Racing to WAR
Assessing the Racial Impacts and Implications of the “War on Terrorism”
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INTRODUCTION

**RACING TO WAR** is a three-part discussion series designed to help organizations examine the racial impact of the “war on terrorism” both abroad and at home. This educational tool will guide community members, organizations, students, congregations, labor unions, and youth organizations in assessing the current political environment, and direct them toward opportunities for action and change.

While each part is designed to stand alone, ideally they will be used as a comprehensive series. Session 1 is a first look at the impact of the “war on terrorism” here at home and abroad, and who stands to gain and lose. Session 2 draws attention to how issues of race are imbedded into the “war on terrorism” and its outcomes. Session 3 is a work planning session to help organizations identify specific ways to take action in their communities.

We encourage you to use any or all parts of this curriculum in a way that makes sense for your organization. Our experience, however, has taught us the following:

- **Together, Session 1 and Session 2** are designed to make the connections between the war at home and the war abroad. Some groups may feel like they already share an analysis of the war, and are ready to proceed directly to Session 3 and begin planning for action. We feel, however, that most people do not share a common understanding of the “war at home,” and disagreement around action options emerges as a result. We strongly suggest that groups who feel ready for action at least conduct Session 2 to develop a shared analysis of the domestic situation.

- **Conducted alone, Section 1** does not include examples of, or opportunities for, action. If you want to conduct Session 1 and not Session 2, we suggest you also give people an opportunity to discuss options for action by conducting the optional “Inspiration for Action” brainstorm section.

We hope you find the discussions in *Racing to War* helpful and encourage you to take action. We welcome any comments and feedback. Contact us at arc@arc.org or visit our website www.arc.org.
ASSESSING THE IMPACTS OF THE “WAR ON TERRORISM”

Purpose
This session engages people in identifying the impacts of the “War on Terrorism” at home and abroad, and who stands to gain and lose most from the war.

Outcomes
1. A list of impacts of the War on Terrorism on the local community/constituency;
2. A list of impacts of the war on other communities/constituencies;
3. A collective assessment of who loses and who gains most from the war;
4. Inspiration to pursue possibilities for action.

Agenda and Total Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>presentation</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the Group</td>
<td>Q &amp; A</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quiz</td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of War</td>
<td>small groups &amp; reports</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspiration for Action</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>full group discussion</strong></td>
<td><strong>(30 minutes)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*optional

Total Time: 1 hour, 12 minutes

Preparation
Optional: Facilitators for the small groups can be selected and prepared in advance.

Materials Needed

- Easel, flipchart pad, marking pens, and masking tape.
- A sheet of flipchart paper and a marker for each of the small groups.
- Copies of Attachments A, B, and C for everyone. One copy of Attachment D for each of the small groups.

Attachments

A: The Quiz
B: Quiz Answers
C: “The War on Terrorism at Home and Abroad”
D: “Assessing the Impact of the War on Terrorism” question sheet
TRAINING GUIDE

INTRODUCTION (2 MINUTES)

Trainer introduces curriculum: Racing to War is a three-part discussion series designed to help organizations examine the domestic and international racial impact of the “war on terrorism.” This educational tool is designed to guide community members, organizations, students, congregations, labor unions, and youth organizations in assessing the current political environment both in local communities and abroad, and to direct them toward opportunities for action and change.

While each part is designed to stand alone, ideally they will be used as a comprehensive series. Session 1 is a first look at the impact of the “war on terrorism” here at home and abroad, who stands to gain and lose, and how people around the country have responded in a way that promotes justice and equity. Session 2 draws attention to how issues of race are imbedded into the “war on terrorism” and its outcomes. Session 3 is a work planning session to help organizations identify ways to take action in their local and regional areas.

ASSESSING THE GROUP—WHO’S BEEN TALKING ABOUT “WAR”? (15 MINUTES)

Group question: How many people in the room have had a conversation about the “war on terrorism” and/or the war on Iraq? Did the conversations take place informally (i.e. near the water cooler) or more formally (i.e. as part of the political work of your organization)? (Quick go around.)

Main Points:

• In these times, organizations find it difficult to talk about war abroad and the war at home because of fear, of not knowing where to start, and how to best connect the crisis with the current work of their organization.

• [Depending upon responses] While some folks have discussed the impending war, the U.S. role, and protest efforts, there’s been much less discussion or formal acknowledgement of the war’s effect on immigrants, refugees and communities of color, and how to protect them and preserve civil liberties and civil rights.

THE QUIZ (10 MINUTES)

Trainer: To get us warmed up, let’s take a little info-quiz to see what information we have and what new info we might want to have under our belt.

• Distribute copies of Attachment A, the Quiz, to everyone.

• After 5 minutes, ask the group what they think the answers are. Discuss, using the answer sheet and distribute attachment (Attachment B) at the end of the session.
QUIZ

Homeland “Security”

1 A middle-age man, living in a small town with his wife and two young children, was picked up by the federal government and taken away from his family indefinitely. He was not charged with any crime. The authorities told him he was being detained because of his race and country of origin, which led the government to assume he might have potential links to anti-government or terrorist activity. This story happened where and when?
   B In Bosnia, to a Kurdish man during the ethnic cleansing by the Serbians.
   C 1933, in Germany, to a Jewish father after Hitler began the war on Jews.
   D 1942, in the United States, to a U.S. citizen of Japanese ancestry during World War II.

2 Darrell Issa, a well-dressed man in a business suit, was refused a seat on a flight in late October 2001. Which is true?
   A He had obtained his visa from the same place in Saudi Arabia as one of the September 11 hijackers.
   B He is a member of a terrorist organization.
   C He is a member of an elite U.S. government group.
   D There was a warrant out for his arrest.

3 After September 11, 2001, the FBI targeted 5,000 young men of Middle Eastern and South Asian origin for questioning. How many of these interrogations led to arrests for criminal activity linked to terrorism?
   A 313  B 119  C 32  D 7  E 0

Political Rhetoric

4 Who said this? “The struggle between two worlds can permit no compromises. It’s either Us or Them!”
   A Benito Mussolini
   B George W. Bush
   C Adolf Hitler
   D Donald Rumsfeld
Government Secrecy

5 The American public did not see the live satellite images of the bombing of Afghanistan because:

A The Defense Department exercised “shutter control” over civilian satellites.
B The Special Medical Attaché to the Joint Chiefs of Staff determined the images would depress the public.
C The Pentagon bought exclusive rights to satellite images and refused to release them.
D NBC, CBS, FOX, and CNN agreed not to run the images.

Polls and Public Opinion

6 In 2001, what percent of Americans said all U.S. residents of Arab ancestry should be required to carry special identification?

A 49 percent
B 58 percent
C 12 percent
D 82 percent

7 An informal *Time Magazine* poll asked people around the world what country they thought was the biggest threat to world peace. The most common response was:

A Iraq
B North Korea
C China
D United States
E Colombia
QUIZ ANSWERS

1 Answer D  This story was told by a Japanese American man during a reenactment of the World War II internment. Now, however, thousands of men of Arab or South Asian descent have been held indefinitely by the FBI or the INS, often without being accused of any crime. Many have been held in solitary confinement, deprived of contact with family or legal counsel, or asked to report to Special Registration or be deported. Like the Japanese internment, there has been legal declaration to require the registering of Arab Americans, and citizens or nationals from 25 countries.

2 Answer C  Darrell Issa was denied the right to board a flight to Saudi Arabia via Paris because he is Arab. He is also a Republican U.S. Congressman. Despite the intervention of Rep. Robert Walker, a Florida Democrat, the crew refused to let Issa on the plane. In another case, Dr. Albader Alhazami was held for ten days of questioning because he had obtained his visa from the same place in Saudi Arabia as one of the hijackers. (Sources: Oakland Tribune, 10/27/01 and “Rights group moves to end secrecy over 1,000 arrests,” Duncan Campbell, Guardian 11/02/01)

3 Answer E  The number is zero. U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft’s “Interview Project,” which profiled men because of their national origin, not because they were suspected of any crime, led to 17 arrests for visa violations and no arrests for crimes related to terrorism. Community leaders and many local law enforcement agencies have argued that the discriminatory operation exacerbates existing racial tensions and spreads fear and anxiety. Nevertheless, Ashcroft characterized the operation as a success and announced a second round of questioning to include at least 3000 more interrogations.

4 Answer A  Benito Mussolini used “Us or Them” rhetoric to pressure people to support fascism versus democracy. In a speech on September 20, 2001, President George W. Bush said, “Every nation in every region now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.”

5 Answer C  Although the Defense Department could have exercised “shutter control” because the images of bombed Afghan bases may have shown the position of U.S. troops or compromised military security, the ban could have been challenged by the media as a breach of First Amendment rights. Instead, the Pentagon simply bought exclusive rights to all satellite images from Space Imaging and refused to release them. (“U.S. Buys Up All Satellite War Images,” Duncan Campbell, Guardian 10/17/01). Meanwhile, Ashcroft sent a memo to all federal agencies assuring them that if they denied any public requests for
information about their activities (as protected under the Freedom of Information Act), the Department of Justice would support their noncompliance with the law.

6 Answer A  A recent CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll showed that forty-nine percent of Americans think Arabs and Arab Americans should carry a special I.D. card. Meanwhile, 58 percent of Americans say that Arabs and Arab Americans should “undergo special, more intensive security checks before boarding airplanes in the U.S.”

7 Answer D  An “informal, unscientific” poll of over 600,000 people conducted by Time Magazine (on its website Time.com) found that an overwhelming 88 percent of respondents said the U.S. was the greatest threat to world peace in 2003.
TRAINING GUIDE

IDENTIFYING AND ANALYZING THE IMPACTS OF WAR (45 MINUTES)

Trainer: Distribute copies of Attachment C, “The ‘War on Terrorism’ at Home and Abroad.” Read each aloud in the large group. [5 minutes]

• Divide people into four small groups by counting off 1-2-3-4. Distribute Attachment D, which includes discussion questions and tell two groups to discuss the War at Home and two groups to discuss the War Abroad. Give each group a sheet of flipchart paper and a marker to record their responses.

• Small groups will meet for 15 minutes. Announce when they have five minutes left. [10 minutes]

• Reconvene the groups. Ask each of the groups to take a turn displaying and presenting their reports. The reports should last approximately 5 minutes each. [20 minutes total]

Group Question: Debrief should focus on answering the following questions:

1. What groups can be expected to gain more power and/or money from the “War on Terrorism”?

2. What groups can be expected to experience adverse outcomes from the “War on Terrorism”?

3. How is race a factor in who loses and who gains?

Key Points: [5 minutes]. Trainer should use the following points and any other key points raised by participants:

• Those who gain the most already have the most political and economic power. The Bush Administration, members of Congress, big oil and defense companies, and wealthy countries allied with the U.S. have become even more wealthy and powerful.

• People of color, immigrants and refugees, and low-income people are being disproportionately detained, deported, sent to fight in wars abroad, and targeted for hate crimes. People of color and low-income people are also hurt by social service cuts necessitated by increased defense funding for the “War on Terrorism.”

• Institutional racism is an underlying issue for the “War on Terrorism.” Although the focus has been on people of the Islamic faith and other Middle Easterners, there is strong evidence that South Asian people, Latino people, and people of color in general, including African Americans, have been subjected to increasing suspicion and harassment by government law enforcement agencies. Patriotism and fear have been successfully manipulated into a mandate for state-sanctioned punishment, violence, and militarism directed largely at people of color at home and abroad.
THE “WAR ON TERRORISM” AT HOME

The U.S. has responded to the September 11, 2001 events with these domestic policies and actions:

The USA PATRIOT Act and other measures expanded the power of law enforcement and intelligence gathering agencies. The government can now spy on domestic organizations and individuals using telephone and internet surveillance. The government can also eavesdrop on conversations between attorneys and clients, use secret evidence during trials, and try suspects in secret military tribunals, violating due process rights. A second bill being prepared by the Department of Justice, dubbed the Patriot Act II, would empower the government to strip Americans of their citizenship if they participate in the lawful activities of any group that the attorney general labels “terrorist.”

The Administration secretly arrested and detained over 2,000 people “suspected” of terrorism without releasing their names to the public. Attorney General John Ashcroft has ordered hundreds of men of South Asian or Arab descent to be held indefinitely without charges, often without bail or access to attorneys. He also proposed detention camps for U.S. citizens who, without judicial review, are secretly deemed to be “enemy combatants.”

The government has deported tens of thousands of immigrants to Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East since 9/11. The INS and FBI, often working with local law enforcement or businesses, have targeted raids and sweeps at workplaces, homes, airports, schools and neighborhoods. In January 2002, the administration unveiled its “absconder list” of 314,000 people targeted for deportation, despite having no evidence that any are tied to terrorist activity. Young men in the U.S. who are from 25 countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East are required to register with the INS, at which time many men have been detained and deported. At the first registration in Los Angeles, law enforcement detained so many immigrants that they ran out of handcuffs. Since 9/11, such racial profiling has become a legal, routine, and acceptable practice.

The creation of the Department of Homeland Security has formalized, increased, and strengthened interagency collaboration on domestic surveillance and “security” efforts. Since September 11, the INS, FBI, Social Security Administration, and other local, state, and federal institutions have worked together to target potential “terrorist suspects,” undocumented immigrants, and voices of dissent.

Social programs have been cut amidst huge increases in military spending. Cuts include $700 million in employment programs, $417 million to repair public housing, $9 million from worker safety programs, and $596 million from the Department of Education. Meanwhile, most states have reported budget deficits ranging up to $35 billion dollars for 2003.
THE “WAR ON TERRORISM” ABROAD

The U.S. has responded to the September 11, 2001 events by implementing the following military policies:

The Bush Administration has waged war against the people of Iraq, resulting in the death and dismemberment of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians. This attack comes despite no credible evidence linking Iraq to the events of September 11. Bush’s “pre-emptive” war on Iraq does not have the authorization of the United Nations, nor is there any legitimate claim of self-defense.

The Bush Administration launched Operation Enduring Freedom, a military bombing of “strategic” sites in Afghanistan aimed at destroying the Taliban, Osama bin Laden, and al Qaeda. Since 9/11, the US has used the “War on Terrorism” to justify sending military trainers, troops, and assistance to the Philippines, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Sri Lanka, and Colombia.

Congress approved a new $355.5 billion military budget in October 2002. It is the biggest increase in 20 years and the largest military budget in world history. Analysts say that a war in Iraq to disarm and oust President Saddam Hussein could cost an additional $100 billion.

Since September 11, 2001, U.S. military and federal law enforcement agencies have stepped up recruitment, particularly in communities of color. In a little-known provision of President Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act, signed into law in January 2002, public schools are required to submit students’ telephone numbers and addresses to military recruiters, even if parents request otherwise. Numerous federal agencies involved in the “War on Terrorism” have begun aggressive recruiting campaigns in communities of color since 9/11 as seen in numerous advertisements in the ethnic press. As historian Christian G. Appy describes in his book “Working Class War,” young people of color were disproportionately represented among those who fought and died in Vietnam, and now African Americans have a much higher representation in the U.S. military than whites.
ASSESSING THE IMPACTS OF THE “WAR ON TERRORISM”

Each small group is assigned to discuss either the “War on Terrorism” at Home, or the “War on Terrorism” Abroad. Select a facilitator and a recorder/reporter. Then answer the following questions, spending just a few minutes on each.

1. What groups can be expected to gain more power and/or money from the war?

2. What groups can be expected to experience adverse outcomes from the “War on Terrorism?”

3. How is race a factor in who loses and who gains?
TRAINING GUIDE

INSPIRATION FOR ACTION (30 MINUTES—OPTIONAL)

Group Question: Efforts around the country have been made to not only stop the rush to war on Iraq (and other countries), but to stop the war here at home against immigrants, refugees, and other vulnerable communities. What are examples of resistance that you have seen?

Trainer: Right now, you are all taking a first step by committing organizational time to talk about what the impact of the “War on Terrorism” here at home will have on your organization and the issues you work on. To help stop these injustices from continuing, we can all take a first step for justice. What could we do as individuals? As organizations? Solicit comments from participants and build a list. Which one or two of these activities might you be interested in or able to do starting now? List.

*Trainer should review the list of actions on Attachment G, “Assessing the Options” (in Session 3). Trainer may want to put these options up on flipchart paper as examples.*
WHAT’S RACE GOT TO DO WITH IT?

Purpose
This session presents an introduction to the concept of structural racism and how it is embedded in the “war on terrorism” by manufacturing and supporting a set of racist ideas (ideology) and practices.

Outcomes
1. A formulated set of arguments that reveal and conceal racism in the “War on Terrorism.”
2. Practice examining the impact of post 9/11 policies in relation to structural racism.
3. A collective critique of arguments that reveal and conceal racism.
4. Introduction to an analytical framework for revealing and concealing racism that can be used to expose and articulate institutional racism related to the “War on Terrorism” and applied to other issues.

Agenda and Total Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Whose War on Whom?”</td>
<td>large group discussion</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Structural Racism</td>
<td>reading &amp; small group</td>
<td>35 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Impacts of the “War”</td>
<td>large group discussion</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Action Options</td>
<td>large group discussion</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 hour 20 minutes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparation
- Prepare flipchart paper with question: “Whose War Is It and on Whom?”
- Prepare flipchart paper with questions 1–3 from small group discussion, “Understanding Structural Racism.” Trainer uses chart for report back.

Materials Needed
- Easel, flipchart pad, marking pens, and masking tape.
- Copies of Attachments E, F, and G.

Attachments:
- E: “Post-9/11 Events”
- F: “Racial Impacts of the War on Terrorism”
- G: “Taking Action”
TRAINING GUIDE

“WHOSE WAR ON WHOM?”

Trainer: The Bush Administration, Department of Justice, the new Department of Homeland Security and the media have all played key roles in coining and popularizing the phrase “War on Terrorism.” But let’s take a moment to ask ourselves and brainstorm [question on flipchart paper], “Whose War Is It and On Whom?” What people and images are conjured up when we hear the phrase “War on Terrorism”? List responses on flipchart paper.

Key Points:

- The Administration is banking on a war image as a means to play on the general public’s fear (and loathing) of immigrants, people of color, and people whose faith are of non-Christian origins.
- While the Media and the Administration to continue to call this a “War on Terrorism,” what we see in our own communities is a war on people: intimidation, detainment, deportation, racist stereotyping and racial profiling.
- As we keep these images in our minds, let’s take a look at how racism has been structured into the “War on Terrorism” and what are the racial implications as a result.

UNDERSTANDING STRUCTURAL RACISM

Small Group Discussion (20 minutes)
We are going to pass out two stories, one for each group, to read aloud with each other (Attachment E, “Post 9/11 Events”). When you are finished reading, answer these three questions in your small group and put on flipchart paper:

1. What happened and do you think it was all right?
2. Who were the individuals involved, what did they do, and how did they justify their actions?
3. What institutions were involved, what did they do, and how did they justify their actions?

The Debrief (15 minutes)
Use the following questions to debrief the small group discussions:

1. What individuals were involved? How do they justify their actions?
2. How do institutions reflect or perpetuate these justifications?
3. Do these institutions support each other’s actions—how and why?
POST-9/11 EVENTS

Incident #1

Three men reportedly overheard talking about a terrorist plot at a restaurant in Georgia were pulled over and detained for 17 hours on September 12, 2002. The men, medical students heading to Miami for training, were of Jordanian, Iranian and Pakistani descent. Authorities said one is a U.S. native, another a naturalized citizen, and the third has a valid visa.

Not long after midnight, two Collier County deputy sheriffs spotted the cars at or near an I-75 toll plaza east of Naples. Representatives of at least 12 law enforcement agencies zeroed in on the isolated site. Those agents were from the FBI; FDLE; the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms; the Collier County Sheriff’s Office; Florida Highway Patrol; the Southwest Florida Regional Domestic Security Task Force; Miami-Dade Police Department; Florida State Fire Marshal; Collier County emergency response; and a Naples hazardous materials team. The road was closed, bomb-sniffing dogs and bomb squad robots were brought in to search the cars, and what appeared to be a backpack, found in one car, was blown up by bomb squad agents. After the investigation, the medical students were cleared of any links to terrorist activity.

Various media organizations, quoting federal officials, said the three men might have been pretending to be terrorists because they weren’t pleased with the way Stone was looking at them. But the men denied making any comments or jokes about terrorism, and told CNN they were unaware of any problems in the restaurant. “The words 9/11, the words September, weren’t even mentioned in the conversation. We were talking about what we were going to do in Miami,” said Ayman Gheith. Gheith, who has a long beard and wore a skull cap, said the woman may have been influenced by his appearance: “She saw obviously the way I was dressed and maybe she put a little salt and pepper into her story.”

The woman who reported the comments is Eunice Stone of Cartersville, Ga., a 44-year-old nurse who was eating at a Shoney’s restaurant when she heard the men talking. “I thought anybody that’s laughing about 9/11, I know they have that right, but there’s something wrong with them,” Stone said. Neighbors in Calhoun, a town of 10,000 in rural north Georgia, said they were proud of Stone for calling authorities. “I appreciate someone like her with the courage to do it,” said neighbor Eric Finch. “For anyone to sit around and joke over a cup of coffee about a couple of thousand people being killed—they should be prosecuted just for that.”

Even after being proven innocent, the trio are no longer welcome to study at the south Miami Hospital. Dr. Jack Michel, president and chief executive officer of Larkin Community Hospital, said: “It’s not safe for them to be here—for them, for the hospital or the patients.” Michel said the hospital had received more than 100 hostile e-mails since Friday’s incident.

**Incident #2**

On January 7, 2003, James Biggs, a 48 year old African American man, entered Chicago-O’Hare International Airport on his way to a meeting in Washington, D.C. Biggs’ work makes him a frequent traveler, but despite his professional appearance he is accustomed to extra scrutiny by airport security officers. After checking his bag at the ticket counter, Biggs proceeded to the security line, where a security officer singled him out for an additional security check. The security officer asked him to remove his shoes, opened his personal belongings, asked him questions, and rifled through the papers in his briefcase. After a 10 minute delay, Biggs continued to the gate.

When Biggs tried to board the plane, two airline agents pulled him aside for another security search. They asked him to remove his jacket, opened his personal belongings, and again rifled through his briefcase. After all the other passengers boarded the plane, the airline agents continued to hold Biggs to the side. No explanation for the delay was offered. Biggs, who had arrived at the airport well before his scheduled flight, was never allowed to board. The plane took off, and the airline allowed him to fly on the next flight.

Biggs reacted to the incident. “Nine out of 10 times I get pulled aside by security officers for extra searches. They always claim that race has nothing to do with it. I’d never been held so I missed a flight until this time, but since September 11 it’s gotten harder for me to fly anywhere.”
GUIDE TO BREAKING DOWN THE FLORIDA EXAMPLE

1 Looking at the sequence of events in the Florida incident reveals:
   • Eunice Stone, a white woman, says she hears terrorist threats from three Middle Eastern and South Asian men.
   • Police and federal officials believe Stone’s story, and launch a 12 agency search for the Jordanian, Pakistani, and Iranian men.
   • The media then believe the reports of police and federal officials, which say that the white woman overheard terrorist threats from the three medical students. From this information, the media depicts the men as potential terrorists and the white woman as a patriot.
   • The hospital, reacting to public sentiment following the media interpretation of events, dismisses the men even after knowing of their innocence.

2 Because of the relationships between the individual (Stone) and the institution(s) (police, hospital, media), and between the institutions themselves, the three innocent medical students face multiple levels of racism: detention by law enforcement, media bias, dismissal from hospital.

3 Meanwhile, none of these individuals or institutions admit that race is a factor—the woman claims to be doing her patriotic duty, law enforcement claim to be responding to a terrorist threat, the media claims to be listening to law enforcement authorities, and the hospital president claims to be protecting the safety of hospital patients and the three students.

4 Racial profiling and violations of civil rights become acceptable when coded as “acts in the interest of national security.” In this way, racial stereotyping is legitimized, even while the media, institutions, and many individuals deny that race has anything to do with outcomes.

Trainer: If the group wants a definition of structural racism, put this up on a sheet of flipchart paper.

*Structural racism in the U.S. is the legitimization of historical, cultural, institutional, and interpersonal dynamics that routinely advantage whites while producing cumulative and chronic adverse outcomes for people of color. Structural racism compounds the effects of racially biased individual prejudices and institutional policies and practices by legitimating each institution’s actions.*
TRAINING GUIDE

RACIAL IMPACTS OF THE "WAR ON TERRORISM" (10 MINUTES)

Distribute to everyone copies of Attachment F.

Key Points:

- The “War on Terrorism” is not only aggravating racial inequality, but also institutionalizing new and expanded forms of racism.

- More efforts are needed to expose and oppose the institutional racism of the “War on Terrorism”—the state-sanctioned policies and practices that result in racial discrimination and adverse impacts on people of color and immigrant in the U.S. and abroad. These policies and practices also have an adverse impact on the civil liberties of all residents of the U.S.
THE RACIAL IMPACTS OF THE “WAR ON TERRORISM”

1 There is increased racial profiling. This is not a new phenomenon. In World War II, 120,000 Japanese Americans were placed in internment camps, forced to work and/or go to war, or killed for resisting. In the wake of 9/11, there has been an increase in instances of people stopped, searched, and detained because of their appearance, and public acceptance of the “necessity” of such practices, like the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System and Special Registrations.

2 There are more hate crimes against people of color. As war rhetoric escalates, U.S. “enemies” will be increasingly demonized. Those who resemble them (Arab Americans, Muslims, East Asians, and other people of color) are vulnerable. Since 9/11, there have been at least three people murdered and according to a November Human Rights Watch report anti-muslim bias rose 1700% across the U.S. Meanwhile, Arabs and Arab Americans have been routinely stopped and harassed when flying.

3 Immigrants are losing their rights. Immigration has been restricted, border patrols have been expanded, raids have increased, benefits have been denied, detentions and deportations have been justified in the name of security, access to public services has been more difficult for limited English speakers, and other civil and human rights have been denied. New “anti-terrorist” legislation permits extended detention of immigrants without charges, allows for deportation based on “secret evidence,” and, most recently, the detainment of all asylum applicants from 33 countries through Operation Liberty Shield.

4 Cuts in social services will disproportionately hurt people of color. Cuts in welfare, healthcare, education, and other services will be made to pay for expanded military operations and “domestic/homeland security.”

5 Tensions among and within different communities of color, and between people of color and whites, may become aggravated as resources and civil rights are limited.

6 Social justice activists, particularly people of color, will undergo increased surveillance and suspicion. Those engaging in protests may easily be branded as “terrorist sympathizers.”

7 U.S. military interventions will continue to occur in countries where most residents are people of color, such as Iraq and Afghanistan. It’s much easier to declare war and sustain domestic support when “colored” enemies are involved.

8 Developing countries in Africa, the Americas and Asia will face increasing pressure to ally with U.S. military strategies and “free trade” agendas. Imposed structural adjustment policies, debt payments, and the threat of economic sanctions will keep financially strapped countries in line and in perpetual poverty.
TRAINING GUIDE

TAKING ACTION FOR JUSTICE (25 MINUTES)*

This section is part of Session 3: Taking Action. The attachment for this section is Attachment G, “Taking Action”, located on pages 26–32.

*Note: Session 3: Taking Action is a planning session designed to move your group into action. If possible, we encourage you to conduct Session 3: Taking Action in its entirety. In that case, you should skip this part and proceed to Session 3.

IDENTIFYING OPTIONS FOR ACTION (15 MINUTES)

Trainer: In the last session, we looked at the impact the “War on Terrorism” had domestically and abroad. We all know that these incidents are no longer business as usual, but a real attack, particularly on immigrant and refugee communities, and communities of color. Right now, your organization is taking the first step by committing organizational time to talk about what impact the “War on Terrorism” will have on your organization and the issues you work on. To help stop these injustices, we can all take a first step. Here are some possible activities your organization can consider:

• Distribute to everyone copies of Attachment G, “Taking Action” (see pages 26–32).
• Call upon different people to read aloud the options listed in Attachment G.
• Ask if anyone else has other ideas to add to the list. List these ideas on flipchart paper.

ASSESSING THE OPTIONS (10 MINUTES)

• Ask people if there are any of these options that they would like to do. Feel free to tailor any of the suggestions to suit your organization and community.
• Ask people to decide which two options they would most like to do, then rank them 1 and 2.
Purpose
This session examines current actions that are taking place to oppose the “War on Terrorism” and explores alternative options for action. This section also takes people through steps to make general plans and commitments for themselves and/or their organization(s).

Outcomes
1. Familiarity with a variety of action options.
2. A decision about which actions the group would like to undertake.
3. Specific plans and timelines developed for each activity.
4. Specific commitments made by as many individuals as possible willing to work on the activities.

Agenda and Total Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Current Actions</td>
<td>large group discussion</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Action Options</td>
<td>presentation/reading</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for Future Action</td>
<td>group discussion</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Plans &amp; Getting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>group planning</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>presentation/group activity</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Time: 1 hour 10 minutes**

Materials Needed
- Easel, flipchart pad, marking pens, and masking tape.
- Copies of Attachment G (5 pages) for everyone.
- A poem, song, or something inspirational to share or do at the closing of the session.

Attachments
- G: “Taking Action”
- H: “Examples of Resistance”
TRAINING GUIDE

ASSESSING RESPONSES TO THE CURRENT POLITICAL CLIMATE (10 MINUTES)

Discuss the following questions:

• What actions have you participated in or heard of in your communities?
• How successful have these actions been in shifting public opinion or shifting the thinking of decisionmakers?
• Are these actions enough?

Transition to next piece: Current activities have not been successful in altering public policy decisions or public opinion. We are in this for the long haul, and it is time to look at other actions we can take to protect those that are most vulnerable while we continue our other organizational work.

IDENTIFYING OPTIONS FOR ACTION (15 MINUTES)

• Distribute to everyone copies of Attachment G, “Taking Action.”
• Call upon different people to read aloud the options listed in Attachment G.
• Ask if anyone else has other ideas to add to the list. List these ideas on flipchart paper.

Trainer: In the last session, we looked at how racism is structured in the “War on Terrorism” and how it manufactures and supports a set of racist ideas and practices. We all know that these incidents are no longer business as usual, but a real attack, particularly on immigrant and refugee communities, and communities of color. Right now, your organization is taking the first step by committing organizational time to talk about what impact the “War on Terrorism” will have on your organization and the issues you work on. To help stop these injustices, we can all take a first step. Here are possible activities that your organization can consider:

ASSESSING THE OPTIONS (10 MINUTES)

Group Questions:

• Ask people if there are any options they would like to do. Feel free to tailor any of the suggestions to suit your organization and community.
• Ask people to decide which two options they would most like to do, then rank them 1 and 2.
MAKING PLANS AND GETTING COMMITMENTS (30 MINUTES)

For each action the group has selected, decide on:

1 What you're going to do. Write all the general plans and specific tasks on flipchart paper.

2 When you're going to do it. Write down the dates and timeline on flipchart paper.

3 Who is going to do it. Ask for volunteers and write down their names on flipchart paper.

   • At the end of this discussion, review what the group has decided to do and when it will do it.
   • Then ask everyone in the room to take a turn saying what they each have committed to do.
   • Acknowledge everyone's commitments with big applause at the end.

CLOSING (5 MINUTES)

• We're part of a movement that's building up across the country. Distribute copies of Attachment H, “Examples of Resistance.”

• End with something inspiring: a poem, song, story etc., that leaves people feeling energized, united, inspired, and uplifted.

“The most difficult struggle of all is the one within ourselves. Let us not get accustomed and adjust to these conditions. The one who adjusts ceases to discriminate between good and evil. He becomes a slave in body and soul. Whatever happens to you, always remember: don't adjust! Revolt against the reality!”

Mordecai Anielewics, Warsaw, 1943
TAKING ACTION

TAKE A STAND: STATEMENTS OF CONSCIENCE

Adopt and publicize an organizational declaration of conscience against institutional racism related to the “War on Terrorism.” Publicize your official organizational statement of conscience by distributing it via internet, fax, and personal visits to peer organizations, allies, and elected officials. Organizations can publicize the statement on their websites, in local mainstream and ethnic newspapers, and write letters to the editor. Use local mainstream media and ethnic press to publicize your statement via a letter to the editor. Statements from the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights and the American Friends Service Committee (both attached).

Ask allies and public bodies to adopt a public statement of conscience. Visit with allies and public officials to talk about the war on terrorism and its effects on the local community. Encourage groups and community leaders to take a positive first step by signing onto a statement of conscience.

PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Conduct internal educational discussions and trainings with your organization about the war and its racial implications. Engaging in, rather than avoiding, potentially difficult and contentious conversations will make your organization more informed, united, and stronger.

Sponsor local public educational events to raise awareness about racist practices and policies enacted since 9/11. Establish an alternative public record that marks discriminatory practices that have a disproportionate impact upon immigrants, refugees, and communities of color. Identify support from communities and individuals less vulnerable to the immediate attacks and garner their support for future actions. The public needs alternative and reliable sources of information to counteract propaganda from the Bush administration and corporate media. Conduct teach-ins, community workshops, race relations dialogues, leafleting and tabling in public places, and other activities that inform people of perspectives and experiences that aren’t typically covered with mainstream press.

Ask public bodies to adopt public resolutions of non-compliance. Demand that your city council, school board, or other local government bodies pass resolutions against hate crimes, racial profiling by law enforcement, statements of non-cooperation between the local police and INS, etc. By demanding that public bodies take a position against post 9/11 hate crimes, a resolution presented by the Japanese American Citizens League garnered public and media attention which then opened the political environment for legislative action. Oregon passed legislation prohibiting political or religious spying by state and local police, as well as legislation prohibiting local law enforcement from acting as INS agents. This legislation was fought for and won by community organizations, labor unions, civil rights groups, the ACLU, and immigrant rights organizations. Meanwhile, dozens of cities have
passed resolutions to oppose parts of the USA Patriot Act, including Cambridge, MA; Denver, CO; Santa Cruz, CA; and Santa Fe, NM.

BUILD PUBLIC AWARENESS

**Sponsor a public hearing** or public truth session (see attached) that provides an opportunity for immigrants, people of color, and others who have been adversely impacted by the “War on Terrorism” to testify about their experiences. For example, Hate Free Zone in Seattle sponsored a hearing with 1,100 people in attendance and testimony from dozens of immigrants and other people. Ask a public body such as a city council committee or a human relations committee to serve as a panel to receive the testimony, or create a panel of community leaders from various religious and civic organizations. This activity can open up the environment to pass resolutions and legislation of non-compliance.

**Make News and Influence the Media.** Meet with reporters, editorial board members, and columnists to share your organization’s perspectives. Write op-eds or letters to the editor about the newspaper’s coverage of and perspective on the war. If you want to be in the news, make news by holding public actions or initiating something new, creative, and interesting. Be sure to include ethnic, alternative, and religious press in your publicity efforts.

TAKE ACTION

**Engage in public actions targeted at local elected officials** who vote for “war against terrorism” measures. Hold a demonstration and news conference outside the local office of your U.S. Congressperson. Invite the media and have visual props, lively speakers and chants so it appeals to the electronic media. Consider coordinated actions with groups in other places, or replicable actions that groups have done already or could do in the future. This can unify diverse and disparate communities around common ideas and actions, and produce an “echo effect” where public officials and the media hear similar messages from different places.

**Protect vulnerable communities.** Your organization can offer sanctuary to undocumented immigrants targeted by the INS, or offer escort services to Muslims who may be the targets of harassment and hate crimes when attending religious services or public events. In some situations, those who have class privilege, white skin privilege, and/or U.S. citizenship are in a better position to take risks, engage in civil disobedience, or stand on the front lines of confrontational actions than those who are undocumented and vulnerable to being targeted by law enforcement officials.

**Engage in civil disobedience.** In small groups or in massive actions, use your body to disobey an environment of injustice, and break through unresponsive “proper” channels. Shut down freeways and intersections to disrupt “business as usual” and draw media attention, or target specific institutions-by blocking or occupying buildings like the INS, military recruitment offices, detention centers and weapons manufacturers. Get creative: hold “die ins,” chain your bodies together, or simply hold hands and refuse to move until arrested. Block or disrupt speaking events, press conferences, and “closed meetings.”
Stop the War Abroad
Stop the Domestic War against Immigrants, Refugees and Communities of Color
We call for an end to the U.S. led war-drive against Iraq

We call for an end to the growing domestic war on the rights of immigrant and refugee communities, and all people of color. To ensure the public safety and security, we must fully protect our civil liberties, and civil and constitutional rights.

We raise our voices and extend our hands in solidarity with the victims of U.S. government racist violence abroad and domestically.

War Abroad, War at Home
The looming U.S. war against Iraq threatens to violently displace entire communities in the Middle East, again creating new generations of refugees and displaced peoples. During the 1991 Gulf War, over five million migrant workers from Asia, the Middle East, and other parts of the world were forced to flee for their lives and countless Iraqis and Kuwaitis became casualties of the war.

The U.S. war drive also has a disproportionate impact on immigrants, refugees and communities of color living in the United States. Our communities already suffer from inequitable domestic policies that result in higher levels of unemployment, incarceration, and military service.

Anti-terrorist laws and policies further criminalize entire communities, shatter lives and impoverish families whose loved ones face detention and deportation.

President Bush’s “permanent war against terrorism” has sown fear and confusion, increasing public anxieties and stereotypes that terrorists are “living in our midst.” A series of policies, practices, measures, and laws targeting immigrants and refugees have been unleashed. The three major post-September 11 anti-terrorist laws – the USA PATRIOT Act, the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, and the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Reform Act – criminalize immigrants, prolong failed border militarization, and give measures of impunity to immigration law enforcement. The 9/11 anti-terrorist measures have increased border militarization resulting in further abuses and deaths of migrants crossing to work in the U.S. The FBI and INS, with other local, state, and federal law enforcement forces, have systematically stepped up harassment and carried out raids where immigrants and refugees live, work, worship, study, and play.

Immediately after 9/11, using illegal racial, ethnic, and religious profiling, the INS with the FBI and other police began arresting and, in many cases, deporting scores of South Asian, Arab, and Muslim men as part of the anti-immigrant/anti-terrorist hysteria and scapegoating that swept the country. The government has yet to account for thousands of illegally detained, deported, and “disappeared” persons. Immigration proceedings are NOT criminal proceedings. In many cases the government utilizes immigration laws when there is no other way to prosecute an individual or group. Immigration laws have built-in profiling techniques that put large sections of immigrant communities at risk of deportation.

Policy Wrongs, Immigrant Rights
Under the guise of “national security,” a coalition of federal government agencies led by the Department of Justice unleashed “Operation Tarmac” raids against low wage airport service workers including non-citizens and U.S. citizens. While over 1,000 mainly Latino and Asian airport workers have been arrested and deported, hundreds more lost their jobs; yet not one single “terrorist” was found.
Thousands of other longtime airport security workers who were lawful permanent residents lost their jobs after the federalization of airport security screener jobs required U.S. citizenship.

The current INS “Special Registration Program” is only the most recent attack on the rights and freedoms of Arab, African, and Asian communities that may lay the groundwork for continuing sweeps of other immigrant communities.

All anti-terrorist immigration law enforcement programs, policies, practices, and laws targeting immigrant and refugee communities must end.

Stopping the war abroad must include stopping the war against immigrants and refugees and all communities of color at home.

**TOGETHER WE MUST:**

**HOLD ACCOUNTABLE** all elected officials responsible for trampling the constitution and eroding civil and human rights in the “war on terrorism.”

**REPEAL** anti-terrorist immigration law enforcement programs, policies, practices, and laws.

**PREVENT** the further erosion of Constitutional guarantees, such as the recently leaked PATRIOT Act II, which would strip people of their citizenship and other rights.

**STOP** hate violence and illegal racial, ethnic, and religious profiling.

**DEFEND** our civil liberties by upholding full constitutional protections and processes, including accountability by the FBI, INS, and other law enforcement agencies.

**GUARANTEE** all members of our communities, regardless of their immigration status, live in peace, safety, and security.

Ending the domestic war on the rights of immigrants, refugees and people of color guarantees the peace, safety, and security of all communities in the U.S.

**SIGNED (Partial List of Endorsements):**

Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach, San Francisco
CAAAN: Organizing Asian Communities, New York
Coalición de Derechos Humanos, Tucson
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles
Filipinos for Affirmative Action, Oakland
Filipino Civil Rights Advocates, Oakland

INS Watch - La Raza Centro Legal, San Francisco
Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, Boston
National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild
National Lawyers Guild, Massachusetts Chapter
National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights
South Asian Network, Los Angeles

To endorse this statement, please email or call:

National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, (510) 465-1984 ext 305; Email: agarcia@nnirr.org

This declaration is available at: www.nnirr.org

NNIRR 310 8th Street STE 303, Oakland, CA 94607 Tel (510) 465-1984, Fax (510) 465-1885
American Friends Service Committee  
www.afsc.org

STATEMENT BY AFSC'S IMMIGRATION CONCENTRATION NETWORK

"Special registration" of immigrants:  
Trampling Rights, Spreading Fear

In recent weeks, the "special registration" program of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has made headlines across the country, while simultaneously sowing fear and confusion in immigrant communities nationwide.

Under this program, all males from certain countries over the age of 16 who entered the United States with temporary visas before specified dates must report to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to be photographed, fingerprinted, and interrogated. All but one of the first 20 countries covered by this program are predominately Arab or Muslim; the sole exception is North Korea.

The initial phase of this program established three deadlines, according to country. The first deadline, on Dec. 16 - for men from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, and Syria - sparked a flare-up of protest after an estimated 500 people were placed in detention facilities when they reported to the INS. Although nearly all of them have since been released, they will now face deportation hearings, in many cases because of minor procedural errors in their immigration papers. The second deadline, on Jan. 10 (later extended to Feb. 7), covered men from an additional 13 countries. It was deemed a "success," according to DOJ statements, because only 124 people were arrested. The third deadline for this phase, on Feb. 21, will cover visa holders from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia.

An Unworkable and Unjust Program

"Special registration" has been roundly criticized, and rightly so, for its inept and chaotic implementation. The problems with this program, however, run far deeper than mismanagement. It flies in the face of basic constitutional principles and broadly held notions of justice and fairness. In the name of "security," it poses new threats - not only to immigrants but also to all people in the United States. Perhaps most dangerously, this program heightens war fever by stigmatizing immigrants as a threat to national security.

Registration is Racial Profiling

Registration targets immigrants based on their national, ethnic, or religious identity. The initial focus on Arab or Muslim immigrants implies that they are more likely to break the law or more prone to acts of violence. This is a form of racial profiling, and as such it violates constitutional guarantees of equal protection, due process, and freedom of religion. These guarantees are not a privilege reserved for U.S. citizens, but internationally recognized human rights that apply to all people, regardless of their legal status.

Registration Undermines Public Safety

Like all forms of racial profiling, registration decreases, rather than increases, public safety. Instead of building trust and lines of communication among different segments of society, it obliterates entire communities to view government authorities as a threat, rendering it difficult or impossible for community members to turn to authorities for assistance or protection - or, by the same token, to assist authorities by reporting threats to public safety. It functions as an incitement to hate violence, with dangerous and potentially lethal consequences for targeted communities. Finally, by substituting prejudice and stereotyping for observation and investigation, it undermines the very possibility of effective, fair-minded law enforcement.

Branding Immigrants as Terrorists

Registration institutionalizes the view that immigrants are terrorists - that "they" are a threat to "our" safety. It reinforces the drive for war by promoting the idea that "foreigners" are a source of danger and violence. It ignores the simple reality that senseless acts of violence may be committed by individuals (and groups) of every ethnic and national origin. It also obscures the difficult truth that U.S. government policies have fostered violent conflict in numerous parts of the world. By treating entire communities as dangerous enemies, it creates a self-fulfilling prophecy, increasing the likelihood that these communities, and their countries of origin, will in turn view the United States as a threat. In today's media environment, where marketing ploys are openly used to sell the public on warfare, registration functions mainly to establish a "brand identity" for the enemy, displacing more pragmatic attempts to prevent future attacks like those of Sept. 11, 2001.

Paying the Price for Registration
Registration forces immigrant communities to pay a steep price for an unworkable policy. Many people have been detained because their pending applications for permanent residency have been caught in massive INS backlogs. Others are facing deportation orders because of minor technical violations of procedures that are so complex that government personnel often cannot understand them either. Those who failed to correctly interpret the instructions for registration, which in at least one case were incorrectly translated by the INS itself, may be deported and barred from the United States for life. The massive confusion of this program offers a foretaste of what is likely to occur once the INS is split into two separate agencies, both of which are slated to become part of the Homeland Security behemoth.

Legalization: A Humane, Democratic, and Effective Alternative

AFSC believes that legalization of people who have established new lives in the United States offers an alternative that is not only more humane but far more workable. By affirming immigrants as an essential and valued element of U.S. society, a legalization program would break the spurious link between racial profiling and public safety. Likewise, temporary visitors to the United States - whether they are students, people traveling on business, or would-be residents whose papers are in process - should be acknowledged as a vital part of our educational institutions, our economy, and our communities. Whether permanent or temporary, immigrants and visitors are our neighbors, not our enemies. In the end, “they” are “us.”

Entrenching the National Security State

At a moment when Arabs and Muslims are openly stigmatized by media and political figures alike, it has been possible to build some support for registration by playing on public fears of further violent attacks. The DOJ’s plans, however, only begin with these communities. Future phases call for extending the registration program to all immigrants and visitors, of every nationality, as well as requiring U.S. citizens to “register” whenever they leave or return to the country. As history shows, attacks on civil liberties always begin with the most vulnerable – but they seldom end there.

Echoes of a Forgotten Era

Registration carries many echoes of the 1950s, when national security paranoia, McCarthyism, and legalized segregation combined to reinforce deeply seated social and economic divisions. Registration itself is a return to the practices of the McCarran Act, which classed foreigners and political dissidents together as a threat to national security and required them to register with the state. Registration defines immigrants as a separate category of persons with fewer rights and a presumption of being a threat. It seeks to turn the clock back to a time before the Civil Rights Era, when the legal framework for these and other forms of discrimination was overturned.

Speaking Truth to Power

Throughout its 85-year history, the Service Committee has proudly upheld the Quaker tradition of “speaking truth to power,” an expression of the foundational Quaker belief that the light of understanding resides within each and every person. In the 1940s, we stood with Japanese Americans and spoke out against internment camps. In the 1950s, at the height of the McCarthy Era, we spoke up in support of civil liberties. Since the 1980s, we have declined to comply with laws requiring us to collect information about the immigration status of our employees, which we find to be a violation of our religious beliefs. In the year 2000, we joined organized labor and other faith communities in speaking out in support of legalization for undocumented immigrants. Each of these actions is an expression of our unshakable commitment, rooted in Quaker values, to building a society that respects the equal and infinite worth of each person and all peoples.

The American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) is a Quaker organization that includes people of various faiths who are committed to social justice, peace, and humanitarian service. Its work is based on the Religious Society of Friends (Quaker) belief in the worth of every person and faith in the power of love to overcome violence and injustice. For more information about AFSC’s immigration programs, please call 215.241.7134 or e-mail jCamps-Rivera@afsc.org.
THE PUBLIC’S TRUTH SESSIONS:
A POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO PUBLIC HEARINGS

Given the increased harassment, mass arrests and deportations in Cambodian, Pakistani, Somali, and other immigrant communities, conducting hearings where immigrants are asked to publicly testify may be very difficult. To gain some of the effects of a hearing without the risks, JUMP, in collaboration with a number of immigrant activists, have devised an alternative: The Public’s Truth Sessions.

What are The Public’s Truth Sessions?

The Public’s Truth Sessions are the public presentation of the post September 11th experiences of immigrants and refugees. They differ from hearings in that the stories may be presented by the immigrant or refugees themselves, or by another community leader—a member of the religious community, a civil rights leader, a union leader, legal advocates, a leader in a community organization, or an elected official.

How The Public Truth’s Works

Organizations in the local area serve as hosts or “anchors” for a Public’s Truth. There are three major areas of work for anchor organizations:

1. Identify members of broader community to serve as audience for a Public’s Truth;
2. Identify sources of discrimination and harassment from “war on terrorism” policies and practices stories from affected communities and collect stories;
3. Identify individuals from communities less vulnerable to direct attacks of current national security agenda that can come gather stories and serve as Truth Speakers at the event.

A unique component of The Public’s Truth is the involvement of individual leaders (i.e. ministers, professors, community leaders, sympathetic politicians, etc.) from communities less vulnerable to direct discriminatory and racist attacks of the national security agenda. Targeted individual leaders participate through visits with community members who have been targeted by the Directorate of Border and Transportation Security and the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (formerly the INS) and FBI policies and practices. The visits chronicle the experiences of discrimination and abuse through video or audio and written documentation. Visiting leaders or “Truth Speakers” then relay the stories to a wider audience in a public forum. Truth Speakers play a critical role to help maintain the anonymity of the individual whose story they share, which in turn provides security and protection for those most at risk of attacks. To represent the people who provided stories, blown-up cardboard pictures as well as video clips of individuals with their identities protected will “stand” next to Truth Speakers. Individuals can also come to share their story and be accompanied by story gatherers during the forum.

The Public’s Truth Speakers play the essential role of communicating the emotion of the stories from affected individuals under national security policies to a broader community audience. It is vital to secure a cross section of less vulnerable individuals, communities, and organizations that bring political weight, credibility, and a base of people that they influence to serves as audience. All groups can assist in the gathering of stories.

After hosting a Public’s Truth, anchoring organizations can organize other activities to support public record of immigrant and refugee experiences and engage with decision makers. These activities include conducting public hearings, passing local and state resolutions of non-compliance, and ongoing public education through trainings and discussions. (A description of these activities can be found in the Reasserting Justice action tool kit by the Applied Research Center, www.arc.org.)
EXAMPLES OF RESISTANCE FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY

1 Public declarations of dissent from organizations and individuals
   • Examples: Statements of Conscience
   • Organizations: National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, American Friends Service Committee

2 Public education for members and staff of organizations
   • Organizations: California Faculty Association, Movement Strategy Center

3 Public awareness campaigns and establishment of Public Record of immigrant detention and deportation
   • HateFree Zone-Campaign of Washington’s “Justice for All” hearing.

4 Resolutions and legislation to prohibit local law enforcement from complying with certain federal investigations
   • INS Watch/La Raza Centro Legal’s San Francisco Board of Supervisor resolution of Non-compliance with the INS
   • ACLU Oregon’s fight for ORS

5 Legal support for immigrants and refugees post 9/11
   • Detention Watch, National Lawyers Guild clinics, targeted law school clinics ie. University of California, Davis

6 Direct actions and mobilizations
   • DRUM’s fight at the INS centers for basic human rights and legal representation.
   • Peace Marches mobilized by grassroots formations: Racial Justice 9/11 and United for Peace and Justice, NION, ANSWER

7 Resistance through art and culture
   • USA Patriot Art