

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

The Reminiscences of

Donald M. Kerwin, Jr.

Columbia Center for Oral History

Columbia University

2013

## PREFACE

The following oral history is the result of a recorded interview with Donald M. Kerwin, Jr. conducted by George Gavrilis on April 9, 2012. This interview is part of the Carnegie Corporation of New York Oral History Project.

The reader is asked to bear in mind that s/he is reading a verbatim transcript of the spoken word, rather than written prose.

3PM

Session #1

Interviewee: Donald M. Kerwin, Jr.

Location: New York, NY

Interviewer: George Gavrilis

Date: April 9, 2012

Q: It's April 9th in New York City. This is George Gavrilis and I'm here with Donald Kerwin, who is the Executive Director for the Center for Migration Studies. Don, thank you very much for doing this session with us. This is part of the Columbia Center for Oral History implemented Carnegie Corporation Oral History Project, so thank you for being with us this morning.

Kerwin: Well, thank you. I'm looking forward to it.

Q: Now, one of the things that we were talking about before we hit record were the things that you are doing today and that is a perfectly good place to start, so why don't you take it away? I think you wanted to talk either about the testimony that you're doing tomorrow or about the blog that you're working on.

Kerwin: Well, let me talk about both. I just published a blog in *Huffington [Post]* and what it was about was the story of an event that took place in Montgomery, Alabama in late 2011. It brought together the Freedom Riders [civil rights activists] and the DREAMers [the network of young people brought to the United States as children that have galvanized the immigrant rights movement] and the idea had been that there was perhaps some resentment or tension about using the Civil Rights mantle by the DREAMers, or by the Immigrant Rights Movement in general,

from people that were part of the earlier and the ongoing Civil Rights Movement for African American civil rights. And what happened at this event is the Reverend C.T. Vivian was on stage—I should say, it was at Dexter Memorial Baptist Church, which is a famous church because that was the church where the Montgomery Bus Boycotts were organized and where Dr. [Martin Luther] King [Jr.] was a pastor from 1954 to 1960. And so the Reverend C.T. Vivian was on stage, as was a former Freedom Rider, quite a courageous woman named Catherine Burks-Brooks, and at least one DREAMer. Reverend Vivian, who was a great Civil Rights leader and a King confidant, spoke and then Catherine Burks-Brooks told her story. And her story was she was one of the original Nashville Freedom Riders and had actually been deported by [T. Eugene] Bull Connor himself from Alabama to the Tennessee border and had told him at the time of her deportation—in the middle of the night, they were thrown out at the border, all their stuff was thrown on the ground—and she told him, we’re going to be back by high noon. And this was the fearsome Bull Connor, the iconic racist and segregationist. In fact, they did go back and then were in Montgomery when the church was stoned and everything else.

But they’re on stage and they speak and then they ask this young DREAMer to speak. And he gets up and he says—this is a young kid who’s a student in Alabama just a few months after the most punitive restrictive immigration law in all of the states has been passed [Alabama HB 56]—and they ask him, why did you come forward? Why did you risk everything to become a public spokesperson on these issues? And he said, I don’t have a great story to tell. My story is kind of unremarkable. I just got tired. Catherine Burks-Brooks turns to him and says, you were tired? He said, yes, I was tired of thinking that, as my mom went off to work every day, we weren’t getting ahead and the fact was, she might get deported any day and I might not see her that night. I might

not see her again. And I just got tired of it. And Catherine Burks-Brooks looks at him and says, that's right, you were tired. He says, and I was tired going off to school, looking in the mirror before I went off, thinking that I might myself be deported that day and I wouldn't see my mom at night. He's getting more and more confident and the Freedom Rider who's leaning into him is encouraging him and it becomes this incredibly powerful testimony.

At some point, everybody in the room realizes, my god, fifty-six years ago, two blocks from here, there was a young woman who was on a bus that got tired, didn't stand up for a white passenger and ignited the entire Civil Rights Movement. That was like the perfect mixing of the two groups and a recognition that what we're about is civil rights.

So the blog is about that. I went back and talked to Catherine Burks-Brooks about that incident, which she didn't remember at all. She didn't remember the story but she was very, very supportive of what these young people are trying to do and she sees that there are differences, of course but sees a lot of similarities as well.

Q: I remember reading a shorter account than you gave here today on the *Huffington Post*, something that you had written. Before we move on to the next thing, I did want to ask you a question about that because it's really on point. It certainly seems to have resonated in the room, the parallels between what's happening today with immigration and the deportations and the civil rights issues of fifty-some years ago. Do you think that these things can also resonate in a more public and broader way?

Kerwin: I think so, because I think what the tactic is on the other side is to try to divide groups and yet ultimately, these are civil rights issues. These are—in the case of the DREAMers— young people who were brought here as children. If anybody’s blameworthy, it’s certainly not them and they’re American in every way except for immigration status. And really they’re tired and sick of being second class non-citizens and of their prospects being so diminished and of their parents’ prospects, being so diminished after they’ve been here for years and years.

So that was quite similar to the situation that Ms. Burks-Brooks talked about and I asked her, I said that’s a very peculiar word for me to hear, “tired”—it’s kind of the feeling that jettisons this issue and motivates people. And she said, you know what? We were sick and tired our whole lives, all of us were, and what you have to do is you have to overcome your fear and take a little step and then big steps.

I think that that’s what these young people did. They took a little step and then they’ve taken a big step. My own view is that they’re the most effective advocates now for immigration reform and they’ve certainly galvanized and united our movement.

Q: And tomorrow, on a similar track, you are going to be testifying before an Ad Hoc House Committee on border issues. Tell us about that.

Kerwin: Well, I thought it was almost like a [Capitol] Hill briefing, which I’ve been doing a few of as well on different aspects of the immigration debate that aren’t seeming to get sufficient coverage given the way that the bill’s being constructed. And this one is on border enforcement.

It's on Border Patrol accountability and it's on family unity, with a particular focus on the U.S.-Mexico border. But what's happened is they've moved it to a larger room. Now there are going to be a lot of members there, even though it's an ad hoc committee, and it's the same day as the [Immigration Reform] rallies that are taking place on the Capitol lawn tomorrow. The attendance in the press is supposed to be fairly significant for it, which means that I have to prepare in a way that I didn't think that I might have to do, which I'm happy to do.

But one point that's struck me in every single report I've read—and I researched and wrote a report like this twelve years ago or something like that—that there are still very significant abuses against migrants by the Border Patrol, by immigration officials and the level of abuses is fairly consistent from report to report. They're looking at very significant data sets in all of these reports too. Some of them are academic reports. Some of them are more from advocacy agencies where they brought in researchers though, so they're all credible in their own way. About ten percent of the people in these reports are saying they were physically abused, some quite severely. Twenty-five percent are complaining of verbal abuse—and I mean really hideous verbal abuse, derogatory racial statements and really defamatory things, sexual innuendo, all of that—and then denial of water, denial of food, just being treated in a dehumanized way. I think that that's the most shocking finding to me, that that still goes on and that there's really been no national conversation about it. The conversation is all about more border enforcement, expansion of the capacity of customs agents and, well, particularly Border Patrol agents, but immigration agents at ports of entry too. And it's quite clear that, yes, we need effective border enforcement but we need humane border enforcement and the latter has really lagged behind and it hasn't improved at all in a dozen years and maybe more than that.

Q: Well, we're going to delve deeper into these issues later on in the session but first, let's backtrack a little bit. I'd like to learn about how it was that you came into this field but tell us how you came into life, actually. Start there.

Kerwin: [Laughs] Well, my parents are from Connecticut—doctor and a nurse—and we basically moved to Washington. My dad went to medical school in Washington, D.C. and we moved back to Connecticut where he worked for a period of time and then came back. And I pretty much grew up in Washington. I'm a D.C. native and grew up there. Of course, haven't lived there my whole life—lived in Michigan for a period of time and lived in Peru after college for a short while—but that's been my hometown. I'm working up in New York now, so I'm up here a couple of nights a week, sometimes more, but my home is still in Washington.

How I got into the work was, I would say, through a very social justice-oriented reading of my religious tradition, which is Catholic. I had a very significant experience of that when I was a sixteen, seventeen year old. I was working with a group that was working with the homeless in Washington and got into, I would say, homeless service or homeless activism a bit and continued that through college and after college went to Peru for a year with a group of graduates from Georgetown [University], which is where I attended college. Then from there to law school, where I started to prepare political asylum cases in clinical program. For a brief period of time I was with a big law firm after law school, where I continued to do those pro bono cases, as well as some lobbying. I really wanted to do nonprofit work, social justice work in the law, and I answered an ad in the paper one day in 1992.



A month later, I was working on an asylum project for 5,600 Haitian boat people, the first wave of Haitians that fled Haiti after [Jean-Bertrand] Aristide was deposed for the first time, and they had actually been screened at Guantanamo Naval Base. About a quarter of those had been paroled, which doesn't carry any criminal connotations, but basically [they were] brought to the United States to seek political asylum. My job was to coordinate the legal response, which had been going on for a few months but there was very little staffing to do it and there were a lot of Haitians all over the country. So it was pretty much a baptism by fire. And I became, thereafter, about a year in, the director of that agency, which is the Catholic Legal Immigration Network.

Q: Also known as CLINIC.

Kerwin: Also known as CLINIC. Right. I directed it for fifteen years.

Q: Let me, before we get too deep into that, I actually want to ask you about 1992 and your work with the Haitian boat people because that's a period that—I remember reading the news at the time—was rather vivid and remarkable and sad and tragic but people, I think, have forgotten about it. So perhaps for the record, you can talk about it a little bit more and tell us some of the stories that you have from that period of your work.

Kerwin: Yes. So Aristide was deposed in a military coup and anybody that was associated or suspected to be associated with his political party, which at that point was regarded as a Reform Party called Lavalas—which means, kind of, The Wave—was at risk. They were targeted and

there were killings, grotesque killings, and bodies left out for the dogs to eat and people on the run. A lot of people tried to flee Haiti in boat at that point and the Coast Guard was—for a period of time there—intercepting them and bringing people to Guantanamo where they were screened to see whether they had a viable asylum case. Now that doesn't happen. Now they just repatriate people but at that time, they did do that and about a fourth of those—I think it was almost forty thousand people were brought to Guantanamo at one point or another—were determined to have a credible fear of persecution. But rather than being brought into the United States as refugees, they were actually brought in to seek political asylum, which meant they had to go through that whole process.

The cases were really gruesome and kind of grueling. I also did this master human rights exhibit on what was going on in Haiti. So we were working with human rights reporters in Haiti and the mainstream human rights agencies as well to document all of the abuses and to categorize them and index them. The federal government, or the asylum officers and courts, were using that exhibit, which started off at 1,200 pages and it grew as kind of the basis of the factual record that they were adjudicating the cases upon. And we were using that exhibit as the objective evidence of what was happening there and tying our asylum cases into it.

So some of—I mean, all of the cases were rough. One that I remember quite a bit because I handled it was a young person who was seventeen years old who had moving fleeing around the country. He'd been going from family member to family member in different places. His dad had been killed and he was a minor Aristide official and had been, like a lot of people, left out and nobody could retrieve the body and they just let the body rot and be eaten by animals. And I

always thought—this kid was, I think, seventeen the first time I met him and he was, as I recall, living with a brother here in the United States—that he ought to be given a medal for courage and for tenacity and fleeing on a boat by himself to a strange country. There he was, in high school and trying to do his best and make a go of it and stacking shelves in Safeway at night and all of that kind of thing. And nobody knew, but here he was. So I always had that sense of, from the very outset, immigrants as kind of heroic people and that would be an extreme example of it. And I've kept up with him a bit over the years and he seems to have done very well in the United States.

Q: Was his story typical of the other people that were coming over on boats?

Kerwin: They're very gruesome stories, the stories of the people that came, and there was no doubt about the fact that there were widespread killings and torture and everything else. So I would say that that's a minor coming by himself. There were a lot of those cases but that wouldn't be the typical story. But the typical story did involve persecution and real threats and real violence.

Q: If I can ask you something about the broader context of this work—now, this was 1992.

You've joined CLINIC. You're working with the Haitians and just several years before that, I think in 1986, was when the U.S. had passed a very comprehensive immigration reform bill [Immigration Reform and Control Act].

Kerwin: Right.

Q: So you're working in the shadow of that.

Kerwin: Right.

Q: How did that affect your initial work in CLINIC?

Kerwin: Well, when I was in a legal clinic in my law school, we were actually handling some of those cases. I went to [University of] Michigan Law School and was surprised to find that there were farm workers in northern Michigan coming down to Detroit who needed their claims or their applications prepared. We were doing some of that, not on any large scale whatsoever but were involved in it in that way, and then the regular legalization cases to an extent as well. There've always been separate programs within the immigration world and the Haitians were part of the humanitarian program—the parole program to bring in people and then the asylum program to actually get them legal status in the United States. The IRCA, Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, was a legalization program.

I didn't really see the connections between the two at that time, I must say. Although, there was, in IRCA, a small program for Haitian entrants to legalize—which people forget about—and for farm workers and another program to move up the date of registry, which is the cut-off date, by which, if you are in the country before that date, you can legalize. And people don't know about that but it had moved up from 1948 to 1972 during IRCA. So some of the really long-standing

residents who didn't have legal status were able to legalize under that. They should move the date up again, frankly.

Q: You stayed at CLINIC after 1992 for a whole many years did you say? Fifteen or so?

Q: Yes. CLINIC—after we got there, there was the Haitian program, which mostly operated in Miami, Boston, Los Angeles and other places as well, which we were coordinating nationally. There was also a review of the agency overall. It had only been in existence for two or three years at that point. And they asked me—as a new attorney, I suppose, and one of the few people in the national office—to actually staff that review for them, which I did. And we came up with a plan to continue the agency but to make it more of a support agency that empowered and trained and tried to grow the capacity of legal service providers across the country instead of running a few direct service projects in four or five places like Miami, D.C., New York, San Francisco and elsewhere.

The idea was, well, try to lift up this network of legal service providers, expand it, increase its expertise and grow it, because we knew then that we were in the third great wave of immigration to the United States. It was clear on the ground, but it was also clear any time it was studied that there was insufficient legal capacity for this new population or wave of immigrants. So that was the strategic shift that we made. It wasn't that we didn't directly represent people thereafter. We always did emergency projects like the Haitians and then we took on the detention system in a very significant way. But the basic strategic shift was to capacity building, to empowerment and support of local programs rather than having a national office try to run everything. And so the

board, which was mostly U.S. bishops, approved the plan and we were off and running. That was late 1993 and it's at that point that I was hired to direct CLINIC.

Q: Now, I have a bit of an odd question, so I hope you'll allow it. I've noticed that Catholic institutions are very actively involved in immigration issues. Why is that?

Kerwin: I mean, I think it has to do with a lot of things. The main reason, I would say, is basic Biblical teaching that flows to Catholics in the form of Catholic social teaching, and which teaches identity or empathy with migrants, based in part on the experience of Jesus himself and the Holy Family which were a migrant family and with an Old Testament tradition of exile and dispersion. This whole infrastructure and body of teaching, known as Catholic social teaching, that's built on that Biblical experience in those Biblical teachings of welcoming the stranger, not molesting the alien, of treating all as brothers and sisters, bringing together the scattered children of God. So it's really strongly rooted in a religious conviction that immigrants are not something out there, immigrants are us. And, of course, in the New Testament we're called to revere and embrace immigrants because Jesus identified with immigrants in a very personal way in the Judgment Day passage from Matthew 25. So I think that that's why, at heart, this work goes on in a very significant way within the Catholic Church and the Catholic Church is very significantly involved.

It's also, in the United States, the case that in 1920—people forget this—seventy-five percent of Catholics were foreign born. Seventy-five percent. So this has always been an immigrant church and it's becoming an immigrant church again and it's just we've been slow to recognize that.

And so all of these institutions that are the defining institutions for the Catholic church—its parishes, its Catholic charities, its schools, its universities, its hospitals, its community-organizing agencies, its labor priests, all of them—were started by and for earlier waves of immigrants. And the question is, for my generation anyway, are these entities still responsive in the way that they used to be to immigrants, to this newest wave of immigrants and not just co-religionists, not just Catholics of course, because it's a universal church and because we serve people based on their need, not based on their religion. But are they appropriately responsive in the way that they were created to be? And so that's basically the—

Q: That's a big question.

Kerwin: It's a huge question.

Q: Do you have a sense what the answer is?

Kerwin: Well, interesting that you ask because we're doing a large study and process now of bringing together those various sectors to look at that question. I don't think that there's a good sense—or even a good documented study out there—of all of what these institutions are doing with immigrants. We're trying to both document that, study it academically, but with the goal of increasing the collective impact and the collective focus on immigrant integration, which, of course, is a major focus of the Carnegie Corporation. It's one of Carnegie's signature issues and I think that of all of the foundations, Carnegie has been the strongest and the most steadfast and one of the earliest supporters on this issue. So my own suspicion is that we do an awful lot and I

know that because I worked in and with those Catholic agencies for years and years. What CLINIC was doing was taking a large social service network, essentially, which is the Catholic Charities Network—second biggest, apparently, I think in the nation still—and it was trying to make it into a legal network and not just Catholic Charities. When I started—this was post-IRCA and so there were more programs during IRCA but they folded afterwards—we had from seventeen affiliated programs—and now CLINIC has mostly Catholic but also non-Catholic affiliates—around 215. And they provide legal services out the 350 offices. So it's an amazing ministry, if you want to look at it that way.

I have actually nothing but praise for the Carnegie Corporation's work because what they did for us is they invested in that network and they allowed us to build that network and they recognized the importance of our work. And that vision of creating services and programs and, particularly, legal services, is a step towards integration that will be in place for a long time in a country that's now seventy-five million foreign-born people or the children of foreign-born people. Twenty-five percent of the country. So that's the kind of scale we're talking about. And that's something that Carnegie realized very early, that the integration of those people—which involves legal services but of course involves an awful lot more as well—is going to be one of the challenges of our era. And, you know, we've done it well before—not easily, but well. But this is a larger group and it's a more diverse country and we can never assume that it's going to just happen. And it won't just happen.

Q: The Carnegie support that you talk about to CLINIC, was that the one in 2004? There was a series of very large initiatives and grants that were Carnegie-sourced that CLINIC did and my



research shows that it's 2004 but there may have been one before. I'm not sure. Could you speak to that?

Kerwin: That's probably right and there was certainly one afterwards as well, I think closer to the last time that legalization became an active issue, which was 2006, 2007. And Carnegie has also funded other projects that I've been involved in. For example, it funded the Woodstock Theological Center Theology of Migration Project and I was, I guess, the co-founder of that and the co-director of that project. So on those early CLINIC grants, the idea was this: you take legalization and integration as the broader goal but legalization, as a step towards that goal, is your frame and you don't know if legalization is going to happen. We still don't know if it's going to happen this time. I mean, it needs to happen. We want it to happen. We're pushing really hard for it to happen but who knows?

Q: Can I ask you a clarification? Legalization had happened, had it not, with a 1986 act?

Kerwin: Right.

Q: So what kind of an environment was the grant operating in politically?

Kerwin: You mean around that time?

Q: Exactly.

Kerwin: Well, as I'm sure you know, it's been an extremely hostile environment and a very tense environment, which is, in fact, why we created that Woodstock Theological project and I could talk about that in just a second.

Q: Sure.

Kerwin: I guess let me talk about that now because the basic idea behind that project was to surface and to institutionalize and to educate people on our faith tradition and to explain to people that very issue that you've just raised and asked me about, which is why do you take the positions that you do on immigration? Why do you make the commitments that you do? And we felt that that wasn't clear and I, as somebody that would go out a lot and talk to groups in often religious settings—but sometimes not, too—found that if you go in and you say, okay folks, let's clear up some facts about immigration here. Let me talk about some myths that people might have. Let me give you the facts. That never works. I mean it never works. And I think we've become a little bit more sophisticated since then and we've learned that if you go in to try to expose people's myths, they become defensive and hardened in their myths. You know, they think that something's up. They think they're being insulted, whatever it is.

But if you go in and you say, look, we're here for half an hour or an hour, we're going to have a conversation. This is where I'm coming from. These are our religious touchstones and based on these—you know, take them or leave them, we just want you to know—this is the kind of country we're trying to create, with these kinds of values, national values and this is the role immigrants play in it and their children play in it. And based on those values, the religious values

and the national values which you might not share—but of course, most people do—this is the kind of immigration system that we think needs in place and these are some of the ways that our current situation doesn't reflect those needs. And then you can start to talk about immigration reform but not before then. Because you have people that have bought in and at least they respect that you're coming to this issue from a place of values and that you're conscientious and that you're basically doing what the earlier Civil Rights activists did, which is say, okay, you know, this is where we're coming from. Do you share these values and if you don't, okay, then you might go in a different direction but if you do, there are some common touchstones here. And we have to talk about these things because the way that it works on the ground doesn't reflect what we want religiously or nationally.

Q: What period was this at the Woodstock Theological Center?

Kerwin: It was created around the same time, 2005. We brought together all of the people that were doing any kind of religious education in parishes, through schools, just standalone institutions through various religious communities. And we created a book, a curriculum, did presentations all around the country and a lot of that work still goes on in different forms. It's not an active project, it hasn't been for the last year or so. But it was a very important project in terms of getting people on the same page and getting people to think in explicitly religious and national-identity terms. And, as you may know, that's happened in a lot of other faith communities now and there's a lot of inter-religious work around that as well and we're involved in that here too.

I think I really appreciated Carnegie funding because I thought there's nothing more important at this point in a really angry immigration debate than to have those kinds of conversations. And frankly, a lot of the secular foundations, they're really scared of religion, or they were traditionally. A lot of what they fund is inconsistent, or at odds, perhaps, with teaching on other types of issues. I thought it was quite courageous and smart of them to be able to take this issue and these teachings, where there are shared values, and to support it, which they did. Because for a lot of foundations, frankly, the word Catholic is a turn-off and you're basically banging your head against the wall. And Carnegie was never like that. They had a larger vision. So I was grateful for that. And then they also, like I said, really understood where we were trying to go institutionally at CLINIC, which was to create this legal infrastructure and they supported that as well in the context of preparing for legalization.

Q: May I ask you, before we talk about CLINIC—I can't resist because you've given us such a really interesting insight into what you did with the Woodstock Theological Center—you mentioned that Carnegie was brave to fund an initiative that was largely Catholic-driven and had these ties to theology. Does this mean that there weren't many places that you could go to get funding for such things?

Kerwin: Not a lot of places, no. The Catholic foundations, they tend to be smaller and, perhaps, they would have funded some work at Woodstock—in fact they did fund some projects at Woodstock. And there's always that issue when you have an agency. Who do you go to for which project? And so there would be a little bit of that, but Carnegie looked like the best possible alternative to us and in fact, they did support it. And we were really, really grateful that

they did and as you asked that, I realized, yes, that was the first choice and it wasn't a Catholic foundation either. So I think, I mean, I think that speaks really, really highly of their vision and their ability to work with religious groups and churches.

Q: And then the other thing that you had mentioned is that you were bringing in teachers and educators and so on to discuss these issues. Not everybody, obviously, will, I suppose, have the same opinion on these things and you must have—even within this group of Catholic educators—must have had very diverse opinions. Do you have any stories or memorable debates that stand out in your mind?

Kerwin: You know, it's interesting that the moral teaching is—there are not huge debates on that—it is what it is. It's mentioned as much as, you know, loving God in the Old Testament in the first five books of the Bible, being solicitous to aliens, to widows and orphans and it's a major theme of the New Testament as well. Now, there were certain rogue priests and others that were identified by the restrictionist movement [to restrict immigration] and they were brought forward and their arguments were, well, there's something to be said for upholding the law—which there is—and giving Caesar his due too. But they mostly talked about, you know, the greed of immigrants who wanted to come to the United States to improve their economic prospects and the fact that not all immigrants are, you know, starving in refugee camps and et cetera, et cetera. It just seemed to me, though—and I think anybody—that those arguments are not a real reflection of the teaching. And so, while those alternative voices emerged, when somebody went down and got them basically, they never had much traction among the bishops,

the religious communities, the progressives, most conservatives, any of them. It's one of those issues that, at least in that Catholic world, crosses all sorts of lines.

Q: Did you—

Kerwin: And I must say, at CLINIC, I probably—I'd have to think back on this—but I'm not sure that I ever had on my board of directors a Democrat. The majority were always bishops, by the bylaws and, at one point, during one board meeting, somebody said, "Who's first generation?" And every hand went up. So I mean these are people that are the children of immigrants. They feel it very personally and of course they feel it religiously but they feel it personally as well. I think the kind of disputes that we had or the kinds of robust conversations we had were about how much of Catholic teaching is top down and how much of it is bottom up? Those kinds of issues came up quite a bit. One of the great lines that I liked was: "It's not Catholic social teaching. It ought to be called Catholic social learning because it has a lot to learn and it has a lot to learn from the community of believers." So there was always that issue within a faith-based group—but maybe particularly within the Catholic Church—of how much of this is top down and how much of this is bottom up and what is the church, all of those issues. But it never got in the way of the basic teaching on how we treat migrants and how we think about them.

Q: When you look back on the meetings at the center, what do you feel that you achieved?

Kerwin: At Woodstock?

Q: Yes.

Kerwin: I think we provided a clear-as-day theological record of why it is that we take the positions that we take and I don't think it's disputable. But that's the Catholic position, and it's grounded in really hard, good theology. It was always there but we lifted it up and clarified it and taught it to people.

Let me back up because it ties in a lot to what I was doing at CLINIC too. We were supporting, remember, this growing network of service providers and one thing that occurred to me, probably five or six years in, was that we'd have these annual meetings and service providers would come to them and they'd be hungry for knowledge on the law. And we have these great attorneys that would train them and answer their questions via 800 [toll-free phone] numbers forty hours a week pretty much from dawn to dusk, every day, and provide legal updates to them. And that was a substantial part and perhaps the main part of the agency—that and raising monies for particular projects that we'd flow through and manage, like the citizenship work. But they'd come to these conferences for something else too, which was they'd want to be reminded of why they did what they did. And most of these agencies were led by immigrants themselves. They'd experienced all that before. Some of them had been people that legalized during IRCA. Some of them had been Sanctuary Movement [a religious and political campaign that began in the early 1980s to provide safe-haven for Central American refugees fleeing civil conflict] people. Some of them came as refugees, some of them didn't, but most of them were immigrants themselves

and most of them weren't attorneys. So they were able, under a federal process, to represent people, become accredited to do that legally.

And they wanted to be reminded. They didn't do this work because they wanted to be good social servants. They did it based on their faith and I think that that's the way that a lot of the migrants experience their own journeys as well. They don't think about this in traditional psychological terms or whatever. They think about, you know I'm out here and God's going to get me through this. Or, you know, He's on my side—or—She's on my side. So they think about their own journeys in explicitly spiritual ways and they tend to be—the clients anyway—more religious than the attorneys.

So it came quite naturally to me that if we're going to start talking to people and making this a feature of our life in terms of our support for our programs, that we needed to be good at it and we needed to do it systematically and we needed to get our ducks in a row and we needed to get the theologians involved and the educators involved.

Q: Well, I think that this is a good point to talk in depth about the Carnegie grants to CLINIC.

Tell me a little bit about the genesis of some of the ideas for the grants, about the architecture of the project, because it's quite a different initiative than Woodstock was.

Kerwin: Yes and I—let me just say, in thinking about this, and I've gone back and looked at what we were exactly funded for and those projects were extraordinarily important for us—but I always think about Carnegie because it was such a large part of CLINIC's life and my own work



as the Executive Director of CLINIC and then when I was at Migration Policy Institute and now at the Center for Migration Studies [CMS] too and through Woodstock as well—that it's hard to really say that its influence and its support was limited to these specific projects. I felt that we were always in conversation and always partnering around a shared vision, a shared commitment to moving these issues forward in a really, really smart way. And so I would give them credit for all of the accomplishments that the various agencies that I've worked with have had, whether they happen to be on citizenship, legalization preparation, immigrant integration, theology or whatever. Actually they're funding CMS now to do a project on refugee issues, which is another one of those neglected issues in the immigration debate—but really, really troubling what's happening in terms of the decline of our refugee program in the United States. But on the specific project—

Q: Well, let me—

Kerwin: Yes.

Q: Since you brought it up—

Kerwin: Yes.

Q: —about the broader partnership and the push that Carnegie gave you—

Kerwin: Yes.

Q: Let me ask a difficult question.

Kerwin: Sure.

Q: Could you say a few words on what you imagine a world without Carnegie would look like for your work?

Kerwin: Well, I mean what Carnegie's able to do is they're in conversations across various fields and with other institutions within the immigration field and the refugee world. And so what a good funder does is it's able to see a large picture and it's able to learn from who it's funding and who it's hearing from and it's able to make connections and see connections in a way that somebody like myself, who day in and out is working like a dog trying to keep their own agency open and viable and responsive, vital, can't. I think that one of the characteristics that I valued most about them is that kind of a vision. This is what's going on in the field. This is the analysis that people have at this point, about how to move forward. This ought to be the final goal. This sector is doing this. This sector is doing that. This issue is covered. That issue isn't, you know, and so it's both the big picture and it's the ability to make connections within the field, even though you might be in the immigrant service or the immigrant rights world, it's really, really hard if you're trying to meet your own mission to stay up with what's going on.

I always wanted to be a person in an agency that brought a lot to the table, that really focused on service and wasn't going to meetings all of the time. And so I think that that's one of the

contributions that I value them most for, is making those kinds of connections. And they could tell you, you know, we're not funding this, but it's not that it's not important. So and so's supporting this or go talk to this network or you might be proposing doing this, but this group is already doing it and they're doing it very, very effectively. That's a big, big help because what they're doing then is they're moving the immigrant rights world forward in a more or less unified, or at least a coordinated, way. You don't want too much lockstep movement because it's a rough and tumble field out there and I don't think it's really the job of funders to coordinate all that, but at the very least, they can give you a sense of a larger vision. So that's one of the reasons I really, really value them.

Q: Tell us about some of the specifics behind CLINIC. And I also want to talk about CMS as well in a little bit, but tell us about the multiple parts of CLINIC that were funded by Carnegie because when I was doing the research, one of the things that I was trying to wrap my head around is how a relatively small organization like CLINIC can manage to have so many different outputs and outcomes behind such a project.

Kerwin: Yes, and remember CLINIC made a tactical choice not to try to be the center of service provision in the Catholic world because we didn't think that that was the way to leverage the most services to the people that really matter, which are the people that we're trying to serve. Whenever we could, whenever we started a direct service project, it would always be only for a limited period of time with local partners and with a plan in place to hand over the project to the local partners when it became viable. And so instead of growing to whatever size it would have grown to if we had just been a standalone, the way we measured our success was how has the

expertise and the staffing and the number of programs out there increased? So it was a small agency, probably around sixty people at most at any one time, but it had a major impact and it measured its impact based on the work of its network, not its own staffing or resources. And so, how did they—I'm sorry. I got diverted there. Why did they support an agency of that size?

Q: Well, I guess the question is more about the architecture—

Kerwin: Oh. Oh, what they funded.

Q: —of the CLINIC grants itself and what they funded and what you accomplished, you know, the stories behind it and so on.

Kerwin: Yes. So the issue was legalization, both in 2004 and 2007. But CLINIC's a network that serves several hundred thousand people per year now and legalization is eleven million people—and CLINIC's the largest network, probably as large as all of the other charitable legal networks combined—and yet it's obvious that it's got to double in capacity to meet the needs of a legalization program, for example. So how do you do that, given that these are, oftentimes, little programs where the people are up to their noses in cases already and working as hard as they possibly can? And so you have to develop new models. You have to build capacity. You have to build programs. You have to have plans in place. You have to do all of that but you can't just do that because you don't know if this legalization program's actually going to happen.

What we were doing with the Carnegie funding, as I look back on it, is we had plans both to test run a lot of what we would be doing in legalization and that would be through citizenship programs, through group processing sessions, through support of local programs to expand their capacity to represent lots of people in a very short period of time. That started around 2005, something like that. At the same time, we were very explicitly trying to get programs recognized, their staff accredited, well trained. We were looking at where unauthorized people were versus where legal programs were and pulling together community resources and affiliates to create programs where there needed to be programs created, and all those things. So we were both doing service provision and capacity building at the same time and that was the whole idea.

Q: And by service provision, do you mean services to the NGOs [non-governmental organizations] that were working on these issues or to immigrants themselves?

Kerwin: By capacity building, I mean service to the NGOs who are working on them and actually creating programs where they didn't exist and expanding programs where they did. But on service provision, I mean straight naturalization services, for example—and by now there have been several programs that are not really reasonable facsimiles for what legalization is going to be like, but the closest that we can possibly get and one of them is naturalization. Another is temporary protected status in particular places. Every so often, certain populations have to renew. It's not nearly as big of a population as legalization but in some places it's a very significant population. The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals [DACA]—CLINIC is doing significant work there in collaboration, of course, with all these other groups as well. And I think that the other one would be the waivers that now exist for people that are eligible for family

based visas but who formerly would have had to have gone back to their country to get them but, as soon as they left, would be barred from reentering because they've been in unauthorized and would need to apply for a waiver abroad. They've had unauthorized presence the United States and so they don't go, they don't leave and they never become legal. There's now the ability to adjudicate those waivers in the United States so that you know before you leave for consular processing that you can come back and these are people that have waited in line and been tentatively found eligible for visas oftentimes years before.

So those are, as I looked at it, the four big programs—naturalization being the biggest, but also DACA, waivers, and TPS [Temporary Protected Status], that are major group processing types of programs. And as you build your capacity out there, you're also kind of test running how you're going to do when legalization comes and you're test running by serving people. And so that was the idea. At the very least, legalization doesn't happen and you have more legal programs that are needed and they've been doing important work with populations that need that help. Once you do that work, of course, it does lead to legal status for more people too but it's not in the context of a large legalization program. So that's what Carnegie was funding and it was, I think, really, really smart to do that. You're accomplishing three or four things with one grant.

Q: And the political context at the time? Give us a sense of what 2005, 2006, 2007 looked like. I think 2007 was the year when there was going to be a big immigration reform act but it didn't pass, right?

Kerwin: Yes. 2005 was when Kennedy-McCain [Immigration Bill] was up, introduced and then there were various bills that ultimately led to [Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of] 2007 and the final blow was the waning days of the 111th Congress when DREAM [Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act] didn't pass.

Q: And for people that may be listening to this many years down the road, could you give us a little bit of context on that?

Kerwin: Why it didn't pass?

Q: The general political context of the immigration debates and the reform attempts in that period, like 2005 to 2007.

Kerwin: My own analysis—and I think it's shared by other people—is that we had been in a mode in the immigration field for years where we would put together blue ribbon panels and we would come up with beautiful policies and supreme recommendations on how the system ought to be reformed. They were well supported and they had the blessing of important thoughtful agencies and they had a lot of sign on. And the anti-immigrant groups would kill them. I mean they would literally kill them. Their analysis would be wrong. Their facts would be wrong. Their tactics would be brutal. But what I think we concluded—or what I did anyway—was that there's never going to be a blue panel type of proposal that passes without being vetted and without a huge fight and in fact, that's not the way change occurs anymore. And I think that at some point in there, everybody realized that, no, we're playing against people that will never let that happen

again. And in fact, I was in a debate with the leader of one of those agencies and he basically said as much, that there will never be any surprises about what's in these bills anymore. These will never pass easily as a package of reforms. We're going to fight these things tooth and nail and in fact, that's what they were doing.

The tactics are really rough. They mobilize. They write more. They scream more. They disrupt meetings. When I go out, for example—this has happened more than once—if it's publicized that you're speaking somewhere, you'll finish and then there'll always be two or three people in the front of the audience whose hands go immediately up. And you know who those people are. Those are the people that have been assigned to cover your event and to disrupt it and to ask the questions—and not really questions—but to speechify and spew their myths and their anti-immigrant ideas and to blame immigrants for the latest negative development in the country, whether it's the return of leprosy or whether it's healthcare or whether it's mortgage defaults. Now it's going to be cost. That's the one they're going to focus on now. We can't legalize people because it will cost us billions of dollars at a time when we can ill-afford that. So whatever they market-test and they find out, whatever the issue is that's of concern to the most people out there, they blame immigrants for it. And they have studies that are methodologically unsound.

So that's who we're up against and I don't think we realized that for a period of time. And people then started to realize—and I think Carnegie and a lot of the foundations realized—that what existed on the pro-immigrant side was inadequate. The best antidote so far has been the DREAMers, but it can't just be the DREAMers.



Q: So what has the pro-immigrant side done to catch up tactically?

Kerwin: I think it's become much more nimble and applied in terms of the papers that it's producing, the policy statements, the press work, the communications work, the rapid-response work, all of it. The other development, which has been quite lovely from the perspective of people who care about immigrants, is the immigrants have gotten engaged in a way that they haven't before electorally and otherwise. And the strategy, I think, ultimately, that was being pushed federally and more on a state and local level of self-deportation—which is the strategy of basically making life so miserable for people by denying their rights, by denying them the right to housing, by denying them police protection, by trying to deny kids the right to go to school, revisiting citizenship-by-birth in the United States. All of these things became so abhorrent for immigrant communities—and they were embraced in the Republican Party platform and embraced explicitly by [Governor W. Mitt] Romney, whose advisor was the architect of the strategy—that they voted historically to renounce those tactics. And that changed context a lot and it wasn't just the more than seventy percent of Hispanics voting against Romney, it was seventy-three percent of Asians—which can be a very conservative group, a large group and a diverse group that can be very conservative—and more than fifty percent of Cubans, which certainly would have been an eye opener. So I think that politically the environment has shifted a bit.

What hasn't shifted, though, is that in a lot of the House districts, the incentives are different. Right? If you're a politician and you're a national politician—the Bushes and the Karl Roves knew this a long time ago—you better have a broader appeal than if you're a House member in

Indiana with ninety-seven percent white district, overwhelmingly Republican. So the national Republicans understand this, the Senators understand it better but they're a bit closer to the hysteria and anger. And then for many of the House members, it's still good politics to be anti-immigrant. So that's what we're up against now.

Q: I want to jump a little bit to some of the more recent work that you've done that's supported by Carnegie. You said that CMS is now doing work with refugees that is Carnegie-supported. Can you speak to that and how that is similar or differs in terms of the political climate with immigrant issues?

Kerwin: What's happened is that, on a state-level anyway—and this is generated, in part, I think, by the same kinds of groups that have created the templates for the anti-immigrant legislation in states—there started to be pushback and state laws that are not welcoming, to say the least, to refugees. They use the word absorption. We can't absorb these people anymore. And the story of the refugee program has been this lovely, beautiful story of people that came over with no resources whatsoever. Since 1975, you know, three million of them have been settled in the United States and overwhelmingly, they've done very, very well and have contributed to the United States in all sorts of important ways. And the refugee program was always supported. It was always the program that was widely supported because it was clear that these people were fleeing persecution. There was no doubt about that. And they were understandable groups too. They were the Vietnamese and they were the Bosnians and they were people fleeing from Eastern Bloc countries and in a way, it's a more diverse group now and their situations are not as well-understood, which I think explains some of the programs.

But the long and short of it is this: we started to look at that system as a whole, both the formal refugee program—in other words bringing people into the United States from camps abroad—and the political asylum system in the United States and the temporary protection programs, in other words the refugee protection system writ large—and it started to really worry me that in every area it seemed like it had become weakened. People couldn't get here anymore. There was all sorts of barriers for people fleeing for their lives to actually reach U.S. territory and to even make a claim. The refugee program was caught up in some very legitimate post-9/11 security reviews but it was also clear that people that were really at risk were languishing in camps for long, long periods of time. Numbers fell down really significantly and then there were new substantive and procedural barriers, at least in the asylum context to actually get political asylum. And in terms of temporary protection, the ability to bring people who don't fit the narrow refugee category has been really curtailed over the years. So if you look at the whole system, you'd have to say that it's still a generous system, but it's a much less robust system and there seems to be increasing public discord over it in a way that there hasn't been traditionally. And that's what this project is about.

Q: Now a question about CMS. Did you come here right after CLINIC?

Kerwin: No, my life's been a little bit complicated because I was at Migration Policy Institute in Washington for three years. I was the vice president there and then I came to CMS about eighteen months ago. And then about six months ago or seven months ago—because one of my successors at CLINIC left to go into the government and become the ombudsman for the

Department of Homeland Security—the bishops asked me to come back and run CLINIC for a few months. So I was doing, for a period there, CLINIC and CMS and I just left CLINIC again. So I had two jobs for a while but I've been full time here at CMS for eighteen months. Six months of that, I was also pretty much full time at CLINIC, so it was very hectic.

Q: But you could go back to CLINIC nonetheless. Was it was an easy decision to go back or was it a tough one?

Kerwin: [Laughs] It was an easy decision but I think it ended up being a lot harder than I thought it would be. I'd been away for four years at that point and I think I have enough of a sense of, you know, the institution and myself, that I think it was good for CLINIC for me to be back there for six months. It may not have been great for the morale of everybody [laughs] but it was important and it's a very important time because they are gearing up as the large network for legalization again in exactly the ways that we did several years ago. And Carnegie is there again for them, supporting naturalization and a lot of other work. So that's my most recent experience of Carnegie. They've pulled together all sorts of funders and other agencies that are involved in this now and really expanded the networks involved. So I've seen again what Carnegie's remarkable brand of philanthropy accomplishes in the immigration rights and the immigration service community and I come back from CLINIC with renewed respect for them.

Q: For this period when you were both here at CMS and at CLINIC, how did you logistically do it?

Kerwin: I'd be there typically three days a week and here two days a week and just basically worked constantly.

Q: Sounds about right.

Kerwin: Yes.

Q: And you did spend, you said was it three years at MPI as vice president?

Kerwin: I was three years at MPI. Yes.

Q: Tell me about it. MPI is in Washington, D.C.

Kerwin: Yes. MPI is a great agency and it's the brainchild of, I think, several people: Kathleen Newland and Doris Meissner, but in particular the great [Demetrios G.] Dmitri Papademetriou. They look very independently and provide fact-based policy analysis for the world. They tend to do it from a good government perspective, but they also get the insights and perspectives of others, as well, including non-governmental organizations. And what you can expect them to do is to be both visionary in terms of where immigration policy ought to go both in the United States but also globally, because they're very active in other parts of the world right now—I think Dmitri probably spends most of his time in Europe.

But they also produce policy products that answer facts or that provide facts and inform the debate. There's a real hunger and a need for that right now. And so I have a lot of admiration and I had a very good three years there. I wrote a lot of those types of papers and reports myself. In fact, the idea of that refugee program came from a paper that I wrote at Migration Policy Institute.

Another project that I led there was their legalization implementation project, which of course would be a lot different from what CLINIC is thinking of doing. How do you create the infrastructure and how do you make this massive program work on the ground? What MPI is doing is it's stepping back and bringing in the various government players, the foreign officials, the state and local people, the NGOs and anybody that would be involved in a project like that and asking the same question—how can this work? At the end of the day, how do you take a population like this that's two times bigger than the number of cases handled by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services every year and create a successful program? And so we did a whole lot of work and a lot of reports and analysis on implementation but more from the government's perspective and with the input of the government officials themselves.

Q: Are there any drawbacks to MPI's proximity to government officials in terms of the work that it does or the direction it takes?

Kerwin: I think that there are a lot of positives in the sense that they get government and former government officials to provide them with information and to participate to the extent that they can in MPI's various processes. One of the reports that I was very heavily involved in just before

I left was this report that they released just in January of this year [2013] on immigration enforcement in the United States. And so I probably spent my last two or three months—when I was at MPI—just working on that and then it went through various stages after I left. And what that report does is it says, okay, we're not making any recommendations here. We're just going to explain to people how the enforcement programs have grown since 1986, since the IRCA act. There are still people out there that say we're not enforcing the law but look at this. And it identified six pillars of enforcement and explained not just spending increases and not just staffing growth but real growth in operations and functionality. And the idea is—they probably wouldn't like me to say this but nobody will hear this for many years—this isn't your grandmother's immigration enforcement system. This is a real immigration enforcement system. This is taking enforcement seriously and more seriously in the United States now than anywhere else in the world.

So back to your question. I think that overwhelmingly, it's positive that they relate to government like that, and they're able to because they're not taking cheap shots and they're listening to policymakers and listening to the kinds of questions and issues that are of concern to them and the kinds of realities that they're facing. They're trying to produce products that respond to that. In coming to CMS, my orientation had always been different. It hadn't been a good government orientation which I value. It always had been based on the needs of immigrants and the people that are exposed to government programs and policies. And so I would say that my background had been more bottom-up and I'm probably a bit more focused on that and that's more my orientation.

Q: What do you mean by that?

Kerwin: How policies work and look and operate from the perspective of the people that are most affected by them, which are, in this case, the immigrants themselves and in lots of cases, really vulnerable people.

Q: Why did you leave MPI?

Kerwin: Well, I didn't leave because I was unhappy—that's important to know—and I left with a lot of good friendships intact I hope and a lot of respect for what they do. But I think probably I was somewhat used to being the director of an agency and I like that. I like being able to shape something. The Catholic part of it matters to me as well, that values piece of it. And I like the fact that we relate here to the Scalabrini [International Migration] Network which is actually seeing vulnerable migrants out there day in and out. I always had that at CLINIC and I guess I missed that. And I like the idea of having that kind of orientation. You produce fact-based, evidence-based work that's very credible but your orientation is, okay, well how does this system look from the perspective of migrants?

Q: I appreciate your candid answer to that. I really do. We're coming towards the end of this particular session and so I wanted to ask you a couple more questions. One of them concerns Carnegie and its role in any of the institutes or in your own personal work, if there's anything that we've—there are many things we've left uncovered—but if there's anything in particular that you wanted to touch on. So that's my first of two questions.



Kerwin: I would say that I think what I appreciate about Carnegie is the large vision that they have, their ability to connect you to other issues and other groups that you ought to be connected with but you're not, the degree to which they're accepting of differences on other issues but are not ideological in a way that would exclude them from working with you. You might know that runs both ways too. I mean if I'm on a board with very conservative Catholics, they may wonder about what Carnegie funds or Ford [Foundation] funds or whatever. And so both of us have to be able to meet to make this work and they were always willing to do that, which I really appreciated.

And then I appreciate that they invest in people too, which I am really grateful for. So I've always felt that, obviously, they're a funding institution, but they spend a lot of time in trying to figure out who the right people are that can accomplish what they support and they tend to follow them. I've always known—now I'm in my third agency in five years—that I could go and at least talk to somebody there about what I'm trying to accomplish and what this agency can do very well and that kind of thing. It may not lead to funding but they've always been open to that. So I suppose you might say it's the personal relationship and the sense that they're investing in supporting your institutions but they're also working with people that they've worked with for a long, long time which I appreciate.

Q: Thank you for that. The second final question I have for this session is a tough one to answer, admittedly, but it gets to the core of what we've been talking about with these political and historical immigration issues. You did mention some formidable opponents to these things that

you're dealing with—political, social and so on—in having a society that is open to immigration and that absorbs immigrants in an institutionalized healthy way. Can the U.S. ever become a non-immigrant society?

Kerwin: That's a good—

Q: In terms of how it looks at its borders and the world?

Kerwin: I mean, I love the way that you asked that because it goes to the very nature of the country—it is a country of immigrants and it's a country that's kind of this ongoing experiment of people coming together who share core values and common commitments. I tell people, I think it's the credal nation, not the nativist nation. It's not closed off to people because of their race or their ethnicity or their background or who their parents are. It's this openness to people that share certain values that want to commit to engaging certain democratic institutions, and that are in search of better lives for themselves and their families.

I think that is the kind of country that we are and I think the U.S. would lose a lot if it didn't have immigrants coming in and not threatening our values, but actually renewing our values. You know? There's this phrase that Bush's speechwriter Michael Gerson used, where he said, you know, immigrants are exhibiting emblematic U.S. values, and I think that's exactly right. The anti-immigrant people can act like that's not true. They can act like these people are all—particularly the unauthorized—this indiscriminate, undifferentiated group of lawbreakers, but we know that this group includes 2.1 million kids, not born here but brought here to the United

States as kids—the DREAMers who are giving us a lesson in civics right now and political participation. It includes the parents of 4.5 million U.S. citizens who want the best for their families. It includes people that do thankless work for very, very little [money] and in jobs that there really aren't sufficient [numbers of] U.S. citizens interested in doing. And it includes our coreligionists, people that are renewing our churches, on and on and on. They wouldn't be considered lawbreakers in any kind of normal system and I have every confidence that they're going to continue to renew and contribute to the country.

So I feel very good about that and I feel that, to a certain extent, the loud mouths and the people with their market-tested messages by the Frank Luntzes [Republican pollster and political consultant] of the world, the people that would make amnesty a dirty word because people don't embrace it and that try to use that word to describe any positive proposal—I believe that ultimately, that's not going to sell. I believe that people, ultimately, will be smart about that and that, you know what, the immigrants are going to become integrated and they are going to become incorporated and they are going to be a part of this country and they are already part of this country because they always have been.

So I think that ultimately, we will prevail but we're living in challenging times/

Q: Fitting answer and a fitting conclusion to this interview session.

Kerwin: Thanks.

Q: Don, thank you very much.

Kerwin: Thanks, George. Appreciate it.

Q: This has been George Gavrilis with Donald Kerwin for the Oral History project of the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

[END OF INTERVIEW]

|                             |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Aristide, Jean-Bertrand     | 7       |
| Burks-Brooks, Catherine     | 2, 3, 4 |
| Connor, T. Eugene Bull      | 2       |
| Gerson, Michael             | 40      |
| King, Martin Luther, Jr.    | 2       |
| Meissner, Doris             | 35      |
| Newland, Kathleen           | 35      |
| Papademetriou, Demetrios G. | 35      |
| Romney, W. Mitt             | 31      |
| Vivian, C.T.                | 2       |