

Insecure Borders and Broken Immigration Laws: A Discussion with Chris Farrell and Mark Krikorian

by Jerry Gordon and Shane Wikfors (September 2014)



As Congress rushed for the exits in late July for the August recess, the massive humanitarian crisis on our Southern borders caused by the massive influx of more than 57,000 unaccompanied minors fleeing drug crime ridden violence in Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. On July 25, 2014, the Presidents of these troubled Central American countries met with President Obama in the Oval Office seeking means to discourage the influx. The President [discussed](#) with these three Central American leaders an experimental in- country program that might allot up to 15,000 positions to permit entry of some of these youngsters under changes in the definitions for amnesty under the Refugee Act of 1980, via an executive order.

President Obama proposed adopting changes in those definitions to reflect the motivations behind this wave of unaccompanied minors from the three Central American Countries infiltrating mainly along the Texas Rio Grande Valley border with Mexico. They had been mistakenly informed that if they reached the US, they would be admitted. That was reminiscent of the [Mariel Boat Lift](#) that brought more than 125,000 Cuban refugees to Florida's shores in 1980.

Additionally, the President [proposed](#) \$3.7 Billion in supplemental appropriations to alleviate this humanitarian crisis. The funds were to be used to cover the cost of the detention centers, medical screening and immigration courts system for processing for deportation cases or granting possible asylum. He had granted limited amnesty in June 2012 under an Executive Memorandum, [Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals](#) ("DACA"), for an estimated 700,000 children of illegal aliens who had been brought to the US before the age of 16. These were the so-called "dreamers" – a reference to the Dream Act that failed to pass Congress. The President's proposals were meant to spur action by Congress before the onset of the August recess. The President threatened executive action on possible limited illegal alien amnesty if the Congress didn't pass suitable legislation to deal with the humanitarian crisis. Both

the Senate and House were at loggerheads over supplemental appropriations legislation. The Senate Appropriations Committee [proposal](#) was “Christmas treed” to cover more than \$2 billion in funds for the detention holdings centers on our Southern border and the immigration courts systems with modest border security funding. It also included funds to combat wildfires in drought-ridden Western states and \$225 million to replenish Israel’s Iron Dome System. On Thursday night, July 31st, the Republican minority blocked the packaged appropriations legislation by a vote of 50 to 44.

On Friday morning, August 1st, the Supplemental Appropriations of \$225 million for replenishment of the Iron Dome System was [passed](#) by unanimous consent by the Senate, virtually assuring passage by the House. The only addition was funding to combat wildfires in the US West. The measure was sent on to President Obama for his signature. The Senate decamped for a five week recess, not waiting to consider border security measures pending before the House.

Before the House adjourned on August 1st for the five week recess in a mid-term election year, it [passed](#) a border security supplemental appropriations of \$697 million to “speed deportations” by a vote of 223-189. Thus defying a veto threat from President Obama who called the House bill “extreme.”

The President’s emergency appropriations legislation stalled in the current Congressional session. It appeared that another confrontation over an amnesty measure by executive order might be in the offing when Congress returns after the Labor Day holiday in September. In an August news conference following recess by the Congress, he said “I promise you the American people don’t want me just standing around twiddling my thumbs and waiting for Congress to get something done.” In a late August *Fox News* [report](#), six vulnerable Democratic Senators in the upcoming November mid-term elections, disagreed with the President’s hortatory remarks suggesting that legislative resolution of the immigration issues was the best course of action.

In the interim, the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) has been forced to divert funds to tackle the unaccompanied alien minor problem on our Southern border from processing 70,000 refugees allotted by Congress under the Refugee Act provisions in the current fiscal year. A mid-August *Wall Street Journal* [article](#) cited a federal ORR official saying:

For fiscal 2014, \$868 million was allocated to the Unaccompanied Alien Children program, and earlier this year an additional \$44 million was added, compared with the \$376 million allocated the previous year. As the flow of children surged, the resettlement agency in June notified Congress that it had to divert \$94 million from

refugee programs to the minors' program.

The WSJ article noted the concerns and lobbying efforts of mainly religious affiliated Voluntary Agencies that benefit from sole source contracts with the US State Department, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration and the US Department of Health and Human Services ORR:

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services and other organizations that serve refugees have taken their concerns to congressional representatives.

[The Refugee Act of 1980](#) was enacted to comply with international standards for handling humanitarian refugees which meant complying with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees program. The Act has resulting in over 3 million refugees being settled in the US, granting them temporary cash benefits, Medicaid eligibility and a Green Card leading to US citizenship in five years. The Refugee Act is overdue for an overhaul that a number of critics have suggested requires congressionally sponsored Government Accountability Office audits and special investigative hearings. The estimated administrative cost of the Refugee Resettlement program exceeds \$2 billion annually. Add to that state welfare cash assistance and Medicaid costs and some immigration experts maintain that the annual costs could well exceed \$10 to 12 billion.

In Mid-June 2014, Texas Governor, [Rick Perry](#) spoke about the crisis along the Texas border where he had ordered the National Guard to enforce security. He drew attention to the spike in Central American, Syrian and other Middle Eastern illegal immigrants seeking asylum. *The Washington Times* [quoted](#) Perry as saying:

The federal government must step up because Texas does not have the money or manpower to protect its 1,200 mile southern border.

Perry went on to express an abiding concern about illegal immigrants harboring possible terrorist threats:

There are a record number of illegal immigrants that are being apprehended at the border that come from countries that are home to groups that pose a threat to the United States.

These people are coming from states like Syria that have substantial connections back to terrorist regimes and terrorist operations. It is a huge problem and a great

concern.

Governor Perry's comments came in the face of a veritable onslaught of [unaccompanied alien minors](#) and women with small children from Central America swarming our borders. There were daily news stories about youngsters being warehoused, and given medical treatment. They are given bus tickets to stay with alleged relatives on the promise to show up for an Immigration court to hear their petition for asylum.

The Wall Street Journal investigated the concerns expressed by Texas Governor Perry. These were reflected in comments by Texas Congressman Henry Cuellar (D-TX), "[Migrant Surge Jams Border](#)".

Cuellar pointed to the 11,000 illegals that were effectively let go in the Rio Grande Valley and other border locations. The numbers are staggering. The DHS has stepped up deportations from 235,093 last fiscal year, up from 151,893 four years earlier.

The major concern is those [unaccompanied alien minors](#) cited by the federal ORR. The number doubled over the previous fiscal year to more than 47,017 and federal officials expect that could double to in excess of 90,000. The reality is the current surge is literally swamping the Immigration Courts system used to handle asylum and deportation matters. Currently the backlog exceeds 350,000 pending cases.

[Watch](#) this CNN news video on the crisis in unaccompanied minor illegal immigrants on the Southern border.

So who is fomenting the current humanitarian crisis on our southern border? Ann Corcoran of Refugee Resettlement Watch suggested in a recent article that may be the same religious groups that were behind the so-called Sanctuary Movement of the 1980's in the Southwestern US that sent illegals across the country, "[Invasion on the border: religious groups telling them to come!](#)"

Corcoran cites a Border Patrol officer reflecting the comments of unaccompanied alien minors as to who told them to come here:

Cueto (Art Del Cueto, president of the National Border Patrol Council Local 2544 in Tucson) says when he asked a group of children about their motivation, they spoke of the "announcer on the radio" who encouraged them to head for the United States. Cueto says Central American radio, television, other media, and religious groups have all encouraged people to move north to the United States.

Against this background, the Lisa Benson Radio Show held a panel discussion on “Broken Borders, Broken Immigration Laws” co-hosted by Arizona veteran radio personality and political activist, Shane Wikfors and this writer. The panel was composed of Christopher Farrell, Director of Investigations and Board member of [Judicial Watch](#) and Mark Krikorian, executive director of the [Center for Immigration Studies](#) , both based in Washington, DC.

☒ Shane Wikfors: Good afternoon America. Hello and welcome to the Lisa Benson Radio Show for national security matters. Week after week this broadcast brings you the accurate, measured and intelligent information on protecting the American homeland and its closest ally Israel. My name is Shane Wikfors and today I will be sitting in for Lisa Benson

Acting as co-host in Lisa Benson’s absence is Jerry Gordon. Jerry Gordon is the Senior Vice President of World Encounter Institute. He is also Senior Editor for *New English Review*. He is a former Army Intelligence Officer who served during the Vietnam era. He has been published widely in many different outlets including *FrontPage Magazine*, *American Thinker*, *WorldNet Daily*, and of course *New English Review*. He is also a frequent guest on a number of radio shows across the country and a co-host on this weekly show.

☒

Jerry Gordon: Thank you very much.

Wikfors: We have quite a great line up today. Would you please introduce our first guest?

Gordon: Mr. Christopher Farrell is a long term member of the staff and board of Judicial Watch in Washington D.C. He is a Distinguished Military Graduate from Fordham University with a Bachelor in History after which he accepted a regular Army commission and served as a Military Intelligence Officer specializing in counter-terror intelligence and human intelligence. Chris is Director of Investigations at Judicial Watch. He has appeared frequently on cable news TV programs, FOX news channel and others. He has been an eyewitness to the breakdown on our Southern border as well as other activities of importance for this country.

☒ Farrell: It’s good to be with you. Thank you very much.

Wikfors: Great to have you.

Gordon: Chris, tell our listeners about the range of activities of Judicial Watch. Many of us consider Judicial Watch as the legal and investigative arm that has kept the Obama Administration "half way honest." Can you fill us in on some of the major investigations that you have or are currently conducting?

Farrell: Probably the single most important project that your listeners would be aware of, number one and really what we have done is we've done the work that Congress should have been doing all along. Your listeners may be aware that we uncovered the Benghazi emails tying Ben Rhodes from the National Security Council staff directly to the phony video story out of the White House. The White House email which really discusses their policy failure was the ignition point. It was the driving factor in House Speaker Boehner appointing Trey Gowdy and the Select Committee to look into Benghazi. That is one notch on our belt I am very proud of. The second one has to do with Lois Lerner and the IRS and the emails that we have been able to obtain by a legal process by suing in court to compel the government to produce records. There has been a lot of activity on that in the last few weeks and there is more to come this month and next, with the trial that we are involved in. The third point just broke this past week. We went to court again and in this case forced the Justice Department to finally start releasing records pertaining to Fast and Furious. Those are three what I think are solid home runs we've hit in the last couple of months doing the work that Congress has been unable to do.

Wikfors: It sure seems like it's more than a full time job as well.

Gordon: Chris, connected with the dramatic revelations about the Fast and Furious investigation, we noticed that there has been an extradition of one of the Mexican drug gang members who allegedly is a suspect in the 2010 killing of US Border Patrol man, Brian Terry. What can you tell us about that?

Farrell: Yes, surprise that occurred on the same day that the Judge ordered the Justice Department to compile what is called a Vaughn Index in the fast and Furious. A Vaughan Index is a listing of documents that the government attempted to withhold, the legal basis for those withholdings and then an explanation as to how it would damage or harm the Republic, if they possibly released this information. On the same day the government announced the apprehension of one of the Mexican Drug kingpins involved in the gun battle that killed agent Terry. That's fine but I don't think there are too many coincidences in life.

Wikfors: What kind of process in terms of time frame do you think it will take before those documents are released and do you think the slowness of that pace will indicate something?

Farrell: I mean if the government strategy is a delay tactics then they are going to do everything they possibly can to drag their feet. We waited very patiently sixteen months while supposedly the House Oversight Committee and the Justice Department went around and around about these Fast Furious records and documents. Your listeners should be reminded that these documents are being withheld on an assertion of executive privilege. That means is the White House is asserting that the President, and the Attorney General, personally were involved in the decision making concerning this gun running operation, Fast and Furious. By making that assertion in court papers, they are figuratively speaking, dragging the body bags of Fast and Furious into the Oval Office. No one should mistake that for a moment. No one died in Watergate. In this case they have at least three hundred dead Mexicans, a dead border patrol agent and arguably another dead deputy sheriff all tied to Fast and Furious guns. The President and the Attorney General say they personally made the decision in the Oval Office. That is breathtaking, shattering, shocking information but for the most part the American people are asleep at the switch.

Wikfors: I think most people in this country are almost in a state of crisis, worn out by the scandals that have occurred. So it continues to drag people into these different scenarios with it or the situations with the Administration.

Gordon: You have been onsite at our Southern border. Late Friday night the House passed its version of a secure border bill. From your work down there how secure is the Southern border and how can we prevent things like drug trading, human trafficking and even infiltration by some international terrorist groups?

Farrell: The border is not secure at all. In fact arguably it's been diminished with respect to security. My first involvement with being on the border, was thirty years ago when I was at Fort Huachuca and Sierra Vista, Arizona. That area wasn't great then but it certainly has been diminished over time. The Bush Administration wasn't terribly strong. However, the Obama administration has turned it into a disgrace. The larger question is with respect to human smuggling, drug trafficking and terrorism threats. The only solution is that a very short order be given to the Chairman of the JCS to secure the Southern border of the United States. That has been done for decades in North/South Korea or any number of other places around the world. We can effectively remilitarize the border. We can at least secure it while routine trade goes on. The trucks and trains do what they do. Commerce continues, but the border itself is an existential threat. The Southern Command Commander said so not long ago that we cannot continue to operate in the manner that we are. There is sufficient evidence of terrorist activity in Mexico. Whether it is Hezbollah counterfeiting money or whether it is Al Qaeda related training camps, there is this substantial body of evidence that points to a

violent threat. I don't know whether it's going to take a city like Tucson or San Diego being vaporized to get our attention?

Wikfers: I have a son who served in the National Guard. He was stationed on the border just East of Douglas, Arizona for a number of months and when I believe the Obama administration pulled funding from the State of Arizona. Could there be a possible problem if we have a Commander in Chief who is not willing to militarize the border. How do you see that playing out?

Farrell: With respect to the Obama administration and Attorney General Holder and Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson, they are the three principals who have direct control over this. However, it is simply not going to happen in this Administration. It's not in the cards; it's not even being discussed, or considered. It's not going to happen. The question is in 2016 assuming there is a new process down the road with a different policy and who knows what that will be. If you are serious about securing the borders the only way to do it in the immediate sense is with the military. However, the current administration has no interest in securing the border. However, we are in grave peril and we're whistling past the graveyard pretending everything is going to be o.k. We are at risk. It's a scary time.

Wikfors: Conceivably this can even drag out until say January of 2017?

Farrell: Easily.

Wikfors: In my opinion it is a manufactured crisis. We are in for a long number of months until the next opportunity to replace leadership and the Commander in Chief.

Farrell: My interest is in proving that the members of La Raza, Bluelack and Maldeath who are down in Central America are stirring this up. These people didn't head north spontaneously. They were organized, promoted and launched. It is my contention that various non-governmental organizations who are operating for political purposes have been synchronizing and coordinating activities with those groups and if those groups down in Central America pushing these people North.

Wikfors: I think you are right there. I also believe that I have heard that the Federal Government was asking contractors for some form of temporary lodging prior to this whole border crisis occurring. I'm not sure if Judicial Watch had anything to do with that but it seems like things were set in place before this whole thing began to go down at the end of June?

Farrell: Correct.

Wikfors: What do you think Judicial Watch's role will be to get Congress to pay attention at this point? Is it to keep pressure on Congress? I know they have recessed, and headed home. It is an election year and of course everybody pays attention to that. What do you think listeners can do?

Farrell: We're going to keep doing what we have been doing for twenty years now. My colleagues Tom Fitton who is the President of Judicial Watch and Paul Orfanedes who is our head Attorney and I are the three directors. We are going to keep pushing matters like Benghazi, the IRS and Fast and Furious. We are going to bring lawsuits. We are going to challenge the government. We are going to keep moving the ball down the field and trying to break these cases open. Congress can play catch up and the rest of the media can swoop in behind us. We are going to keep driving hard on these topics and getting accountability for the American public come hell or high water. I believe it's not going to stop.

Wikfors: Chris Farrell, thank you so much for joining us today on Lisa Benson Show. Keep up the wonderful work of Judicial Watch. We appreciate all that you are doing to bring light to what's happening behind the scenes.

Gordon: Mark Krikorian is our next guest. He is a recognized national and international expert on immigration. He serves as Executive Director of the Center for Immigration Studies in Washington D.C. which conducts non-partisan research, examines and critiques the impact of immigration on the United States. He has frequently testified before Congress. You may have seen him on National Cable TV news programs. He is published widely in the *Washington Post*, *the New York Times*, *L.A. Times* and *Commentary*, welcome Mark.



Krikorian: Glad to be here.

Gordon: In our last segment with Chris Farrell we talked about the insecurity of the border and its possible militarization. Regarding this current dramatic influx of Central American unaccompanied minors, what do you attribute that to?

Krikorian: There is little doubt really that the President's gutting of immigration

enforcement over the past five years has created the expectation on the part of a lot of people that getting into the United States is legal. As long as you are not, a gang banger or a drug dealer you'll be able to get away with it and, the immigration authorities aren't going to bother you. The former head of ICE, the Immigration Customs and Enforcement agency who left two months ago, was quoted in the *Los Angeles Times* recently saying something to the effect that as long as you are a run of the mill illegal immigrant, in the interior of the United States, your chances of being deported are near zero and you know word gets back. Then when you add on top of that this amnesty for so called "dreamers" that the President unilaterally decreed for illegal immigrants who claimed to have come before sixteen even though Congress voted that down. Then when you add on top of that this Administration's policy of letting illegal immigrants, the ones who are being caught in South Texas who were not Mexicans, letting them go with a piece of paper, a summons saying please show up for an immigration hearing for on such and such date, you add that all together and people who want to get out of dangerous places in Central America are going to take the hint and they are going to act on it. So you have to have a reason to want to leave and they do because you know Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala are really unpleasant places. However, you also have to have a realistic expectation that you are going to succeed in getting into and staying in the United States. On that part Obama has clearly telegraphed that illegal immigrants who aren't dope dealers or murderers might as well come.

Gordon: Mark, what are the surprising demographics behind those pictures we see of children in those "detention centers" or temporary holding centers that the media conveys a kind of compassionate humanitarian feeling that we have to do something about them.

Krikorian: The storyline from the media and the Administration is frankly that what we are seeing in South Texas with this border breakdown. We have stories about children who are coming on their own essentially walking a thousand miles through Mexico unaided and showing up at the border. In almost every respect that's false. Firstly, the illegal alien minors, especially those under eighteen, make up only about a third of the non-Mexicans being arrested in South Texas. Secondly they don't come alone. All of them come with smugglers whom their relatives have paid to bring them. Smugglers then direct them here and calling those teenagers. Some may be as old as nineteen.

Gordon: Mark, President Obama met with the leaders of three Central American countries recently in the Oval Office. He was talking about some kind of experimental program. However, underlying that, he was suggesting possible changes in our refugee laws and definitions of what would constitute asylum. That really affects the nature of these unaccompanied minors that we've been discussing about. What is the import of that?

Krikorian: The push that the groups who are advocating for these unaccompanied minors is something that has been going on for a long time. It is an attempt to expand the definition of who gets asylum or refugee status. From the relatively targeted definition of, individuals fleeing persecution based on their race or religion, political beliefs, that type of thing. So basically to expand it so that pretty much anybody who wants to leave the place they are in gets to come to the United States. They say, "I want protection," and we have to take them. This argument would take control over our borders away from the elected representatives of the people. This would hand the right to decide who gets into America to immigrants themselves so that anybody who wants to come here basically gets to come here.

Gordon: One of the big divides in the Congress was the issue of immigration reform. You've referred to the Dream Act and also the limited amnesty provided to children of illegal immigrants that occurred in 2012. Now the Congress is in recess. There is speculation about President Obama potentially doing something administratively through an executive order. What is the background regarding "limited amnesty" for illegals?

Krikorian: A few years ago the President as a campaign measure leading up to the Presidential re-election gave amnesty, unilaterally. This despite Congress's refusal to do so. He gave amnesty to illegal immigrants who claim to have come here before they turned sixteen, the so called "Dreamers." More than 500,000 people have received this illegal amnesty from the President's Executive Order. It's an amnesty, because they obtain work cards, social security numbers, drivers' licenses, and the whole thing. They have everything they need. It's not a green card, but it gives them the equivalent of green card rights if you will. So what the President is saying is he's going to expand that in some form beyond just these illegal immigrants who came as kids. The rationale being it wasn't their fault to become illegal immigrants. He wants to potentially extend that to millions more people on his own despite the fact that Congress has refused to do that. Potentially up to five or six million people is what they are talking about. We'll see what happens. Maybe later this month or perhaps not be until after Labor Day. It would represent one of the greatest power grabs by a President from Congress. Probably the greatest one in peace time in a long time. It is going to set up a Constitutional conflict with the Congress that is supposed to have the power to make these kinds of decisions. The President, who is essentially taking this power, is daring Congress to do anything about it.

Gordon: Senator Marco Rubio of Florida has flip flopped all over the place trying to deal with the immigration problem. What do you suspect is his dilemma and why is he doing this?

Krikorian: Marco Rubio has taken pretty much every position you can take on immigration on

all sides, up and down every other way. He claimed to be tough on immigration and yet he was instrumental in getting the Senate to pass the amnesty bill last year, the one that the President was so desperate to get passed. So he saw that the public really recoiled from this idea of immediate amnesty and promises of enforcement which is the same bait and switch that we heard in 1986. Once he realized how much people didn't like that he now is singing a different tune saying he opposes his own bill and doesn't want the House of Representatives to pass it, even though he got it to passed in the Senate. This whole border fiasco is really increasing the pressure on him to back track, flip flopping from his earlier position. Six months from now he may just have a completely different position.

Wikfors: Here in Arizona we're heavy into the election season. We've got primary Republicans and primaries for Governor and statewide positions. The whole conversation originally started off about economic policies and jobs. Suddenly, to my honest frustration this whole border crisis emerged and became the national issue that everybody is talking about. I'm wondering, unlike back in 2010 when it became an issue with SB 1070 here in Arizona, it does not seem this is going away anytime soon. It's not like a temporary issue unless of course the President was to get tough on the issue. However, to me it doesn't sound like this is going anywhere anytime soon. The next opportunity as our earlier guest pointed out may be January of 2017 before we see some kind of real enforcement action. Would that be your assessment as well?

Krikorian: I think that's a fair assessment because this President just doesn't in his heart of hearts believe that Americans have the right to keep people out of this country. I mean it boils down to that. If this President has people around him who believe that if you're not a drug dealer and you're not a terrorist or what have you, that you basically have the right to move here whether we like it or not. He's not going to be shaken from that or moved from that position by any kind of political pressure at this point. He's already been re-elected even if the Republicans take the Senate, which is not guaranteed. It's not guaranteed but it looks likely. At that point he'll have nothing to lose. I think you are going to see two long years of unilateral amnesty by decree and gutting of enforcement inside the country. There is already almost no recourse. Only in the border area is there continuing enforcement to any degree. It is going to be a difficult two years I think. It's just keeping the issue going. It will stay in the forefront for the next couple of years and play into the Presidential elections.

Wikfors: I have to agree with you there. I also think that we are going to see this issue about states' rights and the ability of states to enforce their own protection emerging as an issue that will put it in a conflict between the States and the Federal government, I'm

wondering how the Governors are going to deal with this given the fact that it's not been their role to control the borders. What can they creatively do to try to curb the influx and find the resources to do that? Is that something that you think is going to possibly occur at the State level?

Krikorian: Almost certainly because one of the reasons for that is the States have to deal with the consequences, the costs of unlimited immigration. But at the same time this administration has people in Arizona as you well know that have actually sued those that have tried to help enforcing immigration laws. You are right that I think States are going to be motivated. They are going to want to do something on their own to deal with immigration. However, this Justice Department in particular under Erik Holder made very clear that it's not going to let states enforce immigration laws that the Feds refuse to enforce. That just goes back to my point. It's going to be a long two years related to lax enforcement we are looking at for the next few years.

Gordon: Mark, what do the polls of American on immigration reform show us? Do they reflect these discussions that we have had during this program?

Krikorian: I think much of the public is either in favor of or resigned to some kind of amnesty for some illegal aliens that have been here a long time under some conditions. The problem is for pro-amnesty people is that Americans are only for that if it is the last thing we do. In other words, if we fix enforcement first, then I think there is openness to amnesty for some illegal aliens down the road so that we can clear the deck and start afresh. But that's not what anyone on the pro-amnesty side is proposing. They are all saying amnesty now in exchange for promises that in the future there will be better and tougher enforcement. That's the deal that has to be resisted. Amnesty first and enforcement maybe later is a deal that people, not just conservatives, but much of the public across the board does not accept. That is why immigration reform hasn't been able to get through Congress.

Wikfors: Mark Krikorian of the Center for Immigration Studies, it's been a pleasure to have you on this show. It's also been very enlightening and revealing as to the direction we are heading as a nation in terms of immigration policy. On behalf of Lisa Benson I want to thank you for joining us.

Krikorian: Happy to do it. Thank you.

Wikfors: Jerry we had a sobering conversation with two experts today. It doesn't give me a whole lot of hope that this issue is going to be resolved anytime soon. How about you?

Gordon: I think it's time for another social media campaign from the National Communications Task Force to alert this nation to the issues that both Chris Farrell and Mark Krikorian have talked about.

Wikfors: I would agree with you and there are a lot of things that we can do to put pressure on Congress to make sure that our word is getting out. Jerry Gordon it's been great to have you co-host the show today and I appreciate you joining me.

Gordon: Thanks again Shane.

Also see Jerry Gordon's collection of interviews,