
Nativism In the House: A Report on the House Immigration Reform Caucus

Contributed by
Tuesday, 09 October 2007
Last Updated Wednesday, 05 December 2007

View the entire report in a printable pdf format by clicking [here](#).

Nativism in the House:
A Report on the House Immigration Reform Caucus

By the Building Democracy Initiative, Center for New Community

In the ebb and flow of nativist politics, the House Immigration Reform Caucus has been one of the most powerful and significant forces on Capitol Hill. With 110 congressmen and women as of this report, its members constitute fully one quarter of the House of Representatives. Members have introduced some of the most punitive legislation proposed during the last two House sessions. Their past chairman, Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-Colo.), is now running for president and participating in national debates. Their current chairman, Rep. Brian Bilbray (R-Calif.), is a former lobbyist for the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). Some of its members have helped legitimize vigilante organizations such as the Minutemen. While voters tend to view their representatives as individuals or by party affiliation, the members of the House Caucus have acted as a bloc. Collectively, they have stood athwart the legislative process, preventing the emergence of meaningful and humane policy choices. And they have gone all the while virtually unnoticed.

In this report, the Center for New Community's Building Democracy Initiative examines the House Immigration Reform Caucus. We have created a map showing the congressional districts they represent. Using data collected by other organizations that have evaluated voting patterns, we have compiled a multi-issue "report card" on the Caucus members. With information compiled by the Federal Election Commission, we have exposed both individuals and PACs that have contributed to their campaign coffers. This report also begins an examination of the relationship between the HIRC and the larger anti-immigrant movement.

Report authored by Devin Burghart, Eric Ward, and Leonard Zeskind, with research assistance from Melissa Nalani Ross and database assistance from Rob O'Mahoney.

Copyright © 2007 Center for New Community. All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced without the permission of the Center for New Community except for sections quoted with proper attribution for purposes of review and public education.

The Anti-Immigrant Movement Sets the Stage

From the emergence of a new nativist movement in the late 1970s, groups such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) have sought influence inside Washington D.C. During the debate over the Immigration Reform and Control Act in the early 1980s, FAIR worked closely with both of its primary sponsors, Senator Simpson (R-Wyo.) and Congressman Mazzoli (D-Ky). According to its founder and leading personality, John Tanton, "FAIR'S part in the passage of the Simpson- Mazzoli Bill cost us eight years of effort and eight million dollars."¹ President Reagan signed this bill in 1986, and made it illegal to knowingly hire or recruit undocumented immigrants, required employers to attest to their employees' immigration status, and granted amnesty to undocumented immigrants who entered the United States before 1982.

In 1994, a referendum election in California became the most important test case on immigration policy at that time. Listed on ballots as "Save Our State," Proposition 187 mandated strict and punitive measures against undocumented immigrants. Entire families would be barred from receiving any type of public assistance, including routine medical care, and their children would be ineligible for public schooling. The initiative required teachers to screen their classrooms for students whose parents did not have papers. Similarly, medical personnel were to report undocumented patients to immigration authorities.

FAIR's Sacramento-based lobbyist Alan C. Nelson was a co-author of the proposition language,² and the organization helped pay for advertising efforts during the closing weeks of the campaign.³ The measure passed overwhelmingly: 4,624,825 votes or 59.1% for, and 3,197,409 votes or 40.8% against.⁴ The Supreme Court struck down the most punitive sections of the measure because they violated Fourteenth Amendment protections. Nevertheless, FAIR executive director Dan Stein argued at the time that, "Proposition 187 is the clearest ringing bell to wake up our national leadership on this question that we've had in 100 years."⁵

Today, a dozen anti-immigrant organizations maintain national profiles. These groups have combined annual budgets of over twelve million dollars, and an active donor base of between six hundred thousand and seven hundred thousand. As these national groups have expanded their influence, the number of state and local organizations has jumped up. Between January of 2005 and January of 2007, such groups have increased in number by 600 percent.⁶

Formation of the Congressional Immigration Reform Caucus and Rep. Tom Tancredo

Tom Tancredo founded the Congressional Immigration Reform Caucus (hereinafter the Caucus or HIRC) in May 1999, soon after he began his first term as a Republican congressman from Colorado's Sixth District. During its first years, the Caucus had few members and served largely as a platform for Tancredo's views on immigration. He had started his career in elective office as a state representative in the 1970s associated with the Christian right.⁷ As an official in the Reagan Administration's Education Department during the 1980s, Tancredo advocated abolishing the Department of Education. In 1994, he began working at a think tank funded by Coors family money. At that time he described California's Proposition 187, as a "primal scream."⁸

Although Tancredo described himself as a candidate from the "religious right" during his 1998 campaign for congress, he had already shifted his main focus to immigration issues. It was a switch that many of those who later joined the Caucus would make as well.

On August 1, 2001—five weeks before the events of 9-11—Tancredo introduced H.R. 2712, a bill intended to begin a moratorium on legal immigration, according to the Library of Congress' THOMAS website. Much of the recent public discussion on immigration policy has been voiced about "illegal" immigration. The particulars of this bill, however, demonstrate that opposition to legal entry remains an integral part of so-called immigration reform. This initial proposal would have cut the number of visas issued for family-sponsored immigrants to zero. And it would have cut the visas for "priority workers" to zero. The bill was referred to committee, however, and went nowhere. Undeterred, Tancredo introduced H.R. 3222 on November 1, 2001 with the intention of sharply reducing the number of H1-B visas issued to high-tech professionals. That bill also was referred and died in a subcommittee.

It is useful to remember that questions related to immigration have always been intertwined with questions of national identity. As Rep. Tancredo told one interviewer, "…if we don't control immigration, legal and illegal, we will eventually reach the point where it won't be what kind of a nation we are, balkanized or united, we will have to face the fact that we are no longer a nation at all…"⁹ His is a sentiment which has been oft repeated by members of the HIRC.

After 9-11, as some of the discourse on immigration policy became intertwined with questions of national security, the HIRC seized upon the opportunity and their agenda began to develop greater traction. During this period of growth, nativist groups provided key staffing for the Caucus. For instance, Numbers USA lobbyists Rosemary Jenks and Linda Perdue served as "virtual staffers" for Rep. Tancredo, while working out of his office, helping coordinate Immigration Reform Caucus meetings,¹⁰ and providing regular legislative counsel.¹¹

During the 108th Congress (2003-4) the Caucus vowed to reduce the number of legal immigrants allowed into the country and "crackdown" on the supposedly "widespread problem of voting by illegal aliens."

The year 2005 was a watershed year for the anti-immigrant movement. In April, the Minuteman organization was launched with an armed civilian "border watch" in Arizona. Although President Bush described the Minutemen as "vigilantes," the HIRC defended and praised the group in a "Field Report" entitled "Results and Implications of the Minuteman Project." In a separate statement, Caucus member Phil Gingrey (R-Ga.) said, "The Minuteman Project is a shining example of how community initiative and involvement can help make America a safer, better place to live." The sentiment was echoed by the eight other congressmen cited in the press release.

Also in 2005, Tancredo personally introduced a resolution proposing that the Constitution be amended to establish English as the "official language," another resolution "recognizing the importance of Western civilization," legislation to enhance border enforcement and curtail H1-B visas, as well as several amendments aimed at changing federal enforcement policies. He introduced eleven different measures in all, none of which succeeded. But Tancredo had raised the flag of the anti-immigrant movement within Congress. By August, the Caucus registry had grown to 82 members of the House.

By December of that year, the House passed H.R. 4437, known popularly as the "Sensenbrenner Bill." James Sensenbrenner, a Republican from Wisconsin's 5th District, was first elected to congress in 1978, and was chairman of

the House Judiciary Committee at the time. He was not then, and is not now, a member of Tancredo's Immigration Reform Caucus. Nevertheless, H.R. 4437 was widely regarded by both immigrant rights activists and moderates as an unnecessarily harsh bill that was unlikely to pass in the Senate. It would have turned undocumented immigrants into felons (current law considers this violation a misdemeanor) and thus make them ineligible for citizenship in the future. It would have also criminalized anyone who gave them assistance of any kind, including providing them with simple social welfare or routine medical services. The bill also called for the construction of 700 miles of fencing on the southern border.

The debate in Congress became so vicious that even conservatives were forced to comment on its racism. "Some anti-immigrant Republicans are guilty of demagoguery and racism," one Republican governor, Mike Huckabee from Arkansas, told the press.

Despite its punitive character, Sensenbrenner's Bill was still not considered tough enough for members of the HIRC. Rep. Nathan Deal (R-Ga.), for example, tried unsuccessfully to amend the bill to include a provision that would have denied citizenship to those children of undocumented workers who were born on U.S. soil—a clear violation of the Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment.¹³

Further, Rep. Virgil Goode (R-Va.) and Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.) proffered a comprehensive measure of their own as a substitute for H.R. 4437. Hunter is another of the HIRC members currently running in the Republican presidential primaries.

Brian Bilbray Chairs the HIRC

After Tom Tancredo formally announced his candidacy for President, in January 2007 Rep. Brian Bilbray, a Republican from California's 50th Congressional District, was selected chairman of the Caucus. Because press reports remarked on the expectation that his leadership style would be different than Tancredo's, Bilbray's record bears examining.¹⁴

First elected to the House of Representatives as a Republican from California's District 49 in 1994, Brian Bilbray had spent the previous two decades holding several different local elected offices in San Diego County. Concerned about preserving California's beaches and willing to vote for President Clinton's assault weapons ban, he campaigned as "San Diego's independent voice for change" during 1996 and won re-election. He prevailed again in 1998. During the 2000 election, Bilbray was defeated by Susan Davis, a Democrat. During that campaign she made an issue of Bilbray's previous support for bills aimed at overturning "birthright citizenship," according to the Almanac of American Politics 2002. Bilbray had proposed legislation to that effect in 1995. The fact that Bilbray advocated overturning the Fourteenth Amendment should end any false notion that his leadership of the House Immigration Reform Caucus will somehow be less rancorous than Tancredo's.

Bilbray became a lobbyist, and worked for the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) and served as co-chair of its National Board of Advisors.¹⁵ FAIR paid him almost \$300,000 for work on its behalf between May 2002 and July 2005, according to press reports.¹⁶ In 2005 Bilbray signed on as a plaintiff in a lawsuit sponsored by FAIR.¹⁷ The suit challenged California state legislation that allowed the children of undocumented immigrants who met certain criteria to receive in-state tuition rates at state universities. A similar lawsuit brought by FAIR against Kansas state universities has, of this date, failed in the courts. (FAIR also paid \$70,000 to attorney Kris Kobach, who worked on both the Kansas and California cases).

In June 2006, Bilbray went back to Congress after winning a special election for California's District 50 seat. The previously sitting congressman, Randy "Duke" Cunningham had been sentenced to prison for taking millions of dollars in bribes from defense contractors. The San Diego Union Tribune noted that "immigration became the defining issue" during the race and Bilbray made a point of opposing a reform bill supported by Sen. John McCain, calling it "amnesty" legislation.¹⁹ He won re-election that November.

As Bilbray took over the HIRC last January, evidence pointed to an expanding role within the Caucus for anti-immigrant groups. The California congressman announced plans to "work closely" with groups such as FAIR and the Center for Immigration Studies, itself a FAIR spin-off, and seek their input on legislation. It would not be an exaggeration to conclude that Brian Bilbray has been the Federation for American Immigration Reform's man in Washington.

Also leading the Caucus are Reps. Steve King (R-Iowa) and Lamar Smith (R-Texas), on the executive committee. Rep. Ed Royce (R-Calif.) heads the policy group on border security; Rep. Nathan Deal (R-Ga.) is leading the effort to end birthright citizenship; Rep. Ted Poe (R-Texas) is examining the supposed costs of illegal immigration; and Rep. John Culberson (R-Texas) works on opposing "amnesty."²⁰

Although House Caucus members continued to propose restrictive, enforcement-only bills during the first months of the 110th Congress, public discussion of immigration policy was monopolized by a Senate bill initially sponsored by Senators John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) After the Senate's reform bill died its final death last June, members of the House Caucus celebrated the emergence of a very visible mass opposition to "amnesty;" meaning any measure that would give undocumented workers a path to legalization and citizenship. Caucus member Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.) labeled the failed legislation "the Bush/Kennedy immigration bill." He argued that the Senate bill's proponents had improperly "dismissed their opposition," and "underestimated the powerful voice of the American people." Bilbray warned that those who would ignore the mass nativist social movement were going to "get hell in the next election." And in the aftermath of the Senate bill's defeat, several new congressional representatives joined the Caucus.

The Caucus: Who They Are and How They Vote

Consider for a moment Rep. Mac Thornberry, a Republican from the Texas 13th District. The population of his district was counted as 30% rural, 27% blue collar and 17% Hispanic by the Almanac of American Politics 2006 edition. These numbers would make his district's demography close to the average for all seats held by members of the House Immigration Reform Caucus. Thornberry votes conservatively: for drilling in the Alaska wilderness, against so-called partial-birth abortion and he would ban same-sex marriage. He voted Yes on Sensenbrenner's punitive H.R. 4437 "Illegal Immigration Control Act" in 2005. Yet Thornberry is most manifestly not a member of the HIRC, at least not yet.

In fact, a first look at the blue collar, rural and Hispanic character of the HIRC districts shows that they have little in common on several key demographic counts. Those districts grouped around San Diego County, for example, are largely middle class and suburban, with the Hispanic population ranging between 15 and 30% percent of the total. In Alabama and Mississippi, on the other hand, a much greater percentage of the population is both rural—and ranging from 22% to 62%—and blue collar.²¹ The Hispanic population in these two states, while it may be growing, ranges between one and three percent—certainly not great enough to pose a supposed "threat" to white English-speaking majority dominance. An analysis of districts held by HIRC shows that the average percentage of Hispanic residents in Caucus members' districts is 7.4%, while the middle of the median is actually smaller at 4%, and more districts are at 2% than at any other number. The districts were on average 30% rural and slightly more than 25% blue collar.

At a congressional district level, this survey points away from citing either the percentage of those of Hispanic residents or the percentage of blue collar and rural voters as a root cause for anti-immigrant voting patterns. This conforms to what we know from previous analyses of votes for California's Proposition 187 in 1994 and Arizona's Proposition 200 in 2004. In both of those instances, an individual's economic circumstance—whether or not they were "worse off" than in previous elections—showed little causal effect on how they voted.²² Nevertheless, questions about voting patterns need further investigation by social scientists, particularly at the precinct or zip code level. And a book-length study similar to V.O. Key Jr.'s 1948 study of Jim Crow voters, *Southern Politics in State and Nation*, would prove invaluable.

Of the Caucus' 110 members, 102 are Republicans. Only eight are Democrats, and they are anomalous enough to call for mentioning by name and state: Bud Cramer from Alabama; Gene Taylor from Mississippi; Heath Shuler and Mike McIntyre from North Carolina; Bart Gordon and Lincoln Davis from Tennessee. Nancy Boyda from Kansas joined the HIRC after defeating an incumbent Republican, Jim Ryun, who was also a member of the Caucus. Democrat Jason Altmire from Pennsylvania was elected in 2006 and joined during the past calendar year. Fourteen HIRC representatives are women. The entire Caucus is white.

The Republican members of the Caucus generally hail from solid Republican districts. But large swathes of the "red states" are not represented in the Caucus, including Montana, Utah and most of West Texas. More than half of the entire Caucus, that is 58 representatives, come from districts in the eleven states of the former Confederacy. Six of the eight Democrats in the HIRC are from the South.

While the geographic and demographic spread among Caucus members is relatively large, their voting records are tightly packed around staunchly conservative positions. For example, although these politicians have often couched their anti-immigrant positions in terms of concern about the earning power of native-born Americans, their voting record on labor issues averages a mere six percent. As measured by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, 86 members of the HIRC scored zero in support of labor.

Their records, as shown in the voting record appendix, are conservative on civil liberties, civil rights, and the environment. Further, the Caucus mirrors the Christian right on the two issues most associated with it: opposition to a woman's right to choose and gay rights. As measured by Planned Parenthood, 89 HIRC members with voting records in the 109th congress scored zero. The Human Rights Campaign, an advocacy group working for equal rights for gays and lesbians, measured all but four of the members at zero.

From this data emerges a picture of a highly ideological caucus, with its nativism one piece of a larger far right and ultra-nationalist whole. While not every HIRC member fits this mold, enough evidence exists to conclude that more than just the number of H1-B visas is at stake here.²³

Funding HIRC Campaigns

Almost 2600 political action committees gave campaign contributions to members of the HIRC during the 109th Congress (2005-2006), according to a comprehensive analysis of Federal Elections Commission records conducted by the Building Democracy Initiative.²⁴ Many of the campaign dollars came from corporations and business associations that make wide-ranging contributions to both parties and are not necessarily associated with hostile positions towards immigrants.

For example, AT&T Inc. Federal Political Action Committee, made 234 different contributions to HIRC members for a total of \$421,000. The American Medical Association PAC gave 203 times for a total of \$496,000, but that amount was only 15% of the total dollars it gave to all politicians. In regard to campaign contributions of this type, the Caucus showed no special characteristics different from other congressional groupings. Conclusions from an analysis of campaign contributions must be carefully drawn. Consider the Home Depot Inc. PAC, which gave \$130,500 in campaign contributions to HIRC politicians, more than 17% of its total donations. Yet, because of its non-hostile attitude toward day-laborers, Home Depot has been under repeated attack by anti-immigrant organizations.²⁵

Of the identifiably conservative PACs donating to Caucus members, the Club for Growth gave the largest total amount, \$381,286. The Club for Growth, which supports free trade and tax cuts, gave almost half of its total contributions during this period to HIRC candidates. The National Rifle Association America Political Victory Fund gave a total of \$372,855. Since the NRA's Victory Fund PAC gives such large sums to politicians, over \$2.6 million, the percentage of their total donations was much smaller at 14%.²⁶ Similarly, the National Right to Life PAC has given over \$2.6 million to politicians, thus the \$280,692 that it gave to HIRC members was only 11% of its total contributions during the period under consideration.

Five different PACs with explicitly nativist agendas also gave money to HIRC members. Two of these are associated with different Minuteman factions. The Minuteman PAC Inc. gave \$60,080 to HIRC members, almost 24% of its total \$253,558 in campaign contributions. The Declaration Alliance PAC, affiliated with Chris Simcox' Minuteman Civil Defense Corps, donated just \$1,500, one-third of the \$4,600 it gave for electioneering. Americans for Legal Immigration PAC also gave a small sum of money, \$500 out of the \$1,500 it donated. Team America PAC, started by Tom Tancredo with Bay Buchanan at the helm, contributed just \$25,997 to congressional campaigns, and only \$4,000 of that went to HIRC members.

While the relative size of the contributions by the Minuteman PACs stands out, the surprise in the data belongs to the U.S. Immigration Reform PAC, most closely associated with the Federation for American Immigration Reform. FAIR recently signed a lease for a 10,000 square foot office space on Massachusetts Avenue in Washington, D.C. and operates on an annual budget in excess of four million dollars. The donors to its PAC reside in 24 states and include Cordelia May Scaife, a major donor to far right causes of all kinds. Over the years she has become the U.S. Immigration Reform PAC's largest donor, giving \$36,500. Dr. and Mrs. John Tanton, who have been FAIR's guiding lights since its founding, have given \$23,500. The contributors also include Harry Weyher, chief executive at the Pioneer Fund, which is best known for funding and promoting eugenics and scientific racism. Weyher gave \$500. Despite this multitude of riches, the total amount of campaign contributions given by the U.S. Immigration Reform PAC to HIRC members was relatively small: \$9,000 out of a total of \$34,202 during the period under review. During the years between 1994 and 2000 the PAC only gave \$7,000 in contributions to Brian Bilbray the congressman, while FAIR paid significantly more to Bilbray while he worked as its lobbyist.

Despite giving less money to HIRC members than AT&T, FAIR remains the one lobby with the most influence within the Caucus. Now that FAIR is explicitly promoting measures aimed at undercutting the Fourteenth Amendment, such legislation should be expected to rise to the top of the agenda for HIRC members as well. FAIR spokesman Bob Dane recently told the Sacramento Bee: "To deal with this tidal wave of human beings coming across the border, repealing the 14th Amendment would be an effective tool." He also said, that such a move "would not harm those coming here legally. The only beneficiaries of the 14th Amendment appear to be illegals."²⁷

Mr. Dane's statement is contradicted by both history and the Constitution. Written immediately after the Civil War, the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees all Americans equality before the law. Section 1 reads:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Fourteenth Amendment has been under attack ever since it was first passed, and significant sections of it were laid in abeyance during the long years of Jim Crow segregation. It was brought back into active service by the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education*. In the recent past, legislation aimed at overturning this part of the constitution and ending birthright citizenship has been introduced with little support. The most recent iteration, however, has generated a good deal of support. Entitled the Birthright Citizenship Act of 2007, H.R. 1940, is sponsored by Rep. Nathan Deal (R-Ga.). As this report was being compiled, 90 members of the House of Representatives had signed on as co-sponsors to this bill, and 70 of those are members of the House Immigration Reform Caucus.

Conclusion

What we have found in this background report tells us much regarding the shape that "immigration politics" and public policy is likely to take in the foreseeable future. The Caucus's extreme ideological agenda, long-standing ties to anti-immigrant groups, and cohesion in a fractured House of Representatives makes it a noxious ingredient in the melting pot of America. It has drawn even well-intentioned immigration reform proposals down into an abyss of nativism and xenophobia. And if its proposals to overturn the Fourteenth Amendment gather enough cosponsors to be taken seriously, it may wind up provoking a constitutional crisis of the most serious kind.

Map of House Immigration Reform Caucus Member Districts

{gallery}HIRC/map:495:295:0{/gallery}Click on the above map to expand to see the entire map, or download it here for a larger image.

Appendices

Appendix: Demographics

Appendix: Voting Records

Appendix: Birthright Citizenship Act of 2007

Appendix: PAC Contributions to HIRC Members * web exclusive

Notes

1 John Tanton interviewed by Otis L. Graham, Jr., "A Skirmish in a Wider War: An Oral History of John H. Tanton, Founder of FAIR," recorded April 20-21, 1989, printed 1992, p. 84.

2 Paul Feldman, "Group's Funding Of Immigration Measure Assailed; Politics: Critics Say Proposition 187 Drive Is Getting Money From Foundation That Backs Racial Research. Proponents Counter That Charges Are A Smear Tactic," Los Angeles Times, September 10, 1994, p. B3.

3 Marilyn Kalfus, "Pro-Prop. 187 group admits it bought ads; POLITICS: FAIR says it only attempted to clear its name," Orange County Register, October 26, 1994, p. A12.

4 "Proposition 187," San Francisco Chronicle, November 10, 1994, p. B4.

5 Paul Feldman and Patrick J. McDonnell, "Prop. 187 Sponsors Swept Up In National Whirlwind; Immigration: Callers Seek Help In Carrying Effort To Other States. Some Believe Next Step Is Up To Congress," Los Angeles Times, November 14, 1994, p. A1.

6 In 2005, there were 37 groups in 25 states. Two years later, there were 255 groups in 42 states. As of September 2007, there are 332 nativist groups. See "Mapping the New Nativism," Building Democracy Monthly, January 2007. <http://www.buildingdemocracy.org>

7 Leonard Zeskind, "The New Nativism: The Alarming Overlap Between White Nationalists and Mainstream Anti-Immigrant Forces," The American Prospect, November 2005, p. A15.

8 Clifford D. May, "California's Proposition 187 heats up debate over sanctity of U.S. borders," Rocky Mountain News, December 4, 1994, Pg. 96A.

9 Zeskind, A15.

10 9/11 Families for a Secure America, "Immigration Reform Caucus meeting," June 7, 2006, <http://www.911fsa.org/articles/art2006jun13.html>.

11 Southern Poverty Law Center, "Defending Immigrants: An Interview with Rick Swartz," The Intelligence Report, www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?aid=91

12 "Huckabee Says Some Anti-Immigration Sentiment In GOP Driven By Racism," The Frontrunner, May 17, 2006.

13 Cite language from the 14th Amendment.

14 David M. Drucker, "Immigration Foes Retooling Caucus," Roll Call, March 12, 2007.

15 For more on the Federation for American Immigration Reform see, Background Report on the Federation for American Immigration Reform, (Chicago: Center for New Community, November 2004).

16 Dana Wilkie, "Ex-congressman Bilbray burdened by lobbyist label," Copley News Service, March 6, 2006.

17 Stuart Silverstein, "Out-of-State Students Sue Over Tuition; Plaintiffs are challenging California practices that require them to pay higher college costs than some illegal immigrants," Los Angeles Times, December 15, 2005.

18 Philip J. LaValle and Dani Dodge, "Bilbray Edges Out Busby," San Diego Union Tribune, June 7, 2006.

19 David M. Drucker, "Immigration Foes Retooling Caucus," Roll Call, March 12, 2007.

20 Ibid.

21 Rural (22 to 62) blue collar (22 to 39).

22 Michael R. Alvarez and Tara L. Butterfield, "The Resurgence of Nativism in California? The Case of Proposition 187 and Illegal Immigration," *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 81, Number 1, March 2000, pp. 167-179. M.V. Hood III and Irwin L. Morris, "Brother, Can You Spare a Dime? Racial/Ethnic Context and the Anglo Vote on Proposition 187," *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 81, Number 1, March 2000. pp. 194-206. Caroline J. Tolbert and Robert E. Hero, "Race/Ethnicity and Direct Democracy: An Analysis of California's Illegal Immigration Initiative," *Journal of Politics*, Volume 58, 1996, pp. 806-18. Jane Adams "Prop. 187-What's to Be Learned?" *RaceFile*, Vol. 3 No. 1, January-February 1995. CNN, "2004 Election Results: Ballot Measures / Arizona Proposition 200 / Exit Poll," <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2004/pages/results/states/AZ/1/01/epolls.0.html>.

23 For those analysts who have wondered about the fate of the Christian right during Pres. Bush's second term, they might begin to look at the new nativism for their answers.

24 A note on methodology. The HIRC member campaign contribution data is from the 2005-2006 election cycle data downloaded from the Federal Elections Commission (FEC), including the 2005-2006 candidate master file, the committee master file, the individual contributions file and its additions, changes and deletions, the itemized records file, and the itemized committee contributions file. The data is downloadable at http://www.fec.gov/finance/disclosure/ftpdet.shtml#a2005_2006.

The 2005-2006 FEC committee master file contains one record for each committee registered with the FEC. This includes federal political action committees and party committees, campaign committees for presidential, house and senate candidates, as well as groups or organizations who are spending money for or against candidates for federal office.

The candidate master file contains one record for each candidate who has either registered with the FEC or appeared on a ballot list prepared by a state elections office. The file contains basic information about the candidate, including name, party, whether the candidate is an incumbent, challenger, or involved in an open seat, address, state and district in which the candidate is running and the year of the election for which the candidate is registered. The individual contributions file contains each contribution from an individual to a federal committee if the contribution was at least \$200. The itemized committee contributions file contains each contribution or independent expenditure made by a PAC, party committee, candidate committee, or other federal committee to a candidate during the two-year election cycle. The itemized records (miscellaneous transactions) file contains all transactions (contributions, transfers, etc. among federal committees). It contains all data in the itemized committee contributions file plus PAC contributions to party committees, party transfers from state committee to state committee, and party transfers from national committee to state committee.

Each of the FEC files was imported into a SQL Server database, and the changes and deletions file was run to clean and update the data. After the importation process we ran specific queries to work specifically with HIRC member data and to extract the information we needed. Those queries included: individual contributions to HIRC members by name, city, state, and zip code; total number of individual contributions by state; all committee contributions to HIRC members; PAC contributions to HIRC members vs. total contributions; and US Immigration Reform PAC contributors. After each query was completed we exported the data to Excel to allow for additional sorting and analysis of the data.

25 Anti-immigrant groups like the Minutemen have targeted day laborers at Home Depots around the country. See Susan McMillan, Roger O. Crockett and Christopher Palmeri, “’IF WE CAN TAKE ONE BIG EMPLOYER DOWN...’”The Minuteman Project, the controversial border watchdog, is now targeting companies that hire undocumented workers,” Business Week, August 21, 2006, p. 30. Oscar Avila, “Day-labor debate flares in Cicero; Minutemen, critics hold separate rallies,” Chicago Tribune, January 8, 2006, p. C3.

26 NRA’s Institute for Legislative Action gives far less in campaign contributions, \$69,537—of which \$14,302 went to HIRC members.

27 David Whitney, “Citizen by Birth? Lungren skeptical,” Sacramento Bee, September 10, 2007.