

Summer 2013 U.S. Immigration Alert!

A Newsletter from National Immigrant Solidarity Network
Summer 2013 Issue, Volume 43
No Immigrant Bashing! Support Immigrant Rights!



<http://www.ImmigrantSolidarity.org>

\$2.00/Copy

Immigrant Rights Movement in 2014: Still Long Way to Go..

In This Issue:

Stopping the TPP IS Immigrant Rights! (Pg 1) | 8immigrant youth activists detained upon re-entry to US (Pg 2) | House Passes 2014 NDAA; NSA Surveillance Will Lead to Indefinite Detention (Pg 3) | Senate Immigration Bill Dashes Hopes for Fair, Just Reform (Pg 5) | How the FBI Uses Rapists and Child Molesters to Entrap Gullible People in Terror Stings (Pg 6) | Updates, Please Support NISN! Subscribe the Newsletter! (Pg 8)

Please Donate to National Immigrant Solidarity Network! All Donations Are Tax Deductible!

Make check payable to NISN/AFGJ and it will be tax deductible! Send your check to:
National Immigrant Solidarity Network
P.O. Box 751, South Pasadena, CA 91031-0751

_____ \$100.00 _____ \$ 50.00 _____ \$ 35.00 _____ Other Amount \$ _____
(\$35 or more will receive 1 year free subscriptions of the Immigration Alert! Newsletter)

Stopping the Trans-Pacific Partnership IS Immigrant Rights!

[Alliance for Global Justice] Following is an open, sign-on letter from the Flush the TPP Campaign, of which the Alliance for Global Justice is a part. Right now the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is being negotiated at the same time that Congress is considering a "border surge" in militarization as part of immigration reform. We have already seen that free trade plus border militarization is a combination that kills. This letter explains the relationship between 'free' trade agreements and militarization of the border. The struggle for immigrant rights includes opening borders, not locking them down, and creating fair trade for people and the planet, not corporate trade for profit with impunity. Please consider signing on to this letter (fill out the form below). Then also share this letter with individuals and organizations in your community that work for immigrant rights or that also might be willing to sign on, and encourage them to add their names. We can stop the TPP! The first step is to educate more people about the effects the TPP will have on our communities. Then together, we will flush the TPP.

We write this letter out of concern regarding a looming humanitarian crisis. The prospect of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) along with a surge in border militarization will leave in its wake a trail of displacement and death. The TPP will continue destroying rural economies and uprooting workers in Mexico and elsewhere. More border militarization and criminalization will leave yet more bodies of the undocumented and their families abandoned and lifeless in the desert. We call on fair trade and immigrant rights activists to join together to stop the TPP and to demand real, just immigration reform.

Over 6,000 undocumented workers and their family members have died crossing the US-Mexico border since 1994, the year that the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was passed. It was also when construction of the border wall began. NAFTA led to a 60% increase in migration across the Southern border—a forced migration of people desperately looking for jobs to feed their families. Because of border militarization the undocumented generally enter the US via its most sparsely populated and harshest desert terrains to avoid apprehension. Those who don't make it die from dysentery, dehydration and exposure. The Trans-Pacific Partnership has been called "NAFTA on Steroids". If it passes, it will be the largest FTA in the world, including not only Mexico, the United States and Canada, but also Peru, Chile, Vietnam, Brunei, Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Malaysia, and Singapore. The Obama administration is asking for "Fast Track" authority to negotiate the TPP....

To read and sign the rest of the letter: <http://www.flushthetpp.org/the-tpp-and-immigrant-rights/>

To read the letter in Spanish: <http://www.flushthetpp.org/detener-el-tpp-es-defender-los-derechos-del-inmigrante/>

7/22: Eight immigrant youth activists detained upon re-entry to U.S.

NOGALES, Ariz. (AP) - U.S. authorities have detained eight activists who asked to be allowed to re-enter the United States from Mexico on humanitarian grounds in a protest against American immigration policies.

Customs and Border Protection officials detained the activists Monday after they filed applications for humanitarian parole at the Nogales border crossing to try to return to the United States.

Customs and Border Protection did not immediately comment.

Benito Miller, an organizer for the National Immigrant Youth Alliance, said the group is probably being taken to a detention center.

Margo Cowan, a lawyer for the group, says she will file asylum applications on behalf of the activists if they are denied humanitarian parole.

On the U.S. side of the border, about 60 people waiting for the activists chanted in Spanish, "No papers, no fear."

Three activists left the U.S. and traveled to Mexico expressly to participate in the protest. The group wants to draw attention to the huge jump in deportations carried out under the Obama administration, and reaffirm their attachment to the country where they were raised.

The first one to be detained was Claudia Amaro Escalera, 37, along with her U.S.-born son Yamil, 13. Amaro Escalera returned to Mexico six years ago after her husband was deported but lived more than 20 years in the U.S. and calls America home.

Cowan said, "This will be a decision to be taken by the Obama administration, maybe not immediately but I trust it will be the right decision."

Humanitarian parole means the activists can be released with the understanding that they are not a menace to society, she explained.

Lizbeth Mateo, Lulu Martinez and Marco Saavedra were the three youths who recently left the U.S. to organize the protest from Mexico with the National Immigrant Youth Alliance. They were brought to the U.S. illegally as children and have no legal status there even though they grew up in America.

"We cannot ask others to do something we ourselves are not willing to do," Mateo said before getting to the border.

She added the group hopes the Obama administration will create a process so all those who were deported from the U.S. can return.

"We are giving President Obama a chance to do the right thing. They always say, 'Why don't you come here legally?' Well this is his chance to create the legal process."

Members of NIYA such as Mateo have participated in other acts of civil disobedience, one of them in 2010 in the offices of Sen. John McCain. They have also entered detention centers to publicize cases where prisoners are about to be deported without having a criminal record or a legal recourse.

The activists have said that if they were detained, they would do the same in detention centers in Arizona.

Maria Peniche and Adriana Gil Diaz could have benefited from a deferred action program recently offered by the Obama administration that lets young immigrants live in the U.S. on renewable two-year stays, but they had both returned to Mexico City shortly before the measure was announced.

Peniche, who was raised in Boston, Mass., was hoping to continue her university studies in Mexico, because they were too expensive in the U.S.

"I want to give a face and a voice to those who are undocumented immigrants like myself," she said.

Luis Gustavo Leon, 20, said he has been deported from the U.S. four times. He had gone to Mexico two years ago to continue his university studies but did not get used to the lifestyle there. His parents and brothers are all in North Carolina.

"I will keep trying because my family is there, because even though I'm Mexican, my culture is the American culture," he said.

He added he was not afraid of being detained.

"As long as there is hope, I will fight," Leon said. "If they tell me I can't do it, then I'll give up temporarily, but not completely. I'll go back to Mexico but later on I'll find a way to return."

6/27: House Passes 2014 NDAA; NSA Surveillance Will Lead to Indefinite Detention

By Joe Wolverton - The New American

The annual renewal of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) is underway on Capitol Hill.

On June 14, by a vote of 315-108, the House of Representatives passed the Fiscal Year 2014 version of the NDAA (HR 1960). Several amendments to the defense spending legislation were proposed, many of which were approved either by voice vote or en bloc. The first method of voting requires no report on how individual members voted, while the second method aggregates amendments, allowing them to be voted on in groups.

A few of the amendments represent significant improvements to the NDAA of 2012 and 2013. The acts passed for those years infamously permitted the president to deploy U.S. military troops to apprehend and indefinitely detain any American he alone believed to be aiding enemies of the state.

While the 2014 iteration doesn't go far enough in pushing the federal beast back inside its constitutional cage, there are at least a few congressmen willing to try to crack the whip and restore constitutional separation of powers and shore up a few of the fundamental liberties suspended by the NDAA of the past two years.

First, there is the amendment offered by Representative Trey Radel (R-Fla.). Radel's amendment requires the Department of Defense to submit to the Congress a report every year containing: (1) the names of any U.S. citizens subject to military detention, (2) the legal justification for their continued detention, and (3) the steps the Executive Branch is taking to either provide them some judicial process, or release them. Requires that an unclassified version of the report be made available, and in addition, that the report must be made available to all members of Congress.

Radel's amendment was passed by voice vote.

Next, an amendment offered by Representative Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) would require the federal government, in habeas proceedings for U.S. citizens apprehended in the United States pursuant to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF), to prove by "clear and convincing evidence" that the citizen is an unprivileged enemy combatant and there is no presumption that the government's evidence is accurate and authentic.

The House approved the Goodlatte amendment by a vote of 214-211.

Finally, an amendment by Representative Paul Broun (R-Ga.) forbids the Department of Defense from killing a citizen of the United States by a drone attack unless that person is actively engaged in combat against the United States.

This trio of amendments represents a laudable attempt to restrain the power of the executive. As constitutionalists and civil libertarians are aware, recent occupants of the Oval Office have usurped sweeping unconstitutional powers, including the authority to target Americans for indefinite detention, to withhold from them rights that have been recognized as unalienable since before the Magna Carta, and to kill American citizens who have been charged with no crime and been given no opportunity to defend themselves from the accusations that qualified them for summary assassination.

Despite these small victories in the battle to restore constitutionally protected liberty, the debate on the 2014 NDAA provided several examples of Congress violating their oaths of office by shrinking the scope of basic rights and expanding the power of the president to act as de facto (and now, de jure) judge, jury, and executioner.

For example, two amendments offered by Representative Adam Smith (D-Wash.) were rejected by his colleagues, to their dishonor.

Smith's first proposed amendment would have prohibited indefinite military detention of any person detained under AUMF authority in the United States, territories, or possessions by providing immediate transfer to trial and proceedings by a court

established under Article III of the Constitution or by an appropriate state court.

Not surprisingly, Smith's amendment failed to garner approval, being voted down by a vote of 200-226 (213 Republicans voted against Smith's amendment).

This was not the first time the "conservatives" in Congress rejected a proposal by Representative Smith that would have protected due process and disgorged the president of powers to which he is not entitled. During last year's deliberations on the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013, the House of Representatives voted to perpetuate the president's power to indefinitely detain American citizens.

By a vote of 238-182, members of Congress rejected the amendment offered by Smith and Justin Amash (R-Mich.) that would have repealed the indefinite detention provision passed overwhelmingly in 2011 as part of the 2012 NDAA.

The Fiscal Year 2013 NDAA retained the indefinite detention provisions, as well as the section permitting prisoners to be transferred from civilian jurisdiction to the custody of the military.

"The frightening thing here is that the government is claiming the power under the Afghanistan authorization for use of military force as a justification for entering American homes to grab people, indefinitely detain them and not give them a charge or trial," Representative Amash said during House debate last year.

In his impassioned speech supporting the amendment he proposed last year, Representative Smith reminded his colleagues that the NDAA granted to the president "extraordinary" powers and divested the American people of key civil liberties, as well as divesting civilian courts of their constitutional jurisdiction.

Smith pointed out that there was no need to transfer suspects into military custody as "hundreds" of terrorists have been tried in federal courts since the attacks of September 11, 2001.

The more things change, the more they stay the same. Members of Congress — mostly Republican members — have united in firm defense of the president's unconstitutional power to apprehend and indefinitely detain Americans.

There are very few more powerful reminders that there is no party in Washington, D.C., that is committed to faithfully adhering to the oath of office or to the upholding of the manifold God-given rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution.

Finally, there is in the NDAA for 2014, a frightening fusion of the federal government's constant surveillance of innocent Americans and the assistance it will give to justifying the indefinite detention of anyone labeled an enemy of the regime.

Section 1061 of the 2014 NDAA approved by the House expands on the scope of surveillance established by the Patriot Act and the AUMF. Sec. 1061(a) authorizes the secretary of defense to "establish a center to be known as the 'Conflict Records Research Center.'" According to the current text of the NDAA, the center would be tasked with compiling a "digital research database including translations and to facilitate research and analysis of records captured from countries, organizations, and individuals, now or once hostile to the United States."

In order to accomplish the center's purpose, the secretary of defense will create an information exchange in cooperation with the director of national intelligence.

Key to the functioning of this information exchange will be the collection of "captured records." Section 1061(g)(1), defines a captured record as "a document, audio file, video file, or other material captured during combat operations from countries, organizations, or individuals, now or once hostile to the United States."

When read in conjunction with the provision of the AUMF that left the War on Terror open-ended and previous NDAAs' classification of the United States as a battleground in that unconstitutional war, and you've got a powerful combination that can knock out the entire Bill of Rights.

Finally, when all the foregoing is couched within the context of the revelations regarding the dragnet surveillance programs of the NSA, it becomes evident that anyone's phone records, e-mail messages, browsing history, text messages, and social media posts could qualify as a "captured record."

After being seized by the NSA (or some other federal surveillance apparatus), the seized materials would be processed by the Conflict Records Research Center created by this bill. This center's massive database of electronic information and its collaboration with the NSA converts the United States into a constantly monitored holding cell and all its citizens and residents into suspects. All, of course, in the name of security.

To wit, Americans zealous about retaining their rights and resisting the constant repeal of them by the federal government would be wise to remember the words James Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson in 1798: "It is a universal truth that the loss of liberty at home is to be charged to the provisions against danger, real or pretended, from abroad."

6/28: Senate Immigration Bill Dashes Hopes for Fair, Just Reform

National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights

(Oakland, CA) With the Senate's passage of S. 744, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013, the Board of Directors and members of the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights voiced their disappointment and concern with the dramatic escalation of border enforcement negotiated to secure support from conservative Republican senators hostile to the legalization of undocumented immigrants.

Executive Director, Catherine Tactaquin, commented, "The Senate passed a historic immigration reform bill yesterday. We had hoped the bill would have been historic for upholding the human rights of immigrants, for providing fair and equitable access to visas, protecting their rights as workers, fueling resources to process the long backlog of pending family visa applicants, and ending flawed and punitive immigration enforcement policies at the border and in the interior." She continued, "Unfortunately, S. 744 was not that bill. This is not the kind of legislation and deal-making that we can support nor encourage."

Susan Alva, a Los Angeles-based immigrants rights attorney, also criticized the immigration "compromise": "Legislative deal-making is a given. But in this bill, the legalization carrot has been beaten to a pulp by an enforcement stick that staggers the imagination. By shamelessly presenting this as a victory, proponents of this bill are banking on the toll that years of historic levels of enforcement have already taken on immigrant communities. This is not compromise; this is blackmail."

Board member Christian Ramirez, Human Rights Director at Alliance San Diego, spoke to the Corker-Hoeven "border surge" amendment added in the final days of negotiations: "Despite this unwarranted aggression against 15 million people who call the border home and the irresponsible language of war and occupation used in the Senate floor to refer to the safest region in the United States, southern border communities will continue to ensure that rights and dignity are restored for the betterment of the people of the United States." He continued, "The threat of militarization by policy makers has no place in a democratic society. Social and economic needs cannot and must not be resolved through military might if we are to preserve our morals and values as a society."

Board Chairperson Eduardo Canales of Corpus Christi, Texas, added that the bill "perpetuates and enhances failed policies of increased enforcement on the border and will continue to increase migrant deaths." He also warned that the expansion of the "E-verify" employment verification system would "allow further discrimination and racial profiling of immigrants and other workers of color."

Other board members also raised an alarm about the consequences of the dramatic escalation of the border security program. Hamid Khan, based in Southern California, stated that the bill served as a model for what he termed as the "Surveillance Industrial Complex." "Under the guise of public safety and security, he commented, "the bill is a political investment in the further strengthening and legitimization of the police state." He identified the huge transfer of public funds to be invested in surveillance equipment, data collection and data mining, enhanced communications interoperability and information sharing between federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies. "Intermixing current and new technologies, enhancing operational capacities, adding thousands of new customs and border patrol agents are key steps in a full spectrum of information gathering, storing, sharing and disseminating as necessary tools for social control."

Monami Maulik, Executive Director of the New York-based Desis Rising Up and Moving-DRUM, raised similar concerns. "This bill is not what thousands of our members, as South Asian immigrants, have been organizing tirelessly for years alongside so many communities," she said. "Congress will send an alarming message to all of us and the world, that human rights are no concern to the U.S." She continued, "This bill is using immigration as an excuse to further a national security state—to fly drones above us, surveil us, and set the stage for a national ID system and database. We need real human rights-based reform. The world is watching."

Gerald Lenoir, Executive Director of the Black Alliance for Just Immigration, described the bill as "a nasty piece of legislation that attempts to codify repression on the border and wasteful spending." He also expressed concern about the limitations of the legalization program: "It falls far short of the promise of a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants. The onerous work and income provisions will disqualify millions of low income undocumented immigrants from accessing the path to a green card and citizenship."

“S. 744 does not deliver even our minimum aspiration for immigration reform: bringing the undocumented community ‘out of the shadows’, commented Lillian Galedo, Executive Director of Filipino Advocates for Justice, based in Oakland, California. “The proposed legalization program will not legalize 11 million people. The 10 to 20 year ‘path’ to citizenship will not benefit the mostly elderly Filipino caregivers in our base.’ She also stated that they “totally oppose the massive militarization of the border and border communities. The only beneficiaries of this boondoggle are the war and prison contractors whose successful lobbying resulted in a \$46 billion set-aside for ‘border security’. This is a sad day for human rights.”

Bill Chandler, Executive Director of the Mississippi Immigrant Rights Alliance and a longtime labor organizer, expressed concern about the bill’s drive to increase and continue guest worker programs. These, he said are “another form of indentured servitude and a benefit for employers, not workers.”

Board member Janis Rosheuvel, Executive for Racial Justice with United Methodist Women in New York, declared, “As people of faith, we call on our elected officials to end the criminalization of communities of color exemplified by this bill. We call for justice-driven legislation that delves into the root causes of migration and does not rely on punitive policies as a matter of course. Our communities and nation deserve more.”

The National Network pledges, as the immigration reform debate focuses on the House and where hostile representatives have declared their opposition to any form of legalization, to continue the fight for fair and just immigration reform. “We will push back on the mean-spirited, xenophobic and punitive proposals that have already begun to emerge there,” said Tactaquin, adding, “The Obama Administration also needs to shoulder greater responsibility for the well-being and safety of immigrant communities, and break this downward spiral in the direction of immigration reform. We call on the Administration to start by suspending detentions and deportations and keeping families together as we continue on this difficult road to immigration reform.”

7/17: How the FBI Uses Rapists and Child Molesters to Entrap Gullible People in Terror Stings

Trevor Aaronson - Alternet

The FBI’s search for would-be terrorists is so all-consuming that agents are willing to partner with the most heinous of criminals if they appear able to deliver targets. That’s what happened in Seattle, Washington, in the summer of 2011, when agents chose to put on the government payroll a convicted rapist and child molester.

The investigation began on June 3, 2011, when a man contacted the Seattle Police Department and told them that he had a friend named Abu Khalid Abdul-Latif who was interested in attacking Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Tacoma, Washington. The tipster told police that Abdul-Latif had already recruited an associate, a man named Walli Mujahidh. Seattle police referred the caller to the FBI, whose agents quickly enlisted him as an informant and launched a full investigation of Abdul-Latif and Mujahidh.

Based on these initial actions, it was clear that the FBI believed it was dealing with two dangerous potential terrorists. But in reality, what it had were two financially troubled men with histories of mental problems. Abdul-Latif, whose birth name was Joseph Anthony Davis, had spent his teenage years huffing gasoline and once told a psychologist he heard voices and saw things that weren’t there. When he was twenty-three, he tried to commit suicide by overdosing on pills intended to treat seizure disorders, later telling a psychologist that he “felt lonely and had no use to live.” His partner in the supposed terrorist plot, thirty-one-year-old Mujahidh, whose name was Frederick Domingue Jr. before his conversion to Islam, had been diagnosed with schizoaffective disorder, which causes mood swings and abnormal thoughts. Dorothy Howard, who met Mujahidh through her daughter when they lived in Pomona, California, remembered him as sweet-natured but gullible, someone who was trying hard to get a handle on his mental problems but wasn’t always successful. “Sometimes he would call me and say, ‘Mrs. Howard, I really need my medications. Can you take me to the clinic?’” Howard recalled. “Sometimes they would keep him three or four days.”

The FBI’s informant, whose name was not revealed, was the only source claiming that Abdul-Latif and Mujahidh were terrorists on the make. And the informant came with an outrageous story of his own. In addition to being a convicted rapist and child molester, according to government records, he had stolen thousands of dollars from Abdul-Latif in the past and had tried, but failed, to steal Abdul-Latif’s wife as well. The state of Washington had also classified the informant as a high-risk sex offender, and while working for the FBI, he was caught sending sexual text messages in violation of his parole—something he attempted to hide from agents by trying to delete the messages. Despite what were obvious problems with the investigation from the start, the FBI gave the informant recording equipment and instructed him to move forward with the sting.

As Abdul-Latif and the informant discussed possible targets—after growing concerned that attacking a military base would be too difficult, given the armed guards and fortification—it became clear that the Seattle man had no capacity to carry out a terrorist attack. In fact, Abdul-Latif had little capacity for anything, since he had only \$800 to his name, and his only asset was a 1995 Honda Passport with 162,000 miles. In addition, his supposed accomplice, Mujahidh, was still in Southern California. But his friend, the informant, said he could provide everything they would need for the attack, including M13 assault rifles, rocket-propelled grenades, and bulletproof vests. That Abdul-Latif didn't have much money and didn't know anyone who could provide him with weapons strongly suggested that the plot was nothing more than talk, and would have stayed that way had the FBI not gotten involved.

After scuttling the idea to attack Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Abdul-Latif and the informant settled on a plan to attack a Seattle processing station for incoming troops, where most of the people would be unarmed. "Imagine how many young Muslims, if we're successful, will try to hit these kinds of centers. Imagine how fearful America will be, and they'll know they can't push Muslims around," Abdul-Latif said. On June 14, 2011, Abdul-Latif and the informant purchased a bus ticket for Mujahidh to travel to Seattle from Los Angeles. Needing to select a password that would allow Mujahidh to pick up the ticket at the station, Abdul-Latif initially suggested "jihad." He and the informant laughed about the password choice before Abdul-Latif decided on "OBL," for Osama bin Laden.

A week later, Mujahidh arrived in Seattle, and the three men drove to a parking garage to inspect the weapons the informant had procured. Inside a duffel bag were three assault rifles. Mujahidh took hold of one of the guns, aimed, and pulled the trigger. Abdul-Latif inspected one of the other rifles. "This is an automatic?" he asked. The informant then showed him how to switch on the rifle's setting for automatic firing. At that point, FBI agents rushed into the garage and arrested Abdul-Latif and Mujahidh. The two men were charged with conspiracy to murder officers and agents of the United States, conspiracy to use a weapon of mass destruction, and four firearms counts. The FBI paid the informant \$90,000 for his work on the case.

Michele Shaw was the public defender appointed to Mujahidh. When she first met him inside a jail in Seattle, she couldn't believe he was the man the government had portrayed as a dangerous terrorist. "He is the most compliant client I have ever worked with in my twenty-two years of practicing law and so appreciative of our weekly visits," Shaw said. From the start, Shaw knew she had a mental health case on her hands, not a terrorist case. Mujahidh was easily susceptible to the informant, she believed, because he had a history of relying on others to help him separate fantasy from reality. But the judge in the case didn't agree. "Walli's mental health issues in my opinion are huge and looming large, but the court stated this week on the record that my client's mental health issues are a very tiny part of this case," Shaw told me in October 2011. Unable to use mental health in an entrapment defense, Shaw reluctantly recommended that Mujahidh plead guilty. He agreed, and was sentenced to twenty-seven to thirty-two years in prison. For his part, Abdul-Latif pleaded not guilty and is awaiting trial. [Editor's note: In March, after Aaronson's book was published, Abdul-Latif pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 18 years in prison.] Had it not been for a rapist and child molester fishing for a payday, Abdul-Latif and Mujahidh would likely be today where they were in June 2011—two Americans you'd never hear about, trapped on the margins of a society to which they posed no threat.

Abu Khalid Abdul-Latif and Walli Mujahidh became terrorists because the FBI and one of its informants had incentives for making the pair into terrorists. The informant's incentive was monetary, while the FBI agents who supervised the sting were under intense pressure from their higher-ups to build a terrorism case. At no point during the sting operation did anyone question whether someone like Abdul-Latif was more despondent loser than scary mass murderer. That is a problem inherent in today's terrorism sting operations: the FBI and its informants are under pressure—albeit for different reasons—to see terrorists, even where none exist.

Since informants have vested interests in seeing their targets convicted—with criminal informants often having their own personal freedom on the line—it's the FBI's responsibility to ensure that these interests do not influence investigations. If the Bureau is following "the book" during an investigation, agents will give an informant tasking orders before each meeting between the informant and the targets. These orders will include what the informant should discuss and how he should behave during the meeting. Ideally, the meeting with the targets should be taped, giving the FBI an indisputable record of what was said. At regular intervals, FBI agents should also subject their informant to a polygraph test to make sure he isn't lying or withholding information. If the informant fails the polygraph, or engages in criminal behavior not authorized by the FBI, agents are supposed to cut him from the ranks.

However, the FBI doesn't always work by the book. We know this because the Bureau has documented many occasions when it doesn't play by its own rules. Elie Assaad, the informant in the Florida stings involving Imran Mandhai and the Liberty City Seven, lied during a polygraph examination in Chicago yet continued to work as an FBI informant. In the Michael Finton case, the FBI had credible information that its informant was dealing drugs yet continued to use him until the final day of the sting operation. The informant in the Rezwan Ferdaus case was caught on an FBI video purchasing heroin and still the Bureau continued to pay him for his work. These informants were allowed to lead terrorism stings because the pressure to find would-be terrorists is so great that it's created a precarious situation in which FBI agents identify loudmouths on the

fringes of society and through, elaborate sting operations involving informants, many with criminal backgrounds, transform these powerless braggarts into dangerous terrorists engaged in horrifying plots to bomb buildings, public squares, and subway stations.

Please subscribe to our ISN Immigrants Daily-Info E-mail List!

Send e-mail to: isn-subscribe@lists.riseup.net or web: <http://lists.riseup.net/www/info/isn>

Please Download Your Activism Videos at ActivistVideo.org

ActivistVideo.org is the video activism service created by National Immigrant Solidarity Network and Action LA, the first professional video sharing site for activist community!

Please Donate to National Immigrant Solidarity Network!

All Donations Are Tax Deductible!

Make check payable to NISN/AFGJ and it will be tax deductible! Send your check to:
National Immigrant Solidarity Network
P.O. Box 751, South Pasadena, CA 91031-0751

_____ \$100.00 _____ \$ 50.00 _____ \$ 35.00 _____ Other Amount \$ _____
(\$35 or more will receive 1 year free subscriptions of the Immigration Alert! Newsletter)

Please join our Following NISN E-mail Lists

Asian American Labor Activism Alert!

send e-mail to: api-la-subscribe@lists.riseup.net
or visit: <http://lists.riseup.net/www/info/api-la>

New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Pennsylvania areas immigrant workers information and alerts

send e-mail to: nyc-immigrantalert-subscribe@lists.riseup.net
or visit: <http://lists.riseup.net/www/info/nyc-immigrantalert>

US-Mexico Border Information and Action Alert!

send e-mail to: Border01-subscribe@yahoogroups.com
or visit: <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Border01/>

Virginia state-wide immigrant organizing E-mail list

send e-mail to: va-immigrantrights-subscribe@lists.riseup.net
or visit: <https://lists.riseup.net/www/info/va-immigrantrights>

May Day 2008 national organizing e-mail list

send e-mail to: mayday2008-subscribe@lists.riseup.net
or visit: <https://lists.riseup.net/www/info/MayDay2008>

About National Immigrant Solidarity Network

NISN is a coalition of community, immigrant, labor, human rights and student activist groups, founded in 2002 in response to the urgent needs for the national coalition to fight immigrant bashing, support immigrant rights, no to the sweatshops exploitation and end to the racism on the community. Please visit our website:
<http://www.ImmigrantSolidarity.org>

Contact Information:

E-mail: info@ImmigrantSolidarity.org
(213) 403-0131 (Los Angeles)
(212) 330-8172 (New York)
(202) 595-8990 (Washington D.C.)
(773)942-2268 (Chicago)

Please donate to NISN! (All donations are tax deductible!)
Check pay to: NISN/AFGJ
Send to: **National Immigrant Solidarity Network**
P.O. Box 751
South Pasadena, CA 91031-0751

**Please subscribe to the U.S. Immigration Alert!
A Monthly Newsletter from National Immigrant
Solidarity Network**

1 year subscription rate (12 issues) is \$35.00

It will help us pay for the printing costs, as well as funding for the NISN projects (additional donations to the ISN is tax deductible!)

Check pay to: NISN/AFGJ

National Immigrant Solidarity Network
P.O. Box 751
South Pasadena, CA 91031-0751