor of law at Boston College Law School and director of the Boston College Immigration and Asylum Project, stated in regard to the 1996 reforms, "Fortunately, due to the efforts of many activists, scholars, lawyers, and politicians, some of the worst aspects of these laws have been ameliorated and others appear ripe for change. The articles in this special issue of *Human Rights* are wonderful examples of this work to which one can only hope the new administration and Congress will pay heed. They represent an eloquent and wide-ranging indictment of the current state of U.S. immigration policy." He also thanked the Immigrants' Rights Project of the American Civil Liberties Union for helping to put together this issue of *Human Rights* which showed no diversity in viewpoint. Among the stranger essays was one by Atlanta immigration lawyer Scott Titshaw critical of the "indefensible" biases against gay and lesbians because U.S. immigration laws do not consider homosexual partners to be the legal equivalent of a married couple; and one by Phoenix attorney

Kristen Rosati suggesting that U.S. implementation of the international Convention Against Torture could ameliorate some of the "harshness" of current immigration law enforcement.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

The American Friends Service Committee claims on its website to be "a practical expression of the faith of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). Committed to the principles of nonviolence and justice, it seeks in its work and witness to draw on the transforming power of love, human and divine." Certainly, when one thinks of pacifism, the image of the pious Quaker comes readily to mind.

However, during the Cold War, and particularly during the Vietnam War, the AFSC embraced the New Left anti-war movement and started beating the drum against "U.S. imperialism." It has carried this theme forward, and now sponsors events like "New England's Empire is Not Healthy for Children and Other Living Things" conference on October 10, 2003, the keynote address being devoted to the topic "The American Century as Imperial Enterprise" by Professor Zia Mian from the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University.

When one clicks on the AFSC website (www.AFSC.org), the first "featured issue" listed is immigrants' rights. It proudly claims that AFSC staff across the country participated in the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride. Held from Sept. 20 to Oct. 4, 2003, this event saw nearly a thousand immigrants and their allies travel across the country which affirmed, "the contributions of immigrant workers, documented and undocumented, and exposed the many injustices caused by a broken immigration system." This cross country ride, patterned after the "freedom rides" of the 1960s civil rights movement, was only the latest action in a campaign waged since 2001 to build momentum for a general amnesty for illegal aliens.

In the spring of 2002, the AFSC and a handful of other U.S.-based immigrants' rights organizations met in Monterey, Mexico and issued a joint declaration with Mexican organizations affirming the need for a "comprehensive legalization program for all nationalities of undocumented immigrants and their families that live in the United States" and "The legalization of future migratory flows." The Monterey declaration also called for protection of migrants' rights and labor rights in national legal codes as well as international agreements. The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund and the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights also signed the declaration, along with 26 other groups, mostly Mexican.

The AFSC links their concern for immigrants with their pacifist philosophy by emphasizing that border enforcement reflects a white racist society that creates tension, leading potentially to violence, in a society that is rapidly losing its white majority. The AFSC complains that the "mainstream media floods the airwaves with negative stereotypes and damaging images of immigrants as well as U.S.-born people of color...[and] whether in news or entertainment programming, the media rarely acknowledge white racism as a factor in community tensions." The AFSC view of American society owes less to theology than to Marxism, as shown by this succinct paragraph from their section on ethnic tension.

"Low-income people must struggle to survive in a world that is hostile to their needs. As individuals and communities compete for scarce and inadequate resources, they are encouraged to see themselves as working against one another, rather than seeing injustice as the common root of their suffering. Mainstream "common sense" about how to succeed furthers this mentality of competition. Conventional images of "pulling yourself up by your own bootstraps" and other notions of individual success promote the idea that anyone can succeed in the United States if only they try hard enough. While individuals who succeed "against the

odds" are held up as models, the communities they come from remain poor—and the structures that maintain a grossly unjust distribution of wealth and resources do not change.

There is a consistency in AFSC ideology, as its attitude on border issues is similar to the position it has held in foreign policy since at least the Korean War. Whenever the United States acts to defend its interests, whether from aggression by Communist regimes, rogue states or Islamic extremists, it is the side that the AFSC accuses of breaking the peace.

The AFSC talks about "class" and "cultural" differences, "hate violence" and "anti-immigrant politics [that] have also given rise to an increase in vigilante activity, particularly in the U.S.-Mexico border region." Thus the source of tension comes from those who favor upholding the law and the principle of sovereign borders, and not with those who illegally cross those borders and make demands on their unwilling hosts.

NATIONAL NETWORK FOR IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE RIGHTS

National Network for Immigration and Refugee Rights (NNIRR) was founded in 1986 by activists involved in opposition to the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA). It is headquartered in Oakland, California. The focus of the NNIRR in the debate over the IRCA legislation was against the employer sanctions which prohibited businesses from hiring known illegal aliens. The NNIRR also claims "multiple roots stretching back to the 1960s movements for civil rights, racial justice, farm workers unions, student rights, and peace." An example of this juxtaposition of immigration and antiwar (peace) activism appears on their website chronicle for the years 1990-91.

"The National Network, in collaboration with MALDEF [Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Foundation],

organizes the California Delegation against Hate Violence to lead an investigation on human rights abuses and hate violence against migrants in the San Diego-Tijuana border area. The delegation meets with Mexican and U.S. counterparts, documenting deepening INS and private citizen violence against migrants crossing and migrant workers in the U.S. and calls for demilitarization of the U.S.-Mexico border and protections for migrants from hate groups and Border Patrol abuse."

In August, the U.S. declares war on Iraq, to repel the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in dispute over control of oil fields; President George Bush calls for a "New World Order," launching military mobilization to the Middle East and prepares attack on Iraq in September. Anti-war mobilizations begin calling for "No Blood for Oil."

As U.S. bombing of Iraq begins on the birthday of renowned civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr., the U.S. war on Iraq unleashes immigration related repression. The war in Iraq results in over five million migrant workers, Arabs, Palestinians, Kuwaitis, and Iraqis being forcibly displaced by the brutal military assault on Iraq. The National Network denounces the war and its debilitating impacts. The growing war-buildup results in threats of raids, actual raids, and other forms of intimidation unleashed against immigrant communities to quell any support for peace and justice as part of the Bush Administration's efforts to build U.S. public support for his war drive.

There is no mention in this section that the war was triggered by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, a border crossing just as illegal as that taking place on the San Diego-Tijuana border area, only much more violent. That many foreign workers in Kuwait (particularly Palestinians) supported the Iraqi invasion led to their expulsion after Kuwait was liberated and demonstrated graphically the threat posed by large immigrant communities which had no allegiance to the country in which they resided. NNIRR's leanings, however, were entirely for Iraq and the aggressor regime of Saddam Hussein.

This opposition to any counterattack against foreign aggression was continued after the September 11 attacks on the United States. In its official response to the attacks issued three days later, NNIRR said "In past years, various acts of international aggression have provoked indiscriminate blame, sometimes resulting in retaliatory violence that has harmed innocent civilians, or which has particularly targeted immigrants and others based on their racial or ethnic backgrounds. We understand that the shock and anger produced by the unthinkable events of this past week also hold that awful potential—and in fact, certain groups, particularly in the Arab and Muslim communities, are already experiencing incidents of harassment or violence. Such retaliatory activity is clearly wrong and should not be tolerated."

This theme was continued in regard to the Middle East. Without any explicit mention of the terrorist attacks against Israeli civilians, NNIRR issued a press release "condemning the escalation of violence in the region, and in particular, the violation of human rights of the Palestinian people by Israeli military forces We urge the U.S. government to follow through on its support of the UN Security Council Resolution 1402, which demands that Israel withdraw its military troops from Palestinian-controlled areas."

The lead editorial in the Fall-Winter 2002/2003 issue of the NNIRR newsletter argued that "the anti-war movement needs to see that immigrant rights and the [Iraq] war closely related. One of the main ways for the anti-war movement to draw more working class people, especially those of color, is to understand that linkage and act on it. Putting them together, we can become the mighty force needed to turn U.S. policy around." After all, the editorial went on, "U.S. militarism is racism raised to an extreme. Look at the post-World War II history of U.S. 'interventions'—a diplomatic word for actions that range from helping overthrow legitimate governments to direct military attacks on governments that inconvenience U.S. interests—stretching from Latin America

to the Pacific Island, Asia and Africa, all lands of color." The guest editorial writer for this screed was Elizabeth Martinez, director of the Institute for MultiRacial Justice, a group founded in 1997 in the San Francisco Bay area "to strengthen the struggle against white supremacy."

The interest of the NNIRR in foreign policy issues reflects those of its Executive Director, Catherine Tactaquin, who is also one of the group's founders. Tactaquin also sits on the executive committee of Geneva-based Migrant Rights International. She frequently writes and speaks on the issue of migration in the era of globalization, including the illegitimacy of borders, the internationalization of labor, and "undocumented" migration. Migrant Rights International has received money from the Ford Foundation, including \$225,000 to support the group's activities related to the "migration and xenophobia issues" at the 2001 U.N. World Conference Against Racism, which turned into an America and Israel-bashing session of such virulence that the United States withdrew from the conference altogether .

At the end of September, 2001, NNIRR returned to its standard domestic program and released its report *From the Borderline to the Colorline: A Report on Anti-Immigrant Racism in the United States* which called on the U.S. government to "affirm the right of workers to cross international borders" and "demilitarize the U.S.-Mexico border to end law enforcement and human rights abuses."

While many "open border" groups argue that immigrants are hard workers who make little use of welfare programs or social services, the NNIRR knows better and has tackled the issue head on, complaining that "The 1996 welfare legislation in the U.S. especially undermined the economic well-being of poor immigrant women and their families by eliminating or undercutting access to benefit programs for those in need."

NNIRR claims "to promote a just immigration and refugee policy in the United States and to defend and expand the rights of all immigrants and refugees, regardless of immigration status. The National Network bases its efforts in the principles of equality and justice, and seeks the enfranchisement of all immigrant and refugee communities in the United States through organizing and advocating for their full labor, environmental, civil and human rights." In this campaign, the NNIRR draws no distinction between legal and illegal aliens. Indeed, it is working hard to legalize the status through a mass amnesty of all those who entered the United States illegally, and for those yet to come. Or as NNIRR puts it "to provide options for legalization for current undocumented immigrants, but which also takes into account future migration flows."

IMMIGRATION DEFENSE PROJECT

Since 1997, New York State Defenders Association has operated the Criminal Defense Immigration Project (IDP) in New York City. The IDP provides immigration law backup support and counseling to New York defense attorneys and others who represent or assist immigrants in criminal justice and immigration systems, as well as to immigrants themselves.

After the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the IDP like other left-wing groups adopted as their first priority the protection of illegal aliens. It embarked on its new Detainee Defense Initiative to provide or arrange legal assistance for immigrants detained or at risk of detention by the Department of Homeland Security (formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service) and subject to deportation or removal from the United States. In 2002, the Immigrant Defense Project joined with other organizations to launch the Defending Immigrants Partnership, a national effort to ensure that immigrants in criminal proceedings nationwide are properly counseled regarding the immigration consequences of choices that they must make when accused of a crime.

The partners include the Immigrant Legal Resource Center and the National Immigration Project of the pro-Communist National Lawyers Guild.

The IDP publishes a manual entitled *Representing Non-citizen Criminal Defendants in New York State*, the most recent edition coming out in 2003. According to the IDP's description, the manual "offers detailed, practical, straightforward information for criminal defense attorneys about potential immigration consequences for non-citizen clients of specific New York dispositions, and about strategies to pursue to try to avoid these adverse consequences." The main consequence to be avoided is deportation. It is unthinkable to groups like the IDP that a non-citizen should be expelled from the United States simply because they have been found guilty of committing aggravated felonies.

The Immigrant Defense Project is supported by grants from the New York Foundation, the Fund for New Citizens of the New York Community Trust, the Ford Foundation and the Open Society Institute, which is part of the network set up by the billionaire international financier George Soros.

IMMIGRANT LEGAL RESOURCE CENTER

In 1979 the Immigrant Legal Resource Center began as a group of volunteer attorneys and law students active in left-wing causes in the San Francisco Bay Area. Responding to the wave of refugees fleeing "war and repression" in Central America in the 1980s, the ILRC joined the sanctuary movement and sought to establish legal precedents in political asylum law. The ILRC claims to have helped make the immigration amnesty program work for three million people.

Though the sanctuary movement has faded from public memory it is still very much alive in left-wing mythology. The sanctuary movement attempted to reverse the political dynamics of the Cold

War which the left saw as being heavily influenced by an influx of refugees fleeing Communist tyranny from Cuba, Vietnam, Laos and Eastern Europe. The sanctuary movement opened the door in the 1980s to an influx of refugees from the failed Communist movements in Central America, in particular from El Salvador and Guatemala. The sanctuary movement was closely tied to leftist support for the communist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua.

The movement faded away after Violeta Barrios de Chamorro's victory over the Sandinista dictatorship in the Nicaraguan elections of February 1990. The elections were forced on the Sandinista junta by U.S. diplomatic pressure and the anti-communist Contra guerrilla movement. The collapse of the Soviet Union also removed vital economic and military support for communist insurgency and radical regimes in Central America, leading to their collapse as they lacked an adequate domestic base. Yet, American leftists still cherish their part in the struggle to bring communism to Central America, and to bring a flock of refugees into the United States to help transform American politics and foreign policy.

ILRC still pursues this issue, working under the 1997 Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act for which it had lobbied. The problem as ILRC sees it is that "tens of thousands of Salvadoran and Guatemalan refugees applied for asylum in the U.S. but, because of bias against them at the time, very few of those petitions were granted. This situation has resulted in a continuing problem: a large number of refugees from these countries reside in the U.S. to this day without permission to remain permanently." ILRC wants to fully legalize and enfranchise these left-overs from the civil wars of 20 years ago. The logic is the same as James D. Cockcroft's—it will enlarge the recruitment pool for the political left.

The end of the Cold War did not change the worldview of any of the ILRC's staff. On the first anniversary of the September 11

attacks, executive director Susan B. Lyndon issued a statement that is still the first thing a visitor to the ILRC's website sees. "Twelve months after terrorism struck on U.S. soil, I'm sobered to find myself living in a country that feels less than American to me," complained Lyndon. Among the evils she saw being enacted in the name of national security "Proposed rules that would require immigrants (from Muslim countries only) to check themselves into police stations. An initiative to proactively hunt down people (once again from Muslim countries only) with outstanding deportation orders for immigration violations. Even a proposal to enlist citizen spies as informers against neighbors they suspect to be terrorists. From my standpoint as a civil rights advocate, these measures are unconstitutional."

ILRC staff attorneys provide on-site and telephone consultation, training workshops and seminars, and educational curricula on immigration issues to *pro-bono* attorneys and nonprofit agencies serving immigrants from all Third World backgrounds throughout the United States. "They also offer litigation support in select cases, including representing clients, filing *amicus* briefs, serving as expert witnesses, and providing analysis of rules and laws, both proposed and enacted. One focus is to ensure that indigent noncitizens who are accused of crimes receive due process and adequate representation in their court hearings and protection from "immigration consequences"—meaning deportation—from convictions.

The Phillip Burton Immigration & Civil Rights Awards, established in 1989, is an annual celebration of leaders in the field of immigrant rights, an event that highlights the interconnections between left-wing groups and a fund raiser for the ILRC. The award is named after Democratic U.S. Representative Phillip Burton who was one of the most influential and powerful leftists in the House. He was a skillful broker of coalitions that successfully passed liberal legislation dealing with civil rights, the environment, public welfare, and immigration. It is thus fitting that

the Phillip Burton Federal Building in what had been his home district of San Francisco became the first of its type in the country to accept Mexican Consulate identification cards. The building began accepting the cards on January 8, 2003, as part of a trial program. The Mexican Consulate cards were created to serve illegal immigrants who are ineligible for U.S. identification cards. Mexico has issued around two million of the cards, known as the "*matricula* consular" to its nationals, whether they are in the United States legally or illegally, in the past two years. The bilingual document lists the owner's U.S. address as his official residence. Guatemala began offering a similar card last year and other Latin American governments are expected to follow suit.

Mexico's strategy is to win acceptance for the *matricula* through a grassroots lobbying campaign at the local and state level, an effort greatly abetted by the support of the left-wing network of lawyers and community activists. In June, Mexico announced that the *matricula* is now accepted by 402 localities, 32 counties, 122 financial institutions and 908 law enforcement offices. The ultimate aim is to use the *matricula* to gain a state driver's license, which as the most widely accepted identity document in America becomes the method of completely blurring one's illegal alien status.

In 2001, the NLRC had revenues of: \$1,394,470, expenses of \$1,630,664 and assets worth \$1,917,147.

MIGRATION POLICY INSTITUTE

While most of the "open borders" immigration groups got their start a generation ago, as an outgrowth of the radicalism of the 1960s or the battle over immigration reform in the 1980s, the Migration Policy Institute is a "new" organization established in 2001 when the International Migration Policy Program of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace became an independent entity.

The Carnegie IMPP conducted migration policy briefings, policy roundtables, luncheon seminars, and study advisory groups aimed at influencing policy-makers and program officials in Washington. Among its areas of interest were: self-governance at the border, meaning letting communities that straddle a national border manage their own affairs rather than letting policy be set "exclusively in national capitals," U.S. refugee admissions and resettlement policy, where the concern is that "the United States is a much less hospitable country for refugees and asylum seekers" than it used to be, immigrants and social welfare, with a focus on how access to public programs affect "the life-chances of poor immigrants residing in the United States," and managing the US-Mexico migration relationship to make it a "true partnership."

On this last point, the IMPP urged the incoming administrations of U.S. President George W. Bush and Mexican President Vicente Fox to negotiate an agreement that would move beyond "absolute notions of sovereignty" so as to recognize "a clear convergence in the labor markets of both countries....the grand bargain calls for the re-conceptualization of the common border and the border region as a line of convergence rather than separation." The IMPP set out its long term visions as "a North America with gradually disappearing border controls...with permanent migration remaining at moderate levels."

The MPI has continued this same theme, issuing a paper in April 2002 by Co-Director Demetrios Papademetriou detailing "the grand bargain" that should be made between the U.S. and Mexico to include 1) a registration program for unauthorized immigrants living in the U.S. followed by an earned regularization (or legalization) program for those who register. The earned regularization program should include a "Mexicans-first" clause but make the option available to other nationalities in phases; 2) A broad U.S. temporary worker program for new Mexican workers; and 3) expedited family reunification to bring immediate

family members of "unauthorized" immigrants from Mexico to the United States with all the legal protections and worker rights as legal residents. This program is set in the context of an agreement with Mexico, putting Mexico (and Canada) in a special North American system outside the normal immigration control system. The current system is called a "unilateral" approach by the U.S. at border enforcement which should be replaced by a bilateral or multilateral system. The "grand bargain" does not, however, seem to impose on Mexico any new obligations. Mexico would be free to encourage migration northward just as it does today.

Dr. Papademetriou was the Director for Immigration Policy and Research at the U.S. Department of Labor in the Clinton Administration and headed the IMPP when it became the MPI. His work is presented as having been influential in moving the Bush Administration in the direction of "the grand bargain" prior to the September 11, 2001 attacks.

The Carnegie connection explains how the MPI was able to assemble such a prominent collection of funders, a list which includes:

Bevölkerung, Migration und Umwelt (BMU) Foundation
Carnegie Corporation of New York
The Center for Global Development
Chicago Council on Foreign Relations
The Ford Foundation
European Commission
European Union Delegation to the United States
The Fannie Mae Foundation
Fundacao Luso-Americana para o Desenvolvimento
The German Marshall Fund of the United States
Government of Italy
Government of Mexico
JEHT Foundation

Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago
The J.M. Kaplan Fund
The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
National Council of State Legislatures
Open Society Institute/Soros Foundation
South East Asian Resource Action Center
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement

Among the grants awarded to the MPI was \$150,000 to support policy development work on "striking the proper balance between national security concerns and civil liberties/civil rights" by George Soros' Open Society Institute as part of its special 2002 program to meet "new challenges to civil rights and liberties that have emerged since September 11."

The connection with other, older "open borders" groups is evident from the MPI's programs. For example, on October 2, 2003, the MPI sponsored a talk by Wayne Cornelius, Gildred Professor of Political Science and U.S. Mexican Relations and Director, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, at the University of California, San Diego to speak on "U.S. Border Enforcement Strategy." The Center for Comparative Immigration Studies is a 1999 spin-off from the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies which Cornelius founded in 1979. Shortly after the Center's founding in 1980, Cornelius published his views on the immigration issue, asserting that "the problem' is not the migrant himself, but his illegal status in the U.S." Therefore, Cornelius argued, the way to reduce illegal immigration is "To transform as many as possible of today's--and tomorrow's--illegal aliens into legal immigrants, whether they are here as permanent settlers or just temporary workers who cannot or do not want to spend the rest of their lives in the United States." With this outlook, the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies received Ford Foundation grants of \$448,000 in 1984, and \$550,000 in 1987.

Since then, the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies has become one of the most active U.S. publishers of research on Mexico and on cross-borders relations, with publications adopted for classroom use at 208 colleges and universities in the United States, Mexico, Canada, Great Britain, and Japan. The Center's core programs also feature a Visiting Fellows Program, a Summer Seminar in U.S. Studies, and a Research Seminar on Mexico and U.S.-Mexican Relations, all of which focus primarily on that set of policies and attitudes on both sides of the border that will best help the development of Mexico.

This emphasis on how U.S. policy affects others is shown by MPI's response to post- 9/11 security measures. Like other left-wing groups, the MPI's saw its role as that of critic. It's report "America's Challenge: Domestic Security, Civil Liberties and National Unity After September 11" claims "The U.S. government's harsh measures against immigrants since September 11 have failed to make us safer, have violated our fundamental civil liberties, and have undermined national unity.....Rather than relying on individualized suspicion or intelligence-driven criteria, the government has used national origin as a proxy for evidence of dangerousness. By targeting specific ethnic groups with its new measures, the government has violated another core principle of American justice, the Fifth Amendment right to equal treatment." The MPI concluded that "The U.S. government has imposed some immigration measures more commonly associated with totalitarian regimes."

It is never mentioned that all of the 9/11 terrorists belonged to a specific ethnic group. It is overlooked that out of several million members of that ethnic group residing in the United States, only a few thousand were interviewed by the authorities and fewer still were detained for immigration violations. These numbers belie the notion of a massive sweep and are much more indicative of "individualized suspicion or intelligence-driven criteria" playing a role in determining who the authorities

approached. The claim that these measures have proven ineffective cannot be more than an insolent assertion at this time, since there have been no terrorist attacks for more than two years following the 2001 assaults.

The report's conclusions were as expected. The panel writing the report included Ishmael Ahmed, Executive Director of the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services; Charles Kamasaki, Senior Vice President of the National Council of La Raza; Anthony Romero, Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union; Frank Sharry, Executive Director of the National Immigration Forum; and James Zogby, President of the Arab American Institute. Heading the study were MPI Senior Fellow Doris Meissner, who was the Commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service during the Clinton Administration and MPI Senior Analyst Muzaffer A. Chishti, a former chairman of the board of directors of the National Immigration Forum; and a current member of the board of directors of the National Immigration Law Center.

In 2002, MPI had revenues of \$2,191,885, expenses of \$1,950,534 and held assets worth : \$1,442,984.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

The National Council of La Raza (NCLR) is the largest national Hispanic organization, serving all Hispanic nationality groups in all regions of the country. Founded in 1968, the NCLR evolved from the Southwest Council of La Raza (SWCLR) in Arizona. A group first brought together by a research project funded by the Ford Foundation, today the NCLR has over 270 formal affiliates who together serve 40 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia—and a broader network of more than 30,000 groups and individuals nationwide—reaching more than three and a half million Hispanics annually. NCLR's Policy Analysis Center is the preeminent Hispanic "think tank" serving

as a voice for Hispanic Americans in Washington, D.C. with a broad based agenda running from immigration and education, to free trade, affordable housing, health policy, and tax reform. Its president, Raul Yzaguirre, has led the organization for more than 25 years, during which the organization has tried to become a mainstream group working to "reduce poverty and discrimination, and improve life opportunities for Hispanic Americans."

NCLR claims a broad base of financial support. It has a Corporate Board of Advisors, which includes senior executives from 25 major corporations and their liaison staff, who provide ongoing consultation and assistance on a variety of efforts, including fund-raising. The organization receives more than two-thirds of its funding from corporations and foundations, and the remaining from government sources as NCLR acts as a gateway to the Hispanic community.

The Ford Foundation currently lists nine grants to NCLR for the 2001-2003 period totaling \$9,830,000, including a single grant of \$8,050,000 in "support for a capital depletion fund to underwrite the general operating expenses of a leading Latino organization." This is almost half of the \$17 million raised for the capital fund by the end of 2002. There are two grants of \$400,000 each in 2001 and 2003 earmarked specifically as core support for civil rights and immigration projects.

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation awarded Cecilia Munoz, a La Raza vice president, a Genius Grant in 2000 worth \$500,000 payable over five years. The foundation also gave NCLR \$120,000 in 2002.

NCLR's 2002 annual report lists revenues of \$42,860,948, expenses of \$23,905,947 and assets worth \$37,983,653. Of its revenues, just over \$5.4 million came from government grants.

A June 2003 issue brief funded by the Ford Foundation, the Open Society Institute, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation gives an extensive overview of NCLR's view of border issues under the heading "Counter terrorism and the Latino Community Since September 11." Because "40% of the Latino population is foreign-born" in the United States, NCLR is concerned that "immigration and national security have become intermingled in the U.S. in unprecedented ways." according to the paper's author, NCLR staffer Michele Waslin. By abolishing the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and incorporating immigration services and enforcement into the new Department of Homeland Security, immigration has been put in a new context. "Placing the immigration agency within a new mega-national security agency jeopardizes our country's rich immigration tradition and threatens to make the already poor treatment of immigrants by the federal bureaucracy even worse" claims the NCLR paper.

The NCLR is particularly concerned about the use of local and State police to enforce the immigration laws. Its argument is that State and local police are not trained in the complexities of the immigration laws, that they will harass legal immigrants on the suspicion that they may be illegal and that illegal aliens or members of households that contain illegal aliens will be afraid to approach the authorities to report crimes or on any matter for fear of being turned in and deported. Obviously, surviving as an illegal immigrant is much easier if one only needs to fear detection by a very thinly spread force of Federal agents.

Yet, the real world example the NCLR includes in its issue brief does not support any of its concerns, but rather demonstrates how well the new system of local enforcement works: "On August 14, 2002, nine Latino day laborer activists from Chicago were driving through Mercer County Pennsylvania on their way to a regional day labor conference in New York when the van they were driving got a flat tire. As they were changing the tire, a

Pennsylvania State Police officer arrived and demanded immigration documents from all of the passengers. The driver showed his driver's license, but the officer insisted that he needed to see all of the passengers' "green cards." The group included four U.S. citizens, several legal permanent residents, and several undocumented immigrants. The police officer brought the entire group to the police station where the undocumented immigrants were eventually detained by the INS and the others were released. One of the detainees was released (with her three U.S. citizen children), one was eventually released on bond, and one signed a voluntary departure form. As of this writing, two still await their court dates.

The attempt to use driver's licenses initially in lieu of immigration documents in the above example leads to the NCLR's desire to facilitate access to driver's licenses by otherwise "undocumented" immigrants in the hope that they will be accepted as proof that a person rightfully belongs in the United States. The paper states: "Without a driver's license, individuals are often unable to open a bank account, rent an apartment, establish service for utilities, or participate in many other facets of daily life." In an earlier issue brief, Waslin argued against a requirement that Social Security numbers be required to apply for a license, because illegal immigrants don't have such numbers.

In her counterterrorism brief, she argues against the Social Security Administration's practice of comparing submitted employee SS numbers with the SSA data base to weed out people who have submitted numbers to their employers that do not match their names. Employers are then informed that "no match" has been found, leading the employer to make further inquiries which often unmask illegal aliens who have been using fake or stolen SS numbers. "No Match letters have been incredibly disruptive to immigrant communities and to employers who are faced with losing valued workers and who must deal with a rapidly changing workforce.....Important sectors of the labor market

are increasingly dependent on undocumented workers" complains Waslin. That individuals might use fake or stolen SS numbers to obtain a valid drivers license, which would then be used to hide not only the person's immigration status but their true identity, she does not consider a problem.

NCLR opposes the Aviation Transportation and Security Act (ATSA) which required that all baggage screeners be U.S. citizens. Many noncitizen Hispanics were employed as airport screeners. "Tying together citizenship and security—without any evidence that the two are linked—sets a new and dangerous precedent in the United States" writes Waslin. She notes that after September 11, there was a surge of "thousands of longtime permanent residents...toward U.S. citizenship out of a renewed sense of pride and patriotism." but is distressed that "many are applying for citizenship out of a sense of fear; they feel that they must become citizens as their only protection from abuse at the hands of various law enforcement agencies." NCLR advocates immigration reform based on a grant of "earned" amnesty for illegal aliens that would give them legal status.

NATIONAL IMMIGRATION LAW CENTER

Since 1979, the National Immigration Law Center (NILC) has been dedicated to protecting and promoting the rights of low income immigrants with a focus on gaining them unrestricted access to welfare programs and other government-funded social programs on the same basis as legal U.S. citizens. The NILC is headquartered in Los Angeles but also maintains offices in Oakland, California and Washington, DC. It has doubled its staff in the wake of what it believes are the "draconian restrictions on immigrants' rights imposed by the 1996 welfare and immigration laws."

NILC claims that thousands of immigrants have received prenatal care, cancer treatment, and other critical health services as a

result of NILC litigation, often done in cooperation with other groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund. NILC has also established formal collaborative relationships with local immigrant advocacy organizations in California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Texas, and Washington. Together, these states account for almost three-quarters of the immigrant population in the U.S. A survey conducted for the Ford Foundation reported that major media outlets, including the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Los Angeles Times*, regularly call on NILC to explain the latest policy developments affecting immigrants and refugees. NILC conducts more than 80 training and conference presentations annually throughout the country to educate local attorneys and advocates about how laws and policies affect their immigrant clients.

Among the successful initiatives NILC lists on its website are restoring \$12 billion in Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and more than \$800 million in food stamps for legal immigrants targeted by the 1996 Welfare Reform legislation. NILC also obtained a clarification from the INS ensuring that immigrants can receive health care, nutrition, job training, and other non-cash public services without jeopardizing their immigration status. Josh Bernstein, who directs NILC's Washington DC office, was formerly director of Californians for a Fair Share, a coalition formed to oppose welfare cuts, and as a welfare advocate for the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles.

The NILC also likes to harken back to its role in the sanctuary movement helping Central American refugees during the 1980s find asylum and jobs in the United States. Linton Joaquin, NILC's Director of Litigation in Los Angeles, cut his teeth on this issue as executive director for the Central American Refugee Center in Los Angeles.

NILC's work is supported by foundation and government grants as well as publications and training revenue, attorney fees, and individual donations. Among the foundations to which NILC acknowledges financial support are:

The California Endowment
California Wellness Foundation
Annie E. Casey Foundation
Ford Foundation
W.K. Kellogg Foundation
Emma Lazarus Fund—Open Society Institute
Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
Norman Foundation
David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Rosenberg Foundation San Diego Foundation
State Bar of California—Legal Services Trust Fund Program
U.S. Department of Justice—Office of Special Counsel

The Rockefeller Foundation gave the NILC \$200,000 in 2002 "to coordinate and service the Low Wage Immigrant Worker Coalition and conduct policy analysis aimed at strengthening protections for workers vulnerable because of their citizenship/immigration status and expanding workforce development programs that improve their earnings."

On April 15, 2002, The Open Society Institute U.S. Programs office announced grants to 29 "frontline organizations" across the country "to meet the new challenges to civil rights and liberties that have emerged since September 11." The Open Society Institute's 2002 Annual Report on programs in the United States termed the response to the September 11 terror attacks as "xenophobic" and stated "the civil liberties crises we face are daunting—vastly increased government surveillance and detention powers, secret legal proceedings, and institutionalized discrimination against noncitizens. But the array of non-governmental organ-

izations speaking out against these abuses, and fighting them in the courts and in the media, is stronger than it has ever been. And—in contrast to earlier periods of great strain for civil liberties, such as the World Wars and the McCarthy era—these organizations have been unflinching in their principled advocacy. OSI has been proud to support this work and will continue to do so."

The grants totaled \$2,520,000 and were focused on civil liberties, immigrant rights, detention and racial-profiling issues. The NLIC's grant was for \$75,000 to support policy analysis, litigation and advocacy work. In 1997, the Open Society Institute had given NLIC \$525,000.

THE OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE

The Ford Foundation has been the main "strategic funder" of left-wing movements, that is, a foundation that sets an agenda then finds or creates groups to carry it out. Coming on strong, however, is The Open Society Institute founded by billionaire currency trader George Soros. The Soros foundations network is headed by Aryeh Neier, founder of Human Rights Watch, formerly national director of the Civil Liberties Union and a regular columnist for *The Nation*. Soros came to America from Hungary via England, and though he is now a naturalized American citizen and has little use for the concept of nationality.

The network funds a variety of left-wing causes both in the United States and around the world in the amount of \$500 million per year. The Emma Lazarus Fund of the Open Society Institute was established with a \$50 million endowment in 1996. Named after the author of the poem whose verse is associated with the Statue of Liberty, it committed \$43 million the following year to organizations committed to fighting "the unfair treatment of and discrimination against immigrants who are lawfully present in the United States." The Fund was a direct response to the 1996 welfare reform law which limited immigrants' access to welfare enti-

tlements. Its mission was to counter the "intensifying anti-immigrant rhetoric" that welfare reform purportedly encouraged and to help integrate newcomers into the American mainstream.

Open immigration is not the only radical cause Soros funds. He has set up several programs that have given lavishly to groups working to legalize narcotics [The Lindesmith Center], to promote abortion [The Reproductive Rights Program] and euthanasia [The Program on Death in America], and to reduce the role of punishment in the criminal justice system [The Center on Crimes, Communities and Culture]. Recently, Soros donated \$5 million to MoveOn.org, a group originally created to defend President Bill Clinton during his sex scandal and impeachment, but which has now become a major part of the antiwar movement. MoveOn's position is that the United States should immediately withdraw all troops from Iraq and turn the country over to the United Nations.

SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER

Morris Dees and Joseph J. Levin, Jr. formally incorporated the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) in 1971, with civil rights activist Julian Bond as its first president. The SPLC is located in Montgomery, Alabama, the home state of both Dees and Levin. Dees had been a successful attorney and publisher who sold his company to Times Mirror, the parent company of the *Los Angeles Times*, in 1969. He had become involved in controversial civil rights cases and turned his attention full time to their pursuit. He attracted the attention of fellow attorney Levin. The SPLC history claims the organization has "achieved significant legal victories, including landmark Supreme Court decisions and crushing jury verdicts against hate groups."

Both SPLC founders have been involved in Democratic Party politics. In 1972, Dees was presidential nominee George McGovern's finance director and in 1976, Levin left the Center to

supervise President-elect Jimmy Carter's Justice Department transition team. He went on to serve as Special Assistant to Attorney General Griffin B. Bell.

Trial Lawyers for Public Justice named Dees the Trial Lawyer of the Year in 1987, and the National Education Association awarded him the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Award in 1990 and its Friend of Education Award in 2001.

SPLC established Teaching Tolerance in 1991, an educational program to help K-12 teachers combat bigotry and promote diversity in their communities. It distributes a free magazine twice a year to more than 500,000 educators, and provides multimedia kits to thousands of schools and community groups. In 2001, SPLC launched its Tolerance.org website to counter "the backlash against Arab Americans following the events of 9.11." From the Tolerance.org site one can go to a section aimed at children called "Planet Tolerance." Here one finds a comparison between Santa Claus and an image similar to Osama Bin Laden. Both images feature what are presented as identical beards. "But change one little thing—transform the jaunty red cap into a turban—and very different emotions may be invoked....Does one image feel different, emotionally, than the other?" asks the caption. This comparison of "images" is meant "to create a powerful lesson about the impact of stereotypes."

The SPLC prefers its own brand of stereotypes, routinely referring to all opponents of open borders and illegal immigration as "neo-Nazis" "racists" or "hate groups." Its standard tactic is to lump everyone from the Ku Klux Klan to the Center for Immigration Studies together as a single conspiratorial white supremacist movement. Rather than extol the virtues of immigrants and the contributions they make to American society as do other open borders groups, the SPLC concentrates on attacking the motives of those who want to halt illegal immigration and place more emphasis on the assimilation of a more manageable number of legal immigrants.

Due to the deteriorating situation along the U.S.-Mexico border, people living on the American side are finding their situation becoming more and more intolerable. This is especially true along a 261-mile stretch of Arizona ranch and desert territory which has become the main crossing point for large, organized and armed gangs who smuggle drugs as well as aliens into the United States. They steal anything they can carry away, vandalize buildings, damage irrigation systems, and kill livestock and pets. Vehicles are a prime target and car jacking is a constant danger. Residents are afraid to travel alone or unarmed, and ranch houses have become to look like the fortified dwellings of the frontier days of the 19th century.

But even the defense of private property against criminal activity is being challenged by "open border" groups. The Southern Poverty Law Center, along with other groups such as the Border Action Network, have launched legal actions against local citizens for allegedly interfering with the civil rights of illegal immigrants by detaining those who trespass on their land and turning them over to the Border Patrol.

During the 1980s and 1990s, SPLC attorneys developed strategies to hold white supremacist leaders accountable for their followers' violence. Suing for monetary damages against the United Klans of America, the neo-Nazi Aryan Nations and the White Patriot Party in North Carolina effectively put those organizations out of business. Few could dispute the good ends of such suits, but now the SPLC is turning those same tactics against common citizens who are trying to do nothing more than defend their own rights and property against depredation by acknowledged law-breakers. Given the financial and legal resources possessed by the SPLC and other left-wing groups, they can bankrupt any private individuals who oppose them with lengthy and expensive court proceedings regardless of the merits of the cases themselves.

SPLC is a 501(c)(03) public charity. In fiscal year 2002 it showed revenues of \$31,527,142, expenses of \$21,549,595 and net assets greater than \$110 million.

THE MOVEMENT AT THE GRASSROOTS

The profiles above cover only some of the larger, better-funded "open borders" groups advancing left-wing political agendas in legislation, politics and the courts. There are hundreds of other smaller grass roots organizations spread across the country working with these larger groups and in local coalitions in pursuit of the same ends. A study by Joseph E. Fallon for the American Immigration Control Foundation, a group that favors stronger border enforcement, discovered 171 nonprofit organizations concerned with immigration that were large enough to have filed with the Internal Revenue Service. There are numerous other major groups which do not have non-profit status, or which are volunteer, grass roots groups.

The left has always been more active in creating larger numbers of organizations to create a perception of mass support and generate a chorus of voices that can shout down any opposition.

One example of this strategy is the Coalition for the Human Rights of Immigrants in New York City. The Coalition was formed in October 1997 in response to an increase in workplace raids by the INS in the New York area following passage of the 1996 immigration law reforms. It's core membership consists of the Center for Immigrant Families (CIF), Centro de Educación de Trabajadores, Comité Guatemalteco Tecún-Umán, National Employment Law Project (NELP) Nicaragua Solidarity Network of Greater New York, NY Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador (NY-CISPES) and UNITE Garment Workers Justice Center. As can be deduced from this list, the Coalition still has strong roots in the 1980s Sanctuary movement and Central American civil wars. It has built on this past focus by

embracing the causes of Palestinian, Pakistani and other Muslims detained in the aftermath of September 11.

The Coalition also works in support of organizing campaigns coordinated by the National Network of Immigrant and Refugee Rights, of which it is a member. A primary focus has been on helping "undocumented immigrants" defend their labor rights, including the right to organize in unions. The Coalition organizes protests and demonstrations, and distributes leaflets. It is not sufficiently organized to receive tax-deductible contributions, but does receive funding through its sponsor, the A.J. Muste Memorial Institute. The Muste institute is devoted to "radical pacifist philosophy" and social change involving "liberation struggles, racism, sexism, and labor organizing." Muste awarded grants totaling just over \$417,000 in 2002, primarily in small amounts to groups opposing war, "colonialism" and the death penalty. The Coalition received \$1,500 from Muste in 2002.

There are groups which work to coordinate left-wing grant-makers to help them find grassroots organizations. For example, the National Network of Grant-makers was founded in 1980 with "the goal of increasing resources, financial and otherwise, to organizations working for social change. Our members are individual donors, foundation staff, board, and grant-making committee members." The NNG held its 21st conference October 12-15, 2003 in Tucson, Arizona under the heading "Building Power for Social Justice." The conference was an exercise in "strategy-focused workshops, interactive plenaries, 'Workshops on the Road' that will take us into Tucson communities and across the US/Mexico border." The keynote speaker was Amy Goodman, host of Pacifica Radio's "Democracy Now" program carried on many National Public Radio stations.

Among the events was a Border Mobilization held on the first day. The Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice (based in Albuquerque, New Mexico) brought together

affiliates, associates and allied organizations to march and demonstrate for "social, cultural and economic justice on the US/Mexico border" at six major border crossing points. SNEEJ claims 50 grass roots organizations as members. The purpose of the demonstration was to "physically represent the unity between two cultures and collapse an imaginary division" and "to imagine that a different world is possible." The group's "Border Manifesto" called for a "Free Border...that permits the free movement of people and not just goods and capital" and "amnesty for all of the illegal migrant workers." October 12 was chosen because it has been designated "International Indigenous Peoples' Day" to protest "the racism, greed, violence, genocide and environmental destruction that Columbus Day represents."

Conclusion

When President Bush and others from the conservative end of the political spectrum talk about adopting many of the same immigration reforms that have been at the center of left-wing agitation for decades—as reflected in the president's proposal of January 7, 2003 to give an "earned" legal status to working illegal aliens—the motive is the narrow one of placating pressure from business interests. "No one can deny that the more than 8 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S. are an integral part of the economy. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan credited this vast labor pool with helping to power growth while keeping down inflation during the 1990s." writes *Business Week's* Mexico bureau chief Geri Smith, "U.S. businesses, from five-star hotels in Manhattan to carpet mills in North Carolina, yearn for a bigger pool of low-wage workers."

Chairman Greenspan is known for ascribing inflation to rising wages, but is the importing of an impoverished alien proletariat really in the long-term national interest of most Americans, or even the business class? One does not have to go to the dreams of Lenin wannabes to find plenty of activists who are betting on the influx of Third World immigrants to change the direction of American politics.

The AFL-CIO has changed its position on immigration for political reasons. It once opposed mass immigration as a threat to high wages. But as manufacturing employment has declined in traditional industrial sectors, so has union membership. The AFL-CIO now sees immigrant labor as a source of new members in expanding service sectors, so has come out in favor of reform. "The AFL-CIO believes that such legislative reform must include, at a minimum: (1) legalization, including the right of immigrant workers in the United States to live and work in this country and become its citizens; and (2) the right of immigrant workers to unite their families in the United States if they wish."

The 1.6 million-member Service Employees International Union (SEIU) endorsed former Vermont Governor Howard Dean for the Democratic presidential nomination on November 12, 2003. Dean was widely considered the most left candidate in the race and was a strong opponent of the war in Iraq. Dean also endorsed the concept of "earned amnesty" for illegal aliens that has been the centerpiece of "open borders" groups. The SEIU is the largest union of health care workers in North America and the largest and fastest growing union in the AFL-CIO. It also proudly claims to be the largest union of immigrant workers and one of the most ethnically diverse unions in the nation. Its leaders participated in the anti-globalization riots and have supported left-wing causes generally.

In sum, a well-funded network of foundations, lawyers and grassroots activists has been created to push the leftist vision of a transformed American society. The existence, composition and agenda of this network of groups advocating "open" borders must be taken into account by anyone proposing to either reform the immigration laws or improve their enforcement.

Notes

¹ Steven Bernstein, "The Ford Foundation: Funding International Terror," www.frontpagemag.com November 12, 2003. The Bernstein article was based in part on the four part series by Edwin Black, "Funding hate: Ford Foundation finances anti-Israel Activists," which was published by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency and led to a public embarrassment for Ford that led its president Susan Beresford to apologize and to initiate an inquiry into Ford funding procedures led by former Clinton official, Stuart Eisenstadt.

Alexander Jutkowitz, "What Latins Think: The Poder/Westhill Survey" *Poder*, January 2004, p. 16. *Poder* is a business magazine published by and for the Hispanic community, headquartered in Miami. The poll was conducted among Hispanics in seven major cities by Westhill Partners for the magazine between October 24 and Nov 16, 2003.

Joel Mowbray, "Visas that Should Have Been Denied: A look at 9/11 terrorists' visa applications" *National Review Online*, October 9, 2002.

Steven A. Camarota, *The Open Door: How Militant Islamic Terrorists Entered and Remained in the United States, 1993-2001*, (Center for Immigration Studies, Paper #21, May 2002). Available at www.cis.org/articles/2002/Paper21/terrorism.html

The Border Patrol is specifically responsible for patrolling the 6,000 miles of Mexican and Canadian international land borders and 2,000 miles of coastal waters surrounding the Florida Peninsula and the island of Puerto Rico. The Border Patrol numbers only 9,500 personnel, including those in administration, training and support slots, with which to guard against smugglers as well as illegal aliens 24 hours a day, seven days a week. By way of comparison, there are nearly 6,000 personnel employed by the city police and county sheriff in the Dallas-Ft. Worth Texas metropolitan area.

² For a detailed discussion of how past immigration reform legislation has served as a catalyst for mass migration to the United States see Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., *Mass Migration and the National Interest* (M. E. Sharpe, 1992), Chapter 6.

³ W.W. Norton & Co., NY 1998

⁴ Grove Press, 1986

James D. Cockcroft, *Outlaws in the Promised Land: Mexican Immigrant Workers and America's Future* (New York: Grove Press, 1986), p. 11.

Ibid, p. 240.

Mario T. Garcia, *Mexican Americans: Leadership, Ideology & Identity 1930-1960* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989) p. 30. Chapter 2 is a history of LULAC.

Annette Oliveira, *MALDEF: Diez Anos*, (Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, 1979), p. 10. This is an "official" history of MALDEF.

Karen O'Connor and Lee Epstein, "A Legal Voice for the Chicano Community: The Activities of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund", *Social Science Quarterly* June 1984, p. 249.

"About Us" ACLU website, <http://www.aclu.org/about/aboutmain.cfm>.

Ford Foundation Annual Report:1983, p. 35.

Ford Foundation Annual Report:1984, p. 39.

Steven R. Shapiro and Wade Henderson, "Justice for Aliens" *Our Endangered Rights: The ACLU Report on Civil Liberties Today*, edited by Norman Dorsen (New York: Pantheon, 1984), pp. 160- 178.

"ACLU of Rhode Island Calls New Driver's License Policy Shortsighted" ACLU press release, May 23, 2003.

"ACLU of Florida Opposes Local Police Enforcement of Immigration Laws," ACLU press release, May 9, 2002.

"ACLU Calls Latest Immigrant Tracking Scheme Discriminatory and Ineffective," ACLU press release, June 5, 2002.

"Ford Foundation Gives \$7 Million to ACLU Endowment Campaign" ACLU press release, June 28, 1999

⁵ "American Civil Liberties Union: FF Grants" Ford Foundation website, www.FordFound.org.

Rose Gutfeld , "Citizens and Persons" Ford Foundation Report, September, 2003.

Andrew C. McCarthy, "Material Damage: The Ninth Circuit eviscerates a critical antiterror law" National Review Online, December 22, 2003, <http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/mccarthy200312220001.asp>.

Toby Alice Volkman , "Crossing Borders: In an increasingly interconnected world, the discipline of area studies is at a turning point," Ford Foundation Report, Winter 1998. Available at http://www.ford-found.org/publications/ff_report/view_ff_report_detail.cfm?report_index=103.

"After 9/11, a Focus on Results" Remarks by Susan V. Berresford at the Federation for Community Planning's Human Services Institute. Cleveland, Ohio, April 5, 2002. Available at http://www.ford-found.org/news/view_reflection_detail.cfm?reflection_index=17.

Grant information, Ford Foundation website, http://www.fordfound.org/grants_db/view_grant_detail.cfm?grant_id=142729.

Grant Information, Ford Foundation website http://www.fordfound.org/grants_db/view_grant_detail.cfm?grant_id=143968; www.nlg.org

Neil F. Carlson, "September 11th in the Classroom" Ford Foundation Report, Fall, 2002.

"Immigration and Citizenship" MALDEF website <http://www.maldef.org/immigration/index.htm>.

"Fighting for Georgia Driver's License Rights" MALDEF Newsletter, Winter 2003, p. 5.

"MALDEF Praises Gov. Davis For Signing Driver's License Bill," MALDEF press release, September 5, 2003, <http://www.maldef.org/news/press.cfm?ID=184>.

"MALDEF Extremely Pleased That Treasury Department Will Not Change The Rules On Matriculas" MALDEF Press release, September 29, 2003. <http://www.maldef.org/news/press.cfm?ID=187>

Dudley L. Poston, Jr., Steven A. Camarota, and Amanda K. Baumle, "Remaking the Political Landscape: The Impact of Illegal and Legal Immigration on Congressional Apportionment" (Center for Immigration Studies, October 2003).

Peter Ross Range , "Voting Rights: The Next Round" *Ford Foundation Report*, Fall 2001.

Quoted in "Civil Rights Movement" *Border Watch*, October, 1992.

"Noncitizens Should Get Vote, Too, Mayor Says: Latinos Fault Access To D.C. Services" *The Washington Post*, October 1, 2002; page B1.

Ron Hayduk and Michele Wucker, "Let legal immigrants vote in city" *New York Daily News*, September 22, 2003.

Joaquin Avila, "Political Apartheid in California: Consequences of Excluding a Growing Noncitizen Population," Latino Policy and Issues Brief #9, UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center, December 2003.

"League of United Latin American Citizens" *The Left Guide*, edited by Derk Arend Wilcox (Economics America, 2001) p. 297.

"LULAC Institute, Inc." Philanthropic Research, Inc.

"Ford Foundation Grantees Helped to Win Recent Supreme Court Decisions on Affirmative Action and Gay Rights and a New York School Funding Ruling" Ford Foundation press release, June 30, 2003. http://www.fordfound.org/news/view_news_detail.cfm?news_index=77.

"Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund" *The Left Guide*, p. 315.

Ann Fagan Ginger and Eugene M. Tobin, editors, *The National Lawyers Guild: From Roosevelt through Reagan*. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988), p. 81.

"Lawyers Guild Marks 50 Years In the Fight for Justice," *Frontline*, June 8, 1987.

"Resolution Calling for Impeachment of George W. Bush, Holder of the Title of United States President, and Cabinet Officials Responsible for suppression of Constitutional Rights and Violation of International Law, Which is part of the Supreme Law of the Land, NLG Convention, Minneapolis, October 2003. <http://www.nlg.org/members/2003resolutions/Impeachment.pdf>.

National Lawyers Guild National Immigration Project *Immigration Newsletter*, November, 1972, p. 1.

National Lawyers Guild National Immigration Project *Immigration Newsletter*, March-April, 1987, p. 2.

Grant information, Ford Foundation 2002 Annual Report, http://www.fordfound.org/grants_db/view_grant_detail.cfm?grant_id=143968.

"Immigrant Rights Groups Urge AFL-CIO to Address Immigration Policy Threat to Workers' Rights" News Release, April 1, 2000. http://www.nnirr.org/news/press_releases/heartrelease.htm.

Susan Schmidt, "Lawyer, 2 Others Face New Terror Charges," *The Washington Post*, November 20, 2003; p. A03

"National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild." Philanthropic Research, Inc.

"Our Mission" National Immigration Forum, <http://www.immigrationforum.org>.

"Comprehensive Reform of Our Immigration Laws" NIF Backgrounder, October, 2003. <http://www.immigrationforum.org/currentissues/articles/CIRBackgrounder.pdf>.

"The 2000 Election: Immigrant Voters and the Future of the Immigration Debate" National Immigration Forum, 2002.

"Fix '96," NIF website,

NIF Letter to the Editor, *Immigration Daily*, n.d. <http://www.ilw.com/lawyers/immigdaily/letters/2002,0606-NIF.shtm>.

"Comprehensive Reform of Our Immigration Laws"

"Key Concerns with Smith Naturalization Bill (HR 3837)" NIF website, http://www.immigrationforum.org/currentissues/articles/060198_3837.htm.

"Terrorism and the Government's Response: Broad Initiatives Do Not Make Us Safer" NIF Background, November, 2003. <http://www.immigrationforum.org/currentissues/articles/GovernmentResponseToTerrorism11-03.pdf>.

Grant Recipients, Immigration, MacArthur Foundation website

"OSI Announces Post 9/11 Grants: Focus on Civil Liberties, Immigrant Rights, Ant-profiling"

FF Grants, National Immigration Forum, Ford Foundation website, <http://www.fordfound.org/search/results.cfm>

"National Immigration Forum, Inc." Philanthropic Research, Inc.

"Governments Crackdown on Immigrants Post 9/11 Creates Climate of Fear, Not Security" AILA press release, November 18, 2003. <http://www.aila.org/contentViewer.aspx?bc=9,594,4129>.

Matt Hayes, "Ties to Terrorism" Fox News Views, July 10, 2003. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,91527,00.html>.

"Comprehensive Immigration Reform" AILA Issue Paper, August 16, 2003.

"Special Registration: Changes Do Not Go Far Enough" AILA press release, December 1, 2003 <http://www.aila.org/contentViewer.aspx?bc=9,594,4206>.

Department of State, "Redesignation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations" Public Notice 4501, Federal Register, October 2, 2003, p. 56860.

Jon Kyl, "Alien Laws: We have rules. Why aren't we enforcing them?" National Review Online, December 8, 2003. http://ads.nationalreview.com/pop-ups/ad_pop_books_christmas03.html.

Congressional Record, May 13, 1975, p. 14159.

"Take Action! Ensure that those who are responsible for war crimes are accountable," CCR website,

David Cole, "Terrorizing Immigrants in the Name of Fighting Terrorism," *Human Rights*, Winter 2002, <http://www.abanet.org/irr/hr/winter02/cole.html>.

"Center for Constitutional Rights, Inc." Philanthropic Research, Inc.

Legislative and Governmental Advocacy: The ABA's Legislative and Governmental Priorities, ABA website, <http://www.aba.org>.

Michael S. Greco, "From the Chair" *Human Rights*, Winter 2001.

Daniel Kanstroom, "Introduction" *Ibid*.

Scott C. Titshaw, "U.S. Immigration Law: Denying the Value of Gay & Lesbian Families" and Kristen B. Rosati, "International Human Rights Treaties Can Make a Difference," *Ibid*.

"Stories from the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride" American Friends Service Committee,

"On borders, migratory agreements, and the rights of migrants" March 21 and 22, 2002. <http://www.afsc.org/immigrants-rights/news/monterrey-declaration.htm>.

"Immigrants and Racial/Ethnic Tensions" American Friends Service Committee, <http://www.afsc.org/immigrants-rights/learn/racial-ethnic.htm>.

"Episodes from the Struggle for Justice, Equality, & Dignity: A Brief History of the Last 15 Years National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights" http://www.nnirr.org/about/about_timeline.html.

"Statement by the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights on the Attacks of September 11" September 14, 2001. http://www.nnirr.org/news/press_releases/sept20.htm.

"A Statement in Support of Peace in the Middle East" April 9, 2002. http://www.nnirr.org/news/press_releases/april9.htm

Elizabeth Martinez "Immigrant Rights and the Fight for Peace" *Network News*, Fall-Winter 2002/2003, p. 3.

Stated on the opening page of the Institute for MultiRacial Justice website at

"U.S. Immigrant Rights Delegation Denounces Rising Anti-Immigrant Racism in United States"

Hands that Shape the World: Report on the Conditions of Immigrant Women Five Years After the Beijing Conference Executive Summary. <http://www.nnirr.org/projects/execsummary.html>

"Legalization Campaign" http://www.nnirr.org/projects/projects_legal.html.

This and other information on the Immigration Defense Project can be found on the organization's website / [immigrant_defense_project.html](http://www.nnirr.org/projects/projects_legal.html).

"About ILRC" on the organization's website <http://www.ilrc.org>

Alan Elsner, "Latin American States Give Aliens ID Cards in U.S." *The Washington Post*, November 13, 2003.

Marti Dinerstein, "The Issuance, Acceptance and Reliability Of Consular Identification Cards" Testimony prepared for the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, June 19, 2003.

"Immigration Legal Resource Center" Philanthropic Research, Inc.

International Migration Policy Program Project Description, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace website, http://www.ceip.org/files/projects/imp/IMP_descr.ASP#Border.

"Mexico-U.S. Migration: A Shared Responsibility: Summary of Recommendations" February 14, 2001, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace website <http://www.ceip.org/files/Publications/SumofRec.asp?p=6&from=pubdate>.

Demetrios G. Papademetriou, "A Grand Bargain: Balancing National Security, Economic, and Immigration Interests of the U.S. and Mexico" Migration Policy Institute, April, 2002. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/files/bargain.pdf>.

"OSI Announces Post 9/11 Grants: Focus on Civil Liberties, Immigrant Rights, Anti-profiling" Open Society Institute press release, April 15, 2002. http://www.soros.org/newsroom/press/post911grants_20020415.

Wayne Cornelius, "Solution to the Immigration Problem: Make the Illegals Legal," *San Diego Union*, May 25, 1980.

Ford Foundation Annual Report: 1985, p. 65; Ford Foundation, Letter, April, 1985; Ford Foundation Annual Report: 1987, p. 74.

Summary, "America's Challenge: Domestic Security, Civil Liberties and National Unity After September 11" Migration Policy Institute, 2003.

"Migration Policy Institute" Philanthropic Research, Inc.

"About The National Council of La Raza" NCLA website, <http://www.nclr.org/about>.

"National Council of La Raza FF Grants" Ford Foundation website, [http://www.fordfound.org/search/results_section.cfm?section=FF Grants&searchstring=la%20raza](http://www.fordfound.org/search/results_section.cfm?section=FF%20Grants&searchstring=la%20raza).

Neil Hrab, "A Look at the MacArthur Foundation" Foundation Watch (Capital Research Center, August 2003) p. 4.

"National Council of La Raza" Philanthropic Research, Inc.

Michele Waslin, "Counterterrorism and the Latino Community Since September 11," NCLR Issue Brief #10, June 2003. p. 1. http://www.soros.org/newsroom/press/post911grants_20020415.

Ibid, p. 6.

Ibid, p. 7.

Michele Waslin, "Safe Roads, Safe Communities: Immigrants and State Driver's License Requirements" NCLR Issue Brief #6, May 2002.

Waslin, "Counterterrorism" p. 10.

"Overview of NILC Advocacy and Services," on the NILC website at

"National Immigrant Law Center", Grant Recipients, Rockefeller Foundation website <http://www.rockfound.org/display.asp?context=4&collection=12&Preview=0&ARCurrent=1>.

Open Society Institute, U.S. Programs 2002, Annual Report, pp. 5, 17. http://www.soros.org/resources/articles_publications/publications/usprogramsannualreport_20030501/a_complete.pdf

"OSI Announces Post 9/11 Grants: Focus on Civil Liberties, Immigrant Rights, Ant-profiling" Open Society Institute press release, April 15, 2002.

"Open Society Institute" *The Left Guide*, edited by Derk Arend Wilcox (Economics America, 2001) p. 392.

Transcript: David Brancaccio interviews George Soros , Now with Bill Moyers (PBS television), September 12, 2003. http://www.pbs.org/now/transcript/transcript_soros.html.

Neil Hrab, "George Soros' Social Agenda for America: Drug Legalization, Euthanasia, Immigrant Entitlements and Feminism" Capital Research Center *Foundation Watch*, April 2003. The OSI has supported the Prison Moratorium Project, to help launch "It's Bigger than Hip-Hop" project, "a pop culture project that engages young people with political activism and community organizing to generate change around the issue of mass incarceration." see "OSI Awards 2003 Soros Justice Fellowships February 3, 2003" OSI website, http://www.soros.org/initiatives/justice/news/justicefellowships_20030203. See also *The Left Guide*, p. 392.

See the group's website at www.moveon.org.

"Dismantling Bigotry, Valuing Diversity"

"Planet Tolerance: Explore Images in Action" http://www.tolerance.org/images_action/answer.jsp?p=0&id=32.

See for example, Bob Moser, "Rough Ride: Anti-immigration activists confront a pro-migrant freedom ride—joined by some of America's leading neo-Nazi groups" SPLC website, .

Evelyn Nieves, "Civil Rights Charges Dog Citizen Patrols on Border" *The Washington Post*, December 15, 2003; p. A03. See also "Leiva v. Ranch Rescue" on the SPLC website www.splcenter.org.

"Southern Poverty Law Center, Inc." Guidestar: The National Database of Nonprofit Organizations, www.guidestar.org.

Joseph E. Fallon, *The Improper Use of Public Funds: Grants, Special Interests and Immigration* (American Immigration Control Foundation, 2002), p. 3.

Coalition for the Human Rights of Immigrants website, <http://www.itapnet.org/chri>.

A.J. Muste Memorial Institute, 2002 Roster of Grants, <http://www.ajmuste.org/grants2002.htm>.

National Network of Grantmakers, www.nng.org.

"Thousands Scheduled to Protest in 6 Border Cities, Demand Human Right" Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice press release, October 3, 2003.

Event description, National Network of Grantmakers,

Geri Smith, "How to Deal with Immigrant Labor" *Business Week*, November 3, 2003.

"The Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride: On The Road to Citizenship, AFL-CIO Executive Council statement, August 07, 2002. <http://www.aflcio.org/aboutaflcio/ecouncil/ec0807d2002.cfm>.

"Nation's Largest Health Care Union Endorses Howard Dean for President" Dean for President Campaign press release, November 12, 2003. http://www.deanforamerica.com/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=10469&security=1&news_iv_ctrl=1301.

