



www.trackedinamerica.org

PRE-WORLD WAR ONE

HISTORIANS:

Geoffrey Stone – The Individual is Above the Government 1:09

One of the dangers in a successful democracy over a long period of time, is that individuals may become more remote from the government and may feel themselves less responsible and believe that somehow this machine just works by itself. One of the reasons why Constitutional liberties are very important is because they mark off that boundary between what government can do to a person and what a person has a right not to have done to him. And the very fact that there are things that the government may not do to the individual – deprive him of the freedom of speech or freedom of religion or search his home without adequate justification or deny equal protection of the laws – those are essentially critical assertions of the fact that the individual is above the government. And people need to have that in their own minds, especially if they are going to fulfill their responsibilities in times of crisis. They need to be aware of the fact that they are the democracy.

Geoffrey Stone – Promise of the First Amendment 1:21

From 1801 until the Civil War, there were very few Federal restrictions on expression and the primary reason for that is we didn't have a major war-time episodes. And another part of it is that the lessons of the alien and Sedition Acts in 1800 had a real impact on the American culture and for a period made pretty real the promise of the First Amendment, that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. Many of the states, particularly the Southern states in that period had laws against abolition literature and they did make it a crime for anyone to advocate abolition of slavery or to distribute abolitionist literature in the slave-holding states. It was really with the Civil War, where truly the continued existence of the Union was at stake, that the pressure was again raised to a level where some efforts to suppress newspapers and to punish individuals who were disloyal in their speech reached the surface. But even in the Civil War, the government did not enact a sedition act.

Ellen Schrecker – Collaboration between the State and the Private Sector 1:09

The employers were using all forms of repression. They also were able to rely on the state, especially the federal judiciary, to hand down injunctions against strikes that were very effective. So that as this country moved toward World War I, there was already a fairly high level of political repression, including surveillance, especially within certain

industries where the workers were trying organize. The corporations paid for large numbers of industrial spies that would infiltrate the work force and provide the names of union activists who the companies would then fire. One of the key characteristics of the suppression of dissent in this country is that it's a collaborative project between the private sector and the state. And this is the case really throughout American history.

Adam Green – Denial of Rights 1:27

The ideal, in a slave society, is one of total control. And total involvement on the part of the population in enacting the discipline and the control of the population that is subjugated. The sense that everybody in the South was responsible for identifying runaway slaves. And of course this is something that carries over after emancipation in the form of Jim Crow laws that basically dictate that there is going to be an investment on the part of every white person in maintaining the culture in the system of white supremacy. This kind of sense of a history of total control as being the ways in which people ideally imagine the disciplining of populations that were seen as alien, foreign, different, in relation to the larger conception of the American body politic is one that we have to think about as, you know, constantly pointing out how profoundly abusive things might become. One has to step back and think about the full arc of the history of this country and understand that there really are not necessarily limits on how deep the denial of rights might go in this country in relation to a population that is indoctrinated to feel scared enough about a particular class of people in their midst.

Gary Okihiro – Land of Immigrants 1:16

America has had this double-standard in regards to its peoples. On the one hand it welcomes people insofar as it considers them useful to this society. On the other, those very same people might be deemed to be threats to the country when their usefulness has expired. What I refer to is labor migrations to the US that included Africans under slavery, Europeans, the poor working classes of Europe that helped to fuel industrial growth, and Asians like the Chinese, Japanese, South Asians, who were recruited to help build America. Those then were welcomed initially. But when they demand higher wages and other kinds of social amenities, then they became undesirable and exclusion laws were instigated against them.

WORLD WAR ONE

WILL BERGFELD

Clip 1 (1:10)

Will Bergfeld got a job as a rural ranch mail carrier. When he delivered the mail, he saw the plight of the immigrants.... their inability to sell their goods, their inability to transport the goods, and the lack of water and access to water. So he helped to form an organization called the Farmers and Laborers Protective Association. But there were a lot of people in the area who objected to the organization. They were powerful people who were afraid of people organizing together, because somehow they might vote them out of office or they might make demands for the water that was needed or they might want better rates for shipping on the railroad. So they were very opposed to organizations like this and they called it socialistic and communistic.

Clip 2 (:59)

World War I was approaching. There was a lot of talk about conscription, drafting people so they would have to fight against Germany. Now these people, many of whom had German surnames, were very afraid of being drafted and put into a war that they didn't really understand. They had so many survival issues right where they were that the last thing they wanted to do was have to leave this country. And Will was very opposed to being drafted and he opposed conscription. In that time if you didn't believe in the war and if you didn't think that Woodrow Wilson was absolutely right or if you didn't like some aspect of the way the war was handled, well then they didn't think you were a good American.

Clip 3 (1:14)

My mother says that she spent a lot of time looking at the prairie dogs that had a big mound out in the front yard and one of the first things that you learned about the prairie dogs is that they could hear a train coming from miles away. And on the night of the arrests, the prairie dogs acted really funny. And, so her mother said, I wonder if a train is coming? Just after dark these men jumped through the windows and shackled and chained her father and put him on this train. And 43 men in those different rural areas were arrested and taken by train to Fort Worth where they were put in jail to await their hearings in Federal Court. He was arrested for resisting conscription, for advocating that American people resist the draft. And he was arrested for threatening to kill President Woodrow Wilson.

MAX WERKENTHIN

Clip 1 (0:50)

Thursday, May the second. A committee meeting according to the report from our members from barrack 5 was a wrangle over words and the legal rights which some seem to think we have. It is surprising that there should still be anybody who claims civil rights. We have none. And the only way to improve our condition is to petition the commanding officer to kindly grant certain reasonable requests. We in our barrack have instructed our delegates to bring to discussion three things: ten minutes more for meal times, one additional night for moving picture show, and to furnish iced tea during the summer. I feel sure that these requests if properly presented, would have been granted by the Captain. It seems to be typically German to debate over trifles, to hold long dissertations over imaginary rights.

Clip 2: (0:39)

Saturday May eleventh. After roll call we oiled our barracks. Then I talked with a Mr. B. about a movement now underway of getting the Department of Justice to investigate the cases of those interns who have their interests here in the U.S. and who have not been guilty of disloyalty in any respect whatever. We figure that, if our cases could be given attention by the Department, there is a strong possibility of our being paroled. In my next letter from Berni I hope to get some information as to the progress he has made in my case, in which parole has been recommended by Mr. Baldwin, U.S. Special Agent, himself.

Clip-3: (0:56)

Tuesday, May twenty first. Worked again on that stone crusher, loading wagons with crushed stones and unloaded the big rocks. In the morning it was not so bad, but still bad enough. In the afternoon, the heat and dust became unbearable. Those of us who have lived and labored in this country, and given to it the best there was in us, will experience great difficulty to forget the treatment accorded us. First, the jail confinements together with criminals of all sorts, then transportations under military cover and handcuff, then placed in a very primitive detention camp, "voluntarily" forced to labor and to get paid for that slavery 25 cents per day. Posterity will not forget that American treatment of interned Americans of German descent.

Clip 4: (0:59)

Saturday, May twenty fifth. There are too many yet who do not realize that they are prisoners. If a prisoner fails to carry out a given command or interferes with the execution of orders given to their guards, they are laying themselves open to punishment. In the case of the so called "voluntary" work in the stone quarry, it is not primarily a question of whether or not the officer in charge of the camps has the right to force men not adapted for such labor to work, but rather a question of obeying a military order or not. The men in the small stockade are in there because they refused to obey the order to sign for "voluntary work." The only criticism I can see in this procedure is that they apparently only ask for "voluntary," while really they mean forced labor. On the other hand I can see that from a diplomatic standpoint of view, it looks very well in a report in

which they can say that the prisoners have “volunteered” to work and that even then the Government has kindly given a nominal pay of 25 cents a day.

HISTORIANS:

Geoffrey Stone –Protesting the War 1:21

Many people feel that dissent in war time is truly treasonable because there is a sense that once you are in a war it is essential to win the war and to win the war the nation must be unified, and for individuals to go around criticizing the war saying it is immoral, saying that the draft is unjust. All of those types of statements infuriate people who are committed to the war because they believe that these statements make it more difficult for the nation to succeed in the conflict and even worse, strengthen the resolve of the enemy. There is the additional factor of politicians who seek to take advantage of a war-time environment and the fears that are generated by such an environment in order to serve their own political ends. So the pressures to restrict civil liberties, and particularly to repress dissent in wartime, are very powerful.

Ellen Schrecker – The Palmer Raids 1:06

The Palmer raids was clearly in part a response to the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, to the increased activities of American radicals, as well as to the activities of very small groups of anarchists who were actually sending bombs around the country. A. Mitchell Palmer was under pressure from Congress to crack down on radicals so that's what he did. And one of the things that's important to realize here is that even though most of the people who were rounded up had nothing to do with any illegal activity, there was enough plausibility to the charges that anarchists were bombing people or to the threat that these repressive rounds-ups were intended to counter. What's interesting is that many of the prosecutions that the government undertook under the Espionage and Sedition Acts worked their way through the courts and are supporting the government. This is another characteristic of political repression that, at the time these repressive activities are taking place, the judiciary usually condones it.

Adam Green African-Americans and Communism 1:21

There is certainly a great degree of social ferment that is going on. African-Americans have fought during World War I and are more apt to assert that by virtue to their service to the country they should be respected as equal citizens within the country. African-Americans are also becoming more militant. They utilize their prerogative to critique the government of the United States. That all said, there is little if any proof that African-Americans are becoming more allied, more connected to the radical movement of Communism or Socialism. The presumption was that if African-Americans are becoming more apt to critique the American state, then African-Americans must be more susceptible to subversive activity. In part because their radicalism is something that is threatening and beyond the kind of comprehension as most people thought about it at that time. And also, paradoxically, because African-Americans, were also seen as incapable of directing their own political passions and energies and that, therefore, there must be some external element that is agitating them and automatically presupposed some larger nefarious subversive agenda in relation to national security.

PEARL HARBOR

ART SHIBIYAMA

Clip 1 (0:53)

Every time a US Army transport came into Callao, word got around so that the head of the family went into hiding, and my father included. And the police came to our house, not finding my father, they took my mother and put her in jail. And my sister, who was only 11 at the time, she went with my mother because she didn't want her to go to jail by herself. My father, as soon as he found out about it, he came out of hiding so they released my mother and my sister. Then they gave him so many days to get ready to board the Army transport. The next thing I remember is when we were on board of the US Army transport.

Clip 2 (1:03)

Twenty-one days from Callao through Panama Canal, to New Orleans. And during that 21 days, we were only allowed to go on deck twice a day and during that time, the women and children had to stay in the cabin. In New Orleans we landed and the women and children were let off the ship first and they were marched into like a warehouse and they were ordered to strip and stand in line naked and then they were sprayed with some kind of insecticide and then after shower they were put on a train and then the men went through the same process. And that was the first time we got to see the rest of the family. We were put on the same coach and my sister says she felt so humiliated because she had to stand naked in front of boys her own age.

Clip 3 (1:07)

We got off the train and put on the bus and the bus took us to the Crystal City camp. In the middle of nowhere. But then they already had Japanese Americans and they had Germans and Italians in there, too. We were enclosed by a barbed wire fence with towers, with machine guns. They were thinking about exchanging Japanese Americans for the prisoner in Japan. But they figure, later on, they are going to get in trouble because you exchange American citizen for another American citizen, except different ethnic, so that's the reason they went to South America to get people to exchange. We found out after, after they took some of the people from our camp to use for exchange.

Clip 4 (1:18)

In 1952 we were fighting deportation now. They classify us as illegal alien. I got a US Army draft notice. Can you believe that? Here I am fighting deportation and I get a US Army draft notice. So then I figure since I am fighting deportation I better go join the US Army, right? In the Army, one day my section leader he says, hey Art, he says how come you not a citizen? So I told him what happened to me. He says I'll get you one. My paper went to Washington, came back. I was denied. Because I didn't have a legal entry. Now how can that not be legal entry when the US brought us here forcibly? They brought us on the US Army transport. They put us in the Justice Department camp. Where is the illegal part?

FRED KOREMATSU

Clip 1: (1:02)

I was a welder at Moore Drydock and Shipyard and I was doing so well that the superintendent said that he would like to advance me as foreman. So Monday when I went in to punch my time in, I find instead of my time card a note telling me to report to the union. So I went to the union. And there the agent approached me and told me I no longer was in the union and you cannot work in the shipyard. And I said, "Why?" I showed him my union card and it showed that I still had two more weeks before my dues were due. And he says, "I'm sorry, this is wrong." And he took my card and he went in his office and I lost my job. Well, I felt that, you know, hey I'm an American and I'm here to help out in defense work and I have nothin' to do with Japan and, ah, so it's sort of an insult to me. I was very upset about it but I couldn't do anything about it.

Clip 2: (0:57)

A guard came to me there and said "You got a visitor." And I said, "I got a visitor?" And it just didn't dawn on me who it could be, because all my friends were either in--in the service or in relocation centers. But I went anyway. But here this man was in the visitors room in a grey suit. And he says, "I'm Ernest Besig, and I'm an attorney. And, ah, I belong to the ACLU." And then he said, "Is there anybody helping you on your case?" I said, "No." And he says, "Well, I would like to--to help you." And it just dawned on me. Here's this fellow, that I don't even know, out of the blue sky come and wanted to help me. And even in the papers it says, "Jap Spy Caught in San Leandro" and so forth. And here this fellow wanted to help me. I just couldn't believe it.

Clip 3: (0:53)

Judge said that I violated the military order, you know. And that um the sentence gonna be \$5,000. And to my surprise, Mr. Besig took out his check book and wrote it out without hesitation and gave it to the uh clerk. And we start walking out. And as we opened the door, I said, "Wow," the sun was shining, and I just couldn't believe it, here we were going out the door. And then I looked real good, there was four MPs standing there. They were waiting, and Mr. Besig said, "You haven't any authority over him." They said, "We have orders from my commanding officer that he is not going to take a step outside this door." And they start pulling out the guns. So the MPs took me. And they took me down to the Presidio.

Clip 4: (0:47)

In 1944, in Detroit, I received a letter from Mr. Besig and, and there he told me that we lost in the Supreme Court. And I just couldn't believe it. And ah it, it just seemed the bottom dropped out. I, I just felt that, am I an American or not? I said, I'm an American and, and just as long as I'm in this country that I'm gonna keep on going and if there is a chance of reopening the case, I will do it. When I was vindicated, after that I felt that I'm an American again, you know, and I wasn't afraid to speak up. That I was just as equal as anybody else. And all Asians are just as equal as others.

HISTORIANS:

Geoffrey Stone – Price Of Safety 1:07

The burden of the restriction of civil liberties tends to fall on a group or groups who are already viewed contemptuously by the mainstream of Americans. During the Civil War for example, it is Unionists taking away the liberties of those who were suspected of being sympathetic to the South. Or in World War I it is the Anglo-American established citizen taking away the rights of new immigrants from Southern Europe and Eastern Europe who are seen as suspicious and possibly disloyal. In World War II the United States responds with particular viciousness against the Japanese and Japanese-Americans. So there is always an other against whom one can address the restrictions and in that sense there is a way of having one's cake and eating it too. That is, the majority of Americans can feel as if they are being made safer without actually paying any of the price for securing that safety.

Ellen Schrecker – Rise of the Communist Party 1:06

During the 1930s and 1940s, the Communist party for a lot of reasons, not all of them very good, was the most dynamic organization on the left. Other organizations may not have supported the Soviet Union, but they weren't out organizing day after day in the in the automobile factories, in colleges, among housewives. The Communist party was really so dynamic during this period that many people who wanted to oppose fascism, who wanted to oppose racial segregation, really felt that the most effective way they could do it was working with the Communist party and they joined it or they worked in many of these organizations that the party supported and established.

Gary Okihiro –The Japanese Menace 1:12

The US government sent various commissions to Hawaii to investigate the so-called "Japanese menace" in 1917-1918. The US military and the then Bureau of Investigation, which is the civilian arm that later became the FBI, investigated the situation in Hawaii, especially after 1920. And they all uniformly declared the Japanese to be a menace to American interests in Hawaii, both in terms of labor and in terms of a potential military threat and they developed strategies by which to contain this perceived menace. And so the expectation of war with Japan was not new on the eve of Pearl Harbor, was that the FBI and the military had names of all of the leaders of the Japanese community. These were not deemed to be subversives or even potential subversives. These were simply leaders of the community and the expectation was to detain them for the war's duration.

Gary Okihiro – Hostage in America 1:11

The US in anticipation of prisoner of wars in the Pacific, which began very early with the fall of the Philippines and the taking by Japanese soldiers of US military and civilian, they developed a so-called hostage exchange plan whereby hostages held by both countries would be exchanged. And so the Japanese in Central and South America were seen by the US government as a means by which to facilitate that exchange because they were not US citizens and these South American governments were susceptible to US influence. So the US government negotiated with various governments in South America and Central America to round up their Japanese, transport them to the US to be held in

Department of Justice camps in anticipation of exchanges with Japan, which in fact they did.

Gary Okihiro – Campaign of Americanization 1:48

The Japanese-American case illustrates or exemplifies this position of minorities in this country. Minorities are those who are separated from power. They are not necessarily people of color. Japanese-Americans, having been put in these detention camps, had the lesson before them that they were vulnerable. A vast majority came to the conclusion that by not protesting, by remaining quiet, by demonstrating their so-called loyalty by being in the camps, they would eventually gain entry into US society. The War Relocation Authority, deliberately undertook a campaign of so-called Americanization and the idea was to assimilate these Japanese into American life in some way. So in some camps, especially in the early years, Japanese language was forbidden. Christianity was preferred over Buddhism. The US citizens were preferred over their parents, the older generation which went against Japanese culture. All of these kinds of seductions of assimilating into American life to gain acceptance, were effective on most Japanese-Americans. The military also was a means by which some of them sought to establish their loyalty with blood on the battlefields, believing or hoping that that demonstration would secure rights for themselves and their families.

McCARTHY ERA

CHARLES MUSCATINE

Clip 1 (1:00)

I was fired in the summer of 1950 for refusal to sign an oath having to do with membership in the Communist Party. I felt that in the first place it was a violation of the oath to the US Constitution that I had already taken. And secondly it was a violation of academic freedom, which is the idea that in a free society scholars and teachers are allowed to express and believe anything that they feel to be true. As a young assistant professor, I had been insisting to the kids that you stick to your guns and you tell it the way you see it and you think for yourself and you express things for yourself and I felt that I couldn't really justify teaching students if I weren't behaving the same way. So I simply couldn't sign the oath.

Clip 2: (1:00)

The prospect of being fired, particularly if you don't have tenure, is a serious one. And many people, a lot of them were younger people who had not made big reputations and could easily find a job, and a lot of them were people who had lived beyond their peaks and who if they lost this job might not be able to get another one. And in that particular climate, which was so poisonous, there was always a problem that if you got a reputation for being "a Communist sympathizer," which none of us was, you couldn't get a job anywhere. So it was a very serious situation, fraught with danger for yourself and your family, that came in upon people gradually as the controversy prolonged itself. It took more than a year, for this to sink in and to realize that the reagents might actually do this.

Clip 3 (1:02)

A lot of the people who actually ended up as non-signers, and there were very few finally, you know 30 or so, were not very subject to fear, but they were subject to heartbreak and disappointment. There were some great, great scholars in this university who had been refugees from the Nazis. Edelstein, the great classicist from Heidelberg, and Kontorovich, the great historian and others, world-famous people, who were forced to go through this a second time. This was a heartbreaking experience for them. Edward Tollman and some of his other colleagues in psychology were men who had been studying the authoritarian personality and been studying these phenomena, these very people that were oppressing us and they knew more than anyone else what this meant in terms of psychology. So that's where the real hurt came.

CONN HALLINAN

Clip 1: (1:00)

What put him on the radar was the Bridges trial. He defended Harry Bridges, who was the president of the International Longshoremen of Warehousemen's Union. Harry Bridges was the trade unionist who organized the 1934 general strike in San Francisco, which was the only successful general strike in US history. The government wanted to get Harry. They said Harry was dangerous. Harry Bridges was an icon in the American Progressive movement. Harry Bridges really created the first integrated industrial union in the United States. The government pulled out every stop it could to get Harry Bridges and my father was a speed bump. It turned out to be a little more of a bump than they thought he was going to be. but he was a speed bump. And so they just went out to smash him. And the best way to do that was to go at the family.

Clip 2: (1:25)

This was when my father was in prison. This guy, he presented himself as a member of the Progressive Party. Well he's a television repairman. And we had gotten our first television. But it wasn't working very well. And so my mother said why don't you come fix our television. So he came over and he had no idea what he was doing. He said I'll take it to my shop. But he was then around all the time. He would come around and he would fix this and he would fix that and he would say can I take the kids to school or... And we all liked him as a kid. He was kind of an adult who would want to talk to you. Well, it turned out he was this FBI agent. Well the thing that was weird about it was when we found out about it, that he was this FBI agent, then what you start doing is you start saying I can't talk to anybody. You don't know who you can talk to. Why is this person being kind to me on the street? Is my teacher really interested in my project? You start to get paranoid and you start to see surveillance everywhere. It's one of those things that once you experience that, it's very disconcerting. You suddenly don't have a basis on which you can trust people.

Clip 3 (0:55)

The first girl I invited to a dance, it took me two weeks to get up the nerve to invite her to the dance and she wanted to go with me. I was just out of control happy about it and her father said no, you can't go out with him, he's a Commie. I remember my oldest brother, who was then 17, Patrick. Two Korean war vets found out who he was at a drive in and they attacked him. They beat him up, knocked him down, and then they put his arm over a curb and jumped on it. One effect of the surveillance was that it wasn't that you heard a click on the telephone. it wasn't that they intercepted your mail. There was a series of ripples that spread out into the larger society and ended up isolating you from your friends and from your neighbors and all sorts of things.

ERIC HALLENGREN

Clip 1 (1:08)

we knew they were coming. I remember I was 12 years old in 1957. So I was old enough to know just how important they were to all of us and what the possible consequence might be. And so the question was whether my parents, mainly my father, would be targeted. My parents talked openly about it and wondered who was going to be the informant. Her name was Irene Barcaglia and she had been planted by the FBI to join the Communist party in Baltimore and she was the chief witness. The other thing that I remember very well about it was what my father did so well. My father was just a great talker. Whenever he was asked a question he would go into great detail with all the minutiae and he was so tedious in his rendition of the answer they just soon got tired of having to listen to him..... So my father was pretty successful.

Clip 2 (0:39)

There was the down side, the dark side of it, this waiting to see what would Capital Airlines do now that he had been called before HUAC and sure enough two days later he was taken into the office and told that Capital Airlines was summarily dismissing him from his job and the reason was that as a security threat and identified member of the Communist Party, he couldn't be trusted to work on airplanes. He hadn't expected that and that was a very demoralizing and crushing blow to him to have that proffered as the reason for his having been fired.

Clip 3 (0:39)

That was a very, very tough time..... he finally did get a job, about six months later... And I say a job he held onto because he got two jobs prior to this one and in both cases the FBI visited his employers and said to them, "Do you know who you have working for you?" They leaned on employers to do the patriotic thing and do the upstanding American thing which was to show these Communists what we think of them. And so my father was fired from both of the jobs after visits from the FBI.

Clip 4 (0:53)

My father's union leader, Bob Quick, was a wonderful man, supported my father from the beginning and asked for a federal arbitration. And as these things wended their way through the system, it took about a year and a half to finally have a final hearing and my father was exonerated completely. Capital Airlines was found to be completely wrong in their dismissal of him and my father was owed every single penny that he would have made had he continued to work for Capital Airlines. He was given every moment of seniority that he lost. So there was a sense of the redeeming quality of American society and ... that we have a system that is stronger and bigger than that fear from people like McCarthy and from the HUAC Committee.

HISTORIANS:

Ellen Schrecker - Finding Communists 1:20

The party was secret and therefore when the government wanted to eliminate Communists from Federal employment, they had a problem and the FBI, which was really in charge of this loyalty program, had a problem because their people didn't publicly identify themselves as Communists. So what they did was they created a list of organizations that worked with the Communist party, that was established by the Communist party, and the assumption was that if somebody belonged to these groups that person probably may have been a Communist. There is this kind of myth of the innocent liberal. That anybody could be called up before a committee, but in fact most of the people who were identified by a committee, who were fired under the loyalty security program, probably were or had been in or near the Communist party.

Ellen Schrecker – The Second Red Scare 1:34

There are a number of mechanisms that are crucial to that second Red Scare after World War II. One is the notion of imposing political tests for employment. The government has its loyalty security program – it is copied by state and local governments around the country. It is copied by a number of private corporations that also have loyalty programs and the implementation of these kinds of programs requires that there be a certain level of surveillance, that lists of names get collected, that files, that the FBI begin to investigate people. And so you do get increased surveillance over American citizens during this period by the FBI. Throughout this period, what you are getting is statements, on the part of J. Edgar Hoover and others, that American national security requires the elimination of Communists, or people who are associated with them, from any position of influence within American society. And it's that national security rationale that makes it possible to do all this.

Adam Green – Targeting African Americans 1:45

All throughout the 1940s, and into the 1950s, there is selective but very relentless targeting of African-American leaders that are seen to be sympathetic with left ideologies, with Communist projects. Individuals like Paul Robeson, W. B. DuBois, Shirley Graham DuBois, or Ella Baker. Individuals found their passports taken away so that in essence they were in a kind of condition of house arrest, being kept within the United States because of the ways in which they were such effective critics of the conditions that African-Americans lived under about how the United States could advocate on behalf of democracy and against Communism and yet not practice democracy in its own home areas.

Athan Theoharris – The FBI shapes Public Opinion 0:56

Once you begin to collect information that has no law enforcement purpose, and we should understand this as the principal role and mission of the FBI, the question that that arises is what do you do with the information you collected. Because in some cases the individual who was the subject of this had committed no Federal crime. And in other cases the information was illegally obtained and thus couldn't be used for prosecutable purposes. What you find taking place in the years after the 1940s is the attempt to use the

information to influence public opinion so you would have the leaking of information to friendly reporters, members of Congress, as a means of shaping public opinion. And to silence individuals, the safest thing you can do during the Cold War years was being apolitical because your political activism might carry with it certain risks, that you might lose your job. What was disclosed in the 1970s was a series of programs that the FBI had initiated in 1950s and extended in the 1960s called Co-Intel-Pros. We found out as a result of the release of these records that individuals lost their jobs because the FBI was disseminating information to their employers.

CIVIL RIGHTS

ABDEEN JABARA

Clip 1 (1:24)

I went to a bank where our firm had done its banking and an employee there at the bank called me over and they showed me a list of names, of basically Palestinian organizations and it was being circulated to all the branches to request information as to whether or not the branches had any accounts in the names of these people, including myself. So I wrote to my bank and I asked them whether or not they had received a memo like this and they refused to answer the question. So I sued the bank in Detroit, and through the course of discovery in that lawsuit I found out, yes, the FBI had asked the bank for information about my banking activities the thing that got them started was I was representing the Arab Student Organization nationally and they wanted to put on a conference and so I lent them \$1000 so it showed that my check had gone into their account and so the FBI was seeking this information about my banking activities.

Clip 2 (1:39)

The Operation Boulder was announced by the Nixon Administration. Allegedly in response to the Munich massacre in Germany, But what did that have to do with the Arab-American community here? I read subsequent to that in the Newsweek Magazine that there were 27 wire taps had been authorized on activist Arabs around the country.... So I filed a lawsuit in 1972 against the FBI, claiming that my lawful political activity had been subject to illegal surveillance. And we began a 13-year long legal battle, much of it that was involving our efforts to get information about the extent and the nature of the surveillance that the FBI had conducted on my activity. We found out, however, that there were other agencies that were involved. That they had obtained information concerning certain communications that I had made overseas that they then turned over to the FBI.... I also found out that the local Detroit Police and the Michigan State Police also were maintaining political files that included my political activity... There was no activity going on that was a legitimate law enforcement surveillance issue. That was pure intimidation....

Clip 3 (1:38)

I was born and raised in northern Michigan and we took civics classes that taught us about the Bill of Rights. I really believed that these guarantees are guarantees that govern how we act and that when I went out to support Palestinian rights I thought I was just fulfilling the rights that were guaranteed under the law. And I had no idea that it would attract as much attention as it did from the authorities because simply these were unpopular. And they admitted that I had not violated any laws and yet this surveillance went on for years. Well, I felt that this battle is never done because one small case is not going to change the actions of the government. They can absorb this. I think I have a great deal of apprehension from seeing what the government can do. If they can charge anybody with anything, it's very, very difficult to combat that in the courtroom and it takes enormous amount of resources and it can be draining.

CONGRESSWOMAN ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

Clip 1 (1:11)

I took a bus from Jackson to Greenwood and I was met by some young SNCC workers who took me to a farmhouse. I will never forget the next morning when they knocked on the screen door and said Medger Evers was shot and killed last night. That was after he had delivered me to the bus station going home. Then they told me that Fannie Lou Hamer had been arrested along with several other people. And Lawrence Guillot had gone to get them out, but that he had been put in jail. Ms. Hamer had been beat. This was a woman who could be my mother. Larry Guillot had been let out every night to be beat and brought back in by the White Citizens Council. The law enforcement, they don't beat them. They give it over to their brothers in the White Citizens Council to beat them. These people just used surveillance as overt intimidation. That was my initiation into the state of Mississippi in 1963.

Clip 2 (0:51)

There are two categories of people here. I think it's really important that we all put ourselves in what category we in. Because when I look at going down to Mississippi, I have to tell you I think there's a difference between the young and the foolish. People who were in SNCC and people lived in Mississippi and if you want to know what it's like to be brave you got to look to people like Fannie Lou Hamer, who was put off the plantation for seeking to register. This was a woman who had no other livelihood so she and her husband were put off, were in constant danger, lived in Mississippi and knew it in a way that somebody like me, from the North, who didn't even understand the full measure of danger we were getting into, I don't think.

Clip 3 (:46)

The best example is a man who died recently. Jim Forman, who was the executive director, held the whole thing together. We were the only organization that was truly movement-like in the sense that it wasn't held together by the rigor of your ordinary civil rights organization. In many ways it did break Jim. He died much revered here. I remember Jim coming to my office when I was in New York City and he was penniless and raggedy. That's the story of a broken man who gave everything to the movement. He had real ups and downs in his life. I hardly recognized the strong man that had kept us together here.

GREN WHITMAN

Clip 1 (0:52)

I was discharged from the Army in 1962 and I had served three years and had an honorable discharge. In 1965, when I was active in both civil rights and anti-Vietnam war activities President Johnson sent US Troops to the Dominican Republic. I got very upset about that. So I didn't burn my draft card and I didn't tear up my draft card. But I did mail it back to my draft board in Towson, Maryland and I informed them that I was not going to carry my draft card anymore. It was a very minor act of civil disobedience. But I, having then got my FBI record several years later, it was at that moment that the FBI started conducting surveillance of me.

Clip 2 (1:00)

In Baltimore, we operated what was called The Peace Action Center. We published an underground newspaper called *Peace and Freedom News*. And we were very supportive of the Catonsville Nine who went into the Catonsville draft board and burned files. We conducted public demonstrations and I know we were under surveillance the whole time. We discovered that some college student or a high school student were in fact police officers and would come into The Peace Action Center, would sit around, would talk, would listen, and as it turned out they would then report on what they were hearing. And as it turned out the police department was spying on about 125 groups, which they labeled them subversive, extremist, civil rights groups, left wing, right wing, pacifists, miscellaneous.

Clip 3 (0:52)

I was surprised at the extent of what they had gone through. They had actually gone to my high school and asked the school about my behavior when I had been a high school student. They had information about my parents in there. That did take me back. But I was very pleased to read that my school told the FBI that I had been a "good campus citizen." I was surprised at how much they had blanked out and I couldn't tell what they had written. And I was surprised that it had gone on for so long. I think it's a waste of time. People are going to engage in what are, in fact, totally legal activities and it is a waste of time and public money for the government to watch them and report on them.

JACK O'DELL

Clip 1 (0:32)

When I first went to a union hall, we went to the Seafarer's International Union in New Orleans and they had a Jim Crow Board. Blacks could only get jobs in the stewards department. They could not ship on deck or they could not ship in the engine room. These were segregated unions. One of the things that contributed to the success of the CIO getting organized was the fact that they took the position that there would be no segregation. When we heard about a maritime union in the CIO, that was all I needed to know.

Clip 2 (0:45)

I joined the communist party after the leaders of the communist party were put in jail. I lived in Harlem and Ben Davis was our City Councilman and he was a member of the communist party, elected on the communist party ticket. So my participation and joining the communist party was not a great act in the sense that people didn't do it, except that the atmosphere by that time was becoming very, very sinister. In Louisiana where I was active in the communist party, you were supposed to register as a communist and if you registered you got 20 years and if you didn't register you got 20 years, if you were on their list and they said you were a communist.

Clip 3 (1:05)

1956 I was summoned to the Eastland Committee in Washington. I go down to Washington and there's no hotel I can stay in except a black hotel. I walk through the House of Representatives and there was not one black secretary. That was what Washington was like. So this Committee, to me, was presiding over segregation in Washington, DC. So I was quite ready for Eastland and I let him know that as far as I was concerned if blacks could vote in Mississippi he wouldn't be sitting up there. He not only had no legitimacy to be subpoenaing me, he had no legitimacy to be in the Senate. People came up to me from the news media and said we don't know if you are communist or not, but Eastland is a greater threat to the Constitution than you are. I was glad to hear that because that was the whole point. The press needed to get on this situation and quit reflecting the fear and the misrepresentation the press was very much a part of this whole campaign to steam roller and create a nation of sheep

Clip 4 (1:02)

I had two positions with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference under Dr. King. Well, when the movement started to grow and it was clear that Congress was going to have to do something about civil rights. President Kennedy asked for a meeting with Martin Luther King. During that meeting he told Dr. King that he would have to fire O'Dell and Stanley Levison because J. Edgar Hoover said they are communists and if the Dixiecrats start making an issue that the civil rights movement has a lot of communists in it, he, Kennedy would not be able to support the passage of the civil rights legislation. I would not have insisted that I had a right to stay, that being the situation because I'm fighting for civil rights, too. So you feel pained, but you also know that some good can come from this because I can go find another job.

JULIAN BOND

Clip 1 (0:55)

During the heyday of the civil rights movement, black people generally and black leadership specifically were considered by some Americans to be a suspect class. And as a suspect class they had to be watched and monitored. Their behavior checked, their thoughts recorded, and sifted to see whether or not they were in any way hostile to what these people believed was the prevailing ethos of America. So as a consequence, surveillance, both electronic and physical, breaking into offices, reading mail, searching files, intercepting communications, all of the techniques that the technology of the time allowed, were widespread. It is absolutely all about political dissent and crushing people who deviate from what is the common accepted wisdom.

Clip 2 (0:52)

I knew, or sort of intuited then, that agents of the FBI and the Atlanta police department where I lived at the time were maintaining some surveillance of me. I met a man in O'Hare Airport who identified himself as a former Army Intelligence Officer and he said he and his counterpart in the Air Force used to have contests to see which of them could report first when I or someone else like me came to Chicago. So we know these things were going on. I know it now, but I suspected it then and just the suspicion makes you act in a different way. You guard your language, you don't say things you might have said, even in jest, particularly in jest. So you just become a different kind of person and you don't take chances and risks that you otherwise might have done. And you try as best you can, not to let it change your behavior, but inevitably it does.

Clip 3 (0:47)

I have an FBI photograph of Martin Luther King and Stanley Levinson standing outside the Stadler Hotel in New York City and here's King talking to a man who probably was his most trusted white friend. A man who helped him in immeasurable kinds of ways and here is the government of the United States photographing them because they believed that Stanley Levinson is up to some sinister purpose. And it made King cautious. It made him approach Stanley Levinson through intermediaries. It frustrated the progress of the civil rights movement. It kept out of the movement, at least in a public way, a viable, valuable ally and friend, a man of great wisdom and great warmth, someone who was a trusted advisor to King.

Clip 4 (0:53)

There is a large body of opinion in the United States then and now that says something like this: The country is under attack, then from the Soviet Union international Communism, today from Al Qaeda and international Islamic-based terrorism. And as a consequence we've got to surrender some of our civil liberties and civil rights in order to stop these people from attacking us again and, of course, you've got to be fearful. You saw what happened on 9-11 in New York City and Washington, you see what has happened in Spain and England and other parts of the world and so you've got to think it could happen again here, and that you might possibly be a victim of it. And so you begin to say to yourself well maybe I could surrender a little bit of my civil rights. But then

hopefully, you catch yourself and you say no, that it's all the more important to have civil rights and civil liberties in these times.

HISTORIANS:

Geoffrey Stone – Opposing the Vietnam War 0:53

Beginning in 1798 and through the Civil War, and World War I, and World War II, and the Cold War, the government prosecuted individuals who were significant political figures because of their opposition to the war, because of their perceived disloyalty, and in many instances put them in jail for very long periods of time. By the time we reached the Vietnam War, no one would have thought it plausible to prosecute Eugene McCarthy for his opposition to the war. And I think the fact that that option was simply taken off the table by a combination of Constitutional developments and changes in cultural attitudes is real progress.

Adam Green – Threat to National Security 0:57

A sense of threat can be made, and a sense of threat can be made in two ways. One threat that is conveyed to people that if they continue their activities of association and endorsement they can potentially find themselves visited by incredibly severe sanctions. And then, two, by propaganda, establish an image of threat in relation to the American public that then creates at the very least some hesitancy on the part of the public to protest what are clear violations of rights because they feel like there is an overriding concern of national security that is at stake in relation to these techniques. When one thinks about the '60s, many people were uneasy about the kind of racist abuses that took place in various parts of the country and yet hesitated to protest that because constantly they had put before them the sense that there might be a link between African-American anti-racist activities, and Communist plots to overthrow the US Government

Adam Green -Targeting Political Figures 0:57

The figures that people don't recognize today – Louise Patterson, Marvel Cook, Ella Baker, Shirley Graham DuBois, Pearl Primus. People know less and less about today precisely because the kind of campaign that was meant to isolate them from other individuals, in essence isolated them within history. I think that Mr. O'Dell is a good example of this. I mean, this is an extraordinarily important figure in terms of the long arc of American politics since World War II to the present day. Yet very, very few people know about him and in part that's because of the tremendous amount of pressure and isolation that was placed on different figures, either because of their actual political affiliations or because of the ways in which suspicions about their political affiliations was motivating governmental branches like the FBI to target people regardless of whether the facts were there to back up those kinds of policies.

Adam Green – Surveillance of Dr. King 0:51

Individuals who are able to escape the most severe forms of targeting, nonetheless felt that they had to be somewhat disciplined in relation to the ways in which, on the one hand they criticized the United States, but did not present other forms of government, in particular socialism or Communism, as specific alternatives within the career of Martin Luther King, for example, you see on the one hand tremendous amount of concern and difficulty that is experienced as a result of having been targeted for surveillance by the Federal Government. But for all of this he had to be very careful to say he was not

someone who supported Communism. He was someone who adhered to American principles and ideal, even though he saw those principles as not being operative in practice.

Athan Theoharris – The FBI's Disinformation Campaign 0:53

In the Bureau's terminology, the purpose of these programs was to harass, disrupt and discredit the targeted organization. And the tactics they employed was, in one case leaking information to the media, another case disseminating information which would cause dissension within the organization. So they begin with the Communist party in 1956. In 1961 they move against the Socialist Workers Party, a really obscure, miniscule organization which sort of speaks to the question of proportionality. They move against the Klan and white supremacist organizations in '64. They move against the Black Panthers and Black Nationalist organizations beginning in '65. And in 1968 they move against the new left, particularly the Students for Democratic Society. So there was this concerted attempt to affect the functioning of these organizations.

SANCTUARY

REV. JOHN FIFE

Clip 1 (1:05)

There was always in United States refugee policy, a politicized difference. Hockey players coming from Czechoslovakia had no trouble getting political asylum. People fleeing Nicaragua were recognized as political refugees during that time. People fleeing Cuba were, of course, recognized immediately but anyone from El Salvador or Guatemala was immediately deported and no one was being given political asylum. The official policy of the United States was that we were in support of the military of those countries under the theory that we were bringing Democracy and freedom to those countries. So we could scarcely acknowledge that the guys we were supporting and training were running the death squads – and were primarily responsible for the repression there. We could scarcely acknowledge that the people who were fleeing were refugees. The official policy of the United States State Department then was that these people were economic migrants. They weren't fleeing death squads and torture and repression.

Clip 2 (0:57)

I was the pastor of a church and as such I had the responsibility to tell people, one, the truth and, two, to provide some ethical and moral guidance for them. I had to say to them there are gross violations of human rights going on by our government against people who are absolutely defenseless. And that the ethical mandate we have is to save as many lives as we can and in good Quaker fashion, to speak truth to power, to hold the United States government accountable for their violations of human rights. I don't think any one of us could have withstood the pressure and the threats of the United States government and that's why we decided to ground the Sanctuary Movement in congregational decisions.

Clip 3 (0:48)

The whole time that we were involved in the sanctuary movement we anticipated that at some point we would be in direct conflict with the government and usually the way the government does conflict is to try to criminalize people who are involved in social change or social reform. And they had threatened it over and over again. What we did not anticipate was the fact that the government chose to infiltrate churches and worship services with undercover agents and paid informants and made 91 tape recordings of worship services and bible study groups and conversations with pastors in the churches themselves.

Clip 4 (1:06)

When I was a theological student in seminary in Pittsburgh, I had these old German theologians who were my professors and they used to tell stories about Germany in the 1930s and 1940s and the confessing church there and the Holocaust and they would say to us don't you ever forget that, remember. And I would nod off and say why don't these guys talk about something that is relevant ...I'm going to be a pastor in a Presbyterian church in North America. And this has no meaning for me at all. And then suddenly I

found that old voice haunting my conscience. It's important that we remember all of the instances in which human rights and civil rights had to be defended. And, that it always has involved some risk. You never get a free ride in the terms of the defense of civil or human rights. It's always a struggle and it always involves some risk.

PEGGY HUTCHINSON

Clip 1 (1:19)

We would get word from either human rights groups or church groups in Salvador or Guatemala or Mexico that there were people on their way to El Norte. I and a few others would go to Mexico, usually to a church, where we would meet them. You would be told maybe there's two men or there's a couple and you would get there and there's a whole family or there would be several families. You never knew. But once we would get there we would talk with them, find out their level of trauma as much as possible. So if they were really traumatized or tortured you didn't want to do the route where you had to hike through some mountains in Mexico and into Arizona. You might want to help them enter another way. We also wanted to make sure that if they were picked up or we were picked up what the process and procedure would be because clearly we knew we would be separated. The risks that I had was very little, compared to what the Salvadorans or Guatemalans were facing. Because I wasn't facing deportation and potential death. I knew that I was privileged.

Clip 2 (0:56)

These guys had shown up and, what are they, they're roofers or something and they volunteered. But I had a really bad intuitive gut feeling about them. He befriended one of the women volunteers who was a widow and would go visit her and would try to get information out of her. He invited himself to the wedding of one of my friends and colleagues and showed up there. Down the road I remember talking to other women who were uncomfortable about these guys and then a couple of the refugees said Jesus would start asking them questions. Who crossed with you? How did you do it? What day was that? Questions that were totally inappropriate from the perspective of the refugees and that's what they were taping. Later, you know, when we were indicted, they had hours and hours and hours of tapes.

Clip 3 (0:50)

We had these long pre-trial hearings where the government filed a motion of limiting because they didn't want us using the 1980 Refugee Act or the UN Protocol on Refugees. They didn't want us talking about the conditions of why people fled to the United States, they didn't want us talking about how INS violated the rights of people trying to apply for asylum. They really wanted to keep everything out. The refugees when they were questioned, you know they couldn't talk at all about what happened to them in their homeland and they couldn't use words like "cry" or "torture" or "death." There was just this whole listing of words that they weren't allowed to use within the courtroom. They didn't want the jury to hear that. So it was pretty clear that we really couldn't put on trial the issues of sanctuary.

HISTORIANS:

Geoffrey Stone – A Balancing Act 1:19

In the absence of a sense of genuine crisis, members of Congress have often been, at least reasonably, respectful of civil rights and civil liberties and have been anxious about giving too much power to the Executive Branch. And so it's not surprising that during the 1990s, when there wasn't a sense of crisis, requests by the Executive Branch for a variety of powers were denied by Congress. Some of those were simply powers that would not have raised civil liberties issues. Others were powers that would have raised civil liberties issues. However, once a crisis strikes that sense of separation of powers often shifts.

Athan Theoharris – Ending the Abuse of Power 0:51

If one looks at the 1970s, there was this concern to preclude future abuses of power and it was highlighted by the so-called Church and Pike Committee. The result of this was that there was for a time consideration within the Congress of legislation which would establish legislative charters for the intelligence agencies to ensure that these abuses would not be conducted again. But nothing ultimately happened and particularly as a result of the election of Ronald Reagan to the Presidency in 1980 on the theme that he championed was the need to unleash the intelligence agencies and the premise was that these restrictions had circumscribed the intelligence agencies and thus adversely affected the nation's security interest.

Athan Theoharris – Sanctuary and Political Surveillance 0:58

The sole restriction imposed upon the FBI from conducting political surveillance investigations were guidelines issued by Attorney General Edward Levi in March 1976, that sought to ensure that while the FBI could initiate investigations based on advocacy, these investigations had to be limited to a 60-day period, and then reauthorization had to be based upon probable cause standard. In 1983, Reagan's Attorney General William French Smith issues new orders that essentially rescinded the Levi guidelines. One byproduct of this was the FBI's intensive monitoring of CISPEP, the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador, an organization that opposed the Administration's Central American policy and the Sanctuary movement which sought to assist those fleeing from repressive governments in Central America. So you did have the recurrence of political surveillance in the 1980s.

AFTER 9/11

ERIC SHAW

Clip1 (0:50)

When the war started in Iraq, we held large demonstrations in San Francisco and effectively shut down the financial district for three days. And we would see officers taking our picture, videotaping us everywhere we went. They were on buildings with telephoto lenses taking pictures of us. In April, we were going to do the same thing at the Port of Oakland, where two companies stood to gain a lot by us being at war and therefore contributed to the campaigns of people that would most likely take us to war. And I wanted to make that connection in the minds of people in America. So we decided we were going to go to the Port of Oakland and we were going to have a community picket, a non-violent spirited picket.

Clip 2 (1:09)

When we got to the Port of Oakland, we were met with hundreds of police officers. They far outnumbered us. They were already in riot gear. They already had tear gas masks on when we arrived. Which said to us that they had every intention of doing what they did next. A line of motorcycle cops broke through the line of police officers and started bumping people with their motorcycles, violently. And then a line of officers with shotguns stepped up and started shooting at us. We had no idea what was being fired out of them. We had every reason to believe that it was live ammunition. They were shooting directly at the protestors. They were throwing these things that looked like grenades above our heads and these things exploded and a bunch of rubber pellets shot out from these grenades and hit people in the head, hit people in the back, hit people in the arms. We never heard a call to disperse. We never got any indication from the police officers where they wanted us to go.

Clip 3 (0:46)

As I noticed that people were running in a way that contributed to their danger, I decided that I gotta be calm here. I gotta help other people be calm. So as I was slowly walking away, I was yelling to people please be calm, please walk away instead of running away, and just then I got hit in the back of the leg with something that felt like live ammunition. And it knocked me to the ground. As I'm on the ground I'm thinking to myself, I went all the way to the Persian Gulf as a Marine to fight for these very rights that we were exercising and I had to come all the way back home to get shot.

Clip 4 (1:06)

The thing that I got shot with was what they call a ricochet round. And it's a wooden dowel that is about an inch in diameter and it's round and it's a solid wooden block. They were designed to be used in prisons where there is a very even floor that is made of concrete and they are supposed to be shot at the floor. But what the police officers in Oakland were doing was they were firing directly at people. Many people got seriously injured. A good friend of mine, Willow Rosenthal, has had so far \$85,000 worth of surgery as a result of the impact of one of these ricochet rounds. Willow Rosenthal can't

participate anymore. She can't bring herself to get past the anxiety. It's too much for her. There are others that can't go. I can't go to many of them. Every now and then I'll work up the courage and I'll go because I realize that if I don't go, that they have succeeded.

LESLIE SALGADO

Clip 1 (1:07)

In 1980 after I had been in Ecuador for about three and a half years, I was invited to travel to Romania in Eastern Europe and I decided to fly through New York because I have an older sister who lives here in the United States and I thought I would come and see her on the way back. Well, interestingly enough my sister got a visit from the immigration service to question her about my trip to Romania. They were also asking her questions about other members of my family, in particular an older brother who was an activist in Ecuador. The Immigration and Naturalization Service at that point, had a file on me that went back to 1972. They had me branded as a possible terrorist. For doing what? For taking leaflets out? For being a member of a radical leftist organization who believes in peace and justice?

Clip 2 (1:36)

We were coming back from Ocean City and my son, came home early to sort of straighten it up and when he went to take the trash out he saw a couple of people walking towards our door and so he went to greet them. They said that they had been at work, and that they didn't see me and so they decided to come by because they were in the neighborhood. Just tell her that Michael and Cathy were here. When we got home, the first thing my son said is, Mom your friends from work, Mike and Cathy, were here to see you. So I said I don't know anybody like that. On Monday I went back after not being in work for one week and at around three o'clock in the afternoon these two people came in and as soon as I looked at them I said, oh, you came by to my house on Friday. They had their FBI badges in front of them and I said well, I guess you are coming to talk to me, to question me, either about my anti-war activities or my Cuba solidarity work. Which one is it? And so the gentleman said well, we are not coming here to question you about anything. We are coming here to protect you because our job is to protect US citizens. They were smiling, I was smiling. We were both smiling at each other. Of course, I'm on the losing side because I'm the one that's being scared.

Clip 3 (0:44)

I don't think that anybody should be scared off in any way, shape or form because of their political beliefs. This is a way of harassing people so that they won't do such things because we all want to keep our jobs. I need a job. I need to work. I am not independently wealthy. We have a right to question. We have a right to dream. We have a right to think that something different is possible and if that is a world where there is more justice, that there is less war, that there is more respect for human rights, for civil rights, then what is wrong with that?

ROXANNE ATTIE

Clip 1 (1:30)

We went on February 4th because our deadline was the 7th of February. We were there early in the morning at 4:00 AM on that cold, miserable day waiting out in the elements before the door even opened at 8:30, 9:00 o'clock. When we went upstairs we announced ourselves and they told us to have a seat and we sat there for three hours before we went up to the window again to ask them have you heard anything yet. Do we even have to be here? They still had no answers for us. Then I realized 5:00 parking ends. What am I going to do? I have to pay my parking...because of my health I can't go fast. I was gone for like 20-30 minutes. When I came back there was this other American lady. She said no sooner did you hit the elevator they took them in.... So I go to the window and that's when they tell me come to the back room. And they led me to this room that had a desk in it and they told me we're sorry, we understand your marriage has been approved, but the appeal was denied and your husband and your son are now in custody. And I just fell to the seat. They just said we're sorry. And I said but I'm married to them. It's legal, it's been approved. Yes, well we found out your attorney mailed your papers to the wrong center. Those papers were supposed to be filed here in Newark, not in Vermont. (NOTE: talking underneath!!!)

Clip 2: (1:13)

I died the day they took them. February 4th, 2002. My son was home. Jeremy was home and he couldn't believe it when I came in and he saw. He knew something was wrong when he saw me. I had to tell him and he, too, cried and collapsed. He couldn't believe it.... We found another lawyer over in Newark. They were the ones that found out Elias went to Georgia. And we didn't find that out until almost three days later. How could they take a minor child away from his only family he has here and take him out of the state of New Jersey? I felt that was like a kidnapping. He had to buy calling cards to call us, which wasn't easy. He had no money. So this kid just left with the clothes on his back. Didn't get to see his family again for 11 months. When he turned 18, on his birthday they brought him back to Elizabeth and that was on November 10th and the next thing I know they decided to seek voluntarily departure instead of being deported and since January of that year 2003, they have been in Lebanon. I never even got to say goodbye.

Clip 3: (0:51)

I call him like maybe once every three months. I should call him more and this is an excuse, but it's not an excuse. I have no money. I can't buy those calling cards to call him. There is no way to write to him, to mail it to him. There is no communication unless I call him. Sometimes, I just can't reach out anymore. I'm tired of being hurt and to hear the bitterness in my husband now and the pain from what I'm not used to. I can't call him like I should. It's hard. Because I just want him to come home and he wants to come home and it's hard on all of us. It's like being dead, but breathing and that's scary to walk like that because of a situation that you don't have control over.

RUTH JORGENSON

Clip 1 (0:38)

I was very involved with an organization called Campus Peace and Civil Liberties Coalition. We started off doing something called the Middle East Forums, which was what we were known for. We were just bringing to the forefront issues of Palestine and Israel and conflicts in the Middle East. I specifically spoke about the deportation of immigrants, specifically with like Arab immigrants after 9-11 and the impacts of that. I spoke about the war in Iraq. Students in college are supposed to be able to challenge new things, you are supposed to be able to think outside the box, analyze, make new decisions.

Clip 2 (0:44)

One week we were bringing Gary Rossi who was coming to speak about Veganism and your health and why you should not eat animals and the impact on the Earth. We were actually told that day by the student affairs that the police wanted us to change our room and they told us we'll have an officer out there to escort people. Well there were never any officers out there and there was a faculty member that was specifically concerned about undercover surveillance. Well the faculty member asked the chief of police specifically where were the police that were supposed to be at this event and he said how do you know there weren't any there? So we started having discussions about what does this mean, were there undercovers there, why weren't there any officers there? We decided we had like five weeks 'til the end of the school that we had to get answers

Clip 3 (1:06)

We kind of did this five-week campaign. And through this campaign we did is what got more lies and different things out of the university. We started getting responses from the president of the university stating that there were not undercover officers there, that there were uniformed campus officers and that more or less they don't engage in surveillance. And then three days after that, we get another letter from the president of the university saying, oops, there were actually three undercover campus officers and three undercover Sheriff's Department officers. So it went from nobody to having uniformed campus officers to there were six undercovers, including the Sheriff's Department, the Fresno Sheriff's Department. But they were also saying we had no connection, we don't know why they were there. It was just ridiculous. We wanted the university to develop a policy against surveillance because they didn't have one. There was no policy against surveillance protecting academic freedom. So we wanted that. We wanted an apology for being lied to and made to feel that we were crazy.

Clip 4 (0:36)

In terms of career I mean you can Google my name and I know people do that when they hire people You Google my name and you come up with all this involved in peace protest, challenging authority, believing that there's being undercover surveillance going on. I can't imagine that I would ever get a job at Fresno State, that's for sure, much less I don't know that I'd ever get a job in the CSU system. Who knows what impact that

would have on me because I was trying to bring things that of course in the end came out to be true to the forefront.

SAMINA SUNDAS

Clip 1 (0:48)

I was getting calls from Muslim communities, are we going to be put in camps? What is happening? Why do we have to do that? There was such fear that we thought you know Muslim community is not equipped with dealing with that so that was why we decided that we need to have a hot line so we could just help the community. Even in the beginning people would call either from public phones or from their workplaces. And when I would ask them I had a form to fill out, information how could they be reached nobody was giving me their telephone numbers. Nobody would be giving me their names. I had to assure them that under no circumstances I will give their information to anybody, doesn't matter what. And people started trusting us after that and then they were desperate for help.

Clip 2 (1:09)

We had 24 hours, 7 days a week for about 6-9 months, there were so many calls. And if somebody got detained their wives needed counseling because they were just ashamed what had happened with their husbands. A lot of the time they would not even share with their family members. They were alone. They were terrified. So a lot of our time went into counseling these women, educating them about that what their husbands are going through has nothing to do with being a terrorist. There were kids who were just screaming for their parents, fathers, you know. The community went through a lot. They registered over 90,000 people. They didn't catch a single terrorist and our problem with that is that if you are going to detain and deport Muslims, Arabs and South Asians who have overstayed or who are here undocumented, you need to go be tough on every undocumented person. Don't treat us differently.

Clip 3 (0:58)

I just came back from Pakistan, so I saw at the airport, now they are registering everybody. I was so happy when I saw that there were two people standing there to help people. So I said what about people who just were registered, you know the 25 countries? Can they use the same system? They said, oh no, there is an office downstairs in the basement. They have to go there. So even now, when the registration has stopped, re-registration has stopped, people who are from Muslim countries, they are still treated differently. That's something that really outrages me. Any terrorist is a terrorist and just call them terrorists. Don't call them Muslim terrorists because that just creates fear in our society and when people look at a Muslim all they see is a terrorist. So it really creates a culture of helplessness, anger, frustration in the Muslim community, here and globally.

GEORGE MAIN

Clip 1 (0:33)

I had been trained as a Russian linguist and it really bothered me that I would be listening to conversations, typically personal conversations that weren't even anything of intelligence value. But it bothered me that I was listening to US citizens holding private conversations. I thought that this was wrong and after being compelled to do this for a short period of time, I approached my commander and indicated that I felt that this was illegal and I didn't feel I should be doing that. And he laughed at me and he ordered me to go back to work and continue my job.

Clip 2 (1:10)

I called for a protest and had started arranging that and on the morning of November 10th 2004 while I was at work I received a phone call on my cell phone from a gentleman who identified himself as a special agent for the Department of Homeland Security and he wanted to talk to me about my protest at the MEPS. And that it was Federal property and did I understand that it was on a holiday because it was going to be on Veterans Day and that there were going to be closed and just wanted to know what I was up to and I assured him that I was a peaceful person, that I was protesting the war, that there was going to be no property damage, that we were going to take no actions except to honor those who had fallen in Iraq. And he questioned me on that somewhat and I thought we reached a nice agreement on that. I have to say that having a special agent from Homeland Security call you on your cell phone is un-nerving. I didn't know he had my cell phone number.

Clip 3 (1:14)

My wife had started listening to the threats, to the e-mail threats and was aware that I was concerned and she had become concerned for her safety and for my children's safety and I had always felt it was somewhat ridiculous that they would pick me as a target. Certainly I am an honorably discharged veteran who served with a top secret clearance. We are Christian home schoolers. We are not some radical element in American that wants any harm. We keep our children at home, we educate them, we are reasonably moderate individuals. We just oppose the war. And that's the only view I have that the government could be opposed to, so I'm totally surprised that they would want to, or take any interest in me. I did nothing to cause surveillance of me. No one should ever question my patriotism. I believe personally that I am a more patriotic individual because I will stand up to defend my Constitution when other people will sit back and wonder what's going on, I think that makes me a strong and courageous patriot.

EDITH BELL

Clip1 (1:08)

I was born in Hamburg, Germany and my father was a business man. He had about 30 employees. When I was 13 my parents decided to move to the Netherlands because there was a fear of being arrested. When Hitler first came to power, my father always said it can't last. The German people won't stand for it. The more progressive people thought it wouldn't last, but then after some time the propaganda became overwhelming, my parent's friends and neighbors would speak about the Jews doing this and the Jews doing that, oh we don't mean you, we don't mean you, well how about Dr. so, no, not Dr. so. It was always the people they didn't know.

Clip 2 (1:39)

I was not surprised. But at the same time I felt we had to fight this being spied upon. The most active people at the Merton Center I don't think get easily intimidated but I was at a meeting a couple of days ago where somebody was saying what do you do about the fear, I am afraid to speak up. Well, that makes me afraid that people are intimidated. If you can intimidate people then you can shut them up and you can do what you want to do. In the last five years I have frequently mentioned my past and my experiences, which I had never done before because I didn't feel there was the need for it. I didn't feel it was something that I had to talk about. But at this point, I feel that it carries weight because I have seen what happens, or what can happen when people are shut up and people's voices can't be heard.

BRIDGET COLVIN

Clip 1 (1:05)

I suppose you can never really be 100% sure unless you can get someone to admit to you that, yes, I am here on behalf of the FBI to monitor you, but when you are at a protest outside of a church and you can see people who look actually a lot like snipers on the corners of buildings across the street from you, it is really hard to believe that for some reason people in the neighborhood are just staked out across the street from you watching, when the rest of the people in the neighborhood are merely milling across the street. Or if you are at a recruiting station and you are looking across the street into a building with large “for rent” signs that is completely empty and the windows are completely bare except for several burly looking guys in t-shirts and mirrored sunglasses with cameras. In the past maybe two years it has become very obvious that there are people at our events who are not there to support us and in fact are monitoring what we are doing.

Clip 2 (0:47)

As long as people have been organizing here at the Thomas Merton Center they have organized under the assumption that we are being monitored to some degree, without any ever concrete proof, but it just has been very common in the United States for any type of group who is doing any type of effective community organizing to at some point come under surveillance of the United States Government and so we have been advised by lawyers and such just to consider that the Thomas Merton Center may be bugged or that our phone lines may be tapped or that there may be people coming to protest at our meetings who may not be exactly who we think they are.

Clip 3 (0:56)

The Merton Center filed two different FOIA requests – one with the FBI and one with the CIA and we only received one of them back. In the FOIA request that we have from the FBI, the Pittsburgh Division Joint Terrorism Task Force, I guess, largely filed the reports that we were given back in the report it says The Merton Center is committed to pacifism and this particular event that was being monitored is an interfaith prayer vigil. And at the same time they have the heading international terrorism matters, so it’s interesting to me that we are involved in this huge war on terror and prayer vigils and leafleting events are being targeted by the Joint Terrorism Task Force here in Pittsburgh.

GEORGE CHRISTIAN

Clip 1 (1:13)

I think there are two ways of looking at the privacy issue. The first is strictly legal. Forty-eight of the 50 states have state laws that mandate that libraries keep their patron information confidential and they specifically mention not just who is registered at the library, but what materials they are circulating, so that libraries feel this legal obligation to keep patron confidentiality. But also from a philosophical point of view, public libraries exist in this country as places where citizens can go to inform themselves on the concerns of the day, whether those are political concerns or whether they are business concerns or whether they are purely personal concerns. This is why public libraries exist, so that people have access to information on a wide variety of topics and have it in privacy. I think there would be a chilling effect if people were afraid that the government or agents of the government could willy-nilly paw through the records on what they were doing at the library.

Clip 2 (0:51)

(10.05) The first instance was last July. My director of computer operations and telecommunications said I just had a conversation with the FBI and they want to send you a National Security letter and I thanked him and that was the end of it as far as he was concerned except I didn't know what a National Security letter was. I had never heard the term before so I called our attorney. She had someone research it and got back to me with the information that a National Security Letter is a blank check to the FBI. It's the ability for the them to write their own subpoenas without any kind of judicial review and there is a gag order associated with National Security letters.

Clip 3 (0:54)

We all want to be good citizens and part of me did want to respond and say help your country out here, but I knew that the vehicle they were using was un-Constitutional. The court had declared it to be un-Constitutional, and I knew I had a responsibility to safeguard patron privacy, so I had no problem really in opposing compliance with the National Security letter nor did the Executive Committee of my Board of Directors. We all reasoned that if this really were a dire emergency that they would go before a judge and show reasonable cause and come back with a warrant in which case we would be very happy to comply with the warrant. But without any judicial oversight we felt that we were really being asked to violate patron privacy for no good reason at all.

Clip 4 (0:53)

The gag order was a total gag order. So we didn't tell anyone anything. In fact, it was really a violation of the gag order to discuss it with the Executive Committee. But again, I felt there was no way I could commit the corporation to a lawsuit without some authority and when the four of us filed briefs and the government didn't object how did these other three people find out about it, obviously the government knew at that point the gag order had been violated at least to that degree. The really frustrating thing was being gagged when we could have gone to Congress and testified before Congress while they were considering the renewal of the Patriot Act. And I'm sure that was quite

deliberate. After the Patriot Act was renewed, suddenly the government decided that well we really didn't need to be gagged any longer.

PETER ACKERMAN

Clip 1 (1:25)

In 2005 the coalition met with Homeland Security, Broward Sheriff's Office, and the Fort Lauderdale Police. And this was a meeting to discuss the protest for the organization of American States Conference and the Air Sea Show. In that meeting in 2005, I believe was this guy that reappears at the Air Sea Show named Bill. I viewed him early in the morning across the street watching us set up at dawn and around 9:30 went over to him and asked if I could take his picture and he said sure, "Pete, why not? I've got plenty of you." At that point you realize that you are being surveilled. And later on I got his complete name and that he was a special investigative officer for the Fort Lauderdale Police, although he was obviously in plain clothes and I do have his photograph and that's probably one of the most obvious proofs of surveillance.

Clip 2 (1:22)

It's hard to monitor the effect of surveillance on the members of our group. There has been some effect. There is a questioning of new people when they show up. Where before everyone was accepted, I don't think it has stopped anybody from doing anything, but in phone calls people are reluctant to say specifics. If we are planning something we will talk about it generally and then specifics will be discussed in private off any electronic devices, so it has changed behavior. Certainly even though we are not planning anything illegal, it does change behavior and I suspect more importantly it has the effect of limiting new people from joining the movement. I think it is more designed to squelch dissent than it is to seek out terrorist plots.

Clip 3 (1:17)

One thing I have noticed in terms of the police that guard demonstrations is that in the '70s you could look across the police line into the faces of the police, whether they be city police or National Guards people and you would be looking into the face of someone who was just doing their job. And there was sort of a bond there, you know, he's a human being, I'm a human being. He's doing his job and I'm doing my job. And that's changed. The police in the riot gear that we saw in 2005, you look into their face masks and there was non-recognition there. They are trained to look at you not as an American citizen expressing their free speech rights, but as the enemy. And that was clear. And that was frightening and that is an expression of the military-type training that the police have gone through now.

KONSTANTY HORDYNSKI

Clip 1 (0:59)

The military comes every year, at least once a year, to the campus career fair, at UC Santa Cruz and so on April 5th of 2005, the military came to campus. We held a rally there at the career fair at the same time people walked into the career fair, from Students Against War. We had about I would say 20 people that went inside and formed lines as if they were interested in joining the military and asked the military repeatedly questions about their recruiting practices, that would sort of tie them up and not allow them to recruit any other people. They were then shut out by the career fair staff and some police and there was somewhat of a skirmish when people were trying to go inside and we weren't being let in, but after a little bit that stopped and we had a big rally outside of the career fair. So this rally made it onto the Pentagon's list, it was in one column highlighted as a credible threat

Clip 2 (0:55)

When I found out that our group had made it onto the Pentagon's list, I had sort of a two-fold reaction. On the one hand, I was kind of scared and I felt like that my paranoid fears being under surveillance or of the government listening into what we were doing were coming true. That those fears were actually a little bit more realistic than I had thought until then. On the other hand, it really all made me very angry and at the same time motivated to do more because I realized that if a peaceful group on campus on a UC Santa Cruz campus, we have obviously no connections to any sort of terrorism or anything like that has made it onto a terrorist watch list, there is something profoundly wrong with the government, with our society. If a group from Santa Cruz was considered a credible threat, who wasn't a credible threat really.

Clip-3 (0:49)

There is part of me that really is happy with the administration. They have been fairly outspoken since then about the spying being something that is not okay by them. At the same time, I think there is somewhat of a sense that because the Pentagon has said that this was a mistake the administration likes to think it is already in the past. The Pentagon did in fact say that we and all those groups that made it onto the list were on there by mistake and not intentionally. But a mistake like that to us is something that is a very serious issue. I don't think it's enough for them to say that this is something that happened by accident for us to feel that the issue is over and we've kind of gotten the sense that maybe the administration has stopped focusing on that because the Pentagon has said this was a mistake.

HISTORIANS:

Geoffrey Stone – Civil Liberties and National Security 1:11

In the war on terror, we have been told that this is essentially a perpetual struggle that will go on for a very long time, at the minimum, well into the indefinite future and that should give us great pause because it means that to the extent we do compromise civil liberties we will be making changes that will be with us for a very, very long time. Essentially, and in a very fundamental sense, changing the structure of civil liberties in the United States. And on the way we understand our Constitutional rights. So it should ratchet up the extent to which we are skeptical about government claims of need to restrict civil liberties. We should be more insistent on demanding proof from the government that the restrictions are truly essential.

Ellen Schrecker – Deportation 1:01

Immigrants have many fewer rights than American citizens. Largely because deportation is not viewed as a criminal process and so as a result the Constitutional guarantees in the Bill of Rights are focused on the criminal procedures, questions of bail, questions of trial by jury, due process. All of those deal with criminal proceedings and deportation, not being a criminal proceeding, means that immigrants can be rounded up and incarcerated without bail or without access to a lawyer or without charges being filed. So what we will see during times of stress, like during the Palmer raids after World War I, or again recently after 9-11, is that there are crack-downs against immigrants that could not have taken place against citizens.

Gary Okihiro – Raising a Ruckus 0:53

By laying low, people say, by being model citizens, you gain acceptance in this society. Others say the only way to secure your rights is to raise a ruckus, to protest, to demand your rights as Americans. And so, for example, post 911 witnessing the victimization of South Asians, West Asians, Muslims cast a deep sense of responsibility upon Japanese-Americans. Some of them felt that we cannot stand up for these people because we now made it so why should we jeopardize our standing. Others said no, the lesson of World War II is that we have to stand up and we have to point out that what happened before can happen again.

Chris Pyle – The Pentagon and Domestic Spying 1:00

Very often top government officials do not know the nature or scale of what is going on within the intelligence agencies. That was certainly true of the US Army Intelligence command when I disclosed its domestic intelligence operations in 1970. And at hearings recently, John Negroponti, the National Intelligence czar of the United States, admitted he knew nothing about the counterintelligence field activity in the Pentagon. This is a 1000-man unit in the Pentagon that is collecting domestic intelligence on threats to the military within the country. And yet he claimed he knew virtually nothing about its operations. And that's really quite extraordinary. But it helps to explain how military units start spying on civilians.

Chris Pyle – Who is Connecting the Dots? 0:41

Well there's a problem with the quality of information. The people who do these investigations are neophytes at conducting investigations. They are not terribly incisive. They don't double-check their facts. They make errors and those errors can come down to defame people's reputations. And it's not difficult for a lazy searcher to confuse you with someone else. Senator Kennedy has been barred temporarily from boarding airplanes 12 times because somebody with a similar name comes up on the watch list. This is the way these large bureaucratic information systems work and every American should be frightened of them.