Season 2, Episode 3

Hiroshi: Alex, it's good to be in conversation with you. Unfortunately, Cristina won't be with us today.

Alex: Hiroshi, we have an interesting episode this week. But I think we really have to start with some discussion of what happened in Minneapolis last week.

The killing of Renee Good, who was observing ICE operations, has really sent a shockwave through the United States. We've seen demonstrations around the country about this. Many people have said this was just likely to happen given the fact that ICE is basically invading communities that don't want them there, that respect their immigrant populations.

And they think that the violence is being caused by the ICE presence, even though the position of the administration is of course, is they're going into the communities to help end violent crime, which seems a total canard. I think the thing that disturbed me most, well, what disturbed me most about it is a human being is dead.

But the second thing that disturbed me about it was the immediate comment by the administration, really unheard of in law enforcement circles, for a chief law enforcement officer like Secretary Noem to declare that the person driving the car, that Renee Goode, was a domestic terrorist.

We may never know exactly what was in her mind or in the ICE officer's mind when he shot. There may be all sorts of explanations. But it seems crystal clear from everything we've seen on the tapes and everything we've learned, she was not a domestic terrorist, she was not aiming her car at this ICE officer.

She was trying to avoid the ICE officer by turning the wheel away from the ICE officer and probably was trying to flee the ICE officer who was trying to get into her car by grabbing hold of the handle, but the immediate announcement by the administration and then by the President of the United States, then by the Vice President of the United States, that she was a domestic terrorist, hell-bent on obstructing ICE operations, seemed so inappropriate, when what is needed is a careful investigation as is normally done after a shooting like this of exactly what happened, whether charges should be brought, what the explanations are, but to prejudge the case in that way is just so disturbing to me in terms of what it says about our system of justice and the people in charge of it.

Hiroshi: On top of that we have two other things, one of which is the takeover of the investigation totally by the FBI as opposed to the collaboration between local law enforcement and federal law enforcement that similar incidents have led to, that type of investigation.

And the other is immediately after the shooting in Minneapolis, we had two people shot in Portland, Oregon. So this indicates how much of this goes to the highest level of the US government, but also that this particular shooting in Minneapolis is one of multiple instances of ICE overreach.

And much of this has to do with, not just the loss of human life, but all different sorts of law enforcement tactics that target US citizens and noncitizens alike and result in other deaths in the course of ICE enforcement.

As we get into 2026, one overall reflection is that the Trump administration's immigration agenda reflects some basic themes we've explored ever since we started this podcast.

One theme is the targeting of immigrants or people in general from certain countries or certain regions of the world for disfavored treatment. The second theme is casting immigrants as national security threats and as invaders, and we've seen this narrative in many of the executive orders and proclamations issued in 2025. One example that has combined these themes in the first Trump administration was the ban on immigration from six majority-Muslim countries.

And in the second Trump administration, the rhetoric has continued and so have concrete measures that continue to target some countries and regions in an apparent effort to shape immigration to America along racial, religious, and economic lines.

These measures include extreme vetting, pausing all processing of immigration-related applications, bond requirements for visas, and stopping asylum processing altogether. The administration has tried to justify these measures by focusing selectively on particular incidents to justify its targeting of entire nationalities for types of immigration or humanitarian protection.

A prominent example is the attack on November 26 of the past year on two members of the West Virginia National Guard who had been deployed to Washington DC. One was killed and the other was severely injured. A few hours later, the administration stopped the processing of all immigration for Afghan nationals. This is to be indefinite, pending further review of scrutiny and vetting protocols.

Around the same time, the State Department paused visa issuance for anyone traveling on an Afghan passport. And before long, the administration announced that it would reexamine green cards granted to people from high risk countries that it had identified earlier.

The administration also stopped processing applications for green cards and naturalization from people from these “high risk” countries. And as for asylum, the administration halted decisions on all asylum cases so that they could be “vetted and screened to the maximum degree possible.”

To discuss these developments and to discuss how the administration has justified the targeting of some people, overwhelmingly from Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, and Latin America, for restrictions on immigration is today's special guest, Elora Mukherjee.

Elora is the Jerome L. Greene Clinical Professor of Law at Columbia Law School, where she is Director of the Immigrants’ Rights Clinic. In that role, Elora has represented many individuals and families who have been directly impacted by these aspects of the Trump administration's efforts to reshape US immigration policy.

So Elora, thanks so much for being with us today.

Elora: Thank you so much for having me.

Hiroshi: We're so looking forward to all your insight on these questions. Elora, you wrote an op-ed piece in the *New York Times* in early December, and your opening line was, “I've spent the last week telling clients that their asylum cases are indefinitely on hold.”

Why were those cases on hold? And what does that tell you about the state of the asylum system now?

Elora: So as many of your listeners will recall, on November 26, the day before Thanksgiving, there was a heartbreaking tragedy in our nation's capitol. Two West Virginia National Guard members were shot. Sarah Beckstrom was only 20 years old when she died on Thanksgiving Day, and Andrew Wolfe, who is only 24 years old, was struggling for his life. Thankfully, he's been making important strides in his recovery, including breathing on his own.

Both these Guard members should have been home celebrating the holiday with their loved ones, but they were among hundreds of West Virginia National Guard members sent to patrol the streets of Washington DC as part of the president's push to send the military into cities run by Democrats.

As you may recall, back in August, President Trump had issued an executive order declaring a crime emergency in the capital and that order was issued, notwithstanding the Department of Justice's own statistics confirming that violent crime there is at a 30-year low.

The man charged in the shootings is Rahmanullah Lakanwal, a 29-year-old from Afghanistan, who was granted asylum in April 2025. According to NPR, he had been cited for mental health concerns by a resettlement agency volunteer. He has also apparently been suffering from trauma related to his work with a paramilitary force that worked with the CIA in Afghanistan. And now his criminal case is making its way through the American legal system, and that's how the American legal system is supposed to work. It's supposed to seek accountability against the perpetrator of a crime.

But the shootings on November 26 have produced another tragedy. The Trump administration is seizing on the shootings to further reshape America's immigration system, to demonize Afghan and other immigrants, and at least temporarily block deserving asylum seekers from receiving the protections they need.

Inflicting this collective punishment based on the heinous and isolated crimes of one person is not a rational, appropriate, or moral policy response. In terms of

what this means for the state of the asylum system, all affirmative asylum applications before the agency called USCIS, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, all those applications are on hold indefinitely. This hold applies to people of all nationalities pending what USCIS has called “a comprehensive review.” It's not publicly known what this comprehensive review will entail, or how long the review will take.

I also want to be clear that the hold on asylum applications doesn't apply to those who have cases pending before the immigration courts. The immigration courts are run by a separate agency, the Executive Office of Immigration Review, which is part of the Department of Justice. Those cases continue to be adjudicated every day by administrative law officers who have historically been called immigration judges, though, after more than 100 immigration judges were fired over the past year, the Trump administration and its hiring announcements are now calling these officers “deportation judges,” making it very clear what the Trump administration's expectations of these officers are.

Alex: Elora, you said that there's been an indefinite hold put on cases filed before the asylum corps. How does that number compare to the number of cases that are filed before the immigration judges?

Elora: So the pause on asylum application adjudications before USCIS will affect the more than 1 million asylum seekers who have pending applications there. USCIS is continuing to accept asylum applications. It's just not adjudicating them. So people are now waiting indefinitely before their asylum applications before USCIS can move forward.

And that's different than the immigration courts, where there is a backlog of 3.4 million cases. There asylum applications can continue to be filed, and they are adjudicated every day across the country.

Hiroshi: So before going more into the legal system aspects of this, could you say a little bit about how the new measures have affected your clients? Not just their immigration cases, but their lives.

Elora: Yeah, it's been devastating. The indefinite pause by USCIS on adjudicating asylum applications has just been devastating for the children, the families, and the individuals who I represent.

So let me provide some background. I represent asylum seekers from around the world who are seeking safety in the United States. And in the days after USCIS announced this new pause, I reached out to dozens of clients to let them know

that USCIS was going to pursue a comprehensive review of asylum applications, and that I did not know when their cases would move forward.

All of the clients who I reached out to have either suffered past persecution in their home countries, or they fear persecution if forced to return. None of them has a criminal record here or elsewhere.

I have photographic evidence documenting their torture scars, their burns. Some are survivors of female genital mutilation, which is also documented by forensic medical evidence. Many of them are continuing to suffer from mental health effects based on what they experienced in their home countries.

And all of these clients face the prospect of not having their asylum cases heard in the near future, not being granted asylum, not having their green card applications approved, not having their naturalization petitions eventually decided.

Many are concerned that even if they already do have green cards, their green cards may now be rescinded, and many of my clients have been waiting for years while their asylum applications have been pending before USCIS. Some have been waiting for almost 10 years.

And what this means is that for my clients and hundreds of thousands of others, they've been in many cases separated from their spouses and from their children for years. And they've been fervently hoping to be granted asylum so that they can petition for their family members to join them in the United States and so that their families can be reunited.

And as my clients learned about this indefinite pause, they've been asking difficult questions. They've been asking, will they lose their work permits and their jobs? Will they lose their status and face arrest, detention, or deportation? Will they need to leave their US citizen children behind? Will armed ICE officers show up at their homes, their workplaces, at their schools?

Can they walk down the street without needing to look over their shoulders? How stable is their life in the United States and should they leave? So there have been many questions, and it's hard to give concrete answers, unfortunately.

Alex: You mentioned a particular case in your op-ed involving one of your Afghan clients. Can you talk about that?

Elora: Sure. On December 2, one of my Afghan clients, with a pending asylum application, was required to report to 26 Federal Plaza, that's one of the federal immigration courts in New York, for a routine meeting with Immigration and Customs Enforcement. He was represented by both me and two of my law students in the clinic.

And our client complied with this reporting requirement because he wanted to do everything right. He believes in the promise of America. He believes in following every aspect of American law, and we counseled him on how his nationality, especially in the wake of the November 26 shootings, put him at very high risk of being arrested.

At the immigration building, both my law students and I tried to stay by our client's side, but ICE officers insisted on separating us. They had our client wait in a large room and put us down the hallway where we couldn't see him. The officers promised us that when our client would meet with ICE officers, we would be allowed to be present, but that didn't turn out to be true.

Our client was taken into an office without us knowing, where he was cuffed, both his hands and his feet, and my students and I did not know where he had been taken. His family didn't know where he had been taken. And about a day later, he called from a detention center to let us know that he was detained in northern New Jersey.

And this is an asylum seeker who had done everything right. He had entered the United States through a lawful process that was in place at that time with a CBP One App appointment. He had no criminal history anywhere in the world. He had a pending asylum application supported by more than 1000 pages of evidence. He had already survived imminent and menacing death threats from the Taliban in Afghanistan, and he had shown up for literally every ICE check-in throughout his time in the United States.

While he was detained, he had a very difficult time both during the day and during the nights. He was hungry because he didn't have access to halal meals. He couldn't sleep properly.The lights in the detention center were on all night. He was assigned a bunk bed close to a TV that was on all night at very high volume, and he was denied access to medication needed to treat his stomach pain.

And unfortunately, his arrest and detention in December wasn't an isolated incident. Dozens of other Afghan asylum seekers with no criminal histories were similarly arrested and detained since last November in cases that have

been tracked from California to New York. For my client, I filed a federal habeas petition for him on December 3. A federal district court held two hearings on the case, and fortunately issued an order on December 17, finding that his arrest and detention was both illegal and unconstitutional.

So our client was so relieved and so joyful to be reunited with his loved ones, his family, and to regain his freedom. But he is one of the lucky ones. It is so difficult to navigate the process of filing a federal habeas petition, especially for those who don't have access to counsel.

And in this particular case, as well as thousands of other cases across the country, the Trump administration is claiming that the mandatory detention provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act require detention in circumstances where they do not. And the Trump administration's claim of mandatory detention has been rejected by more than 300 federal district court decisions in federal habeas cases. And according to a Politico analysis from the last two weeks, Politico estimated that federal court judges have ruled against the Trump administration's claim of mandatory detention in more than 1,600 cases over the past year.

Hiroshi: But each of these has created a need to individually sue for release. Is that correct?

Elora: Yes, and federal habeas petitions need to be filed extremely quickly, and this is because in the first instance, it's best to file the federal habeas petition, often in the jurisdiction where the person is detained, before ICE moves the person to a far state where the person may not have access to counsel.

And, as we have seen in this administration, from the time of detention to the time of deportation, it can be merely days before a person is out of the country. So the federal habeas petitions do need to be filed very quickly. They're often done just on behalf of individuals because there's not time, there's often not time to file this type of relief on behalf of a larger group of people.

Alex: Given the very large number of habeas cases you've described, does the law permit a class action case or some other broad litigation that would prevent the government from undertaking the mandatory detention in these cases?

Elora: Yes, there are currently legal challenges pending to broad stripping of parole protections, to broad claims of mandatory detention by the Trump administration, and many of these cases have been successful at the federal district court level. It's also worth noting that group punishment based on race or

religion is anathema to modern U.S. constitutional law. That's just not what we permit as a nation anymore.

So while vetting asylum seekers and other immigrants is necessary for the safety of all of us, punishing law-abiding immigrants, asylum seekers, children, adults alike for the violent acts of one person is anathema to the country that we should be, and it betrays our nation's highest ideals.

Hiroshi: I wanted to ask you about something else you put in the *New York Times* piece. You mentioned administration measures against some people from Afghanistan who are lawful permanent residents of the United States, so they already have their green cards, and also some who are in the process of naturalizing as U.S. citizens. Can you tell me more about those cases?

Elora: On November 26, just hours after the shooting, President Trump announced "we must now reexamine every single alien who has entered our country from Afghanistan under Biden." On December 1, the White House press secretary, Karoline Leavitt, also said that the administration is "actively reexamining" all the Afghan nationals who entered the U.S. during the Biden administration.

So this means a few things. First, any Afghans who have pending green card applications probably won't be getting their green cards anytime soon. Similarly, any Afghans with green cards who have naturalization applications pending probably won't become U.S. citizens at any point soon. And for those who already have green cards and those who already are hoping to become naturalized U.S. citizens, they are concerned that their cases might be reexamined.

There is an effort, an increased effort, under this administration to detect fraud, national security concerns in the asylum process, and there is concern that national origin, and specifically Afghan national origin, may be used as a proxy measure for the Trump administration to reexamine and reopen certain cases and the benefits granted to certain individuals. What this has meant in effect is that even Afghan families with green cards right now are very scared about what might happen to them next.

Hiroshi: This affects more than people from Afghanistan. Is this correct?

Elora: Yes, it affects individuals from the, I believe, 19 countries on the President's June 2025 travel ban.

Alex: I would be very surprised if a court would sustain reviewing all Afghan asylum cases or refugee claims because of the acts of one Afghan refugee. That, as you say, Elora, that seems to strike at the very core of anti-discrimination law. But the broader look at all refugees who came in under the Biden administration policies, that might be harder to attack. What do you think?

Elora: Immigrants' rights advocates, immigrant organizations, and immigrants themselves are pushing back on the Trump administration's efforts to deny, rescind, terminate protections for those who came in during the Biden administration.

One effort by the Trump administration is to purportedly rescind parole to all individuals who came in during the Biden administration using the CBP One appointment process. And the Trump administration has purported to do so by sending more than half a million pro forma notifications to people saying that their parole has been terminated.

But in litigation, immigrants' rights groups and immigrants themselves have pushed back saying, first of all, the statute requires parole to be rescinded based on an individualized case-by-case determination of whether parole is appropriate or not.

It can't be rescinded wholesale, in one fell sweep. And federal district courts across the country have also recognized that when a person has entered the United States lawfully, has abided by every aspect of U.S. immigration law, has no criminal record and has been living at liberty in the United States, they have an interest under the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment not to have their liberty interests arbitrarily, suddenly, abruptly taken away, as we have seen in so many arrests across the country.

So the federal district courts have been a really important bulwark against some of the Trump administration's worst abuses, even abuses that one might think in theory could be difficult to challenge but these are really important interests that must be safeguarded, and folks are fighting every day to do so.

Hiroshi: So I want to ask you about something, which is a more general question. In your *New York Times* piece, you don't ever use the word "racism," but I assume it's something that you thought about doing. It's been part of conversations. The Northern District of California issued a judgment regarding Temporary Protected Status for Venezuelans, where one of the findings had to do with racial animus. Can you talk about using the word "racism" when talking about the Trump Administration's immigration agenda?

Elora: Both of President Trump's. Presidential campaigns and both of his administrations are making very clear appeals to white nationalism and to our worst racist instincts, and we can do better as a nation. We must do better as a nation. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 requires us not to be racist when treating immigrants in the United States, when making decisions about who to allow into the United States, who to exclude or bar from the United States.

Hiroshi: Yeah, it's a difficult set of questions and in multiple pieces of litigation against the federal government, it's always been a choice, because whether it's discrimination being the word, or racial animus being the word, or racism being the word, I think it's been a difficult choice as to how to communicate and how to describe what's going on, both for the public but also in the context of court litigation.

We can't overlook the fact that of the 19 countries that have been identified by the president as high-risk countries – they are in Asia, Latin America, and the majority in Africa.

Alex: Elora, do your clients perceive these as racially based rules or just anti-immigrant. How do they talk about it?

Elora: So yes, Hiroshi, you're right to mention the 19 countries on the June 2025 travel ban, and there's also the president's December 2025 travel ban, which affects nationals from an additional 20 countries.

Alex, to your question about how do my clients perceive these restrictions? Yes, they have the highest hopes for the United States of America; and notwithstanding everything that is currently happening, many of them believe in the promise of the American dream and that this country will live up to its best ideals. That said, they are increasingly shocked, appalled, and some despairing about what is happening in our country.

The recent shooting in Minneapolis of a mother of three children has been shocking for many of my clients. What one of them described to me in a phone call late last week is, if they're even shooting blonde, white women, what chance do I have?

And I try to reassure my clients that they are doing their best to follow immigration law, that they should stay out of all kinds of trouble and that hopefully we will all get through this extraordinarily difficult moment.

Not all of my clients, though, are able to bear the intense stress of living in the United States during this moment. Many of my clients are deeply anxious. They're having trouble sleeping, they're having trouble concentrating. They're constantly thinking about the worst case scenarios. Some are scared to leave their homes. They're afraid to take their kids to school. They're afraid to attend houses of worship. They're basically afraid to live their lives in a public space.

Last week, one of my Afghan clients wrote me an email to let me know that he had made the choice to leave the United States, and I can read to you an excerpt from his email: “I left the United States of America, my dream country and my dreams, where I wanted to improve and make progress in my life. But unfortunately, everything was against me and I couldn't stay in the United States of America for longer.”

Cumulatively, all of the Trump administration's actions on immigration are creating enormous pressure on people to self-deport. And self-deportation is also a pillar of this administration's deportation agenda.

Hiroshi: How is it possible to move beyond the Trump administration's focus on immigrants as invaders and the use of isolated incidents to target immigrants?

Elora: It's difficult because the president has the bully pulpit and he can control a lot of the discourse in terms of how immigration is talked about in the United States, but reshaping the public narrative is critically important.

I think centering the experiences of asylum seekers, immigrants, and others who are affected by the Trump administration's actions is really important, to show and shape how the Trump administration's actions are shattering the lives of children and adults who are doing everything right, who are our neighbors, who are embedded in our communities, who are essential to making America a country that is functioning, where both immigrants are making contributions at the highest levels of the technology sectors, for example, and are ensuring that our food supply chains work.

One important way to highlight the voices of those who are most affected is through public advocacy, through media work, and through theater work. Back in 2019, one of the projects that I worked on that was very important in shaping public discourse around immigrant children in detention was the *Flores* Exhibits project.

It was shaped by Waterwell and the Broadway Advocacy Coalition, which are both theater groups, and they organized an online project that had actors and other prominent individuals reading the testimony of children who had been detained in border detention facilities and using theater as a mechanism to convey children's sworn testimony, which had just for decades been sitting in a federal courthouse docket, was a very powerful way to influence potential voters. Waterwell organized a series of public events in swing states, in the lead up to elections, in an effort to reach potential voters who would care about these immigration issues.

So I think there are ways to change the public discourse. I think it's hard to do so, but I think that's part of the imperative for those of us who care about immigration and immigrants' rights in the United States at this time.

Hiroshi: One thing we haven't talked about is the role of Congress. Does it have a role here?

Elora: Absolutely. Congress has enormous discretion and power to set and shape immigration laws in the United States, and immigration law and policy is squarely within the domain of Congress. And we should be asking: what is Congress doing at this moment when the executive branch is far overreaching in its authority?

The U.S. Constitution sets up a system of checks and balances, and here, as we've seen over the past year, the executive branch is far overreaching in its authority, especially in the immigration space. And lower federal courts, especially district courts, have been trying to curb the worst abuses of the administration. And if Congress were a functioning institution, it would also be checking the worst abuses of the Trump administration, but that doesn't seem to be happening.

Right now we are in a year with the midterm elections coming up, and I hope that we, as the American people across party lines, vote Congresspeople into office who will care about building a functioning asylum system, a functioning immigration system that takes into account both what America needs in terms of its economy and also what basic humanity requires in terms of respecting human dignity and keeping families together and protecting children.

Alex: Elora, we've seen a closing of the US refugee program except for white South Africans. Refugees in the country, they've had benefits taken away from them. You've described the attack on the asylum process. We've seen increased

detention and removals and making life so miserable for people that they decide to go home to dangerous situations.

Is there a future of humanitarian protection in the United States, or have we just abandoned our basic principles? And if so, how do we restore them?

Elora: There is no denying that this is an extraordinarily difficult time for those seeking humanitarian protections in the United States, whether that's refugee status, asylum status, or other humanitarian protections. I've been a lawyer for about 20 years, and this is by far the most difficult time I've had in terms of working on immigrants' rights and civil rights issues, and still I have reason for hope.

So in 2025, in the summer, Gallup did a poll which showed a record all-time high for support for immigration. According to that poll, 79% of Americans believed for the first time that "immigration is good for the country." And increasingly, people across party lines are concerned that the Trump administration's immigration crackdown has gone too far.

We are seeing building resistance to these crackdowns, to these abuses, to these excesses, to the destroying of children's lives and families lives and communities in the form of, for example, the No Kings protests, which brought out millions of Americans across party lines to say, this is going too far.

And so I do believe that there is room to reshape the point where we are at now. I hope that this Trump administration is a nadir in terms of America's protections for refugees and asylum seekers in the period after the passage of the 1980 Refugee Act.

I expect that our country will get to a place where we are more consistent in following what is immigration law and not having a president and an administration that's willing to disregard immigration law and claim mandatory detention when mandatory detention isn't appropriate, and to claim that children can be detained indefinitely when we all know that detention is harmful for children, especially prolonged periods of detention.

We are a nation that has been built on immigrants, on the sacrifices that immigrants have made across generations. And those ideals are the very best of our nation, our country. And I hope that both with these upcoming midterm elections and with the next presidential election, our nation can have a reset on these issues.

Hiroshi: Elora, thank you so much for sharing your insights today. We really appreciate it.

Elora: Thank you, Hiroshi. Thank you, Alex.

Alex: Well, those are really some gripping statements from Elora, Hiroshi, both at the individual level about her clients and how they're feeling and the fear that these actions have put into the lives of people and their families. But also at the more general level about what it says about this country. I was really taken by her statement and the quote she read from one of her clients that they had come to this country because it is the land of the free and the brave and wanted to be here, probably had helped in the war effort as many Afghans did in Afghanistan, thought they were coming to a place they could be safe and raise their kids and look what they've found as a nation here.

Hiroshi: That's absolutely right; my reaction as well. But I was also struck by how every episode that we've done, including, and perhaps especially this one, makes you realize that there's so many dimensions to this.

We started out talking about Elora's op-ed about Afghan clients, and it quickly broadened, I think, to the history of the United States, the role the United States has played, the way immigrants see the United States, but also to questions of racial discrimination, to humanitarian protection.

It feels like every time we focus in on something in particular, it becomes a window into a larger set of themes that in a sense unify what we've been doing in this podcast, but very much so, and it's not just the legal aspect, right? One of the things I really appreciated was the conversation about the human impact of this. And that's something that shouldn't be forgotten, and yet it's so difficult, I think, to get into that in any particular focus that we've had.

Alex: You asked the question about racism and should that be a part of the discussion and the actions that have been taken by this administration? It's very hard not to see race as a factor when we've closed the refugee program except for white South Africans. It's very hard to understand that in any other terms other than race.

But Elora said something else. She quoted to one of her clients as saying, with the shooting in Minneapolis, if Renee Good, a white, blonde woman could be killed in her car then no one is safe. I must say I think that the Good killing here may spark broader protests.

I would like to see a million migrant march similar to after the killing of George Floyd led to big protests around the country. But it would be interesting that it would be the death of this white observer that would produce this kind of protest rather than the everyday indignities, which I guess is a mild word for what immigrants of color are going through.

But perhaps we could put these together into a much broader kind of public protest that Elora was talking about, which she thinks is the way to, in the end, change these policies and maybe more effective than the thousands of lawsuits that lawyers are required to file to get their individual clients out of detention.

Hiroshi: I'm glad that Elora talked about the public narrative and the importance of doing things that are outside the courts. That's so true, the fact that this shooting is an inflection point, potentially, points out something that's always been true, and that is that I think a lot of the resistance or pushback to what the administration's been doing is going to come with people who are U.S. citizens understanding that they, too, are in the crosshairs of what the administration's doing. And that's what's gonna build the public pressure and the public support for pushing back.

And maybe that's part of the reality, catching up to what the political conversation is. But this is one of the reasons why this becomes an inflection point, I think. And it's also in the context of many other things that are out there in the political space, whether it is what we do in other countries, or what is happening in the healthcare space, and the targeting of Democratic states for withdrawal of federal funding. These are all things that the administration is doing that broaden the group of people who feel that they, too, are being targeted.

CREDITS

Thank you for listening to Unsettled: Immigration and Turbulent Times. You can find more information about the podcast, its transcripts and other relevant documents at the website of the Zolberg Institute on Migration and Mobility at The New School.

Special thanks to Achilles Kallergis for composing and recording our intro and outro. And to Samantha Gattsek, our engineer and producer. This podcast is produced with generous support from the Zolberg Institute on Migration and Mobility at the New School and the Center for Immigration Law and Policy at UCLA.