

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
RELIGIOUS ACTIVISM AND THE DEBATE OVER IMMIGRATION REFORM

Washington, D.C.
Tuesday, June 15, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderators:

WILLIAM GALSTON
Senior Fellow and Ezra K. Zilkha Chair
The Brookings Institution

E.J. DIONNE, JR.
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

Opening Remarks:

JIM WALLIS
President and Chief Executive Officer
Sojourners

PANEL 1 - HOW RELIGIOUS ACTIVISM HAS SHAPED IMMIGRATION REFORM:

REVEREND SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ
President
National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference

BISHOP KATHARINE JEFFERTS SCHORI
Presiding Bishop
The Episcopal Church

KEVIN APPLEBY
Director of Migration Policy and Public Affairs
The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

PANEL 2 - UNDERSTANDING THE CONNECTION AMONG ETHNICITY, RELIGIOSITY, AND PARTISANSHIP:

DAVID LEAL
Associate Professor, Department of Government
University of Texas, Austin

MARK LOPEZ
Associate Director
Pew Hispanic Center

ROBERT JONES

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Chief Executive Officer
Public Religion Research Institute

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DIONNE: I want to welcome everyone here today. This is a wonderful turnout and welcome to the Brookings Institution. My name is E.J. Dionne. I'm a Senior Fellow here as is my colleague, Bill Galston, who is my partner on this event today and on the larger project of which it's part.

Today's discussion of the role of religious groups in the immigration debate marks the beginning of a new Project on Religion, Politics, and Public Policy where we'll build on the work we've done here at Brookings over many years now, and we want to thank the Ford Foundation for its support for this project.

Over the next couple of years we plan to explore a variety of issues in which faith-based groups are deeply engaged, including not only immigration but also the environment, poverty, and the quest for social justice. We plan discussions and research on how the media cover and affect religious engagement with public life on issues surrounding efforts to protect the rights of conscience within the framework of consistent public policies. And, of course -- I say "of course" because everyone gets to this question eventually -- and we will also look at both changes and continuity in how religious groups and individuals are affecting electoral politics.

To carry out this project, we plan collaborations with scholars, religious leaders, journalists, and others around the country, short papers and articles and forums like the one we are holding today.

Our purpose is to encourage a richer conversation on matters that are so often discussed, as so many of you in this room know, in stereotypical terms. You might say that God is capacious, but discussions about God and politics often are not. This is an area where it's hard to escape assumptions and previous positions, and we recognize that people do have very strong views in this area and have a right to them. But

sometimes the discussions on this subject are narrowed by plain prejudice. We will be working as hard as we can to keep our explorations open, welcoming, and rigorous.

You could, as I said, say that our project is aimed at challenging stereotypes about religion's role in politics, and there would maybe no better topic with which to kick off this effort than the one we're exploring today. At the moment, there are two dominant frames on the national discussion of religion and politics. One sees religion operating primarily on the right end of politics as a predominantly conservative force. A more recent and somewhat more accurate portrait acknowledges the existence of both religious conservatives and religious progressives with, by the way, a great many moderates who often are very involved in public life but are rarely talked about very much.

But there are limits even to this newer paradigm, and the immigration issue brings that home. We have seen around the cause of comprehensive immigration reform one of the broadest alliances of religious groups ever assembled in our history. It cuts across left and right; it cuts across denominations and traditions; it cuts across theological orientations. A case can be made that religious groups have played as much of a role as anyone in keeping the cause of immigration reform alive this year.

Today we will be talking about that extraordinary alliance, and I want to underscore that while Bill and I have our own views on this issue, as do all the participants here today, our purpose is not to make a particular case on the question, though some of the preacherly-minded on the platform will certainly express their views, but I have even asked the preachers to be as analytical as they can within the framework of their vocation.

I should also emphasize that we are not staging a debate on the immigration issue today. If we were, we would have additional people up here today. Rather, we are

trying to describe a phenomenon to begin the search for an explanation of why so many diverse groups have come together around this issue. What is it that has brought this alliance together? What does this alliance tell us about the increasingly important role of Latinos in the life of so many of our Christian traditions?

We don't, by the way, pretend that every religious person holds the same view on this matter. Indeed, we suspect there is some dissent in the ranks within the traditions represented here, and we're going to ask our panelists to discuss that. And it goes without saying, but needs to be said, that support from religious groups by no means guarantees the success of immigration reform efforts in Congress. Even miracles are sometimes beyond the capacity of religious groups on this earth. This is one of those issues that may cut sideways along a different dimension than the religious conservative/religious liberal/secular divide that we are so often discussing.

And to kick off this event, I want to welcome Jim Wallis, one of the country's great religious progressives who has been fighting stereotypes in this area his whole life. The subtitle of one of Jim's books says a lot of what needs to be said in talking about religion in public life. The subtitle asks - or declares - *Why The Right Gets It Wrong And The Left Doesn't Get It*. Jim was one of the very first people who pointed out to me the expansiveness of the immigration reform coalition within the religious community, and he's been very helpful to us in setting up this event.

I could go on and on and on about how much I like and respect and admire Jim, but thanks to modern technology, I will save time in this area and tell you, you can Google all of my past praise for Jim Wallis. I'll just say that Jim is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Sojourners. His most recent book is *Rediscovering Values on Wall Street, Main Street, and Your Street: A Moral Compass for the New Economy*.

I am honored to introduce my friend, Jim Wallis.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

(Applause)

MR. WALLIS: Thank you, E.J. I want to commend this place again for seeing something ahead of the curve. E.J. and Bill often do that. They see things that are happening before the media catches on, but this I think is one of the most significant in a long time.

Let me just state the paradox right here up front. There is growing polarization in this country on the issue of immigration. Look at the polling on Arizona, especially the white and Hispanic divergence. There is a growing, alarming polarization in this country, moving in a more polarized direction than it was when it was discussed many years ago.

At the same time, I have never seen the kind of unity in the faith community on this issue in any issue in a very long time. There is remarkable unity across the spectrum: Evangelical, Pentecostal, Catholic, mainline Protestant, and I'll just share some recent political meetings in this town that will illustrate that point.

I remember a meeting recently in the Roosevelt Room of the White House with the president's team on immigration reform. It was a meeting of faith leaders, and I asked the leader of the NAE, National Association of Evangelicals, and a leader of the NCC [National Council of Churches] to sit together, side by side across from the White House team. And then I said, "This is the NAE and the NCC. They have been in the past on many issues like the Crips and the Bloods. I often like to have a minute I could sit between them in case something happens. But in this case you see their arms are locked, and after they've locked their arms together, they're presenting a unified front to you today about comprehensive immigration reform."

Then just this past Wednesday a meeting with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, the room was full of conservative white Evangelical leaders. Sam Rodriguez was there. He was one of the few Hispanic clergy in the room with white Evangelical leaders and

Nancy Pelosi. It was pointed out that the Scriptures say that we will have something to answer some day which goes like this: "I was a stranger and you didn't welcome me." Then it was suggested that saying, well, we had an August primary of a friend to protect, or the issue plays well on cable, or it really can energize the base, or we could inflame a constituency that we need for re-election, but it probably won't be satisfying to the Lord.

And the Speaker of the House said, "Isn't that Matthew?"

And the Evangelical said, "Yes, Madam Speaker, that's Matthew."

So we had a biblical conversation in the Office of the Speaker of the House.

And then later that day with Valerie Jarrett in the White House with again the Administration team. Who was in the room was significant, and why they were there in town was significant: To talk to their Republican friends on immigration reform and to push both sides. And it was pointed out that the unity of the faith community here could be leveraged in a way that could perhaps break this issue out of its painful stalemate where it is right now.

I suspect E.J.'s right that the immigration reform agenda in a polarized political environment in an election year is not hopeful, but if there is any constituency that could break this issue out of the fray, I would suggest it would be bipartisan pressure on both sides from the Faith Community. It was suggested in the meeting with Valerie Jarrett that it was time to replace the Gospel of Glen, Rush, Sean, and Bill with the Gospel of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

And I would say that the two reasons for the shift -- and Sam Rodriguez will speak of this, I think, eloquently, because he's been in the middle of the shift -- is twofold: One is there is a biblical rediscovery in the Evangelical world about what the Scriptures say about how we should treat the stranger. This is becoming for a lot of evangelicals a Christological issue, a following Jesus issue, a faithfulness issue, not a political issue.

I remember I was in a phone call with 500 Hispanic clergy, that Sam organized a couple weeks back, and Arizona has become Selma for a whole generation of Hispanic clergy. It is their Selma. On the phone, the only other non-Hispanic member of the call was the Dean of the Law School at Liberty University and myself. And we were asked by Hispanic clergy: Is this a time for a civil disobedience? For Christian civil disobedience? And both of us said, yes, it may be. Again, across the boundary focus on this issue here.

The second issue is growth, and Sam can speak to that, too. The growing constituencies among Evangelical and Pentecostal churches are, in fact, Hispanic and people of color. That's where the growth is, and while this may sound demographic let me also say this: Evangelicals tend to fall in love with their people, and that's happened here. The reason Billy Graham turned against the arms race was because he fell in love with his audiences in Eastern Europe that he was preaching to and realized his government's nuclear warheads were aimed at them. And he told me that's why he changed his view on the arms race.

So when I hear white evangelicals in the Speaker's office and in the White House last week telling painful stories in tears about their parishioners, their people, those they have come to love, that is a political force that we have yet to really reckon with.

Finally, I'd say that when we have such a bipartisan failure on this issue, Democrat and Republican for decades and decades, so that we've had two signs up at the border: One says "No Trespass," and one says "Help Wanted." And those two signs put vulnerable people at risk. And because of that you hear the faith community saying very clearly a couple of things: Enforcement without reform is cruel; enforcement without compassion is immoral; enforcement that breaks up families is unacceptable to us; and enforcement that makes Christian ministry illegal -- and the Arizona law makes Christian

ministry illegal, and pastors feel that and know that and have said, "We will disobey these laws" -- when that happens, you have a force to be reckoned with.

It won't really break through until the faith community dares both sides, politically dares them: You will not use undocumented seven-year-old girls for political purposes this fall in the election. When that rebuke, when that daring comes, I think from both sides, I think the issue could break open very possibly.

So thank you to Bill and E.J. for recognizing a faith phenomenon that could have political implications certainly in the short term but also even more in the long term.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. DIONNE: As I said, a preacher is a preacher is a preacher. Thank you very, very much, Jim, for that very thoughtful talk. I just want to say that we could have invited two or three dozen good people to join this panel, but, as you can see, this room is narrow. I hope our minds are not, and 10-or-15-person panels really don't work.

So we chose to invite, and we are blessed today with three excellent panelists whom we do believe embody a good part of the diversity on the issue we are discussing, and to Unitarians in the room, I want to say that we were not -- we did not have an intentional Trinitarian bias here today.

I want to welcome Sam Rodriguez, Katharine Jefferts Schori -- Bishop Katharine Jefferts Schori -- and Kevin Appleby. I'll just introduce them briefly. Reverend Rodriguez will go first, Bishop Jefferts Schori will go second, and then Kevin Appleby will bat third.

Reverend Samuel Rodriguez has been named the leader of the Hispanic Evangelical Movement by CNN and *The Wall Street Journal* has identified him as one of America's seven most influential Hispanic leaders and the only religious leader on the list.

He is currently serving on President Obama's White House Taskforce on Fatherhood, and he is president of the National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference, America's largest Hispanic Christian organization, although Kevin Appleby of the Catholic Church may have a slightly different analysis of that particular statistic.

Katharine Jefferts Schori was elected presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in June of 2006. She serves as chief pastor and primate to the Episcopal Church. I learned earlier that she was the Bishop of Nevada, which I find to be very interesting work for a bishop. Over the course of her nine-year term, Bishop Jefferts Schori is responsible for initiating and developing policy for the Episcopal Church and speaks on behalf of the Church regarding the policy strategies and programs authorized by the General Convention.

And Kevin Appleby has been Director of Migration and Refugee Policy for Migration and Refugee Services of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops for the past eight years. Prior to joining the MRUSCCB, Kevin worked as Deputy Director of the Maryland Catholic Conference in Annapolis. He is a member of the board of the National Immigration Forum and the Social Policy Committee of Catholic Charities USA.

Many of you are probably familiar with the work of his brother, Scott Appleby. I consider Kevin and Scott the DiMaggio brothers of Catholic social thinking, and we are very honored to have this great panel with us today.

Reverend Rodriguez.

(Applause)

REV. RODRIGUEZ: Well, first, I'm honored to be here. Thank you for having me. Faith, religious activism as it pertains to immigration reform. First without the firewall of the faith community, I'm convinced that Arizona and Hazelton, Pennsylvania, and the

legislative measures in corresponding areas may very well stand today as the law of the land, de facto or de jure .

Without a doubt, faith has played a significant role. First in contextualizing the narrative of the moral imperative in support of comprehensive immigration reform. Evangelicals have come along and said: We are framing the theological imperative that reconciles Leviticus 19 with Romans 13, not supporting amnesty or mass deportation but, rather, a faith-filled compromise in the spirit of the good Samaritan. So the faith community comes along and provides the moral imperative in support of immigration reform.

Second, the faith community has risen the incarnational and missional ethos to address and prophetically confront the xenophobic and nativist threat imbedded in the debate. In the spirit of Martin Luther King, Jr., Wilberforce, and Finney, we understand that any social and civil rights movement with sustainable and viable objectives must be led and based on the eternal truth, one that transcends political expediency and engages the conscience of the culture. Faith engagement will lead to cultural reformation.

Third, the faith community rises and has risen to its prophetic role in order to confront both the elephant and the donkey, wherefore righteousness and justice are the framework around the issue of immigration reform. So to the donkey the faith community, the Evangelical, particularly Evangelicals and Catholics, have risen to ask some questions. To the donkey the faith community's constantly asking: You've demonstrated spiritual fortitude and moral wherewithal to save healthcare, banks, housing market, auto industry, yet you lack the profile and courage to save the least of these. Then to the elephant the faith community has pressed the family values, traditional values party and movement, to somehow reconcile their harsh rhetoric that stems from segments of the party with a Christian world view. So I'm going to reiterate a

little bit of what your friend Jim Wallis has stated -- who was more influential in the Republican party, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, or Rush, Arpaio, Tancredo, and Hannity. And we remind -- the faith community reminds the elephant that a Tea Party without chips and salsa is not a party at all.

Finally, the faith community really stands poised to increase what I call prophetic presence by leading a movement, a movement in favor of the Church, a movement reminding Americans, particularly those of faith, that deportation -- those that are Christian in my community, the Evangelical community -- that deportation may actually result in the deporting of the Christian faith.

The fastest-growing segment in the Evangelical community and in the Catholic Church, unless I got my facts wrong from Luis Lugo at Pew Research, is the Hispanic community. So we may very well be alienating the future viability of the Catholic and Evangelical movement in America. The fastest-growing segment in many of the denominations is the Latino demographic.

So faith must -- particularly in light of the current reality that reform may not pass this year, will probably not take place this year -- faith has more final responsibility, not only in conceptualizing the narratives, serving as a firewall, not only in engaging a grass roots movement, providing the moral imperative, but faith must provide today, this year in 2010, what it provides best, which is hope: Hope to the immigrant community, hope to the grass roots, and hope to the nation, collectively, that the words on the Statue of Liberty will one day again resonate with authenticity throughout our society.

Thank you.

(Applause)

BISHOP JEFFERTS SCHORI: (Spanish)

Thank you very much for your invitation; it's an honor to be here. Christians understand that we are all aliens and sojourners seeking our home in God. In a spiritual sense, we are all migrants. As Americans we are a nation of immigrants. All of us, even native peoples originated as the human species evolved in Africa, and humanity has been migrating for tens or hundreds of thousands of years ever since. That migration is a persistent movement in search of food, shelter, safety, employment and even adventure and discovery.

The current crisis of immigration policy in these United States stems primarily from economic and resource imbalance and an exodus from poorer nations unable to sustain adequate opportunities for growing populations. That imbalance is complicated by violence, both terrorism and the drug trade, as well as the currently reduced employment opportunities within the United States.

Most Americans recognize the failure of our current migration policies, but there's a wide range of preferred solutions or appropriate political responses. The passage of Arizona's identification laws is the most recent expression of our national political failure.

The Episcopal Church has repeatedly expressed its position on immigration issues from a theological perspective. That theology begins in the biblical charge to love God and to love one's neighbor as oneself. The alien or foreigner is among the neighbors to be regarded with love and justice. Hebrew scripture repeatedly directs the faithful to "care for the alien and sojourner in your midst." "You shall love the stranger for you were also a stranger in the land of Egypt." That sense of having the shared experience of migration and being a foreigner opens us up to the shared reality of all humanity and motivates us to find all sorts of partners who also understand that shared reality. It's a central way in which religious motivation engages the political.

Theological responses to issues of migration are also based on Jesus' mandate to care for the least of these, the hungry, thirsty, homeless, sick, unemployed, oppressed, and imprisoned. Anyone experiencing those realities is alienated from the state of healed and whole reality that we speak of as the Kingdom of God, that ancient prophetic vision of a world of justice and peace often called *shalom*. Those who experience such alienation are also migrants, sojourners in search of healing and wholeness.

The Episcopal Church has been involved in work with refugees and migrants in a formal way since 1940 with the advent of Episcopal Migration Ministries. Today we resettle 4,000 to 5,000 migrants a year in partnership with the federal government and local community agencies. We know something about successfully integrating newcomers.

The Episcopal Church is not only an American church. In addition to the United States, we have congregations in 15 other nations from Taiwan and Micronesia to Central and South America, the Caribbean and Europe. Within the United States, our congregations include more than 300 serving Latino immigrant communities and it also is our fastest growing demographic. But we also have immigrants from Sudan, Korea, Liberia, Vietnam, Haiti, the Philippines, Taiwan, Laos, and many other nations.

Our historical partnerships and covenant relationships with other Anglican churches around the world inform and challenge us to build just political systems in many nations. We strive to see that all human beings are treated with dignity and respect whether they are Filipino guest workers in Saipan, migrant Latino farm workers in the United States, or Sudanese, Bolivian, and Afghani migrants in the city of Rome. Our congregations address the needs of these and many other groups of sojourners and immigrants.

The current thrust of our immigration advocacy work seeks dignity and justice for all. Our priorities are to provide legal entry opportunities for those seeking to respond to the needs for labor, to normalize the status of aliens already present, and to provide roots to legal residency or citizenship, to reunify families, and to equalize the burden of enforcement so that it is humane and proportionate, all of it in the context of secure borders and reduced levels of fear and violence.

As a church, we're troubled by the impact of current immigration policies. On Good Friday this year in Phoenix, local police stationed outside a church with a large Latino membership prevented many of those people from worshipping. We note the fear engendered by raids on workplaces. Children live in fear about whether or not their parents will be there when they come home from school. We're hampered as a church by an inability to find adequate numbers of effective leaders with correct immigration status for immigrant congregations.

The bishops of our church are scheduled to meet in Arizona in September, a meeting that's been planned for a couple of years. At present, we are committed to continuing with that meeting both as a way of expressing solidarity with the Latino community, and in exposing the community of bishops to the realities on the border. A number of our bishops are themselves temporary sojourners whose primary ministry is in another nation, and some are themselves immigrants to the United States. Members of the group will be at some hazard themselves of being required to provide identification while they're in Arizona. We hope to make an on-site witness through learning and accompaniment as well as to express our concerns as a church.

The Episcopal Church seeks justice, dignity, and equality in these matters, and we will partner with any and all who share those values and priorities.

(Applause)

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

MR. APPLEBY: Thank you very much. I'm sorry that one of our bishops isn't here. They are meeting in Florida. They have a spring meeting this year, so they sent me. E.J., I want to thank you for mentioning my brother. If we're the DiMaggio brothers, I'm Joe.

MR. DIONNE: I'm a Red Sox fan.

MR. APPLEBY: Anyway, and thank you for having us, and it's an honor to be here with the faith leaders.

I want to do three things in my talk. I want to say first why the Catholic Church is involved in this issue, which is often a question that I'm asked in parishes around the country.

Secondly, what does the Catholic Church bring to the debate?

And, thirdly, what is the ultimate moral issue that we see in this debate that needs to be answered, not only by Catholics but by the American public?

First of all, why is the Church involved in this debate in the first place? I get that question all the time from Catholics who are trying to be educated on this issue, and once I get past the explanation of what the separation of church and state means and they understand that, I tell them this: First it's part of our Church teaching.

It's who we are as Catholics, and it's part of what we believe. In the Old and New Testaments, of course, there are themes of migration throughout, and, of course, Jesus himself was both a refugee and a migrant, a refugee fleeing Herod in Matthew, and an itinerant preacher throughout Judea and Galilee, who, in Matthew, said he has no place to lay his head. He also calls us to welcome the stranger, as Reverend Wallis said, so in Catholic teaching in the face of the migrant we see the face of Christ and need to welcome him.

Secondly, it's part of our identity. It's who we are. To borrow a phrase from a toy store, immigrants are us. The Catholic Church has grown parallel with the country in terms of immigration over the last 200 years. We welcome waves of immigrants who have been Catholic -- Irish, Italian, those from Eastern Europe, and now those from Latin America -- so it's part of who we are. It's part of our identity. We see it every day or every Sunday in our parishes and in our programs.

And today it's no different. And all our institutions -- in our parishes, in our hospitals, in our schools, in our social service programs -- we have immigrants. And they come to us and they say, please, help us. My son or my husband is in trouble, what can I do? And a lot of times there's not much we can do unless we try to change the law, which we see as broken.

We've been criticized, of course, for being in this because we want more Catholics in the pews. Well, the reality is they're already here. They're already there, and we're trying to respond to their needs within the confines of the law. And I'll say, in all honesty, it's not lost upon us that they're Catholic. Sixty percent of migrants coming are Catholic. I'm not going to say that's not true, and we do have a special obligation to respond to them. But, of course, we've always followed the theme of Need, Not Creed, and we would continue to do that even if the migrants weren't predominantly Catholic.

Thirdly, we're in this debate because ultimately this is a humanitarian issue. In Washington and inside the beltway, they look at the economics, what's the economic fall-out? What's the social change of these new immigrants? Certainly, the rule of law is an issue, but there's no one talking about the human dignity aspect of it, and faith groups have to do that, and as an institution that's protecting or dedicated to protect the dignity of human life, we're obligated to point out these human consequences of a broken system and what the moral implications are.

Secondly, what do we bring to the debate? And I think this would be consistent with a lot of Faith groups. As the Catholic Church we bring an intimate knowledge of the immigrant experience. We've helped integrate immigrants over the last 200 years in our parishes and our programs and our English classes, et cetera. We know the immigrant experience. I always say to audiences that migrants come -- they go first to family, but secondly they'll come to the church. They'll knock on the parish door. So it's part of our experience. We bring that experience to the debate from the migrant's perspective.

Secondly, we act as a convener. Catholics are involved in every aspect of this phenomenon. They're not just migrants. They're also border patrol agents. They're also elected officials. They're also members of the community. So the Church should be able to bring these folks together and find a common solution. We all sit in the same pew, so we really need to come up with a common solution under what our faith teaches us.

Thirdly, as Reverend Rodriguez mentioned, we are a moral voice in the debate. Too often we see these nativist tendencies in our history which tend to dehumanize migrants. The faith groups can counter that and remind people that these are human beings, it's not chattel here. These are human beings that have basic human rights. We're not going to buy into any polls that say we should call persons illegal immigrants, despite what party says, despite what both parties are doing. We're going to point out that these are undocumented immigrants, not illegal immigrants.

Fourthly, we bring a global perspective to this debate, and this is an issue that really hasn't been highlighted in this debate, but this is a global phenomenon. And the ultimate solution to this does not necessarily lie in immigration reform. It will certainly help in terms of illegal immigration, but regional and global cooperation is the way to go, and we have that experience because we're present throughout the world. We're a global institution, we're with migrants in sending communities on the way and in receiving

communities, and we need to look at the root causes of why they're coming. That's the ultimate solution to this problem. That's our answer to the border wall. That's the most humane answer.

And, finally, we have a constituency, and all our faith groups have constituencies. Now we need to do a better job of bringing that constituency along, certainly, and we get a lot of push-back from them. We need to organize them better, and we need to address the rule of law issues that they have because we believe that our solution does restore the rule of law. This is what we bring to the debate and will help change the debate.

Finally, what is the ultimate moral issue in this debate that we want to highlight? Well, there are several, of course, and we see it every day: separation of families, exploitation in the workplace, deaths in the desert. But the ultimate moral issue is do we want to live in a country where we have a permanent underclass? Where we have a system which expropriates the work and taxes of human beings but does not offer them the protection of the law? I think the American public would say no because it undermines our values of fairness, opportunity, and compassion in this country which has really served our nation over the last 200 years. And I firmly believe that working together, the faith groups will lead the American public to that conclusion and that they will say that immigration reform is the answer.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. DIONNE: I want to thank Scott [sic]. You've lived up to your Joe DiMaggio claim. And as I said, I'm a Red Sox fan, so Dom is okay with me.

And I am grateful to Reverend Rodriguez. You all now know this is not a Tea Party event because we don't have chips and salsa here today. And all of the panelists'

and the bishop's comments made me think of one of Franklin Roosevelt's great lines. He opened a speech to the Daughters of American Revolution once with the words "fellow immigrants."

Now I'm reluctant to use this term in the context of today's event, but I'm going to be a bit of a devil's advocate today, and I'm going to -- we've heard about elephants and donkeys -- I'm going to begin with a question and then turn it over to my wise owl friend, Bill Galston, who will also have a question.

But let me just put it straight up: If the religious institutions have as much influence as we think they do, why did the Arizona law pass? And why do polls show -- at least you can argue about the wording of the polls -- but why do polls suggest that something like 60 percent of Americans support laws like the Arizona law? What is the disconnect between so many people in our -- leaders of our religious community and, if you will, people in the pews?

And whoever wants to -- Scott, go ahead. Scott -- I did it again -- Kevin.

MR. APPLEBY: I'm proud to be my brother. You know, it's a good question, and I think the Arizona law, frankly, is, it shows the frustration of the American people with this more than support of the law itself. It always depends on how the question is answered -- asked, of course. We've done polls of Catholics over the last several years, and the overwhelming majority support our solution: Provided people register with the government, they can get on a path to citizenship.

So I think part of it is that, you know, Congress has not stepped up to the plate on the issue and needs to do so, and people are frustrated. Having said that, however, I do believe that we need to do a better job, at least speaking for the Catholic Church, of reaching into those middle Catholics, the ones that are in the middle who may be a bit ambivalent, unsure, want to ask questions but may not want to challenge the bishops,

really answer their questions, you know, the questions such as: What part of "illegal" do you not understand? Answer that question. Are we for open borders? Answer that question. We need to answer those questions, educate those in the middle, and I think we'll see a sea-change come and we'll get this bill passed.

MR. GALSTON: Reverend?

REV. RODRIGUEZ: A similar question may be asked, how can a nation founded on Judeo-Christian values support slavery, and how did we tolerate segregation for so long? There is this thread imbedded within our DNA that really prompts and provokes those committed to faith to push back. There is a disconnect between the pulpit and the pew. I believe we have the majority of faith leaders in this nation in support of immigration reform and of biblical or faith narratives that support immigration reform, but the pew is -- the pew is completely disconnected.

The pew is still listening to the demagoguery from political pundits, of certain cable news networks, so forth and so on, and in light of our current economy, again it's the Chinese Exclusion Act, it's looking at the immigrant and the other. So I think we do have some work to do. I think there's a lot of work to be done, but at the end of the day, I think if we continue this historic unprecedented coalition, I think we're going to see that disseminate more and more down to the grass roots.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Bishop?

BISHOP JEFFERTS SCHORI: When people feel threatened, they retreat often to their worst, worst sensibilities. And that's certainly what's been evoked in this debate.

The reality, however, is that as much as the United States thinks it's a Christian nation there is a large segment of the population who are not affiliated with any religious tradition, particularly in the West. It's growing. The religious community has an

opportunity there to lead, to provoke conversation with those who are not believers, and I think it's one that we have often abdicated.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. And now my owlsh colleague Bill.

MR. GALSTON: Well, I have just one question you'll be happy to hear. You know, when I heard that Bishop Jefferts Schori was previously Bishop of Nevada, I said to myself that sounds like steady work. On the other hand I then reflected on what various faith traditions have to say about the ubiquity of sin, and I decided it's steady work everywhere.

I wonder whether, before asking my question, I could simply spend one minute representing a tradition otherwise unrepresented in this discussion. You know, as a couple of speakers have already pointed out there is repeated language in what you folks call the Old Testament about the treatment of the stranger, and the standard formula is do not mistreat the stranger because you were strangers in the land of Egypt.

Well, a few weeks ago, we were reading our weekly portion from Leviticus, and a line that I'd never noticed before jumped out at me. It was a stark deviation from the standard formula, and it's in Leviticus and it goes something like the following: "Do not mistreat the stranger" -- the literal translation is "resident alien" from the Hebrew -- because "in my eyes ye are all resident aliens to me, saith the Lord."

And I mention that only to point out that this notion of universal sojournership is not confined to the Christian tradition but has -- I taught in Texas for many years, and there was a troubadour and itinerant novelist by the name of Kinky Friedman, whose most famous song is "They Don't Make Jews Like Jesus Anymore."

And at any rate, here's my question: On the one hand, there is the formula from Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy about the treatment of the stranger. On the other hand, in the Jewish tradition there is a longstanding principle which enjoys

quasi-economical status to the effect that the law of the nation is the law. And so the question I want to address to you is -- and we've already heard reference to, quote, "rule of law concerns" -- how do you grapple, theologically and practically, with the fact that the overwhelming majority of Americans strongly believe in the rule of law, believe that the law whose justice has been challenged is still law until changed through lawful, legal procedures? How do you all come to grips with that, because you must encounter it in your own views and not just from the likes of people like me.

BISHOP JEFFERTS SCHORI: That's certainly the role of the prophetic tradition to challenge laws that, or structures, that have authority that appear to be unjust. It's certainly where the work of Martin Luther King, Jr., came from, and the work of Gandhi. It's certainly where much of the willingness to, you know, promote boycotts in Arizona comes from, to challenge the legal structure in the place where it's going to hurt the most deeply, in the pocket.

MR. APPLEBY: Well, under the Catholic tradition, the Church authorities taught that the sovereign has the right to control its borders. How is that consistent with persons coming out of status? And not to get into the details of the debate, but the debate revolves around whether people who are here out of status who have broken the law should get some sort of legal status, and those on the other side say -- or if they've broken the law what should their penalty be?

Those on the other side say immediate deportation, detention, et cetera. We say: Get in the back of the line, pay taxes, pay the fine, et cetera. We believe our response to the rule of law is much more proportionate than theirs. We think that it maintains the rule of law because they're paying a fine, they're paying their debt to society at the same time as we accept, you know, their toil and taxes. We also get a win,

too, because we still honor our values of fairness, opportunity, and compassion at the same time.

Our point is we can't have it both ways. I mean if we're going to say they're breaking the rule of law and everything, but we also accept all their toil, their taxes, we need them in these important industries, going forward we're going to have to reconcile that.

So in our view there's a balance between the rule of law and the right to migrate, and that our solution maintains the rule of law. In fact, by reforming the system we'll restore the rule of law because right now it's just chaos.

REV. RODRIGUEZ: The Evangelical community would not support -- and it took, when we first initially brought up to the National Association of Evangelicals in 2006 the argument in favor of comprehensive immigration reform, we were flatly rejected. It took now finally three-and-a-half, four years to convince the Evangelical community at-large, or at least the leadership that this would benefit the community. It's actually their sustainability of their future. They have some vested interest in this.

But without the component of the rule of law, our argument -- meaning the Hispanic Evangelical Community -- Uncle Sam, after Reagan's amnesty in '86, said we're going to secure the borders, wink, wink, and, by the way, we're here, and you can't come in here illegally, but we have some incredible job opportunities across the border, and if you come here, we'll look the other way.

So the government never really, never really truly implemented the laws that were on the books, and to have these communities in Northern Mexico and Laredo, in Sevar Juarez suffering, et cetera, and right across the border is the saving grace for their children and their children's children, it speaks to -- the number one guilty party in all of

this is the federal government, the lack of the federal government's will to enact the law that's growing a head.

But at the same time the question is no longer, do we secure the borders? The question is what do we do with 12 million people? Mass deportation is not a practical solution, so in order to respect the rule of law let's make sure that the consequences fit the crime.

MR. DIONNE: Bill, do you have a follow-up to that?

MR. GALSTON: No. I vowed to practice the virtue of moderation to leave maximum time for the more than 100 people who are gathered in this very small room.

MR. DIONNE: That's honorable of you. I'm going to ask if we could -- if we could -- well, I'm going to ask one question while we get the mics. We have two mics going around. If you could kindly identify yourself and try to get as many people in, if you could keep your question down.

Let me just take off the devil's advocate hat and put on the hard-bitten journalist or social scientist hat. All three of you spoke of the importance of the Latino community in the growth of each of your traditions, and for all I know there might even be some new Sephardic Jews to add to Bills tradition.

To what extent is this -- how does one separate out the obvious interest of the religious communities in an immigrant group that's very important to them, important to their growth, important in some, perhaps to their survival, from the advocacy on moral grounds? I don't expect you can separate them entirely because you address this -- this sort of dual fact.

And then we'll go to the audience. Scott [sic], maybe?

MR. APPLEBY: Well, I'd like to harken back to the late Cardinal Hickey of Washington. He had a famous quote that says we respond to people not because they

are Catholics but because we are Catholic. And that would maintain regardless of the population's faith adherence or faith membership in this debate.

There's a moral issue here. I've tried to point -- we've tried to point that out on several occasions in the debate that these are people that are just trying to feed their families. They don't have enough visas to come; we use them when they get here. There's a moral issue there.

Having said that, though, of course -- and I've said this -- the majority are Catholics, and they appear in our institutions and our parishes every Sunday, so we do have a special obligation to respond to them as well. And I wouldn't say that's, certainly, not the only reason we're involved, but it does heighten the awareness, and we would make the argument, bishops make the argument, that Catholics should be in solidarity with other Catholics in this regard. And we did not shy away from that.

So it's both/and, not either/or.

MR. DIONNE: Bishop?

BISHOP JEFFERTS SCHORI: I would point to the fact that we're meant to see every human being as a neighbor and deserving of the same justice that we expect for the ones who are our blood relations and our faith comrades. I, you know, this is not popular in the United States, but I think the same kinds of privileges and justice need to be extended to Muslim immigrants as to Latin immigrants. This country will benefit from the gifts and skills of people of all sorts of different ethnic backgrounds and traditions, and we need to be conscious of the fact that their skills are needed here and everyone who comes here needs to be treated with equivalent justice.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Reverend?

REV. RODRIGUEZ: From another perspective, the Latino church would view it, surprisingly enough, as a prophetic mandate, not necessarily that America is saving

the Latino immigrant community but, rather, the Latino immigrant community may very well save America. So the fact that they want to be here is more of a missional, incarnational thrust rather than help from the other side.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you.

Who wants to -- in the back there, if we could have one mic in the back and one mic in the front. Why don't you come up to that? And what I may do is, let me identify the second questioner so we can get the mic to you right away so we can keep it moving. Right up here, Peggy. Please?

MS. JULIANA: Hi. My name is Juliana, and I'm from the Religious Action Center. We've been reading a lot lately about how the Democratic Party wants to change the rhetoric on immigration reform and make it increasingly more aggressive in order to answer what we've been hearing on the other side. So what we've been used to with a more compassionate vocabulary to talk comprehensive immigration reform is now turning increasingly toward enforcement, toward discussions of illegality and penalty. And I'm wondering how you feel this is going to resonate with faith communities who are used to and, obviously, prefer to use the other vocabulary to discuss this obviously very personal issue?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. I just want to tell the panelists, everybody doesn't have to answer every question. You can jump in as you see fit. But that's an excellent question. Somebody should want to pick that up. Scott?

Scott -- how can --

MR. APPLEBY: That's all right, I'll be Scott.

MR. DIONNE: Let me confess, I'm a Catholic, I'll confess. His brother wrote a wonderful review of a book I wrote. So he looms very large in my mind, and I will always love him. Go ahead.

MR. APPLEBY: On these panels the truth eventually comes out.

MR. DIONNE: Right.

MR. APPLEBY: Yeah. You know, I was discouraged by the fact that I saw this report that the Democrats are going to use this language because of the polls. But I think it just cheapens the debate, frankly. It reduces the voice of those who are most vulnerable by making them less than human. So it creates an environment where their rights are really not examined to the full extent because they're looked at as not being fully, having the full rights that others might. And in our traditions, they do have full human rights given by God.

So I think language does matter in this debate, no matter what people say. And I think faith groups are just going to have to stand up and say this is not the case, these are not, you know, no human being is illegal, these are human beings, they have God-given rights. We can't exploit them like this. And we're going to have to fight on that because, you know, if we continue to -- if we concede to that language, then we're going to be eventually conceding to other things that will actually harm these people.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Peggy?

MS. ORCHOWSKI: Hi. Peggy Orchowski. I'm the Congressional correspondent for the *Hispanic Outlook* magazine, and I've written a book on immigration called *Immigration and the American Dream: Battling the Political Hype and Hysteria*, and words like xenophobic, nativist and even undocumented contribute terribly to the hype.

I also talk about a paradox in immigration which really comes out here so much because the paradox is that, yes, every human being has a right to migrate. Every human being, it's in the UN Charter. But no human being has the right to immigrate to any country just because they want to. That is the right of the nation state to decide who can come in and who can't.

And I think the problem with the religious community's approach is it's -- I see the division not between Democrats and Republicans but between very strong Libertarians on one side and on one end -- I call it a vertical issue. And then what I -- David Berth so often calls "national economics" or "economic nationalists" on the top, those who are worried about the economy and especially the work conditions of the national -- the citizens.

So my question is to you, you don't want to use the word "illegal immigrant" but, of course, that's what they are. It's not an illegal person, it's that they have the status of being illegal in the country. There is such a thing as an illegal immigrant, a temporary immigrant, a permanent immigrant, and the citizen. And they do have different rights. They may have different -- same human rights, but they have different civil rights.

In so much of this discussion, you talk about a nation of immigrants. There's two factors in that statement: There's the nation and there's the immigrant, and immigrant policy has to balance both of those.

So what -- do you have any feeling at all about stopping illegal immigration, or are you all just for open borders. I know Peggy Levitt wrote a book a little while ago called *God Needs No Passport*. I've heard Catholic bishops at Georgetown saying there is no such thing as an illegal person, we answer to a higher God than a nation state.

So do you believe in stopping illegal immigration? Do you believe in immigration laws at all, or do you think there should just be open borders? And what do you do about the unemployed American whose jobs, especially black Americans whose jobs are being taken in construction and hospitality by so many of the illegal immigrants in the country?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you.

BISHOP JEFFERTS SCHORI: Immigration law is important. A rational immigration policy is desperately needed. We have what is effectively an illegal immigration policy because we encourage people to come here from an economic perspective, but we don't provide them the means to come here and work in a legal fashion.

MR. DIONNE: Is anybody else? Scott, you were next.

MR. APPLEBY: Kevin, sir. I'll be calling him after this, and --

MR. DIONNE: Yes, you --

MR. APPLEBY: -- letting him know he was here. You know, the myth here -- the myth here is that our solution is the best path to securing the border. I mean over the past 10 years we've spent well over \$100 million on immigration enforcement in this country, and during the same period the number of undocumented has almost doubled, you know, and it's more of the same, more of the same, and it's not solving the problem.

I mean, we don't condone illegal immigration. It's not good for the migrant. It's certainly not good for society. We're trying to replace illegal behavior with legal avenues, and there aren't any legal avenues for people to come. That's part of securing the border, you know. If you provide legal visas, the Border Patrol is going to be going after criminal elements, not people that are trying to work. And if you have a worker program that's properly constructed, you're going to have those protections for U.S. citizens so that they have first shot at the jobs.

Right now there are no rules that govern that, and it's just really chaotic. And what we're trying to do is restore that rule of law, restore that order and put some legality in the system. That's what our solution proposes.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, Kevin.

Reverend, against?

REV. RODRIGUEZ: Of course, against illegal immigration. The narco traffickers in Northern Mexico, the impact in New Mexico and Arizona and Texas, we have to protect our borders. As a sovereign nation we have the right to protect our borders. I'm not in favor of open borders; I don't think anyone on this panel is in favor of open borders or of blanket amnesty. Nonetheless, we have a moral responsibility and a higher responsibility to call it by name: Truth-telling. That's prophetic. Truth-telling. So if it is xenophobia, not everyone who is opposed to immigration reform is committed to xenophobia or is a xenophobe, but there is a strong element. There is an imbedded element, and we're going to call it by name.

And if there is a bit of nativism, we're going to call it by name, and we're not going to hold back. It's not a matter of political correctness, it's a matter of truth-telling. And we get paid to tell the truth, and the truth shall set you free. And the idea to try to separate communities, the African American community, it's a wonderful tactic to try to put the African American community against the Hispanic community.

I just had a wonderful conversation yesterday with probably the most prominent African American family in America, the Kings. And they completely support our push for comprehensive immigration reform, and we're planning some things down the line, and they repudiate the notion of anyone attempting to separate our communities. They are committed to justice and righteousness just as these panels and this discussion is articulating and presenting via this forum.

So I think it's critical for us to push back against those that attempt to polarize our communities and attempt to stop us from speaking truth to power.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you.

Korin, we're close to the time on this panel. How much -- I want to bring in several more voices, so let me go to the gentleman here. Another hand in the back.

That lady way in the back. This gentleman first, you second. Let's have three or four folks come in, and we'll let the panel close out.

Sir?

MR. GETTMAN: My name is Tom Gettman, and as a former health staffer and NGO executive, I spent a lot of time in South Africa. Athol Fugard had a huge impact through the arts on moral issues, biblical issues. He's got a new play called "Have You Seen Us?" set in the United States. It's between an ex-pat -- a debate between an ex-pat South African and a Mexican illegal alien. It's one of the most powerful things I've ever seen in terms of the issue.

Have you all thought at all about using the arts, music and drama, like they did in South Africa to get this out wider and transform hearts like Athol Fugard says: Each person, the central transaction of the universe, each person caring for another person.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Hold your answer for a second. The lady in the back, and then let's have another hand. I'll bring one other voice in. Way, way in the back there. Why don't you go back while this lady is talking? Thank you.

MS. GRAJIEV: Hi. My name is Emma Grajief, and I am Mexican. And I really don't understand the argument that we come here to take anybody's jobs because I don't think that anybody is physically or legally forced to hire anybody. So it's everybody's choice to hire whoever they want.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Sir?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. My name is Hector Rodriguez. I'm a Latino missionary with the Episcopal Diocese of Maryland. The law in Arizona that was recently passed is about the same result we would have gotten if the Sensenbrenner bill had passed and become law in the full Congress rather than just the House.

Our response in Maryland through the Industrial Areas Foundation, particularly billed Baltimore (inaudible) and Leadership Development, and was to convene the Black, White, Latino, and general community in Baltimore, so every color was represented in one of our churches where we asked to meet with our two U.S. senators. As a result of the meetings, which we did obtain with each of them, we asked our own Senator Mikulski to put on her old organizer hat and to go together with Paul Sarbanes, go with the other 98 senators and try and -- and not just try but bring about comprehensive reform.

Obviously, in that context, that was not possible, although that initial phase of debate was historic if you go back and see them in C-Span files.

What I'm wondering -- and I think we need a similar kind of action across this land in terms of working with our senators, 'cause that's where the debate is going to begin, since we already have a bill introduced in the House -- I'm -- I want to ask the panelists, because I hear all the time that CIR will not happen this year. It's not going to happen until after the election; it's not going to happen until next year; it won't happen until who knows when?

I'm wondering what your response is to people on both sides of the debate who pretty much have given up on the possibility of CIR this year.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. Why don't we go -- Kevin, Bishop, and Reverend.

MR. APPLEBY: Okay, I'll try to answer at least two or three. Just on the arts and using that to educate -- I mean we live in a sound-bite society unfortunately. We live in a cable talk show society. The way that you change people's hearts is through these personal stories, and I've seen it happen. If you do it right and people understand what's really going on, on a personal human level, it really changes people's perspectives. And that's a challenge in this society because you don't have the television

shows that can really do that and reach people and that's a challenge we've been faced with.

Yes, in terms of, you know, the job situation, again, part of the solution of immigration reform is, as Reverend Wallis pointed out, you know, there's a "help wanted" sign as well as a "keep out" sign. And what we would want to do is create a system where everyone is legal and, you know, people are on the same playing field. And we don't have an underground society where people are living off the books without the protection of workplace rights.

And then lastly on the political aspects of it, I mean, our role is not to play their politics. Our role is to point out the need and the importance of this issue and the urgency of it. We have to be informed by the politics certainly, but we keep going forward and say, "This needs to be done sooner rather than later and you're the one that has to deal with the politics; that's your job."

BISHOP JEFFERTS SCHORI: The issue of the arts, I think, is related to what you spoke about in terms of the personal story. Members of our congregations are converted in important ways by experiencing the gifts of other cultures that immigrants bring with them. And I think that's an essential, you know, person-to-person way in which minds and values are shifted and transformed.

In terms of a political situation, we are meant to be people of hope; that's why we're here. We believe that change is possible. I was talking to the churches from Middle East Peace this morning, and I said to them, "We have to be like the importunate widow, the widow who keeps beating down the door of the judge who won't give her justice." Eventually, eventually, we will get what is important and desperately needed here.

REV. RODRIGUEZ: Quickly in respect to the arts, I'm in. (Spanish)

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

In respect to the question about what happens this year, what's next, what happens this year, my dear friend, Reverend Jim Wallis and I and a number of others are working on, if not comprehensive immigration reform in the Congress this year, at least some sort of executive, moral guidance or declaration -- I don't want to give too much away; Jim, stop me please -- but something that would at least push back on Arizona to make sure there's no duplicity across the board this year and give hope to the immigrant community.

I still think that the "elephant in the room" may not very well be what she alluded to of the rule of law. I think the "elephant in the room" is that many Americans are looking at the Latinization of America. At 50 million Hispanics, hence the word "panic" in the word "Hispanic," and they're looking at this emerging community and they're asking, "Are we losing our Western European cultural heritage?" What does America look like in the 21st century? That's the "elephant in the room," that one day somewhere down the road needs to be discussed and analyzed.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. I am grateful that I learned a lot today, including Kevin's name. And I thank our panel members for their eloquence and their witness. We are Brookings; data is honored even if we don't see it as sacred, and so I'm going to bring up a second panel that my brother, Bill, is going to moderate. And so if you could all just keep your seats and we're going to switch to the second part of the program. Thank you all very, very much.

PANEL 2 - Understanding the Connection Among Ethnicity, Religiosity, and Partisanship

MR. GALSTON: Well, I'd like to thank all of the members of the first panel, not only for their witness and their clarity, but also their brevity, an inspiration to all of us and in particular to the second panel.

As E.J. indicated, we are going to make a transition now from the language of prophetic witness to the language of the social sciences. But perhaps it's not quite as stark a transition as all that; after all, in a democracy, public opinion matters. We can't regard it as the end of wisdom, but I think we are enjoined to regard it as the beginning of wisdom, certainly something that cannot be set aside altogether. That would be an act of supreme arrogance, to set aside as negligible or somehow unworthy what the citizens of the United States believe about important matters.

And I would add just one other point before introducing our three panelists, and that is that in addition to moral witness, we need moral imagination. And by moral imagination, I mean the capacity to understand the sentiments and beliefs of people with whom we may profoundly disagree and to resist the very human impulse to cast those beliefs in the worst possible light. It seems to me that if we try to believe the best about our fellow citizens and fellow human beings, we are more likely to get the best out of them.

And having said that, let me introduce seriatim, the three distinguished practitioners of the dark arts of the social sciences from whom you are about to hear.

David Leal is an Associate Professor of Government, Faculty Associate of the Center for Mexican-American Studies, and Director of the Irma Rangel Public Policy Institute at the University of Texas at Austin where I happily plied my trade for a decade. His primary academic interest is Latino Politics and his work explores a variety of questions involving public policy, public opinion, and political behavior. He's the co-editor among many, many other distinguished politicians of the forthcoming volume, *Latinos and the Economy*.

Second, Mark Lopez, who is the Associate Director of the Pew Hispanic Center where he studies the attitudes and opinions of young Latinos and the political

engagement of Latinos. Lopez also coordinates the Center's national surveys. Additionally, he currently serves as Visiting Professor at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy where I was proud to hire him almost a decade ago for a Research Center that I directed when I was there. And Mr. Lopez received his PhD. in economics -- but we'll forgive him for that -- from Princeton University.

And finally Robert Jones who is the founding CEO of the Public Religion Research Institute, a non-profit, non-partisan organization specializing in research at the intersection of religion, values, and public life. He's the author of two books, *Progressive and Religious*, and *Liberalism's Troubled Search for Equality*. He holds a PhD. in religious studies from Emory University and a Master's in Divinity from the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Because two of the three presenters have PowerPoint presentations, rather than gathering on stage immediately, they will troop up to the podium one after the other and then we will assemble for the panel discussion. So David, the floor is yours.

MR. LEAL: Well, thank you, Scott, for that introduction. I think we should just all be "Scott" for today. There's no reason to pretend that we have our own identities.

This is the academic part of the panel so the coffee is in the back and the restrooms are around to the right as we alluded to earlier. My presentation will summarize in the 8 seconds -- I mean 8 minutes -- that I've been allotted the main points from a chapter I wrote for the book, *Religion and Democracy in the United States: Danger or Opportunity*, which is the product of the American Political Science Association's recently concluded Task Force on Religion in American Democracy. My chapter was on "Religion and Latino Political and Civic Lives."

But first I want to discuss a couple of big-picture dynamics that are relevant to our discussion. So from the social science perspective -- and that's what I

am, a political scientist -- the word that comes to mind in understanding immigration reform and policy is "complexity." And this has long been true for the immigration policy debate and now analysts need to understand the role of Latinos as both political actors and as objects in this debate. So as we all know the process by which immigration policies are adopted in the U.S. is murky, the laws and policies themselves are complicated, public opinion is contradictory and highly dependent on question wording. It's unclear whether public opinion has much affect on immigration policy outcomes anyway. The partisan dynamics are cross cutting, and then we have to add Latinos to the mix. And we have to do this today for a variety of reasons. The population includes many of the new immigrants. It's a fast-growing electorate. It's of crucial interest as we've heard to religious groups. And it's increasingly found throughout the United States rather than just in the Southwest and a couple of large urban centers.

But to understand the Latino role in immigration policy debates, we have to understand a few questions that we don't know very much or not as much as we should. First, we need to consider the opinion of Latinos themselves about immigration reform and about immigrants. We have to study Latino political behavior such as how often Latinos vote and for whom do they vote for. We need to understand better the reaction that's been alluded to earlier of non-Latinos to Latinos. For example, does agitation over immigration reflect anti-Latino views and concerns about cultural change? Or maybe economic worries, national security concerns, or some mix of all the above? I don't think we have a good handle on that. And we also need to understand Latino acculturation dynamics in order to evaluate some of the common claims made about today's immigrants.

But wait, there's more. We also need to understand that Latinos themselves are a complex and diverse population. We use terms like "Latino" and

“Hispanic” because they’re convenient, because they speak to some fundamental underlying similarities across national origin groups. But they also overlook a lot of politically relevant opinions and behaviors and migration experiences and receptions in the U.S. and socio-economic status -- Mexican-Americans are not exactly the same as Cuban-Americans who are not exactly the same as Puerto Ricans who are not exactly the same as Dominicans.

So in doing so, when we try to understand this complexity, we find a few things. First of all we see that Latino views of immigration policy are a little more complicated than we assumed. Latinos are not necessarily as liberal concerning immigration policies as we often think they are in the media. Latino opinions about immigration policy vary by national origin group, they vary by generational status, and they vary by acculturation with support becoming less strong as we go down across the generations and across acculturation status.

We also need to take into account the differences between the views of the overall Latino population and the Latino citizen electorate. And we’ve seen that, for example, in Arizona in a few ballot initiatives and elections where the Latino electorate has been more supportive of some of these laws than we might think. We also need to think more about the Latino issue agenda versus opinions about specific issues. So some observers appear to believe that Latinos must prioritize issues like immigration reform, like bilingual education, and maybe affirmative action. But if you just ask people, Latinos included, which issues are the most important, the Latino policy agenda of the 2000s is actually very similar to that of everybody else -- the economy, jobs, war in Iraq, war on terror -- immigration tends to be a little down there. Now there’s a caveat here because Latinos do recognize that this is an important community issue and they resent being -- having this issue used as kind of a political football as a way to indict all Latinos.

But for the most part, the Latino policy agenda is very similar to that of other groups even if their policy solutions tend to be more on the liberal side.

We also, I think, need to better understand Latino political influence and think about it in new ways. We often hear that the parties must address the immigration issue if they want to win the Latino vote, but there's some reason to doubt this. In addition, as Latino populations grow, we hear talk about whether Latinos determine an election outcome or won a battleground state. But instead of trying to measure whether Latinos won Indiana for Obama or will it determine the outcome of the 2012 election, we might rather think about Latinos as a part of coalitions that collectively contribute to victory or defeat of a Presidential candidate or members of Congress. And we might also ask if there's really necessarily any specific Latino content in these kinds of coalitions.

So, for example, did any issues traditionally thought of as a "Latino" issue play a role in the 2008 elections? Certainly not immigration reform, which neither candidate wanted to talk about. So scholars like Rodolfo de la Garza at Columbia are beginning to talk about, you know, these kinds of ideas, about new ways of thinking about Latino political power, Latino coalitions, and the Latino issue agenda.

So maybe the way to best understand Latino influence is not the sort of standard media narrative that studies Latinos as a growing electorate, that flexes its electoral muscles based on issues like immigration and ethnic center outreach, maybe we should think about Latinos as a group and coalition with other groups whose support for Ds and Rs depends on context just like it does for any group. So, for example, if you look at Latino support for Presidential candidates over the last twenty years, you'll see that it rises and falls in the same way that it does for other groups. Think of it sort of like parallel roller coasters. Candidates that were generally popular among Latinos, like Reagan in '84 or Bush in 2004, also did pretty well among Whites.

There's also new work on Latino political coalitions being developed by scholars like Benjamin Marquez, and it appears that ethnic group identification can lead individuals in groups in many different kinds of political and activist directions. So he talks in one of his recent books about how "Latino identities are elastic enough to expand to accommodate virtually any political agenda, from social justice to business." So we shouldn't necessarily assume that Latinos with a sense of ethnic identity will automatically gravitate to the immigration reform issue. Ethnic community focus in Latino communities can take on all kinds of organizational directions. So I think we need to take that into account.

And so these sort of big-picture statements having been said, I wanted to talk a little bit about the chapter that I wrote about for this edited volume, edited by Alan Wolfe and, yes, Ira Katznelson -- sorry Ira -- or Scott I should call him. So my chapter explores the role of religion in Latino political and civic lives. Part of this is a social science discussion of how the religious activities and affiliations of Latinos affect their political participation. But maybe more importantly, I more broadly examine how the support of religious institutions and the inspiration of faith have contributed to the preservation and the empowerment of Latino communities in the past and the present, going back 200 years in the United States; which now the United States' political role of religion in Latino communities is not very well known to scholars. There's not a lot of understanding about how religious organizations and beliefs have shaped Latino political lives. Some even see religion as an impediment to Latino participation or maybe just irrelevant. And some have even suggested that activists and some academics have been more comfortable with a secular perspective on Latino activism over the last 30 or 40 years. For example, you can see accounts of César Chávez's life that don't talk about his religious faith.

So what explains this lack of research on Latinos' politics and religion?

Well, I think first of all there's no Hispanic church. There's no Latino church. There's no place to go to study; it's complicated, I mean, many different churches, many denominations, many faith traditions. Religion, and especially the Roman Catholic Church in particular, has also played multiple and sometimes uncoordinated and even contradictory roles for Latino individuals, organizations, and movements. So when you examine the history of the American Southwest, there's really no single story line. Sometimes the church neglected Hispanics, sometimes it was opposed to certain kinds of Latino political and civic activism, and sometimes it provided active support of resources and spiritual support.

But there is a growing interest in these kinds of topics in a lot of academic disciplines, such as sociology, religious studies, ethnic studies, theology, and history. Scholars have begun to examine the organizational efforts by and on behalf of Latinos that are directly or indirectly religious. They're also studying the wide range of practical assistance. It's increasingly provided by parishes and priests, as well as the inspiration of religious symbols like the Virgin Guadalupe. Theologians are also interested in developing a Hispanic theology. For example, Elizondo proposed the Gallelli Principle based on Mark 12:10, "The stone which the builders rejected has become the cornerstone."

So what do I conclude in this chapter? I find that religion has always been important to Latino communities. Sometimes this manifests itself outside of official, formal church structures, through popular religiosity, through lay leadership. At other times it involves institutional support, especially from Catholic but also some Protestant denominations. And some even say that religion is the glue that for over 150 years has held together Latino political and community struggles. And today religion continues to

be a source of individual political and community strength. And Latinos are likely to become, as you've heard before, even more important to the religious debate in the United States.

So I think that is probably about my time so thank you.

MR. LOPEZ: Good morning. My name is Mark Lopez and I'm from the Pew Hispanic Center and I want to talk to you a little bit about some public opinion polling, some facts because at the Pew Hispanic Center we like to call ourselves a "fact tank" rather than a "think tank" and that is that we talk just about facts because we're non-partisan, non-advocacy. But I also want to show you some polling results from not just the Latino community but also from some national polls as well, comparing different religious groups on attitudes towards immigrants and attitudes towards some forms of immigration reform.

So to get started, let me first sort of set some facts. When we talk about immigrants, how many people are we talking about? Well, there's about 40 million immigrants in the United States today, about 12 million of whom are undocumented. Now that estimate of the undocumented is a Pew Hispanic Center estimate from 2008. More recent estimates from other sources such as the Department of Homeland Security put the number more like at about 10.8 million. And the economic slowdown appears to have really affected the flow of people coming into the United States. So when you take a look at Mexican data, for example, you'll find that the flow of Mexican immigrants in the United States returning to Mexico has remained unchanged throughout this recession. What has changed is the number of Mexicans deciding to come to the United States. So there are relatively fewer undocumented immigrants in the country today than there were just a few years ago.

Now when you take a look at undocumented immigrants, for the most part they're of Latin American or Latino origin. Seven million of those 11.9 million undocumented immigrants in 2008 were of Mexican origin. So when we're talking about undocumented immigrants, it's largely a Latin American group of folks that we're talking about. Where are they? Well, one of the great stories of the last 10 years with regard to the Latino population, but also the undocumented immigrant population in the United States, is that it has become more dispersed. So when we're talking about how many undocumented immigrants there are in the United States, yes, California and Texas dominate the numbers. But they don't dominate the numbers like they used to just 10 years ago. In fact, California, while it still has the single largest group and is by far the single largest state with regard to its undocumented immigrant population, other states are catching up. And even Virginia, for example, and Georgia are in the top ten of states with undocumented immigrant populations in those states. Arizona has about 500 thousand or so, about a half a million according to our estimates.

One other interesting fact to note here about undocumented immigrants is their children. When you take a look at households that have children who -- households who have at least one parent who's undocumented, there are about 5.5 million children who live in those households. Four million of that 5.5 million are U.S. born with at least one parent who is undocumented. The remaining 1.5 million are themselves undocumented immigrants. So I just wanted to give you some of those facts because I want to put those numbers into perspective when we talk about the Arizona law.

Now there's been a lot of recent polling about what people's opinions are about the Arizona law, and at the Pew Research Center we did a national survey about a -- almost a month ago now -- that asked Americans about what they think about specific

aspects of the Arizona law. And here what we did was we asked, "Do you approve" of these aspects. We asked about requiring people to produce documents verifying their legal status. We asked about allowing police to detain anyone unable to verify their legal status. And we asked about allowing police to question anyone they think may be in the country illegally. Now as you can see, generally speaking the public is in favor of each one of these components. And what's also interesting about this is whether you're talking about Republicans or Democrats or Independents, you see similar levels of support. Majorities of Democrats support each one of these elements. Overall, according to our survey, about 59 percent of Americans consider the Arizona -- have a positive opinion or approve of the new Arizona law. One of the downsides of this particular data collection, however, was we didn't ask about religious affiliation and we didn't ask about church attendance. So I can't show you what these numbers would look like for some specific groups.

Now when we talk about approval ratings of Barack Obama with regards to immigration policy, you'll see that there's been somewhat of a decline in the public's view of support -- I'm sorry, the share of the public that says they approve of Barack Obama's handling of immigration policy. In November of 2009 I had about 31 percent of American delegates said they approved of Obama's handling of immigration policy. That's down to 25 percent by May of 2010. There's been a slight decline. It's hard to say whether or not this is a statistically significant decline, but the trend appears to be down.

One other question that we regularly ask at the Pew Research Center is a question about, "Are immigrants a strength to the country today or are they a burden to the country today?" And when you ask this and you compare how different groups look at immigrants, you'll find that generally speaking, for the most part folks are more likely to say that the immigrants strengthen our country -- and I think you'll see that there's an

error. I think if you guys see the error? There's an error right there. Evangelicals and Catholics need to be -- the numbers need to be flipped. So my apologies for that -- however, yeah, you were going to run with it weren't you? Look and see 38 and 35 percent for Catholics -- yeah, that's really great. -- But anyway, in taking a look at this, you'll see that for the most part folks are more likely to say that immigrants are a strength for our country rather than a burden for our country. In fact, among all adults it's 46 percent versus 40 percent. This is data, however, from October of 2009, the last time we've asked this question nationally. The Pew Research Center is about to go into the field again with a new national survey which will update these numbers. What I do wonder is how this has changed as a result of what's happened with Arizona and, of course, we don't have any recent numbers to sort of update this.

All right, let's see. What about a pathway to citizenship? Again, this is not -- this is data from April 2009 so this is over a year old now. So it's not the most recent data, but you'll see that no matter how we cut this, across all these different groups the majority of each one of these groups supports the notion of a pathway to citizenship. But let me read you the question just to be very clear about what we asked about. The question read like this, "Thinking about immigrants who are currently living in the U.S. illegally, do you favor or oppose providing a way for illegal immigrants currently in the country to gain legal citizenship if they pass background checks, pay fines, and have jobs?" Now this wording is a question that we've asked many, many times and so we're trying to keep the trend here is what we were trying to do. I don't think this is necessarily the best way to word this question, but there hasn't been a lot of movement over the years on this particular question when we ask this question generally of the American public. And as you can see, across all these different groups, particularly

among Catholics and those who are non-affiliated, there is strong support for a pathway to citizenship.

Last I want to close with some data which is from 2007. And in 2007 the Pew Hispanic Center did a national survey of Hispanics asking them about their religious behaviors and what are they experiencing in their churches, et cetera. Now, of course, this was right after the last big debate about immigration reform, and one of the questions that was asked was, "Does your clergy at your place of worship ever speak out about laws regarding immigration?" And these results are among those Hispanics who said that they go to church regularly. And you'll see that when you ask them about are their clergy actually talking about this in their churches, about 44 percent of all Hispanics said, "Yes." Nearly half of all Catholics said that that was indeed the case, 35 percent of Evangelicals and 37 percent of mainline Protestant Hispanics said the same. So when you're taking a look at this, at least after the last immigration reform debate, there was some discussion in churches by clergy about immigration reform.

One other thing to note about the last round of the debate with regards to Hispanics, about one-quarter of Hispanics in this survey had said that they had participated in a protest related to immigration reform. We at the Pew Hispanic Center are about to go in the field as well with a new national survey asking about immigration reform, and I'm anxious to see how some of these numbers have changed as a result of the Arizona law. But it's hard to sort of get into the field quickly with a good set of questions right away, and frankly we aren't that far away from when Arizona implemented its -- when the new law was signed into law by the Governor. But I do think that you're going to find that there have been some changes for Hispanics, both in the issue priorities -- some other research suggests that immigration is now high up on the list of issue priorities for Hispanics -- and I think you're also going to find that Hispanics do have

a very different point of view on both immigration enforcement and on immigration reform than the general public. Thank you very much.

MR. JONES: Thank you very much. I'm Robert Jones. I'm the CEO of Public Religion Research Institute. And the data I'm going to be talking about today is fairly new data; it was dated from March 2010 from a national study sponsored by the Ford Foundation, so all the data that you'll see will be coming from that. I do appreciate the dark arts thing here, and certainly we'll try to respect the descriptive nature of this thing. But I would say that often these descriptive analyses are often pregnant with moral implications, right? And it's up to sort of the moral advocacy practitioners to figure out which of those they should take the ball and run with and which of those they need to launch a great, you know, education campaign and maybe push back on. So I'll say that as a caveat in the beginning.

So three things to make in this short presentation: We set out to understand and to test whether the broad coalition that E.J. mentioned here -- really in many ways unprecedented on a policy issue, the kind of broad coalition that we see among American religious groups -- whether it had depth and breadth. That is, did it indeed go across the religious divides that they seem to be going to, and did it go down to the pews? So those were two things that we set out to find.

The second thing we set out to look at was what values -- there'd been a lot of talk about what the policies are, but there hadn't been a lot of talk about what values underlie and certainly not much polling on what values underlie American support for immigration reform.

And then finally, what are people hearing from clergy? You saw the slide about what Hispanics are hearing from clergy. We have data on what other people are

hearing from clergy. The little teaser there is that the people in the pews are with their clergy, but not because of them. I'll come back to that in large extent.

So the first thing to say is that we asked a set of questions about comprehensive immigration reform, spelling it out. Tried it a number of different ways to make sure we were getting fair readings on it. And whenever we spell out the components of comprehensive immigration reform and pit it against arguments against amnesty, arguments against enforcement-only approaches, we get basically 2-to-1 support among the American public and across a range of religious groups. We do a lot of polling on a number of other issues. We were sort of shocked really to see this data when it came back in, to see the real consistency -- I mean you can really see it here. The blue bars are support for comprehensive immigration reform. The red bars are opposition to comprehensive immigration reform; 2-to-1 among White Evangelicals, White mainline Catholics, and majority support among unaffiliated Americans. The bottom line, 2-to-1 support -- in support of a comprehensive approach to immigration reform.

Secondly, we set out to look at what values underlie comprehensive immigration reform. For those of you in the back who can't see, we had a set of values that are really -- we called "pragmatic legal values," that is, enforcing the rule of law, promoting national security, ensuring fairness to taxpayers. Those certainly appeared at the top of the list with 8 in 10 Americans basically saying, "Those are the most important - very or extremely important -- values for comprehensive immigration reform." But we also found among what we call "moral and religious values," also strong support. Two in particular, "protecting the dignity of every person," and "keeping families together." You heard Reverend Rodriguez mention family values as one sort of thing that has come up

as a way of support here. Also, those are statistically really indistinguishable. They are 8 in 10 for all of those values.

So the moral pragmatic -- sorry, the legal pragmatic values, also the moral -- what we call moral religious values -- the other one dimension following the Golden Rule, giving immigrants in the country today the same opportunities that people would want if they themselves were immigrants in the country -- we spell it out like that -- 7 in 10 Americans saying that they think it is a "very" or "extremely important" value in America. That one we can come back to in the Q&A. I'll just throw it out as a teaser. Arizona, right, is the Golden Rule state. It's sort of become known as the Golden Rule state and that began under Governor Brewer's tenure as Secretary of State, so we might want to come back to that discussion at the end.

A couple of things about nuances and support for comprehensive immigration reform: One of the other things is that we found that you can't draw a straight line between concerns and fears about current levels of immigration, concerns and fears about the impact of immigrants on the country. This data -- actually we asked the same question as Pew in order to get an updated benchmark here, so this is the same question, wording, about whether immigrants are a burden on the country or whether immigrants are a strength to the country. What we found is 54 percent -- it was the inverse -- 54 percent of Evangelicals in March 2010 said immigrants are a burden on the country because they take American jobs, housing, and healthcare. Only 31 percent said they strengthen the country. Americans overall in March 2010 are basically evenly divided on this question: 45 to 43 percent, 45 percent actually on the burden side. Those are statistically a dead heat. However, the interesting thing about this is despite those concerns, Evangelicals still strongly support comprehensive immigration reform over alternative proposals by this 2-to-1 margin that we talked about. So it's a kind of

complex issue that these fears and concerns don't actually translate into opposition to a comprehensive approach to immigration reform in the way that one might anecdotally think that they do.

I am not going to spend a lot of time on this slide in the interest of time here, but just to mention there's been a lot of debate about terminology. Do we talk about "illegal immigrants?" Do we talk about "undocumented immigrants?" Interestingly enough, in the country there's a slightly lower favorability that we found among using the word "undocumented immigrants" interestingly enough versus "illegal." Our thoughts about that are basically that we think the term is less familiar than "illegal" and it has some -- what happens is as the education level goes up, those terms become even. And when there's a lower education level, there's a gap between the terms. And you can see that effect over religious groups here.

Finally, I mentioned that there is -- that basically people are with their clergy here on the data or with their clergy on a comprehensive approach to immigration reform, but I said not because of them. Our data found that overall, despite the high numbers you saw among Hispanics from the Pew Hispanic Center, overall for Americans only one in four Americans report hearing about immigration reform from their clergy and their places of worship overall. That number is higher for Catholics. It's about a third for Catholics overall and lower for Protestants. However, despite that we also found -- we asked about whether Americans would be comfortable with their clergy speaking out in a variety of settings. An overwhelming majority saying, "Yes," ranging from the pulpit -- these numbers, sorry about this first bar, you can't read the number here but it's 55 percent -- so a majority is from the pulpit. And then it goes up from there: congregation's newsletter, and then adult education settings, and the local media, at a local community meeting. Those are like three out of four people saying they'd be very comfortable with

their clergy standing up and talking about immigration reform in those settings. We think the pulpit thing is reflecting some concerns about policy talks from the pulpit, but still majority support even there.

So to sum it up is that Americans in our studies across religious groups support a comprehensive approach to immigration reform by 2 to 1. There's also near consensus on values that should underlie the values of securing the border, but also values of keeping families together, the Golden Rule, protecting the dignity of every human being. Also very strong values they want, and Americans open to hearing from their clergy.

So I'll stop there and we can take anything else with questions.

MR. GALSTON: Well, I am very, very happy to be able to commend the second panel as well for clarity and brevity. And before I turn over the microphone to E.J. for a question, let me just offer three very brief comments based on what I've just heard.

First of all, we frequently think of a tension between concern about strong enforcement on the one hand, and on the other hand a path to legal status and even citizenship. As I look at these numbers and think about them, it seems to me that our fellow citizens do not see that contradiction or tension at all. They see both of them as part of the same package, even as two sides of the same coin. It is not the case that one of those sides is Caesar's and the other is God's. So that's the first thing that jumped out at me.

The second thing that jumped out at me was that we spent an enormous amount of time in the first panel trading theological thoughts about conceptions of the stranger and welcoming the stranger. And I was struck at how low down that was in the rank order of values cited by Americans in favor of a relatively welcoming and hospitable

attitude. That surprised me as a matter of fact. Other things were 20 or even 30 points higher.

And third, resuming, however briefly, my role on the first panel, I must protest. David Leal cited the line, "The stone that the builder has rejected has become the cornerstone," attributing it to Mark 12:10. Well, I'm in no position to argue with him about that. But if memory serves, that started out as a line from Proverbs and Mark took it, alas without attribution. So, you know, I am here to drop a footnote. Okay, and with that, E.J., the floor is yours for a provocative question.

MR. DIONNE: Just on that last point, I had a roommate in college who was Jewish. He said, "You look at the Old Testament as the preface, we see it as the appendix."

So I have a question for each of the panelists in order if I could.

For David, you make, I think, a very important point that when you look at the issue agenda for Latinos, for Hispanics, it's not all that different from the issue agenda for all other Americans which I believe is true. I think the data's very clear on that. However, there does seem to be a shift that happens when the immigration issue becomes very important. And in particular, what I have noticed in the data -- I'm curious how you read it -- the Republicans have made much more, have made much larger gains among Evangelical Latinos than they have among Catholics over time. President Bush carried the Evangelical Latinos, he lost the Catholic Latinos in 2004. But in 2006 when the immigration bill went down and it was blamed on the Republicans, there was a real drop in the Latino vote for the Republicans and in particular among Evangelicals, and you saw similar data in '08. So I'd like you to talk about that.

To Mark, in your very interesting data there is this Catholic exceptionalism. I'm curious if you drop Hispanic Catholics out of that number, how do

other -- do other Catholics look like Evangelicals or mainline Protestants? What's the situation there?

And to Robby, I want to make a related point to the one that Bill made. I looked at your data and was focused less on the totals when you added two categories than on the really strong, "extremely" in the first question and "very" in the second. And it did really strike me as it did Bill that -- well, first, the unaffiliated are much less in favor of comprehensive immigration reform than the religious groups which suggests either the preachers are having an effect or that there is something going on in the secular movement. The Tea Party does seem to be a bit more of a secular movement than it is a religious movement. I'm curious about that. But "welcoming the stranger" was very low when you looked at it, you know, as an "extreme" version, and the Golden Rule was low, too. And then only 25 percent were "very comfortable" with their preachers preaching about this from the pulpit which I thought was significant. So I drop each of those questions on you and then Bill will take it where he will. David, do you want to start?

MR. LEAL: Okay. So the two groups that are the most strongly supportive of Republicans are Cubans and Evangelicals in the Hispanic community. So it is true that in the 2008 election, support for Bush among Latinos did drop off quite a bit. But it's also true that it dropped off among a lot of other groups, too. And it did drop off among Evangelical Hispanics I believe, but it also, I believe, dropped off among Evangelical Whites, especially those who sell themselves as sort of less committed Evangelicals than others. So, again, I think we have some parallels that are going on here and not necessarily a politics of difference. I think that there is just a lot of drop off for Bush in '08 and for the Republicans and we've seen that in parallel ways between Latino and also with Anglo communities.

But I also want to make the point that Latinos are perfectly capable of reacting against anti-immigrant politics if they see it as indicting all Latinos, it's seen as a way of indicting all immigrants. We can look back at California in the 1990s and how that reaction solidified the Democratic Party in California. I grew up in California and it was certainly trending Republican going into the '80s and the early '90s. After I left it became solidly Democrat and I think a lot of that was because of Latino reaction against anti-immigrant politics that was seen as not worries about immigration policy per se, but against really about the cultural change that was going on in California.

MR. DIONNE: But you just said -- quickly -- I do think the drop off among Evangelical Latinos in the Republican vote was much higher than among other kinds of Evangelicals.

MR. LEAL: Right. The trend was in the same direction. I think it's possibly because they had just been -- they had just spent less time in the Republican coalition. They were more relatively newly recruited, I think, into the Republican Party and this had happened in the 2000s. So they may have just been less solidified in there. It's possible.

MR. LOPEZ: In answer to your question about whether or not the Catholic numbers that we saw in a lot of the stuff that I presented are driven to a large extent by the large share of Catholics that are Hispanic -- absolutely, that is the case. And so if you take out the Hispanics, you're going to see that Catholic support among non-Hispanics from many of the things that I showed start to drop off a little bit. They're going to generally be higher. How much higher? I don't remember the numbers, but generally speaking, you're going to see a drop off compared to when you have the Hispanics in there.

I would also say that, you know, when we talk about Hispanics, particularly Hispanics in the Catholic Church, two-thirds of all Hispanics identify as Catholic. It's the single largest group. So when we're talking about this, we are talking about a group that is very Catholic.

MR. JONES: I'm just going to piggyback on that real quickly. We did some focus groups in Ohio among White moderate Catholics actually and White moderate Protestants to sort of tease out these Catholic-Protestant differences. And one of the interesting things that we found, even among White Catholics, is that they were much more connected to their own families' immigrant experiences than the White Protestants in Ohio were. And so that actually led to some -- even among White Catholics -- a sort of closer to home, a sense of what the immigration process is like and about, that led to higher levels of support that we see. And you can see it in our data, too. Our data has all Catholics. We didn't separate out White and Latino. And the support for Catholics is a good 6 points above the national numbers. So you see it there.

On "welcoming the stranger" I think this is a great point, maybe the point I began with about the social sciences can describe what's out there, it's up to religious leaders and others to describe what to do about it. You know, I think that this may be, as Stephen Prothero and others have pointed out, an issue of biblical literacy here, and this is a general population sample. And we had this on the list because as we looked out at the landscape of what arguments people were using, this was one that we heard all the time. "Welcoming the stranger" comes right out of the Hebrew Bible, comes right out of the New Testament, I mean, it works very well in terms of what religious leaders naturally gravitate to. I think the challenge with it is, absent a biblical literacy that makes it ring in a certain way in one's mind, we have the competing frame of things that we tell our children, right? "Don't talk to strangers." And I think it's this competing frame without a

biblical literacy to trumpet that is kind of conflicting here that makes it a problematic message for the general population. I think that's part of what's going on with that message.

And the Golden Rule, you know, we found a number of issues, works across inner issues. It is a little bit lower. It is interesting that the 8 in 10 are really keeping families together, protecting the dignity of every person. Those were the kind of 8 in 10 values that actually compete head to head with things like promoting national security, securing the border, ensuring fairness to taxpayers. It's up on the top list.

The unaffiliated lower support actually ties to a point that was made earlier in the first panel about increasing -- I think, Kevin, was it you who brought up this rhetoric? There was a piece in *Politico* about Democratic pollsters giving advice to toughen the rhetoric on this. What we see in our data actually is that we're already at the point where we actually are picking up -- in some ways rephrasing the question -- more support from conservatives than we are from liberals. So that unaffiliated number dampening down actually is partially because as we describe the conditions for what it means to have an "earned path to citizenship," many of those liberals actually think that's too harsh, right. And they don't support it, not because they don't support a comprehensive immigration reform, but because they think those conditions of paying a fine, paying back taxes, registering with the government, maybe that bar is too high. So we actually see some dampening as we spell this out with those kinds of provisions. We see some kind of unexpected patterns, like where more liberal groups tend to support it at slightly lower levels. Now they still support it; that's important to say here; that there is still this kind of broad support; there's still majority support.

The last one I want to make real quickly is that we're operating here -- the ghost of the -- another point in the first panel -- we're operating in this thing with an

issue where people say, the majority think the immigration system is broken. Only 7 percent of the country thinks that the immigration system is working well or generally working. However, few Americans say they know a lot about the immigration process. So we've got a situation where the majority of the country thinks something is broken that they don't know a lot about. And I think that leads to an interesting situation where things like the Arizona law fill that vacuum. When we spell it out on surveys and we say this is what a comprehensive approach looks like, then we see this high support.

MR. DIONNE: I just want to add a point where a pollster I know checked on whether requiring illegal immigrants to become citizens -- he discovered that requiring illegal immigrants to become citizens polled better than allowing illegal immigrants to become citizens either because there was, you know, a negative view was, it has a punitive sense, and the positive view is that it deals with the injustice issue. So that I expect some day politicians will toughen their rhetoric by saying, "We're going to require illegal immigrants to become citizens."

MR. GALSTON: Well, alas, we're running a bit late but Korin, can we spend another 10 minutes in here without being thrown out? Okay, then we will. And I would only comment as people -- as the two microphones are arrayed in the front and rear, respectively -- and as people raise their hands, that your point about people thinking that the immigration system is broken but not knowing very much about it is a small instance of a much larger point, namely that people think the government is broken. They don't know very much about that either, which is not to say that if they knew more they'd think better of it.

Okay, in the back I see a hand raised. Who has the microphone in the back?

SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm (inaudible) from Baltimore. You showed (inaudible) of immigration. What comes to our mind are only Latinos or Hispanics and there is really or hardly no mention at all about Asians. And Asians also contribute to some portion of illegal immigrants or whatever. Now when Asians do come here to the United States, usually they arm themselves with education. Many of them have degrees beyond college. Many of them have professional degrees, even Masters and doctorates. So when they come to the United States, they are not a liability. They contribute to the economy. They work hard. They pay taxes. And they get their own health insurance. Now in your own basic sense, who do you think are more of a liability to this society and a burden than those are only eating food stamps, don't work, rely on Medicare and Medicaid, and they live on the streets, on parks, on sidewalks and practically all of their lives they are a burden and a parasite to the government. Whereas these people who come here and work and pay taxes -- in your own basic sense, who do you think are more of a liability and who do you think are more of a burden? Thank you.

MR. GALSTON: Well, there's a question embedded in there. Yes.

MR. LEAL: Well I would just say that Latinos -- this whole idea of liability -- I think Latinos are filling lots of jobs in the economy that many people who are already here don't want to do. And so I think there's a lot of complementarities in the labor force as economists would say. And so I think that Latinos are playing crucial parts throughout many industries in the United States; that it might be difficult for those industries to even exist in the United States if they didn't have immigrant or Latino labor.

As far as qualifying for government programs, most unauthorized immigrants don't qualify for most government programs. Maybe they can get emergency medical care at a local hospital, but for the most part they're not qualifying for a lot of programs. And a lot of immigrants are actually paying taxes. They may not be paying

taxes through their own social security number; it may be somebody else's social security number or a number that doesn't exist, but there actually is a fair amount of taxpaying that goes on through immigrants, even unauthorized immigrants. So I think those are just the first few things that come to my mind. I don't know if anybody else wants to comment on that.

MR. GALSTON: Well, I think in the interest of time since we only have 6 minutes left that perhaps we should move on to the next question. Yes, I see, in the middle there.

MR. FREED: I'm Richard Freed from Lexington, Kentucky. I wonder if in gathering your information about a comprehensive reform the wide support that you have found might be caused in part by the lack of specificity of what that term might mean to the people who respond to it.

MR. JONES: You know it's a great question. I mean it's always worth asking, "what's the question saying," in polling things. And because of what we knew going in, that people don't know a lot about the immigration process, we did spell it out in the survey. We actually spelled out what it means for an earned path to citizenship. And on our Web site the full questionnaire is there. You can see the full question wording. It's all out there, so you know, there's no question about it. We spelled it out saying, "Requiring all illegal immigrants to register with the government, meet certain requirements including working, paying taxes, and learning English before having the opportunity to apply for citizenship." So that's how we spelled it out in the survey. And even when we put competing -- even when we did that and then put competing arguments on the other side that said, "No, that's amnesty, we should just secure the border," we still found 2-to-1 support even with the competing arguments on the other side.

MR. GALSTON: Next question, please. I'm going to take a question from someone who hasn't yet asked one if there is a question from someone who hasn't yet asked one. Way in the back there?

MS. CASING: Did I understand you -- oh, excuse me, Norma Casing. Did I understand you correctly to say that because of differences from countries from which Latino immigrants have come and for other reasons, one cannot politically assume that the Latino electorate is in support of immigration reform, comprehensive immigration reform?

MR. LEAL: What happens in surveys is that support drops off across generational status, and there also are some differences according to national origin group because for some groups like Puerto Ricans, immigration isn't really an issue, so to speak, in the community because they're all Americans and have been since 1917 in the Jones Act; and for Cuban Americans, too, because they've had a special place in U.S. immigration law. So I think that there are differences. I wouldn't say that there's no support, it's just that statistically speaking, it does drop off a little bit and that's one of the complications that we ought to understand. It's not just saying Latinos believe this. I mean there is evidence, I think, the majority of evidence suggests that Latinos are more supportive than others when we talk about more open forms of migration -- not open borders, but in terms of, you know, more sympathetic approaches to migrants and Hispanics. But there is a complication and there are changes according to generational status, according to electorate, and according to national origin groups. And I just think that we have to take these into account when we talk about "Latino opinion" on immigration.

MR. LOPEZ: One other thing that I would add as well is when we ask Hispanics about whether or not the Hispanic community is a single common community

in the United States or if it comes from many different cultures, we find that two-thirds of Hispanics see the Hispanic community actually as coming from separate and different cultures and distinct cultures so that it's actually a very diverse group on many dimensions, along the dimensions just described here, generation, nativity, where people live, in addition to their country of origin.

MR. GALSTON: Okay, here's my game plan for the last three minutes. Peggy, first of all, I want you to know that you are going to get a journalist's bonus for the last question. But what I'd like to do for one of the three remaining minutes is to interpret some body language and perhaps get a dialogue going between Panel 1 and Panel 2.

David, when you speculated that the sharper-than-average drop off between 2004 and 2008 among Latino support for the Republican ticket was attributable - among Evangelicals -- was attributable to the fact that Evangelicals weren't as strongly rooted in that coalition, if I understood you correctly. I saw Sam disagreeing I thought pretty vigorously -- at least to judge by body language. So, Sam, would you like to state your disagreement?

REV. RODRIGUEZ: Respectfully, of course.

MR. LEAL: Well, I didn't mean less strongly; I meant historically. There's a newer sort of group recruited not that right now is less. And this is only a hypothesis because I don't have a super good answer for this trouble.

MR. GALSTON: Well, but still, it's an interesting hypothesis and I think Sam is likely to have an interesting response.

REV. RODRIGUEZ: Respectfully, with the increase of the Hispanic Evangelical support as it pertains to the Republican Party, particularly on socially conservative issues such as life and marriage, we saw 44 percent of Hispanic support on the Republican ticket in 2004. The number of Hispanic Evangelicals was over 60

percent. That number decreased in 2006 after the Sensenbrenner bill. It decreased in 2008. And in polling Hispanic Evangelicals throughout the country, and in conversations with Pew -- we did some exit polling on that -- we saw that immigration was an issue. Not the only issue, not the only concern, but that Obama's narrative resonated with the Hispanic Evangelical community.

MR. GALSTON: Well, this would be an interesting topic to explore more fully.

MR. LEAL: These are all testable hypotheses as we say.

MR. GALSTON: I'm sorry?

MR. LEAL: These are all testable hypotheses as we say in social science.

MR. GALSTON: Right. So many testable hypotheses, so few tests.

MR. DIONNE: --I think it's fantastic myself.

MR. GALSTON: Peggy, you get the last question.

MS. ORCHOWSKI: Thanks so much. I've seen statistics that say that by 2020, the majority of Mormons in both Utah and Nevada will be Latino. I think that's interesting, also to show the diversity of the Latino community. It seems to me just as a comment that the unity among Hispanics is not cultural so much as it is the language, that they come from a Spanish-speaking heritage. Leastways I'm going to be writing about language and politics, and I think there's a lot of identity issues in a heritage language.

But I wanted to ask further, take E.J.'s question about why -- if the religious are so strong, why aren't there so many people support enforcement? Why does -- in Arizona -- if the Latino community is so strong in Arizona, why did the majority of the electorate vote for and support the Arizona law? And could you parse out that

Latino electorate? I understand it's only about 7 percent of the national electorate and about 30 percent normally vote Republican, that's the line I've heard.

MR. LEAL: Well, I think in Arizona the Latino electorate is in the teens, so it's not a strong political force in Arizona. Nationally the average -- it's about 2 to 1 Democrat over Republican. So like in 2004, George Bush got probably the all time high at around 40 percent. But that was, you know, Reagan in '84 had something not too far below that. But the average is about 2 to 1, about 66/33 percent, 35/65, something like that for Ds and Rs.

MR. LOPEZ: One other thing I would add about parsing out the Latino electorate is when we talk about the Latinos not necessarily quite stepping up to the plate like we've always thought that they would given their relative size in the population, that's largely because they're so young and so many are under the age of 18. And when we talk about the Latino electorate sort of coming of age or at least expressing its voice, then equal size to its share of the population, that's probably not going to happen for another 20 to 30 years because we're going to see, true, about an additional 50 to 60 thousand young Latinos turn 18 every month and that's going to continue for another 20 years to 50 to 60 thousand. But it's going to be a very slow process. It's going to take 20 to 30 years for that share of the electorate that's even eligible to vote, that's Hispanic, to kind of match its share in the population, but it's a long-term process.

MR. LEAL: That's right. People talk about the sleeping giant sometimes, this problematic term I think. But the issue is that Latinos vote for the most part for the same reasons that other people do. Latinos vote for age, you know, age issues, citizenship issues, and you also have what's called socio-economic status. And when you take all those other factors into account, the Latino turnout is pretty much what you would expect based on those factors. There's not a lot of cultural leftover there to

explain. There's not a lot of unique Latino culture that's somehow holding the community back. There's not a lot of evidence for that; the evidence is at the same factors structure everyone's turnout in American politics.

MR. JONES: Peggy, I'm going to respond not about Hispanics and the Arizona law, but just to take us back one loop quickly to the values that we found in our poll about what Americans want to see as very important moral guides to immigration reform and the Arizona law. One of the things when the *New York Times* did polling on this, they found a majority supporting, you know, the Arizona law. But in the same poll, they also found 8 in 10 thought that it was going to lead to racial profiling, and 8 in 10 thought it was going to lead to the Hispanic community not cooperating with police out of fear of being deported. And in the article, one of the people they interviewed called the law "a necessary evil." And I think embedded in that is actually something -- going back to this information gap that I was talking about earlier -- that people know it's broken, they don't know what to do with it, they don't know a lot about the process. But this "necessary evil" approach, you know, when they're not presented with a comprehensive solution, they'll reach for a necessary evil. But what our polling shows is what Americans really want from immigration reform is not a choice that's necessary and evil, but a choice that's necessary and good, right, that leads to upholding the best of American values.

MR. GALSTON: Please join me in thanking our second panel.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190