

Center for American Progress



SPECIAL PRESENTATION

“STRANGE BED FELLOWS? ANTI-IMMIGRATION ORGANIZATIONS AND HATE GROUPS”

MODERATED BY:

**HENRY FERNANDEZ, SENIOR FELLOW,
CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

FEATURED PANELISTS:

**MARK POTOK, DIRECTOR, INTELLIGENCE PROJECT
AT THE SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER**

**DEVIN BURGHART, DIRECTOR, BUILDING DEMOCRACY
INITIATIVE, THE CENTER FOR NEW COMMUNITY**

**9:30 AM – 10:30 AM
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2007**

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY
DC TRANSCRIPTION & MEDIA REPURPOSING**

MR. HENRY FERNANDEZ: (In progress) – titled “Strange Bed Fellows? Anti-immigration Organizations and Hate Groups.” We have two of the nation’s leading experts to discuss this topic with us this morning, but before I introduce them, let me explain just a little bit about the ground rules for this morning’s discussion.

Both of our panelists will give short opening presentations of about six minutes. We’ll follow this with questions from me and answers from our panelists totaling about 20 minutes. And then, I’ll open the floor for questions to be answered by the panelists from members of the audience for about 20 minutes. And before we do that, I’ll give the ground rules for that.

Let me just take a second to explain why we’re interested in this topic. Anti-immigrant groups have gotten a tremendous amount of attention for their cause over the last year, and despite this, the public actually knows very little about these organizations, how they came to exist, and the broader goals of their leadership. Fortunately, we have two folks with us today who know more about this issue than just about anybody in the country. So let me introduce those two gentlemen.

Mark Potok, who is to my immediate right, is the director of the Southern Poverty Law Center's Intelligence product – sorry, Intelligence Project, and editor of *Intelligence Report* magazine. Mark has previously been a reporter for *USA Today*, the *Dallas Times Herald*, and the *Miami Herald*. Based in Alabama, he and his team have done years of investigative work, showing the long history of relationships between anti-immigrant leaders, eugenics, and white supremacy.

Recently, they may be best known for showing that Lou Dobbs, relying on lies told by white supremacists, erroneously reported an increase in the number of leprosy patients, and that somehow, immigrants were responsible. This research was picked up by both *60 Minutes* and the *New York Times* in stories that wound up being critical of Dobbs.

Devin Burghart, at the end of the table, is the director of the Center for New Community’s Building Democracy Initiative, a national program to defend civil and human rights based in Chicago. Devin has done extensive research in the nativism and white nationalism, and has used that research to help community based efforts to defeat hate-filled propaganda, including the groundbreaking Welcoming Iowa Coalition. For the last decade, he has written on the anti-immigrant organizations and their impacts. His latest book, *Lady Liberty No More: The New Nativism in the United States* will be published later this year. Both men are quoted heavily by the nation’s leading newspapers, radio news, and television news programs. So I’m going to start off by just asking Mark to tell us something.

MR. MARK POTOK: Well, thanks for having us, Henry. I appreciate it very much. Let me just say very briefly what we do – SPLC, the Southern Poverty Law Center, is a civil rights organization. We're based in Montgomery, Alabama and we're probably – probably most well known for the lawsuits, actually, that we filed over the last 20 years or so against the white supremacist organizations.

Recently our legal department, which I'm not a part of, has brought a number of cases having to do with immigration as well. We sued Ranch Rescue, which is one of the nastiest vigilante groups down the border, including a number of mercenaries and so on, and ended up seizing, for our clients, who had been pistol-whipped by a particular rancher, and people in the Ranch Rescue group, a paramilitary training compound on the border in Arizona that was supposed to train more vigilantes.

We've got a suit right now going against the Imperial clans of America, a similar thing. Three clan – two clansmen attacked a young kid at a particular country fair in Kentucky, thinking he was Hispanic. He wasn't, as it happened, but it was a 300-pound man attacking a 150-pound kid. We've got a number of other suits along those lines. We've sued forestry companies, some construction companies in New Orleans for essentially holding immigrants in a kind of indentured servitude.

Let me jump on to say, in these very few minutes I have, our interest in immigration began probably about the same time as Devin's on the late '90s. In '98, in particular for us, we saw a meeting in Cullman, Alabama hosted by the Council of Conservative Citizens. This is a descendant of the White Citizens' Council, a group that says that blacks are, quote, "a retrograde species of humanity."

Attending this meeting was an unrobed clansman, William Burchfield, the Western states' regional coordinator of FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform, a guy named Rick Oltman, who incidentally, has spoken to the CCC several times, a woman named Barbara Coe, head of the California Coalition for Immigration Reform, and a man named Glenn Spencer. And so what we saw right then was we were seeing the very beginnings of sort of new nativist movement, and we're seeing allegedly mainstream organizations like FAIR mixing with these kinds of people.

From there, people will remember very briefly that Roger and Donald Barnet, two brothers in Arizona, got a huge amount of essentially fawning publicity over the fact that they claimed there were many, many thousands – there were many people crossing their leased ranch lands in Southeastern Arizona.

To jump ahead in this history, in April of 2005, the then relatively small Minutemen Group held something called the Minutemen Project, on the board in Cochise County and out of that, although it wasn't terribly successful and there were far, far fewer people who came, and they said – and the Minutemen said it kind of spawned a very – a really prairie fire of these groups.

As both Devin has noted, in his own work and ours as well, something like 250 new groups were formed in the next year and a half or so. By our count, 144 of those are

what we've sort of called nativist extreme, meaning these are groups that don't merely oppose immigration policy or want to change immigration policy, which of course is everyone's right in a democracy without question. These are groups that go out and confront and harass individuals.

In any case, the effects of this nativist movement, that we feel we're seeing is, of course, is the failure of any kind of legislative solution, and I think that's largely due to the fact that this nativist movement has managed to split the Republican Party between this kind of populist wing and its business wing. Also, and this relates very specifically to our work with white supremacist groups. White supremacists, I would say, as a general matter, find it very tough to get out there and get their message to the public and get any kind of real hearing.

This is a different story. Immigration, I think, has worked for these groups extremely well because it's such an easy issue to cast in terms of skin color. So by our count, there were 602 hate groups operating in the United States in the year 2000. By 2006 that has reached 844, which is almost precisely a 40 percent rise. Our analysis of that rise is that it is almost entirely due to hate groups exploiting the issue of immigration. This – every two weeks or so, there's either a Klan demonstration or a neo-Nazi demonstration, and they're virtually all about immigration. They are not about the evils of black people or gay people really at all anymore.

At the same time, the ultimate effect of this kind of propaganda, I think obviously, is to push along hate crimes, to help to grow hate crimes, as it were. Later, the statistics are extremely shaky on hate crimes. So this is certainly not definitive, but in the latest two years, latest three years of numbers, from 2003 to 2005, the FBI hate crimes statistics show a, what, 23 percent jump in anti-Latino hate crimes. In California, it's about double that percentage, the jump in the same period.

Let me just give you an example – a few examples of what these hate crimes are. I know in this area you've heard a lot about it, but as long ago as 2004, we have three kids really, a couple of teenagers and their cousin, who traveled all the way from Missouri to Arizona to set up a roadblock in the middle of the desert with stones, and they've gone down to kill Mexicans. That's their thing. The first guy who stops at this roadblock – there're boulders; they've rolled into the middle of the road – is an unfortunate Cuban-American who is murdered right on the spot. It kind of goes on from there. I mean, there are many, many cases. I'd like to tell you about more than I have time to tell you about.

But I think of David Ritcheson, the incredible case of the kid in – last year in April of 2006, who was attacked at a party for supposedly trying to kiss a white girl. It's a 17-year-old boy, the kind of teenage sort of a high school party. This kid is attacked. He is beaten severely, has bleach poured on him, has a swastika carved into his flesh, and ultimately, is sodomized with a patio umbrella tent pole, horribly, to the point where when he finally goes back to school, it's after 30 surgeries and he's wearing a colostomy bag and in a wheelchair.

The sort of incredible end to this story is that these three – obviously, I think, by the newspapers, he’s a rape victim. He’s not named for a long time. Ultimately, he decides, almost a year after the attack, very early this year, that he is going to go to Congress, go public, let his name be used, and testify in support of the federal hate crimes bill. And the end of his testimony is just kind of a dramatic moment where he says essentially “Don’t worry about me. I’ll be okay. I’ve sort of found new strength through this terrible ordeal,” and so on. Three weeks later, that boy jumped off a cruise ship and committed suicide.

So I realize I don’t have time to go through my list, but those are the kinds of things we’re talking about. It’s been a real horror story. A lot of it has happened around here and we can only really guess at the dimensions because, as I say, statistics are very difficult; statistics that are meaningful really don’t exist. But I think there’s no question that we’re seeing a very serious upswing in these kinds of things.

What we’ve come here to talk about a lot is kind of the idea of – and let me say that I don’t think anybody up here saying that everyone who wants lower immigration levels in this country is an evil white supremacist. That’s clearly not true. If you look at the people who are in this movement, this is not so. But very many of the leaders are maybe not precisely white supremacists, but they are a very frightening bunch of people. Some of them seem quite imbalanced. Others lie routinely, and many, many others produce statistics and conspiracy theories and so on that are absolutely bogus.

So what we’re sort of trying to do as a group here is to, particularly with regard to sort of the press and the public discussion of immigration, get out the ideas of who are these people really? I think that we probably all agree up here that a lot of the press on these groups, particularly a few years ago, was extremely sort of naïve. It really did not look at what these people were, what they said when they were not in front of the TV cameras, and so on, and the kinds of connections that I’ve mentioned at the very beginning between – FAIR meeting with the Council of Conservative Citizens and holding a little demonstration in Alabama to burn the Mexican flag, were simply not noted.

So let me say in that sort of spirit, here’s a few examples of the kinds of leaders who were quoted very routinely, but very rarely are sort of the details of these people discussed. Chris Simcox, the original founder of the Minutemen, this is a guy who is on “Lou Dobbs,” for instance, some 20-30 times now, treated as a serious commentator on immigration. What Dobbs has never said, what the many other people who’ve quoted him have almost never said, is that this is a man who says, who tells audiences that he has seen the Chinese army maneuvering on the Mexican border. I think it goes without saying, once that’s established that this is what this guy is telling audiences, his credibility becomes a bit much to accept.

Jim Gilchrist, the – he joined the Minutemen project with Simcox. For a while now has his own group, but another major character. He – when he ran for Congress in 2005-2006, he ran on the ticket of the American Independence Party. George Wallace is the vehicle that George Wallace used to run for president as a segregationist back in the

'60s. He is now a John Burke's Society official speaker, bureau speaker. So he's very associated with the far right.

John Tanton, the original founder of FAIR and kind of in many ways, the architect of many of the older groups in the anti-immigration movement, this is a guy who has talked about things – who, for instance, put out a special issue of his journal, the *Social Contract*, called *Europhobia*. And it was all about how the race was in danger, the white people were endangered by immigration. Tanton has oftentimes been a little more careful, but if you look at this guy for long, it's, I think, difficult not to conclude that the man is a racist.

Barbara Coe, leader of the California Coalition for Immigration Reform, the woman who was largely responsible for Proposition 187 passing in California. This is a woman who just lately has admitted that she is, in fact, a member of the Council of Conservative Citizens. She's been on their advisory board and so on. This is a woman also who has promoted the completely bogus conspiracy theory, the Aztlan conspiracy theory, the idea that Mexico, in some versions, in league secretly with the Chicanos, American-born Latinos, is plotting to recapture, to re-conquer as they say, the southwestern United States. They're going to take seven states and make it a part of Mexico.

Glenn Spencer, another often quoted guy, American Border Patrol. What is rarely mentioned about Glenn Spencer is this man is so paranoid about what the evil Latinos, the Mexicans are coming to do, that one night he heard something outside his house, and he ran outside his house and just started shooting, and nobody was killed, luckily. God knows what he heard, but his neighbor woke up the next morning to find her garage shot full of holes. He was charged with four felonies originally, and unfortunately, as typically happens in Arizona, particularly southern Arizona, those charges were somehow magically reduced to a single misdemeanor, but I think it gives you an idea of who Spencer is. He is –

Another one, Virginia Abernethy, and this was Devin's work that really exposed this Virginia Abernethy who became an important advisor to the Protect Arizona Now campaign, another similar campaign that passed kind of anti-immigrant proposition. This is a woman who, in fact, describes herself as a white separatist. That's what she said when she was confronted with Devin's research, and is also on the Council of Conservative Citizens advisory board.

I keep mentioning the CCC; let me say, this is a group that is directly descended from the White Citizens' Councils which were formed in the '50s and early '60s to oppose the desegregation efforts of the Kennedy administration. And when I say, it's reincarnation, I'm not kidding. It's not propaganda. They were literally formed from the mailing lists of the old White Citizens' Councils.

Yes, it goes on. I don't really have time to go on, but let me say, I mentioned the Aztlan conspiracy theory. I think a large part of all of our concerns is the ways these kinds of ideas, these false ideas, these false accusations, make their way out onto the

airwaves into the public arena, so that now we hear these kinds of things, that I'm going to describe in a second coming, out of the mouths of U.S. congressmen, coming out of the mouths of Lou Dobbs and any number of other cable media personalities like that, out of A.M. radio show, talk show hosts all over this country.

So there is another conspiracy theory, the North American Union, in which George Bush and his conservative – his neo-conservative pals are supposed to be working secretly with the Mexican government and the Canadian government to form a single country called the North American Union. There's only one small thing. There is no such thing as the North American Union. There is a process that's going on, which is incredibly ineffective, to kind of ease regulatory discrepancies between the three states. That's it. That's what they're talking about, but these – the propagandas of the nativist movement have managed to get this idea out there so strongly that 18 state legislatures have passed resolutions opposing the fictional entity of the North American Union.

It goes on from there. Republican Congressman Steve King of Iowa is perfectly happy to get out there and say, and keep saying to this day, that “criminal illegal aliens” quote, unquote, are responsible for the deaths of 25 Americans a day; 12 are murdered, 13 are run over by drunk “criminal illegal aliens” quote, unquote. Well, the fact is when you look at these statistics, and where he says he got them from, it is completely and utterly bogus. There's nothing to it. But this is repeated almost weekly in the public discourse on immigration.

Another one, a bunch of radio talk show hosts that come up with the idea that “illegal aliens” quote, unquote, have murdered 45,000 people since 9/11. If that were true, that would mean that about 4 percent of the people in the United States, in the physical United States, documented or undocumented, are responsible for 53 percent of the murders. I think it's obvious on its face that it's a parody. This is absolutely – it's completely bogus.

Tom Tancredo, in many ways the congressional leader of the nativist movement, is perfectly willing to get out in public and make statements like, “Illegal aliens are coming here to kill me and kill you and kill our families.” I think that's an amazing statement for a congressman to make when he's referring to 12 million people.

In any case, that's our concern. That's what we're really trying to do. We're trying to kind of end this. It's not in order to create an open borders country. It is in order that we, as a democracy, may have some kind of civil discussion of immigration without resorting to tales about leprosy and 45,000 murders and so on.

MR. FERNANDEZ: I'm going to say I let Mark run longest because he was, I thought, quite great. So given that, I'm going to let you run a little long too, Devin, and I'll just take the time out of my questions and give it back to the audience for their questions.

MR. DEVIN BURGHART: Oh, much appreciate it. First, I want to start by thanking Henry, Carrie (sp), Vanessa, and everyone else here at the Center for American

Progress for making this possible, as well as having another opportunity to share the stage with Mark. Mark and I go back all the way to prior to the Oklahoma City bombing, when I was working with the Coalition for Human Dignity in Seattle. And Mark, when he was working at the *USA Today*, would call up and he would say, “Can you tell me everything you know about a particular organization?” And I was more than happy to do so, and it’s been a pleasure to be able to work with organizations like the Southern Poverty Law Center to deal with this problem of the new nativism.

I work for the Center for New Community. We’re a Chicago-based civil and human rights organization dedicated to community, justice, and equality. My work has been to track the new nativism, going all the way back to 1994 with the passage of Proposition 187 in California, and watching it grow over time and advance. With a book we published – we’re publishing later on this year, *Lady Liberty No More: The Rise of the New Nativism*, we document the origins of the new nativism, contextualize it by looking at each of the organizations involved and look at the individuals who are promoting the new nativism as well.

Rather than being able to go into the 350 pages documented in that book, what I can tell you specifically are that virtually none of the major national organizations are untainted by their connections to white nationalist organizations, and as a movement, they have been more than willing to play to a white nationalist base, while giving lip service to diversity and tolerance. What that has done, has created, in many respects, a backlash to the gains of the civil rights movement.

When you look at immigration, we often view it in a vacuum. It’s important to understand that immigration and immigration reform was one of the cornerstones of the civil rights revolution. Along with the Voting Rights Act and the Civil Rights Act, the immigration reform removed the last messages of white supremacy from our legal system, from our political system, and made it possible for the dynamics and for the demographics of this country to change.

So in many respects, what we’re seeing not only isn’t playing to that white nationalist base, but playing to the fear of demographic change, playing to a fear of expansion of civil rights, and playing to fear of what we can look like as a truly multiracial, pluralistic democracy.

When I began doing research for the book back in 1996, what I expected to find, given my background in investigating white nationalist organizations, was a few bad apples involved in immigration reform, so-called immigration reform activities. What I uncovered, unfortunately, was rather than a few bad apples, that the entire basket had been spoiled by connections to white nationalism. As I mentioned, virtually none of the organizations – none of the national organizations that Mark mentioned in particular are untainted by their connections to white nationalism. There are at present approximately a dozen national organizations that continue to support and promote the new nativism.

Those have a variety of different names. They include the Federation for American Immigration Reform, the oldest and most influential of the new nativists, and it

includes spin-off groups like the Center for Immigration Studies. It includes less well known organizations like U.S., Inc. It includes organizations like NumbersUSA and Project USA. And to combine those dozen national organizations have combined annual budgets of approximately \$15 million and an active donor base between 600,000 and 750,000 individuals.

Now, that donor base didn't spring up overnight, nor are all of those white nationalists. Many of them are concerned about the changes going on in our society and are being played to by a movement that appeals, in an emotional and scapegoating fashion. This – these national organizations have helped give birth to the new nativism and in fact, in 2005 – 2005 was really a watershed moment for the new nativism. In 2005, we watched an explosion of state and local anti-immigrant organizations fueled by groups like the Minutemen, as well as fueled by national organizations like FAIR, CIS, and NumbersUSA.

Between January of 2005 and January of 2007, we saw a 600 percent increase in the number of new nativist organizations spring up around states and localities around this country, growing from 37 organizations in 25 different states to now, today, 323 different new nativist organizations in 43 different states.

Now, Mark makes a distinction to those who are specifically promoting hatred. What we've determined in the course of our research is that there is not a clear bright line that these new nativist organizations, nearly all of them, promote many of the same kind of ideas which would be abhorrent to those who are concerned about civil and human rights. Over two thirds of that 323 different organizations promote the kind of racist Reconquista theory that Mark talked about. The majority of them promote ideas which could easily be defined as racist, both in their conception of Latinos, their depiction of immigrant communities, as well as in terms of their policies.

That, in and of itself, is cause for concern, but once you peel back the veneer, once you start examining these organizations, what you find is something clearly disturbing. From its origins back in the late 1970s, the movement has been dominated by the ideas of nativism, dominated by the ideas of white nationalism, eugenics, and racial superiority. As early as its founding, the oldest and most influential of those organizations, the Federation for American Immigration Reform, was dominated by folks with this view.

In fact, John Tanton, the founder of FAIR, continues to share an office in Petoskey with none other than Wayne Lutton. Wayne Lutton, in addition to his work with the *Social Contract Press*, the publication, as Mark described, published by U.S. Inc., Wayne Lutton also has a number of other jobs. Those jobs include working for the Council of Conservative Citizens. It includes working for another outfit called the *Occidental Quarterly*, a racist and anti-Semitic publication designed to promote white nationalism, and has on occasion even spoken to the Institute for Historical Review, for IHR, the holocaust denial outfit so reviled in this country and reviled abroad as well.

Tanton himself, while portraying himself as untainted by these beliefs, though continuing to employ Mr. Lutton, has, in fact, a documented history of playing to that white nationalist base. It includes, for instance, a 1974 paper Mr. Tanton wrote, which was a defense of passing (ph) eugenics. It includes taking more than \$1.2 million from the White Nationalist Pioneer Fund, an organization established in 1938 to promote Hitlerian notions of eugenics and race science. It includes continuing those conversations well beyond 1994, when allegations first emerged about the Pioneer Fund's contributions to FAIR.

And it continues to emerge to this day, where he continues to carry on conversations to folks like Harry Weyher, the former president of the Pioneer Fund. Weyher, in fact, contributed money to FAIR's original political action committee, now known as the U.S. Immigration Reform PAC, which has given money to a variety of different candidates, now who serve as part of the House Immigration Reform Caucus. The House Immigration Reform Caucus is the prime example of how the ideas of white nationalism, once confined to the margins, confined to the David Duke and the Tom Metzgers of the world, have now moved from those margins right to the mainstream.

It was unacceptable 20 years ago, and completely unthinkable to think of a national organization which gets national television and radio coverage, to be willing to talk about the abolition of the Fourteenth Amendment, one of the cornerstones to civil and human rights in this country. Yet, that's precisely what Mr. Dane of the Federation for American Immigration Reform did earlier this year; mentioned that it would, in fact, be a good idea to abolish it because of their concern about so called "anchor babies," in and of itself a problematic and disturbing term, but indicative of the kind of notions behind the organizations which are promoting – continuing to promote white nationalism.

FAIR is not the only organization that has these kind of problems. As I mentioned, none of the national organizations can escape these kind of connections. As Mark mentioned, even the groups that are seemingly the most benign here in Washington, groups like NumbersUSA, largely credited for helping bring down comprehensive immigration reform in 2007, has played to the white nationalist base. Roy Beck, the leader of NumbersUSA – NumbersUSA, which in and of itself, was a Tanton project up until 2002, Roy Beck has in fact also spoken to the Council of Conservative Citizens, that literal reincarnation of the White Citizens' Council.

All of these organizations, as they continue to move forward, not only pose a severe threat to civil and human rights, they also pose a severe threat to public safety by the kind of political climate that they create. They also pose a threat to pluralism. Whether it's the abolition of the Fourteenth Amendment, whether it's a policy that as inhumane as enforcement through attrition, or it's the idea of continuing to play to a white nationalist base for support, these organizations have, in fact, infected the body politic with these ideas. There aren't just bad apples anymore. The entire basket has gone bad, and what we need to do is to look for new ways in which we can have a civil, humane, and rational discussion about immigration politics, not infected by white nationalist ideas and white nationalist organizations.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Let me just start a quick question to both of you. You both really laid, I think, some pretty devastating background on different organizations and individuals, but this is not part of the public dialogue when we talk about immigration, immigration reform. Many of the folks that either one of you identified have testified, or their organizations have testified, before Congress within the last month. So I would be interested in your thoughts about how to make this stick as it relates to the press, as it relates to the public dialogue. I'd be interested in either or both of your impressions on that.

MR. POTOK: Well, I think that is the problem. It's making it stick. That really is the work that we have before us. I feel like there's been a bit of a change, certainly not a sea change in the coverage, in that more reporters, more journalists are essentially coming to understand the movement better and making some of these points. However, it's really only just starting. What I would say just from the point of view of kind of dealing with the media, which all of us – certainly, Devin and I do in our work because we're really in a sense, sort of national resources, or that's what we try to be to grassroots groups, it is – in many ways, it's to keep the message simple.

For instance, to give you an idea of sort of our tactics, really, when we deal with this kind of thing, we did a very serious, long investigative profile of Chris Simcox, and there were many nasty things to be said about Simcox. For instance, we quoted his ex-wife accusing him of molesting her daughter. But what I'm trying trying to say is that that's not really the most useful way to kind of make it clear to the press who these people are. And I think sometimes, the press has trouble with saying, "This guy is linked to this group which was descended from the White Citizens' Councils," or that kind of thing.

Sometimes it's a little tough to – because a reporter, I think – (unintelligible) – speak to someone who's been a reporter for a long time, feels like we can't just accept that at face value. We've got to go out, figure out if it's really true and so on. So I think that it's been – just as a tactic, it's been more useful to kind of key in on something simple like what I said about Simcox earlier. This is a guy who thinks that there are people running around with little red stars on their caps, getting ready to invade the United States and he personally has seen them.

In a very similar way, in our sort of battle royale with Lou Dobbs over this false leprosy claim that Henry mentioned in the introduction, that, in some ways, the most important thing, the most important point we are able to make, aside from the fact that Dobbs simply wouldn't back off this completely false claim. He claimed 7,000 new cases; the real number was 398. The most effective thing we were able to point out, I think, was he did not get this from any government statistic. Lou Dobbs, as reporter, got this, as she said on the air a couple of different times, from a woman named Madeleine Cosman.

Who's Madeleine Cosman? Well, as it happens, we had a reporter, one of my reporters at an event, a number of events at which Cosman spoke, but she captured this kind of amazing quote. She's talking about all Latino men who come North across the

border. She says, “Most of these bastards, most of these bastards rape – molest girls under 12, though some specialize in boys and others in nuns.” To me, at least, that was sort of the end of the discussion. There are like Mexican rape squads coming up here, looking for nuns? It seems like an odd direction to go if you’re looking for nuns. But in any case, that’s how she characterizes the majority of 12 million people. Anyway –

MR. BURGART: Yes, I think the other problem, largely that’s been had, is a framing issue and that it’s largely been framed as a kind of he said, she said issue, and that it’s – that it is new nativist organizations on the one hand, and then immigrants’ rights organizations on the other being responsible for responding. Our position as an organization is, just as it is the responsibility of Christians to respond to anti-Semitism, and just as it is the response of white folks to respond to anti-Black racism, it’s a response of all folks who aren’t immigrants to deal with the rise of the new nativism.

That’s why it’s important to have people of good will who don’t necessarily have and – a stake in the current immigration debate to stand up and say that the kind of rhetoric being promoted by these organizations is simply unacceptable, that the ties of these organizations are unacceptable, and that enough is enough; that if we’re going to have a debate about this stuff, about the direction that this county is going to take, that we have to remove these elements from the dialogue, to detoxify the political climate, if you will, before we can get to that point.

So it really requires having local initiatives who are willing to take that stand and be able to speak up in unison, so it doesn’t become that he said, she said framing issue, problem.

MR. POTOK: May I add, I think we agree on this point too, but I don’t think it’s very useful for local groups kind of fighting this battle out, especially in the papers, to say, “They’re all racists. They’re all white supremacists, “ because, A, it’s not true. It’s clearly false. And B, I think you know, any reporter, really any rational person, is going to recoil a little from that saying, “Well, yes, surely people are deluded in that they feel like this is patriotic and a great thing to do or whatever their reasons are, one can argue with.” But to say that all of them are sort of unrobed Klansmen and neo-Nazis, is obviously false.

It’s an overstatement of what’s really happening. I think you can say things closer to that kind of setting when you’re looking at the leadership of these groups and what they really do, but if you characterize the whole members – we’re talking about hundreds of thousands of people, maybe millions of people, who are in some way involved in this movement, and it’s false. And you will lose the battle if you fight it that way. So I think you need to be specific. Name-calling is not helpful to sort of our side of this debate either.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Let me ask one last question before I go to the audience. I’d be interested in both of your perspectives, or either of your perspectives, on how this plays out locally. So certainly here, near to here, in Virginia, this has been a huge issue.

My understanding is that FAIR actually crafted the original ordinance in Prince William County. And certainly, these issues didn't get covered at that point.

But there was also a lot of local support for FAIR's efforts there and a lot of local concern around immigration issues. I'm interested to what extent the local organizations have relationships with the national anti-immigrant organizations. Are there direct connections? Are there loose connections? Are there no connections? And how have you seen that play out since both of you did mention the local element?

MR. POTOK: I think you should then – let me just say one very brief thing. I think it's more Devin's world in a way. FAIR just hired a guy named Joe Turner and Joe Turner is the architect of the original, the San Bernardino Ordinance, trying to crack down on people who rent to "illegal aliens" quote, unquote, and so on. And Joe Turner is a nasty, unpleasant guy, but he has become a major player within FAIR. Joe Turner is a guy who, among other things, has said, "There's really nothing wrong with being a white separatist. That's okay with me." He has also tolerated just an amazing number of uniformed neo-Nazis at his own Save Our State rallies before he joined FAIR. Anyway, that's one kind of connection. I know Devin works in this world a little more than I do.

MR. BURGHART: Yes, we've worked pretty closely around the country with local communities who are experiencing the kind of division and intolerance that emerges when national organizations come in and help stir stuff up. While – because we're dealing with over 300 different organizations, there are various different connections to various different groups, but what we've discovered is, in many of those instances, national organizations have helped provide training, logistical, technical, and even financial support to a lot of these organizations, as well as providing them a model from which to organize, whether that be the development of these local ordinances, statewide ballot initiatives, or just a model of how to stir stuff up in the community.

What we've uncovered over and over again in these communities is a disturbing pattern, and it looks like this, that a local individual or group of individuals would contact a national organization like FAIR. They will deploy a field representative who will help them establish an organization. That local organization will then help toxify the political climate in that community by promoting the ideas of Reconquista, by shouting down opponents, by visibly harassing individuals, either who are attempting to get work, who are attempting to promote immigrants' rights, or are simply attempting to maintain some civility in that community.

They will ratchet up that level of violence and often in that way, it becomes actual violence. Certainly, the case of Farmingville, Long Island, has been well documented now, including in a PBS documentary where, thanks to FAIR's organizer, Jim Staudenraus, they helped form a local organization called Sachem Quality of Life, which brought in white nationalist speakers like Jared Taylor from *American Renaissance* and Glenn Spencer from American Border Patrol, whipped up the community into a frenzy.

Not surprisingly, a few weeks later, two white power skinheads in that community decided that it was time to take the law into their own hands, grabbed two day laborers,

took them to an abandoned warehouse at gunpoint, and forced them to dig their own graves. By the grace of God, those two got away with only minor injuries, but from their hospital room, one of those workers who survived the attack said unfortunately that he guesses that that's the price to pay for the American dream.

It's that kind of rhetoric which leads to that kind of reality and the kind of divisiveness in our communities. And that's why we're so concerned about where this debate is heading and why we're concerned about the new nativism.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Thanks. So let's turn it to the audience. We started about 10 minutes late, so we'll run about 10 minutes long. The – I believe we have a handheld microphone and so the way that we're going to handle this is, we'll take three questions. I'll point to folks that raise their hand. I will take three questions and – at a time. I'll then paraphrase those questions and ask the questions to our panelists. Once they've answered, and I will ask them to keep their answers as brief as possible, but accurate, then we'll go back and we'll take three additional questions, and we'll do that until we run out of time.

It's important that you actually ask a question and if – and that you keep your question as concise as possible. I know this kind of dialogue can encourage people to want to make a statement, but it's important that you do ask a question and that you keep it concise. And if you fail to do that, I'll gently remind you. So are there any questions for our panelists? I saw this gentleman and then the woman behind him as the first two and then, I believe there was a question over here. Also say, if you could introduce yourself and if you have any organizational affiliation, I'd appreciate it.

Q: My name's Travis Moore. I'm with the United Nations Foundation. And *Harper's* magazine this month notes that in 2006, that there were 1,404 immigration measures introduced into state legislatures across the country, whereas in the previous 10 years, that number was only 1,300. Can you comment on whether the Right is using – whether you think the Right may be using immigration as sort of the new – laying the foundation as the new wedge issue for the 2008 elections?

Q: Thanks. I'm Ana Avendano with the AFL-CIO. I actually run the Immigrant Worker Program at the AFL and I'm the lucky recipient of all the hate mail and positive mail that comes in about immigrants to the federation. What I've noticed, especially over the last couple of months, is that the groups are now hiding behind the American Worker, Americanworker.com and everything, and most of the calls I'm getting now are about how are you – how are you supporting illegal aliens betraying the American Worker? And I know in your report on the caucus, you mention the Right to Work Committee for example, and I'm just wondering if there's more research of that connection between the anti-worker groups and the anti-immigrant groups because that's something that we could really use.

MR. FERNANDEZ: I saw the woman right here.

Q: Thanks. Hi. My name is Priscilla Huang. I'm with the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum and I'm just wondering – you both alluded to some of the population politics that's involved. And so I'm wondering if you can expand a little bit more about how eugenics has played into this movement and how immigrant women in particular, and sort of these perceived over-breeding and birthing practices have played into the media.

MR. FERNANDEZ: All right. So maybe if we could start as it relates to the state legislatures, and I think the broader issue of the use of immigration as a wedge issue. We certainly saw it recently, just the last month, in the special election in Massachusetts, Mass '05. So I'd be interested if either one of you would give us your thought on that.

MR. POTOK: I just wanted to say something national, because again, I think Devin is much more on the ground in terms of what's going on in local communities. I actually think that immigration has played very badly for the Republican Party. It split the Republican Party right down the middle. So it seems to me that the kind of nativist movement is a bit like Christian evangelicals at the moment, in that there are a very large number of people, but it's not enough to control the party. And so you have this very serious split in the party which, in my view, actually weakens the Republicans.

MR. BURGHART: Well, in many respects, I think what we've seen is rather than creating the idea that there is some kind of clear division between those who are of Christian evangelical persuasion versus those who are the new nativism, is what we've seen those two move closer, much closer together, particularly inside the Republican Party, and that you shouldn't view the new nativism as something independent, but rather, as Pat Buchanan said in his speech before the Republican Convention, more as one of the core elements of the culture war.

So in many respects, what we're fighting is one of those fronts in the cultural war. It's in some respects a different front, but in some – in many respects, has some of the same – same players. As we documented in the report we released last week, called "Nativism in the House," a report on the House Immigration Reform Caucus, we look at the voting records of the 110 members, now 109 members, of the House Immigration Reform Caucus, and many of those mirror what you would consider voting patterns of evangelical supporters in terms of their opposition to reproductive rights, their opposition to LGBT issues.

But it also goes, I think, to the question in regards to the issue about the American Worker, that they also have a pretty clear anti-worker agenda, that 86 of 110 had a zero score when it comes to labor issues on the – on that scale. And really, what has happened is, we're seeing an emergence of that larger, more ideologically defined block inside the parties. And it's something that has influenced both parties on the electoral process, both for the bad and both, I think, not only bad politics, but also bad ideas.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Now, as it relates to this issue of the American Worker, I believe the organization's name is A Coalition for the Future American Worker, which is a coalition of a number of anti-immigrant groups, including the American Immigration

Control Foundation, which, I believe, the Southern Poverty Law Center has called a hate group directly. Maybe, Mark, you could talk us through a little bit about the efforts around trying to appeal to American workers.

MR. POTOK: Yes, let me leave the bulk of that to you because I think you know that particular topic better and the details of how that was formed. Let me just say that FAIR has been involved in creating essentially false front groups. And this is a movement – I think it’s obvious, that is often criticized as being racist and bigoted and so on. And so it’s very important for the nativist movement, as a movement, to show that it embraces Hispanic people and it embraces Vietnamese people, and so one and so forth. So FAIR, for instance, and this is one we really concentrated on; that’s why I’ll talk about it and leave the workers’ group to Devin, created a group called Choose Black America.

This was obviously supposed to represent – to show that black people, too – African-Americans – are mortally opposed to immigration or illegal immigration. In fact, what happened was that FAIR simply created this group out of thin air. It basically made a series of calls, invited people to come to Washington, paid their way, paid their hotel, brought them together at a press conference. Most of these people did not know each other. We interviewed the bulk of them. Many of them had no idea who the other people in this group were going to be and, in fact, one or two of them said to us, “Had I known, I never would have gone to D.C.” And that’s basically the whole story about Choose Black America. They’ve essentially done nothing more.

We see similar kinds of groups. There’s a Vietnamese group. This is not FAIR related, but a group which was created and presented itself as we’re Vietnamese people opposed to illegal immigration. Its leader was guy named, he said, Tim Binh, B-I-N-H. Well, that wasn’t his name at all. I’ve forgotten his last name. It’s a very – he’s a white guy. He’s not Vietnamese. When he was confronted by an enterprising reporter from the Oakland paper, what he says is, “Well, I really like Vietnamese food.” That’s his answer. (Laughter.)

MR. BURGHART: Yes, I think looking at the so-called Coalition for the Future American Worker, once you peel back that veneer, you see not a coalition at all, but yet another one of these phony front groups that FAIR has promoted. There are, in fact, at least 10 of them, now that they’ve created on a variety of different issues to try to promote their agenda.

When asked about the Coalition for the Future American Worker, when they began running ads in Iowa, Mark Smith, the president of the Iowa Federation of Labor, made it pretty clear where they stand. They have no relationships to workers in Iowa. They don’t speak for them, and the stuff that they’re promoting is racist stuff that they want nothing to do with. That was a pretty resounding message and it has been repeated over and over again when that coalition rears its ugly head, yet they continue to do the same kind of stuff, often with very little results.

When they ran those ads in Iowa in 2004, NumbersUSA – one of the staffers from NumbersUSA made it pretty clear that they got virtually no traction on the ads. They

blamed it on the fact that there was bad weather that January in Iowa. In fact, what it was is a group of over 2,000 individuals who would come together to form the welcoming Iowa coalition who said, "This kind of stuff is not what Iowa is about. We embrace our immigration tradition and we are not going to allow you to claim this mantle and, in fact, our communities with this kind of nonsense. That's what really had the difference and that's why they got no traction.

MR. POTOK: But let me say something else about kind of false front groups, if I may, which is John Tanton and a number of other people in this movement tried very hard to take over the Sierra Club a couple of years ago. People may have read about this. This was a very, very important battle. Way back in 1986, John Tanton wrote in a series of internal memos that were circulating among FAIR staff, and I guess, U.S. English staff, he talked – he essentially laid out how we can move forward with this movement.

And within that, he talked specifically about these kinds of ideas, of creating other sorts of groups, and he specifically mentions the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club may not want us to touch them, but we'll be touching or something to that effect. They may not want it, but we'll be there soon. And in fact, there have been a series of attempts to take over the Sierra Club for the simple reason that, as Tanton said in the memos, when you say these things and you appear to be coming from the right, you will be immediately tarred as a racist or a bigot and so on. So the idea is, let's capture a group that is progressive in the minds of the broad public, and we'll do it by making this argument about population. The only way to protect the environment is to limit the population and the only real way to limit the population is to seal the borders.

So this is a very, very important effort. We essentially ran a whole campaign against it, and I won't bore you with the details, and ultimately, these men were beaten. There were three men who run for the board and there were a series of other attempts as well. I think, at this point, the Sierra Club's completely inoculated and cannot be taken over by the nativist movement, but that was a scary, serious attempt, so it's not all amusing stuff like the Vietnamese group. That could have been a very serious matter indeed.

MR. FERNANDEZ: The last question was around the role of eugenics. We'll just ask maybe just Mark if you could briefly give a reaction, and particularly, as it relates to women and population control. I believe it was the origin of the question.

MR. POTOK: You want to go ahead?

MR. BURGHART: Yes, I'll actually take this. We actually did a special issue of the *Building Democracy Monthly* on the gendered attacks of the new nativism and the focus is on women's issues. But understand that eugenics has been at the core of the new nativism since the late 1970s, whether it's the ideas that John Tanton has promoted, including his – that publication of the paper as early as 1974, called "The Defense of Passive Eugenics," or it is the funding of the Eugenics Pioneer Fund, which includes funding not only FAIR to the tune of \$1.289 million. It also includes the American Immigration Control Foundation and even more recently, it includes groups like

Californians for Population Stabilization, or CAPS, and Project USA, not to mention white nationalist groups like American Renaissance.

So the ideas of eugenics, and that kind of population control, have been at the heart and at the core of the movement since its origins.

MR. FERNANDEZ: More questions? I guess maybe take those three right there, so the gentleman in the blue, the gentleman to your left, and the woman behind him.

Q: David Oxtter, Research Institute for Independent Living, and I'm interested in the wedges issue among the immigrants and how it plays out in the media because it seems like there's a hierarchy. You've got immigrants; they're kind of neutral, and then you have the refugees from Eastern Europe; they're okay. And then you've got illegal immigrants and they're pretty bad. And then you have highly skilled immigrants and they're good. And then you go to the aliens, who are totally dehumanized. I guess my question is, is there any way that you can address those wedge issues somehow?

Q: My name is Gabriel Rojo (ph). I'm with the National Capital Immigrant Coalition. I'm also a student at the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason. My question is along the same lines as this gentleman. It's basically regarding interventions and working the working strategies that can be employed to not only prevent the pattern that one of the panelists talked about in terms of FAIR deploying somebody to community, and then kind of rolling up the community, blah, blah, blah.

Is there something that can be done to prevent that? What can be done to deescalate that? And perhaps what can be done after that's already happened to address those issues, aside from the obvious community mobilization and lobbying and all that kind of – are there any other things that you've seen that a community could do to adjust those issues at those three different points?

Q: Hi. I'm Lisa Sugar and I'm with the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society and since the Senate CIR Bill failed, predictably, we've seen the administration step up their enforcement efforts with things specifically like raids, worksite raids, but also home invasions. And I think the most recent incidences in Long Island are good examples of what their initiatives have been as of late. And I was just wondering if you could sort of comment on – because we're very concerned about this. We sort of see this as – obviously, it's going to be increasing and this is going to be something that we're going to have to really deal with on a local level.

As a national organization, I'm wondering if you could just sort of comment on what – to what extent you think this is being fueled, as we think it is, by some of these local hate groups and anti-immigration groups? And to what extent do you think national organizations can be – organize themselves in a way to sort of target these local communities to support the local groups that are actually trying to combat these efforts? I know there are lots of lawsuits right now pending and so forth, but I sort of feel like there needs to be some sort of a media and advocacy strategy that goes along with it.

MR. FERNANDEZ: I'm actually going to combine these, I think, into one question and that is, do you see particular strategies, given that this is – wedge issue and the question was about intervention strategy, the question about intervention strategies and questions about kind of what's spurring enforcement. Are there strategies locally that you believe, or techniques or tactics locally, that you've seen to be effective in countering these efforts? And are there things that don't immediately – might not immediately come to mind as strategies that you'd recommend?

MR. BURGHART: I think we have sort of two different areas to address. For us, we really do stand back. We're not in any sense a grassroots organization, and we really think of ourselves as a national organization that is trying to do research that will be useful to people on the ground kind of fighting this battle.

So I would urge people to use the national organizations in much the same way that local nativist organizations use FAIR and so on, and CIS, to kind of back their argument, because I think we're seen as kind of standing, and I think we do stand back a little more from the battle on the ground. And so it's – that's very much what we're focused on. It's kind of research and fact-based advocacy, I guess you might call it. And so I very much encourage people to do that kind of thing.

MR. FERNANDEZ: So someone could just – if someone had a struggle at the local level, they could reach out to you and –

MR. POTOK: Well, I think it works better for – rather than for the local organization – this may seem like a credit stealing exercise; I don't mean that at all – but I think it works better often than, rather for the local organization to say, "This is what we think about John Tanton or this group or that group and he's a bad person," or even repeating some of the research. I think that's perfectly fine.

But what I'm trying to argue is that I think a lot of times, it carries more "Uumph." Basically, when it comes to an organization that really is national, it really is focused on research and has some kind of reputation, and that's what we're essentially seeking to do. And it's probably worth mentioning that in one way, that's why we're all gathered here; that's why Devin had his own thing to do at the press conference. They're watching their own campaign, but really, we're trying to work together to get together to address these very questions.

What is the best way that we can kind of get these things into the hands of local groups? How can we help people fight this battle on the ground? And I think it hasn't been easy. In any case, that's very much our focus. It's kind of public information.

And in the case of the Sierra Club, I'll just mention, this was a tactic. We saw that as a national battle and kind of our battle because we felt like nobody else was really taking it up. And in the case of the Sierra Club, what we wound up doing was first of all, I wrote a very long letter to the presidency of our club kind of laying out what we characterized as a hostile takeover attempt.

And this caused a huge hubbub within the Sierra Club, but ultimately, even though we managed – our strategy was very much let’s get national press for this, so people who are members in the Sierra Club will understand what is going on. Ultimately, we worried that we weren’t getting enough press and we did something unusual, I think, for anybody – certainly for us – which was, we asked Morris Dees, who is our founder, our co-founder and a very well known guy, a bit of a celebrity, more – we got him to run for the board of the Sierra Club for the single reason that when the Sierra Club sent out its ballots to 750,000 members, they allow every candidate to the board to print a – as I recall, it was a 300 word candidate statement.

And so we used his candidate statement to say, “Basically, don’t vote for me. I’m not – I don’t have any real record in the environmental movement. I’m not trying to pitch myself as an environmentalist, but I have a background in studying the radical Right and I am here to tell you, don’t vote for the following of three people.” And it was an extremely effective tactic. I realize I’m talking about a national campaign. I’m not really answered the question of how locals might do it, but I’m kind of trying to describe the role that we try and play and what we’re trying to provide to local groups.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Devin, you have a lot of experience with that.

MR. BURGHART: Yes, we’ve spent the last decade trying to work on strategies and figuring out what works at the local level in terms of dealing with the new nativism and trying to detoxify communities. There are three things that I want you all to know about that I think are important, that can be useful, particularly to local folks.

The first is that yesterday, at the National Press Club, we launched a new national campaign designed to do specifically this, to deal with this issue and to detoxify the topic. The campaign is called a Campaign for a United America. If you go to campaignforaunitedamerica.org, all of you can join up. The campaign will include voices from around the country who are speaking for a United America, rather than the divisiveness and intolerance that comes from national anti-immigrant organizations. We’ll be developing a resource kit which local communities can employ, which includes tactics that anyone from any part of the country can use to deal with these issues.

So the campaign is very important and I encourage you to check it out. It includes some wonderful case studies of individuals who’ve decided to get involved from around the country simply because they’re fed up. They’ve decided that enough is enough and that no longer are they going to allow anti-immigrant forces to dominate and deal with this debate. It includes, for instance, Matt and Nora Flanagan, a firefighter and a teacher from Chicago, who’ve decided that this issue is simply is just not right and they want to speak out against it.

It includes folks like Judy Hellman, a leader from the Jewish Community Relations Bureau down in Kansas City, who’s taken a stand against the Minutemen. It includes folks like Auntré Hamp, a young African American student from Atlanta who’s decided that he’s not going to let the African American community be divided by anti-immigrant politics anymore; and many, many more inspirational stories like that of

individuals who are willing to say, “This is not what our country’s about, that the values that this nation holds dearly are not represented by the anti-immigrant movement, and in fact, we can rekindle what is best about America by standing up for those values.” So that’s the first thing and I encourage you all to get involved with that campaign.

The second thing in relationship to this, and it goes back to a part of that work, is the specific work that we’ve been doing in the African-American community to work to develop a base of African-American leadership to deal with these issues. Knowing that FAIR has front groups like Choose Black America, we understand that it is essential, not only to deal with the real issues that face the African-American community, but also to deal with the impact of anti-immigrant policies and politics on the African-American community, whether it be the abolition of the Fourteenth Amendment, that cornerstone to our civil rights; whether it be the increased restrictions on voting and drivers licenses, which we all know have a disproportionate impact on the African-American community; whether it be the division that these organizations are trying to promote from their front groups, we know that work has to be done there and we’ve launched a program as part of the Campaign for a United America to do specifically that.

And more long term, we’re at the statewide level, in addition to that work at the local level, we’ve helped develop a strategy called Welcoming Coalitions. We initially employed them in Iowa in 2002, after we saw national anti-immigrant groups go into the state around the 2000 caucuses, and watch them toxify the political climate where you had FAIR deploy organizers there to try to stir up trouble, if you will. They succeeded. They succeeded so much in that state that within a space of a year and a half, an English-Only Bill that has always been laughed out of committee, not only was passed in a law by 2002, but was signed in a law by a Democratic governor. That’s how quick they were at toxifying the community and that’s why we knew something there needed to be done.

So in this instance, the Welcoming Iowa Coalition formed with folks from business and labor, from civic and religious organizations, governmental and nongovernmental groups, immigrants and nonimmigrants alike, from around every corner of the state coming together in a united fashion to speak out against the bigotry and intolerance.

So that – when in January 2004, those Coalitions for the Future American Worker ads began to run in Iowa, as I mentioned, they were quickly removed from the television station because they were denounced as borderline racists and that even the television station said, “That’s not any business we want any part of,” not to mention that a community group, the Coalition for Welcome to Iowa, which included the Iowa Federation of Labor, which included the Iowa Ecumenical Council, included thousands of people from around the state, came together and said, “This is not what we’re about. We’re a welcoming state. We want to encourage and embrace our immigration tradition rather than reject it. We want to encourage and welcome newcomers, rather than reject them. We don’t want to be responsible for the politics of division and intolerance. We want to be responsible for those who respect our community and understand the importance of unity and diversity.”

Those kind of things make a difference. Those kinds of things are being now replicated in a variety of other states. There is now a welcoming Tennessee initiative and at least a half a dozen other states are looking at employing that model as well. If you are all interested in getting more information about that, please see me or check on our website at BuildingDemocracy.org.

MR. FERNANDEZ: With that, we've run a little over, so I'm going to bring us to an end. So first, I want to thank both Mark and Devin for joining us here today. So thank you. (Applause.) This issue has certainly become important to many of us and it's something that we've looked at pretty seriously here at the Center for American Progress. I want to thank the entire immigration team here.

I particularly want to thank Vanessa Cardenas, who is here and who's been a tremendous help and a real leader for us on immigration matters, and helped me tremendously in pulling this together.

We've also put some of the things that we've published around immigration and hate groups out for people to pick up. And both Devin and Mark will be here for a few minutes at the end, so if people have further questions, they can certainly come up and ask them.

Thank you all for coming, and thanks again.

(Applause.)

(END)