

“Oh, What a Tangled Web We Weave”: The Triangulation of Environmentalism, Population Growth, and Immigration in the U.S

Susan A. Berger¹

Abstract

This paper reconstructs the political and discursive formation that triangulated environmentalism, population control and immigration into a troubling Foucauldian knowledge-based discourse relying on nativism, racism, and misogyny. The phenomenon of the Donald J. Trump 2016 presidential candidacy has placed this narrative formation, and its accompanying biopolitics, center stage in American politics, but its immediate roots can be traced to the manipulation of fears over resource scarcity and population growth starting in the 1960s. As a result, John Tanton created a tight-knit group of organizations that intertwined philosophically and organizationally and depended on a biopolitics and a foundational narrative that looks to control the bodies of immigrant women. It is this movement that the Trump candidacy and discourse continue to depend upon today.

Key Words: U.S. immigration, nativism, anti-immigrant movement, alt-right

“What is so perilous, then, in the fact that people speak, and that their speech proliferates? Where is the danger in that?” (Michel Foucault, “The Discourse on Language”)

The presidential campaign of Donald J. Trump tests the limits of prevailing political practices and wisdom. His brand of provocation, delving directly and deeply into racist, misogynistic, xenophobic, and Islam phobic statements and positions has confounded and dismayed many even while it has delighted and energized his followers. Political pundits identify the groundwork of Trump's license as having been established by decades of "dog whistling" by the Republican Party and its Tea Party base in response to globalization's dislocations and inequality along with the still operative and deeply institutionalized practices of white supremacy--in housing, employment, education, incarceration, and the economy. While these dynamics do help explain the Trump phenomenon, there remains another undisguised component that underpins Trump's provocations and gives them a solid basis in a classically Foucauldian discursive formation that collectively heralds a knowledge-base that is profound and troubling as it is deeply invested with the strengthening and maintaining of a hierarchy of humankind.

One portion of this discursive genealogy can be traced through today's movement in the United States to restrict immigration. It has its roots in a conservative environmentalism that explains environmental damage primarily as the result of over-population.² This often overlooked fact is important to remember because it signals a singular example of the development of a spurious knowledge-base constructed with an almost text-book-like precision along the lines of Foucauldian discursive formations. This conjunction has become noteworthy again because at the present time, this formulation is one of the foundations for the current demand that immigration be curtailed, by any means necessary.

¹ Professor, Political Science, Fordham University, 113 West 60th Street, New York, NY 10023, USA.

² While conservative environmentalists like Paul Ehrlich focus on biology as the primary cause of the environmental crisis, radical environmentalists such as Barry Commoner have explained it as "rooted in the *economic and social* system that was profoundly anti-ecological" [emphasis in the original] (Angus and Butler 20).

Rather than an oversimplified characterization of Donald J. Trump's racism or xenophobia, which characterizes many of his pronouncements stemming as they do from conspiracy theorists and ultra conservative talk radio fodder, his immigration platform actually has an important, albeit dubious foundation. His stand on immigration which is at the foundation of his thinking about "Making America Great Again," can be traced in part to a branch of the environmentalist movement's modern incarnation, which began with the publication of Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb* by the Sierra Club in 1968. The book served as a rallying cry for conservationists who believed that if population was not rapidly reduced, the U.S. and world should expect environmental devastation, and as a result, rising insecurity and chaos. Along with too robust domestic birth rates, immigration was seen as another destabilize of the population balance. The environmentalist alarm pre-dates our current debate on climate change though it subsequently ran parallel with the eventual discourse of the Anthropogenic, the epoch known for the consequential destruction of the environment by collective human actions. Nevertheless, this paper is not about Donald J. Trump's candidacy or his policies; rather, it undertakes to reconstruct the political and discursive formation that triangulated environmentalism, population control and immigration into a troubling knowledge-base. The phenomenon of the Donald J. Trump candidacy has placed this narrative formation center stage in the 2016 American presidential election.

Background Preamble: The Contexts of the Tanton Factor

After the publication of Erlich's *The Population Bomb* Sierra Club members and other environmentally conscious individuals joined Ehrlich's organization Zero Population Growth and also became active in Planned Parenthood (Gutiérrez 17-19, Reimers 44-46). They worked to make contraception more available for women and encouraged Americans to rethink the timing, spacing, and numbers of pregnancies and children. Even before the publication of *The Population Bomb*, however, birth rates in the United States had begun to decrease. While in 1960, women on average had 3.7 children, in 1972, the reproduction rate was considered at replacement level for the first time with 2.1 births per women. The rate continued downwards to 1.7 by the mid 1970s (Angus and Butler 21). While activists considered these new lower numbers promising, some increasingly expressed concern that rising immigration and the fertility rates of immigrant women were continuing to fuel unacceptably high rates of population growth. The dismantling of national origins quotas with the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, not only opened the U.S. more fully to immigration from non-European countries, but it also ended a period of relatively low immigration that had begun in 1924 (Gutiérrez 22).

Peter Schrag notes that in 1910, 14.7% of the population in the U.S. was foreign born, but by 1960, that percentage had been reduced to 5.1% (151-152). In the 1970s, the percentage of foreign-born began to increase once again from a low of 4.7% or 9.6 million in 1970 to an estimated 14.1 million in 1980 that included a growing undocumented population (Schrag 70). After 1965, immigration from Mexico and other parts of Latin America increased, as did migrants from Asia and Africa, raising alarm from a growing number of immigration restrictionists.³ Wayne Lutton's comments were not atypical in criticizing the 1965 immigration reforms for "result[ing] in a flood of Third World immigration, both legal and illegal. Today between 85 and 90 percent of legal immigration comes from the Third World. Those who cannot enter legally come in outside the law, reflecting the indisputable Third World disdain for the rule of law" (Reimers 69) While "Third World" immigrants were in general derided, it was immigrants from Latin America and especially those from Mexico that were labeled the most numerous and undesirable, becoming the face of the illegal for the growing restrictionist movement. Paul Ehrlich and his co-authors began their 1979 book, *The Golden Door: International Migration*, with words that capture well the growing preoccupation with the role Mexican immigration was perceived to be playing in leading to a crisis:

Across the southern border of the United States are 67 million Mexicans. They are poor and Americans are rich. They speak Spanish and we speak English. They are brown and we are white. They want it and we've got it: jobs, prosperity, and the *Ladies Home Journal-Playboy* lifestyle. As a result we are being invaded by a horde of illegal immigrants from Mexico...The furor has attracted the attention of bigots and bureaucrats as well as concerned citizens who ask: If we are limiting our family sizes so that our children can inherit a better nation, why should we throw open our doors to over-reproducers?(VII)

³I am using the term restrictionist to refer to a wide range of individuals and groups, including Trump and his base who want to severely restrict or completely halt immigration to the United States.

The control of the bodies of poor Mexican women was thus linked as an imperative to saving "the American way of life." This biopolitics continues to shape restrictionist discourses about immigration today, most recently and notoriously in the embellishment of "rapists" the barring of whom requires a "wall" that Trump has added to the conversation. The movement stresses the need to close borders to reduce population growth in order to save American culture and resources. The increased immigration of women over the last several decades, has served only to intensify focus on the fertility and mothering modes of immigrant women ("Third World" women) with claims that pregnant women come to the U.S. to have "anchor babies," "illegal" women collect entitlements for their American born children and live off U.S. tax payers, Latina women have a higher fertility rate than U.S. women which proves they are less civilized, and Mexican women—the bearers of Mexican culture—bring Spanish and an alien culture to the US and instill it in their children rather than encouraging them to assimilate (Tanton, McCormack, and Smith 1996; Volpp 2011).

While the restrictionist movement is by no means united, groups arising from the organizations established by John Tanton have in particular continually linked environmental devastation and resource burden to over population caused by immigration from developing nations. John Tanton, an ophthalmologist and conservationist in a small town in northern Michigan, was inspired by *The Population Bomb*, and ultimately helped to form and/or fund several of the founding organizations of the current restrictionist movement including the Federation of American Immigration Reform (FAIR), Californians for Population Stabilization (CAPS), Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), Immigration Reform Law Institute, Numbers USA, Pro-English, Project USA, The Social Contract Press, U.S. English, U.S. Immigration Reform PAC (USIRPAC), and US Inc. These organizations, along with other restrictionist organizations, support securing/closing the borders and increased deportations, and are against any immigration reform that would regularize immigrants currently in the U.S. But unlike some of their allies in Tea Party circles, groups that sprang up from the Tanton organizations also support family planning and women's easy accessibility to contraception, abortion, and sterilization. The ways in which they have linked reducing population, immigration, and the fertility of immigrant and poor women, have led to criticisms of racism and nativism (Southern Poverty Law Center 2002).

While the purpose of this article is to trace the linkages and triangulation between the environmentalism, population control, and the restrictionist immigration movement, in particular, I want to examine how the ideological roots of the restrictionist movement in conservation and population control have shaped and limited the narrative of the movement and cemented it in a particular gendered and classed analysis that lends itself to criticism of nativism and racism. In the first section, I will trace the links between environmentalism, population, and restrictionist beliefs through the organizational networks created by John Tanton. I will show how the organizations are intertwined philosophically and organizationally, creating a tight network of independent organizations each targeting a specific sector and task as a means of achieving the united goal of immigration restriction. In the second section, I turn to look at the ways in which restrictionist leaders translate their concerns about the fertility of poor developing nation women into a controversial sterilization project, illustrating the brute materiality rather than simply the ideological contours of this movement. In the last section of the paper, I will reconsider the political implications of restrictionist narratives and projects in the current political climate.

The Strange Bedfellows of Environment, Population, and Immigration "Do I think our side will ultimately be successful? I, of course, don't know - many other civilizations have gone through periods of decline. But at least we want to make the ennobling effort of trying to pull back from the brink. I hope you will join us in this."

John Tanton, *Social Contract Journal* 6:1(Fall 1995), 240 John Tanton has been key in building the institutional foundations of the current restrictionist movement. His importance to the movement lies in the number and strength of organizations he has helped to found, the many ways in which the organizations intertwine and support each other, and the success that his organizations have had in writing and successfully lobbying for alt-conservative legislation in the United States. While in a letter to the author in 2011, Tanton maintained that "population and environmental concerns...played a very negligible role in shaping the debate over immigration policy in the postwar period," I will argue that, on the contrary, the two concerns have largely shaped the discursive framing of the restrictionist movement, creating a strong advocacy network that helps to explain the recent rise of Trumpism in the 2016 presidential elections. John Tanton grew up on a farm in Michigan and became interested in conservation issues early on.

By the late 1950s, he was active in environmental organizations and over the next two decades she participated and took leadership roles in a variety of national and local groups including the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, Audubon Society, the Michigan Natural Areas Council, Bear Rivers Development Commission, and Little Traverse Conservancy. By the early 1960s, Tanton had also come to believe that population numbers mattered to conservation. After graduating from the University of Michigan Medical School in 1960, he did an internship in Denver that included a stint with the family planning clinic at Denver General Hospital. He became convinced that “the growing population was a significant challenge for both conservation and preservation of natural resources” (Gutiérrez 76). He returned to Michigan for his residency in ophthalmology and moved with his wife to Petoskey, a small northern Michigan town, to practice medicine. There, he and his wife helped in 1965 to found the Northern Michigan Planned Parenthood Federation and Tanton became the chairman of the Great Lakes Public Affairs Committee of Planned Parenthood (Tanton Resume; Gutiérrez 75-77; Reimers 47-48). After the publication of *The Population Bomb* in 1968, Tanton encouraged environmental organizations that he was involved in to adopt policies against population growth, becoming the chairman of the Sierra Club’s National Population Committee from 1969-1975 (Tanton Resume). He also joined Zero Population Growth (ZPG), an activist organization begun by Paul Ehrlich pressuring for a severe reduction in fertility to ward off impending environmental and food production disasters. By 1973, Tanton had become a member of ZPG’s National Executive Committee and from 1975-1977 served as the organization’s president.

In the early 1970s, with decreasing American fertility rates and increasing immigration, Tanton began to worry that immigration was undoing efforts to control overpopulation. In 1971, Tanton started to encourage ZPG to include immigration in its population control platform (Gutiérrez 82). He headed the ZPG Immigration Study Committee from 1973-1975 and in 1974, he was instrumental in convincing the board of directors to pass a resolution calling for a 90% decrease in legal immigration and a complete halt to illegal migration (Gutiérrez 85). A full-time staffer was hired in 1977 by ZPG to focus on immigration restriction and the organization took a leading role in pressuring the government to pass reforms to drastically cut immigration (Gutiérrez 86). In a 1977 fundraising letter for ZPG, Paul Ehrlich praised the organization for helping to reduce the size of American families but called on activists to turn their focus to the next crisis. “Thanks in no small measure to ZPG’s educational efforts, America’s attitudes about family size began to change. The fertility rate has dropped and we have made important strides toward stabilizing our growth except for the massive hemorrhage of illegal aliens—which in 1976 account for an astonishing one-third of our population growth” (Gutiérrez 87). Thus for ZPG leaders, immigrants had become the key source of continued population growth in the United States.

John Tanton and others in ZPG also pushed environmental organizations to take up the call to restrict immigration. Mainstream environmental organizations, like the National Parks and Conservation Association and Sierra Club, however, resisted fearing that they would be labeled nativist or racist (Reimers 46-47). The Sierra Club did pass a resolution in 1978 that called for the need to reach a balance between population and resources and asked Congress “to conduct a thorough examination of U.S. immigration laws, policies and practices” (Meyerson 65) but it refused to go further. In fact, the Sierra Club continued to struggle over the immigration issue into the 21st Century. In 1991, a resolution that “The U.S. should sustain replacement level fertility (2.1 children per family); the U.S. government should enact legislation establishing an all-inclusive legal immigration ceiling set at replacement level (i.e., immigration equals emigration)” failed to pass and in 1996, the board of directors voted to take a neutral stance on immigration (Meyerson 66). Another resolution was put forward in 1998 advocating club support for immigration limits, but it too failed after a bitter debate (Meyerson 66). In 2002 and 2003, those who supported adopting a restrictionist policy successfully elected several members to the Sierra Club board and hoping to gain a majority on the board put forth three more supporters for election in 2004.⁴

⁴ Pressures on the Sierra Club to adopt a policy in support of restricting immigration was led internally by a group of club members known as the SUSPS (formerly known as Sierrans for U.S. Population Stabilization). Members of the group have ties with John Tanton and some of the restrictionist organizations founded, financed, or supported by him. For example, before his death in 2008, Alan Kuper, the co-founder of SUSPS, was a Federation for American Immigration Reform board of advisors member and the founder of Comprehensive U.S. Sustainable Population. Ben Zuckerman, also a co-founder of SUSPS is vice president and former board member of Californians for Population Stabilization and a member of the board of advisors of Progressives for Immigration Reform.

By then, the fairly well organized national restrictionist movement urged their members to join the Sierra Club so that they could vote for the three.⁵ After a fierce struggle, however, the restrictionist candidates were defeated (Angus and Butler 120). In 2005, the Sierra Club rejected once again a proposal to adopt a more aggressive immigration restriction policy (Center for New Community 2004). John Tanton knew that the immigration issue could be a volatile one and result in supporters being labeled as nativists and racists. Tanton said as much in a rather convoluted argument that he made in a 1975 article entitled "The Case for Passive Eugenics." In the piece, he makes the distinction between active and passive eugenics arguing that while active eugenics identified the "superior" stock and "encourage[ed] its reproduction," passive eugenics looks for and eradicates traits that "are not desired," including he wrote, "genetic defects (such as Mongolism or Down's Syndrome), or physical defects, such as low birth weight or prematurity, which can lead to physical and mental damage and hence reduce life potential for the individual" (2-3). Tanton maintained that "[f]ar from being racist or genocidal, [passive eugenics] seeks to improve the potential of minority groups, which will do more for their prospects than any increase in numbers which might be foregone through larger family size and reproduction outside the years of reproductive efficiency" (4). Thus, while Tanton tried to discursively finesse the links between his ideas on immigration control and eugenics, as I will show later, his support for the sterilization of poor women in the developing world put in place a material social engineering project clearly modeled upon the eugenics framework.

Foreshadowing today's thinly disguised partisan "Think Tanks," designed to produce "objective" studies backing the said organization's political or ideological agenda, Tanton encouraged the collection of social science and scientific data upon which to ultimately rest the development of his extensive organizational network. In 1976, he published a well-received article in the *Ecologist* entitled "International Migration as an Obstacle to Achieving World Stability" where he traced the inter-related problems of population growth, international migration, and natural resources in both developing and developed nations (Tanton 1976). He also sought the help of demographers such as Kingsley Davis to provide the scientific evidence behind restrictionist claims. Encouraged by some in ZPG, Davis wrote several pieces illustrating the negative relationship between high fertility and development.⁶ In his 1974 article in *Scientific American*, for example, he stated "the indirect effect of immigration on population growth depends on the fertility of the immigrant women. Insofar as they come from underdeveloped countries, their fertility is high compared with that of native women.

In the U.S. in 1970 the number of children ever born to women aged 40 to 44 was 4.4 per women for those of Mexican origin and 2.9 for all women" (Davis 103). In passing Kingsley's statistics on to an ABC correspondent, Tanton mentioned a popular television show in support of the soon to be popular anchor baby argument, "the TV show "Chico and the Man" highlighted this last week a common phenomenon—the pregnant Mexican girl who comes to the U.S. to deliver, conferring U.S. citizenship on the child...making her an immediate relative of a U.S. citizen. Wild!" (Gutiérrez 89). This mixing of scientific data and emotive symbols and the use of rhetorical devices such as parallels is have become a common mobilizing tactic of the restrictionist movement, as we have seen in aspects of the Trump phenomenon.⁷ During the 1970s, John Tanton and supporters such as Elaine Stansfield, then president of the Los Angeles chapter of ZPG and later Californians for Population Stabilization and Save Our Earth (Gutiérrez 89-91), testified before Congress and other government bodies, held news conferences, and networked to bring together like-minded people.

Fred Elbel who is currently listed as maintaining the SUSPS website writes for *The Social Contract*. Tanton's connection to these various organizations will be discussed more completely later in the article.

⁵All three individuals running for the board were linked with John Tanton and his restrictionist network. Richard Lamm, governor of Colorado from 1975-1987, was a member of the board of directors of FAIR from 1979-1997, a member of the advisory board of Californians for Population Stabilization, and a contributor to *The Social Contract*; David Pimentel was a board member of the Audubon Society and on the board of directors of the Carrying Capacity Network and Frank Morris was a board member of the Center of Immigration Studies and on the Advisory board of the Carrying Capacity Network (Center for New Community 2004).

⁶See: Kingsley Davis, "Zero Population Growth: The Goal and Means," *Daedalus* 102:4 (Fall 1973), 15-30; Kingsley Davis and Fredrick Styles. *California's Twenty Million: Research Contributions to Population Policy*. Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1971; and Kingsley Davis, "The Migration of Human Population." *Scientific American* 231(3), September 1974: 93-105.

⁷Jennifer Mercieca, "The rhetorical brilliance of Trump the demagogue." *The Conversation* (12/11/2015) <https://theconversation.com/the-rhetorical-brilliance-of-trump-the-demagogue-51984>.

Many supporters of the cause were conservationists and part of the ZPG network. As noted previously, under Tanton's leadership, the ZPG adopted--at least temporarily--a more aggressive anti-immigration narrative. In doing so, however, the organization received push back from those who wanted the organization's focus to be on global population growth rather than on closing the doors to immigrants and on the empowerment of women rather than on curbing the fertility of poor and brown women.(Beck and Kolankiewicz 133-136). According to Elena Gutiérrez, the ZPG board realized that the organization could not be the forum for the advancement of national immigration reform and in the spring 1978 approved a proposal by Tanton to start a new organization whose primary goal would be to halt illegal and dramatically limit legal immigration. With this, the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) was born and John Tanton started on his journey of building an organizational network of restrictionist groups.

FAIR was the first building block of the current restrictionist movement. From the start, FAIR was an autonomous organization even though Tanton obtained start-up funds from ZPG. Tanton served as chairman of FAIR from 1979-1987, and continues today on the board of directors. He convinced Roger Conner, who also came out of the conservation and population movements, to be FAIR's first director (1979-1988) and brought on board others who were active in environmentalism and the ZPG (Reimers 48-49). Dan Stein, earlier the executive director of the FAIR affiliate Immigration Reform Law Institute, has been president of FAIR since 1988. Today FAIR is one of the major players in the restrictionist movement. A lobbyist on Capitol Hill and a frequent presence in congressional hearings, it mobilizes individuals and groups to pressure the government against reforms that would provide status to undocumented individuals or increase the numbers of immigrants legally admitted into the country. For example, Stein warned that the 2013 Senate proposal for immigration reform (S.744) "would unleash a staggering wave of immigration to the United States, unprecedented not only in American history, but in human history.

The consequences of this flood of immigrants entering our labor force, utilizing our infrastructure, school systems, welfare programs, and natural resources, are almost unimaginable" (FAIR).⁸In its campaign against the S.744, FAIR put together an "activist toolkit" with information to help "Stop the Gang of 8," encouraged members to pressure Senator Marco Rubio to pull his support from the proposal, helped to filter bill amendments to likeminded Senators during the markup period, sent staffers to testify against the bill, increased the presence of FAIR leaders on the television interview circuit, and funded paid advertisements. Not surprisingly, FAIR did not fall behind Rubio in his 2016 presidential bid. After the formation of FAIR, John Tanton helped to build a fairly extensive network of related organizations. Their mutual self-authorization and its growing density are startlingly illustrative of the Foucauldian power/knowledge nexus. The organizations support each other philosophically, each tends to address a specific aspect of the larger narrative for restricting immigration, and key figures in the movement hold positions on a number of the organizations either simultaneously or consecutively.⁹ In 1982, Tanton founded U.S., Inc. as the fund-raising and charitable arm of his projects. The next year he joined with Senator Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa to start U.S. English to lobby against bilingual education and for the adoption of English as the official language. Over the next six years, states began to consider English-Only bills at least in part due to pressure from U.S. English. During the English-Only campaign in Arizona however, a memo written by Tanton to those who had attended his WITAN IV¹⁰ conference in 1986 was leaked to the press.

⁸S.744: *Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act* is an 844-page proposal for comprehensive immigration reform negotiated by a bi-partisan group of Senators on the Committee of the Judiciary. The bill was passed by the Committee on the Judiciary on May 22, 2013 (S.744) and is scheduled to move to the Senate floor for consideration in June 2013.

⁹The individual links between restrictionist organizations are extensive. Here are just a couple of examples. Gerda Bekales was director of U.S. English from 1983-1987; she was on the board of directors and advisory board of ProEnglish from 1994-2006; and she sat on the advisory board of *The Social Contract*. Otis Graham was an original member of the board of directors of FAIR; he served as executive director and board member of CIS; he was on the advisory board of *The Social Contract* from 1991-2006; and he is a current board member of Californians for Population Stabilization. Frank Morris is a vice-president of the board at Progressives for Immigration Reform (PFIR); he also sits on the board at the FAIR and Center for Immigration Studies (CIS); he ran for the board of the Sierra Club in 2004 with two others who supported a restrictionist policy; and he has recently helped to form the African American Leadership Council (AALC).

Causing a scandal that ultimately required Tanton to leave the organization. As was his custom, Tanton had presented in the WITAN memo a variety of topics/questions to be discussed at the conference, including:

- "Will the present majority peaceably hand over its political power to a group that is simply more fertile?"
- "Is apartheid in Southern California's future? The demographic picture in South Africa now is startlingly similar to what we'll see in California in 2030"
- "Will Latin American migrants bring with them the tradition of the mordida (bribe), the lack of involvement in public affairs, etc.? What in fact are the characteristics of Latin American culture, versus that of the United States?"
- "Do ethnic enclaves...constitute resegregation? As Whites see their power and control over their lives declining, will they simply go quietly into the night? Or will there be an explosion? Why don't non-Hispanic Whites have a group identity, as do Blacks, Jews, Hispanics?" (WITAN Memo III).

Though chillingly prescient in its projections, as Trump's candidacy has shown, the memo proved embarrassing to U.S. English, several board members resigned including Arnold Schwarzenegger and Walter Cronkite, Director Linda Chávez left, and Tanton was also forced out. A few years later in 1994, however, Tanton started a similar organization called Pro English bringing several former staff and board members from U.S. English with him. Today, Tanton is still a member of the board of Pro English.

Between 1985-1996, Tanton helped start four additional restrictionist groups that are pivotal to the advocacy network. In 1985, he and FAIR founded the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) as the independent research arm of the restrictionist movement. Like FAIR, CIS today has a high profile in Washington, D.C. Its primary goal is to produce and publish studies that provide data and support for arguments to restrict immigration. Donald J. Trump's first national advertisement in the 2016 presidential race,¹¹ for instance, cites a CIS claim that the Obama administration is allowing criminal aliens to not only to stay in the United States but also to collect social security.¹²

CIS also holds conferences with the likes of Breitbart News and others on the alt-right, its leaders testify on Capitol Hill, and CIS directors are regularly interviewed on television and in the press. In 1989, Tanton and FAIR created the Immigration Reform Law Institute (IRLI), as the legal arm of FAIR to work with lawmakers to draft restrictionist legislation. As noted earlier, Dan Stein, now president of FAIR, was initially the executive director of IRLI and today, Kris Kobach, currently the Secretary of State of Kansas, who played a significant role in drafting Arizona's SB1070 and several other state anti-immigrant bills, is chief council of IRLI.¹³ Kobach was an early endorser of the Trump presidential bid coming on board during the primaries in February 2016. Kobach has also advised the Trump campaign on immigration and on how to get Mexico to pay for building the wall. Restrictionist leaders like Peter Brimelow, in fact, lobbied, albeit unsuccessfully, for candidate Trump to pick Kobach as his vice presidential nominee.

¹⁰ Tanton called the meetings WITAN after the Old English witenagemot, or council of wise men to advise the king. He arranged the WITAN meetings so that a small group of invitees could talk about problems and strategize across organizations. After the unfavorable publicity after WITAN memos surfaced publically, however, the name of the gatherings was changed to Writers Workshops and they are held once or twice a year (Collins/Epstein 2010, 221).

¹¹ Rachel Maddow offered an analysis of the advertisement on her cable news show on August 19, 2016 tracing the CIS to Tanton and eugenics sentiments.

¹² The CIS claim is not true. In the article, CIS states "Under DAPA, the government is handing out work permits and making illegal aliens eligible for to (sic) work in the United States as well as to receive Social Security, unemployment, and disability benefits." In reality, the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) is not in effect and as of August 2016, it is being held up in courts. (cis.org/Articles-List-DAPA-SCOTUS)

¹³ As IRLI counsel Kris Kobach helped to draft Alabama's HB 56, a law considered even tougher on immigrants than Arizona's SB 1070. He also represented local communities that passed ordinances to discourage unregulated immigrants. In addition, he represented out-of-state students in lawsuits against states that grant in-state tuition to unregulated immigrants. In 2010, Kobach was elected Secretary of State in Kansas.

In a parallel round of an equally material discursive formation, in 1990, Tanton established the Social Contract Press to publish a quarterly journal, *The Social Contract*, and to print other books and pamphlets in support of the cause. He remains at the helm of the press with Wayne Lutton, criticized by the Southern Poverty Law Center as having connections to racist organizations, as the editor of the journal. The press and journal have raised more than a few eyebrows with their publication choices including the reissuing of Jean Raspail's *The Camp of the Saints*¹⁴ and incendiary articles against Mexicans, immigrant women and of late Muslims. In 1996, Roy Beck, a former Washington editor of *The Social Contract*, founded Numbers USA with financial help from and initially under the guidance of Tanton's U.S., Inc. Today, Numbers USA is independent of U.S., Inc. but shares office space with Pro English. The organization makes an economic argument against immigrants, maintaining that immigrants take American jobs and particularly the jobs of African American men. It has called for rethinking the U.S. policy of birth citizenship and consistently uses arguments that subtly drive an ethnic wedge into the working class.

Other organizations have been added over the years to the restrictionist movement that have received the financial and/or leadership support of John Tanton. Californians for Population Stabilization (CAPS) was formed by Tanton colleagues in ZPG in 1986 and is closely linked philosophically and through personnel to FAIR and CIS. Tanton's wife, Mary-Lou Tanton co-founded in 1996 the US Immigration Reform PAC (USIRPAC) to endorse political candidates.¹⁵ In 2009, two longtime FAIR board members and Tanton allies, Frank Morris and Richard Lamm, formed Progressives for Immigration Reform (PRIF) with Leah Duran, a former attorney with IRLI, as the organization's director. Duran and Morris have also helped to form the African American Leadership Council to work against immigration reform in 2013 (youtube 4/24/2013). Other organizations have come and gone in attempts by the movement to address specific issues in local communities and/or to broaden mobilization of desired sectors. Because of age and Parkinson's disease, John Tanton's personal involvement in the everyday activities of the restrictionist network has necessarily diminished. Still, the network he helped to build continues to flourish and attract the next generations. Several of the main organizations like FAIR and CIS have fellow and internship programs with which they bring in and train young philosophically like-minded individuals.¹⁶

The Social Contract Press also organizes a yearly Writer's Workshop and invites promising young activists. Many supporters of the alt-right like Kris Kobach and Jason Richwine have passed through the Workshop.¹⁷ Organizational representatives also speak on university campuses and at a wide array of academic conferences to make connections with youth and social scientists. In addition, movement leaders have an extensive presence in the media and are often interviewed on national and local television and radio programs. Finally, restrictionist organizations appeal to the next generation—as well as their current supporters—with well-planned and executed paid media campaigns.

¹⁴ *The Camp of the Saints* tells the story of the disaster that strikes France when the government fails to halt a flotilla of ships that brings poor people fleeing overpopulated India to the South of France. The book was originally published in France in 1973 and two years later Scribners published it in English. Social Contract Press reissued it in 1995 and it achieved a level of cult status within the restrictionist movement (Betts 86).

¹⁵ Another illustration of personnel overlap is visible with a quick look at USIRPAC. Mary Lou Tanton is president of the organization and board members include William Chip, Robert Park, and K.C. McAlpin all of whom are either on the board of directors or advisory board of FAIR. William Chip is also on the board of CIS and Park and McAlpin sit on the board of Pro English.

¹⁶ Fred Stanback, a major supporter of Tanton organizations, set up the Stanback Internship Program at Duke's Nicholas School in 1995. According to the program, students were to be placed in internships with environmental non-profits. Stanback selected the groups and being a supporter of John Tanton he put FAIR, Numbers USA, CIS, and PFIR on the list of acceptable internship organizations. In April 2013, Duke University notified Stanback that they would no longer allow students to be placed in internships with the restrictionist groups classifying them as anti-immigrant not environmental non-profits (Sorg). While the organizations are focused on restrictionist policies, as I have tried to illustrate, they come out of the conservative conservation approach of John Tanton and ZPG activists of the 1960s-1970s and I would argue still retain environmental concerns, albeit not liberal environmental thinking or explanations.

¹⁷ Jason Richwine is the co-author of the Heritage Foundation study that claimed that the immigration reform proposed by the Senate in 2013 would cost taxpayers at least \$6.3 trillion and who wrote a Harvard dissertation that maintained that Hispanics had lower IQs than native whites (ADL).

The ads were widespread and ubiquitous enough that in April 2012, Steven Colbert lampooned one, a national television advertisement funded by CAPS that blames immigrants for increasing carbon emissions in the U.S. As Colbert noted,

Saving the planet by demonizing immigrant's gives liberals and conservatives something they can do together (other than shouting at Thanksgiving dinner). Now when a liberal yammers on about the record heat we had this winter, a conservative can say let's save the environment by building an electrified border fence that runs on alternative energy (solar death panels). And, liberals you know that you can trust this ad because the group behind it, Californians for Population Stabilization shares your concern about the environment.

That's why their website talks about anchor babies, the Mexican reconquista movement to reclaim California, and recycling or as they call it bottle and can deportation (Steven Colbert, *The Colbert Report*, 4/26/2012). In New York City, the advertisement was aired on the liberal cable station MSNBC presumably seeking support from viewers who might be environmentally inclined. The ad thus continued the movement's earlier attempts within the Sierra Club to convince independent and liberal environmentalists to put immigration on the environmental movement's agenda. The anomalous or incongruent pairing that has also withstood the national polarization has been the alliance between restrictionist movements and the pro-family planning agenda. Having first emerged from the population-growth movement, restrictionist organizations in John Tanton's network, unlike some of their anti-immigrant allies on the far right, support family planning including birth control, abortion, and sterilization. As noted, John Tanton and his wife, Mary Lou, were involved in Planned Parenthood early in their careers as were many other ZPG advocates who later joined the restrictionist movement.

Originating from a population control ideology, however, has led most restrictionists to support a top-down approach to women's health rather than for one that starts with the empowerment of women to make their own decisions about their bodies. In the next section, I will explore the debate over the use of a non-surgical sterilization method called Quinacrine Sterilization (QS), which some leaders in the restrictionist movement have backed. In supporting QS, leaders have argued that by sterilizing poor women in developing countries, population pressures on the global south will be reduced and people will have less of a need to immigrate to the United States. Rather than merely theoretical, however, this advocacy has already created material realities that clearly illustrate the linkages between knowledge production and biopolitics within the immigration restrictionist movement.

QS: Reduce Births in Developing Nations=Reduced Immigration:

Eugenics by any other Name."I have no faith that this method would go forward without Dr. Kessel and me... We have made it live."Stephen Mumford to Marie McCullough (Philadelphia Inquirer 2/28/2000). Along with the establishment of a politically powerful though dubious knowledge-base, the constellation of movements described above is also, inevitably, operational in exercising what Foucault termed bio power: the management and control of bodies. The history of the use of quinacrine as a non-surgical means of sterilization (QS) for women has been controversial and has raised questions of both safety and ethics. Supporters of the use of the drug maintain that quinacrine meets the needs of poor women and particularly poor women in developing countries: quinacrine pellets are affordable at just pennies each, pellets can be administered by health professionals other than doctors in non-hospital settings, the procedure does not require anesthesia, and women can return to regular activities almost immediately (Lippes1999, 2002a, 2000b, 2015, Sokal et al 2000). Some of the key supporters of the use of quinacrine, including John Tanton and FAIR advisory and board members Donald Collins and Sally Epstein, are linked to the restrictionist movement. Opponents of the use of quinacrine for sterilization have accused advocates of proceeding with the distribution of the drug without adequate testing and without FDA approval, of using it on poor women without their consent, of ignoring women's rights for adequate information and the right to choose, and of not properly monitoring the use of the drug (Center for New Community 2013, Ordover 2003).

In this section, to underscore the materiality of biopower, I will use a rights based lens to analyze the links between quinacrine non-surgical sterilization and the restrictionist movement. A rights approach starts from the premise that economic, social, and human rights are inseparable (Hamm 1006). At its center is a belief that development policies and program s(including those in education and healthcare) should help to empower the poor, expand their choices, and increase their participation so that they are able to better make claims to opportunities and services and live the lives that they choose to live.

An assessment of the use of quinacrine through a rights lens focuses on whether women have had the necessary information and options to make a decision about the safety and suitability of the procedure and if they have access to the health and monitoring facilities that will enhance their ability to make and realize their decision.

At the same time, a rights focus requires that we think more thoroughly about technology, technological advances, the ways in which technology is made available, and to whom it is and is not distributed. We cannot ignore the ways in which technology is embedded in power relations, shaped within systems of extreme socioeconomic inequalities, and influenced by socio cultural dynamics. Quinacrine was originally developed in the 1930s as an anti-malarial drug. In the 1970s, the International Fertility Regulations Program (IFRP), [later renamed Family Health International and today called FHI 360 and referred in much of the literature as FHI], a U.S. research institute based in North Carolina, supported the research of Dr. Jaime Zipper who used quinacrine to sterilize approximately 4,000 women in Chile (Scully 104, Carignan, et al 2).

Initially in the form of a liquid called quinacrine slurry, Dr. Zipper injected the quinacrine into the uterus of approximately 550 patients to cause intentional scarring in and closure of the fallopian tubes. The quinacrine slurry was reportedly also used in a small sampling of cases in Canada, Florida, Jamaica, and Thailand (Zipper & Kessel S8). The liquid quinacrine, however, failed in about 35% of women and three women died after the injections (Zipper & Kessel S8, Scully 105). Because of these problems, Zipper and researchers at IFRP reformulated the drug in 1975 into pellets to be inserted into the uterus using an instrument much like that used to insert an IUD (Zipper & Trujillo S24). Within thirty minutes after insertion, the pellets dissolve, and the chemical runs into the fallopian tubes, burning the inner walls of the tubes. Over the next few weeks, scar tissue forms in the tubes, which eventually completely blocks the tubes so that the egg can no longer travel to the uterus? This results in the permanent sterilization of the patient. It was originally recommended that the procedure be replicated three times at one-month intervals to ensure effectiveness but later the recommendation was reduced to two applications (Kessel and Mumford 730-732). While the drug quinacrine has FDA approval for treatment of malaria and several other diseases, it has yet to be approved by the FDA to be inserted in a woman's uterus in order to cause permanent sterilization. Still, over the last several decades, QS has been used to sterilize over 200,000 women in mostly developing countries including Bangladesh, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, the Philippines, Romania, Venezuela.¹⁸

Several countries have banned the use of QS, including Chile and India in 1998, but it continues to be used, even in some of the banned countries (Dasgupta 2005; Freedman July 1998). Dr. Elton Kessel, a former director of IFRP, and Stephen D. Mumford, an employee of the firm from 1977-1983, have been driving forces behind the production and distribution of the drug.¹⁹ According to Judith Scully, "In a remarkably quiet crusade, Mumford and Kessel have paid for the manufacture of quinacrine in Switzerland, arranged for its distribution in about twenty countries and mobilized a network of doctors, nurses and midwives to administer it. Most of the sterilizations are a result of free donations or gifts of quinacrine given by Mumford and Kessel to doctors and health practitioners all over the world" (Scully 108).²⁰ After being forced out of IFRP in 1980, Kessel founded the International Federation for Family Health Research (IFFHR) and three years later when Mumford was dismissed from IFRP, he started the Center for Research on Population and Security (CRPS).²¹

¹⁸ Without FDA approval, it is illegal to use quinacrine to sterilize women in the United States. Advocates for QS have argued that the drug is merely being re-purposed and has already been shown to be safe after years of use for other diseases. They thus maintain that quinacrine use for sterilization does not need to go through a completely new FDA approval testing process. The FDA disagrees and QS use in the U.S. has been limited primarily to several small clinical tests. A physician in Florida, however, advertises the availability of the procedure and claims to have used quinacrine to sterilize women in his clinic. (Center for New Community, 2; Zipper and Kessel; Mumford and Kessel 1992; Whitney drwhitney.com).

¹⁹ Kessel is a medical doctor trained at Harvard and the University of Chicago and Mumford has a PhD in population studies from the University of Texas.

²⁰ After unfavorable publicity about QS in 1998, the Swiss firm withdrew from producing quinacrine pellets.

²¹ As with the restrictionist movement, the founders behind QS are aging. Dr. Elton Kessel is in his 90s and Stephen Mumford in his 70s. It is not clear that the organizations that they have founded will continue without the two men.

Both organizations focus almost exclusively on expanding the use of QS and the distribution of quinacrine pellets worldwide. Beginning in 1994, Donald Collins, who was a founding board member of FHI (Collins 2010), joined forces with Kessel and Mumford. Initially, Collins and Epstein donated funds to both CRPS and IFFHR through Collins' non-profit, International Services Assistance Fund (ISAF).²² In 2004, however, they became more involved with the QS project. Mumford was named CEO of the ISAF and Kessel became vice president (although Kessel has since retired). Tax records note that the main goal of the organization is "to encourage women's reproductive health by developing the QS family planning method (ISAF 2010). Today, ISAF is working to remove the FDA's clinical hold on Phase III trial of quinacrine sterilization. John Tanton is a supporter of QS and is personally, financially, and ideologically linked with some of the key proponents of quinacrine sterilization. Tanton claimed in a 1997 memo that he "know[s] Steve Mumford fairly well" (9).

Dr. Kessel has been less concerned with immigration, but Mumford is a member of FAIR, Americans for Immigration Control, Negative Population Growth, and Zero Population Growth (Center for Research on Population and Security) and a regular reader of Tanton's journal, *The Social Contract*.²³ Like the restrictionist groups he belongs to, Mumford believes immigration to be the main source of population growth in the United States and sees it as undermining the nation's stability and security. For him quinacrine sterilization is a means of controlling immigration primarily by helping to reduce population growth in developing nations. Mumford explained in 1998, "This explosion in human numbers [in the United States], which after 2050 will come entirely from immigrants and the offspring of immigrants will dominate our lives. There will be chaos and anarchy" (Freedman A1).

He has also made statements that link immigration to a pending environmental crisis, "We have 1.2 million legal immigrants annually and who knows how many illegal... Every environmental indicator in America is in decline, so immigration already is affecting our quality of life... This overpopulation boom is going to drive terrorism in the United States" (McCullough F1). John Tanton is said to have originally brought Stephen Mumford, Elton Kessel, Donald Collins and Sally Epstein together over the quinacrine issue (Center for New Community 9). Both Collins and Epstein are personal friends and professional colleagues of John Tanton and his wife Mary Lou. Collins is currently the co-chair of the board of advisors of FAIR and Epstein is a long-time member of FAIR's board of directors. Collins' son, Donald Collins Jr., is also a board member of FAIR. In an article praising Tanton, Collins wrote in *The Social Contract* "For Sally and me, our association with John Tanton and his wife Mary Lou has proved to be something of a family affair, defined by our innate trust of each other and a steadfast devotion to urgent policy issues in which we all believe" (Collins and Epstein 220).

Like the Tantons, both Collins and Epstein have long supported and worked around issues of women's reproduction. Collins is a founding board member of FHI, Ipas, and the Guttmacher Institute. FHI is the revamped IFRP, Ipas is dedicated to providing safe abortions worldwide, and the Guttmacher Institute advocates maternal and reproductive health of poor women internationally. Collins established International Services Assistance Fund (ISAF) in 1976 to work on issues of environment and population and now as previously stated the organization's main goal is around the education and research of QS. According to Epstein one goal of ISAF would be to "distribute low-cost QS kits worldwide" once FDA approval is secured (Veteran Feminists of America). Epstein is the daughter of Dr. Clarence Gamble, heir to the Procter and Gamble fortune, who was an advocate for family planning and birth control and who collaborated with Margaret Sanger. Gamble and Sanger were both active in the American eugenics movement. Gamble co-founded the Human Betterment League in North Carolina 1947 which encouraged the forced sterilization of the poor—primarily African Americans—and "feeble-minded" (Ordover 154). In addition, he was earlier involved in population control in Puerto Rico in the 1930s, helping to staff family planning clinics and according to Nancy Ordover using those clinics as "recruitment centers for sterilization and testing grounds for pharmaceutical companies" (151).

²² Donald Collins is President of ISAF. In 2010 tax records, Epstein is listed as the secretary of the organization and other family members, including the son of Mumford, are listed as directors (ISAF 2010).

²³ Mumford wrote a complementary letter to the editor of *The Social Contract*, praising the journal as the "most intellectually honest periodical published in the population/immigration field - and there are no close seconds" (Mumford, *The Social Contract*. 6:2 (Winter 1995-1996), 84).

Gamble also established over 20 sterilization clinics throughout the South and Midwest in the United States (Ordo 153-154) and Epstein's first husband helped Gamble form the Pathfinder Fund (today Pathfinder International) to set up family planning clinics in developing countries.

After her divorce from her first husband, Epstein met Collins and in 1993 travelled with him to study the use of quinacrine sterilization in Vietnam. According to Epstein, women in Vietnam chose QS over surgical sterilization eleven to one. Ultimately, 50,000 women in Vietnam were sterilized using the QS method, until 1993, when as Epstein puts it, "Unfortunately, political and religious forces in the World Health Organization forced the Vietnamese government to terminate this research" (Veteran Feminists of America). There is evidence however that some women did not actually *choose* to be sterilized, much less *choose* QS. Alix Freedman reported in 1998 that at least 107 workers on a rubber plantation were sterilized without their consent. One worker "recall[ed] that on March 10, 1993, she went to the plantation health clinic, where she was told that she would receive a routine gynecological examination. Instead, Duong Dang Hanh, the clinic's director, removed Mrs. Thi's IUD and sterilized her with quinacrine" (A1). Do Trong Hieu, who was then the director of family planning in Vietnam, had become an advocate of the procedure after meeting Dr. Kessel in 1986. He told a reporter in 1998, that while the low price and easy application of QS made it "good for a poor country," the same qualities also made it easy to abuse. Still, he remained a supporter, "you have to weigh the benefits" (Freedman A1). While QS is cheap, supporters have had to raise funds for the production and distribution of the quinacrine pellets and to finance clinical tests required for FDA approval.

Donald Collins and John Tanton have been particularly adept at helping to fund raise in support of quinacrine sterilization. Many of the same private foundations that are key donors of restrictionist organizations like FAIR, Numbers USA, CIS, and Progressives for Immigration Reform, and Californians for Population Stabilization, and U.S. Inc. also have contributed to organizations in support of quinacrine sterilization. Collins and Tanton have personal and professional connections to some of the foundations and one can only assume that these have helped those secure funds for QS. For example, Collins is on the board of the DSF Charitable Foundation, one of the Scaife family foundations and he is friends with Lee Fikes of the Leland Fikes Foundation. Both the Scaife family and the Fikes foundations have helped to fund the QS project. In addition, Tanton, Collins and Epstein all have links through FAIR with Alan Weeden who is president of the Weeden Foundation and sits on the FAIR Board of Directors. The Weeden Foundation has also funded QS. Tanton and Collins also developed associations with Warren Buffett who donated \$2 million to FHI to fund FDA Stage II approval of QS.²⁴

Tanton even secured a small \$5000 contribution from FAIR to support the quinacrine project (Center for New Community 8). Collins' non-profit ISAF was a major contributor in the 1990s and early 2000s to the organizations set up by Kessel and Mumford. Over the last decade, ISAF has been one of the main funders of QS. The non-profit does not report its funding sources but upon questioning from the IRS, Collins wrote that the organization makes personal appeals to private foundations and individual donors (Collins 2003). Between 2005-2009, the organization raised almost \$4.6 million dollars (ISAF 2009) in this way, which it then spent on education and research of QS. ISAF also pays Mumford a salary as the CEO of the organization (ISAF 1990s 2004-2010).

As with the links between restrictionist organizations, the connections between the restrictionist movement and quinacrine sterilization is often best visible through the personal, professional, and funding links between various individuals and groups. Tanton, Collins, Epstein, Mumford, and Kessel have remained at the center of the mobilization in support of QS.

²⁴ John Tanton's link to Buffett was through Fred Stanback, a supporter and contributor to Tanton organizations. Stanback went to Columbia University's business school with Buffett and was the best man at his wedding. In a 1995 memo (cc'd to Dan Stein at FAIR), Tanton reported on a meeting he and his wife had with Fred Stanback, "[T]he Buffett name came up frequently as a source for funds on projects relating to sterilization, abortion, and population overseas. It turns out that one of Stanback's sons works for Family Health International (FHI) in Chapel Hill. Stanback did not know about the quinacrine sterilization—I should send him some information on it" (Stanback Memo). Buffett stopped funding QS in 2003 (Population Research Institute). Donald Collins also had links to Buffett through his board work on Ipas and The Guttmacher Institute, both organizations have consistently received substantial Buffett funding. Buffett foundations do not accept unsolicited applications for grants but rather locate organizations to fund on their own. Thus, personal connections between Stanback and Buffett or Collins and Buffett may have played a more important role in securing funding than one might expect from non-profits that regularly seek proposals in a grant competition framework.

They have rallied the support of individuals and groups within the restrictionist movement, claiming that the procedure is safe and will benefit poor women. Critics of quinacrine sterilization outside the movement, however, point to a host of possible health concerns with the drug and are critical of the way in which it has been used in developing countries (Carignan, et al 3-5). Health professionals have expressed fear that the quinacrine produces a mutagen in the uterus that could be a carcinogen.

They are also concerned about the potential of toxic psychosis, uterine adhesions, the increase of entropic pregnancies, of birth defects if the tube closure is not complete and negative effects on the nervous system from the drug and procedure (Scully 105, Carignan, et al 3-5). In addition, women who have undergone the procedure have reported immediate problems of heavy bleeding, headaches, abdominal pain, fever, and backaches (Scully 106). Because of safety questions, in 1998 the FDA demanded that Mumford and Kessel destroy their stockpiles of the drug and halt distribution. According to reports, however, the two merely moved their inventory outside the U.S. (Scully 111-112, McCullough). Supporters of QS deny that the drug or procedure produces any serious side effects but opponents counter that the drug has yet to be adequately tested to guarantee its safety. In addition to potential health risks, opponents of QS believe that the manner in which the distribution and testing of quinacrine sterilization has proceeded presents serious ethical concerns. For the most part, poor and brown women in the developing world have been the recipients of the procedure, sometimes without their consent but almost always, critics argue, without the information and options that would allow women to make an informed decision about whether to have the procedure. Judith Scully compares the way QS has been used in developing nations with the experimentation of earlier reproductive technology on poor women: tests of oral contraceptive pill on Puerto Rican women in the 1950s; the early clinical trials for Norplant with poor women living in Egypt, the Pacific, Africa, Latin America, and Asia; the initial tests of the Dalkon Shield with African American women in Baltimore; and the first uses of Depo-Provera in black townships in colonial Namibia (Scully 114-116).

In all of these cases, women suffered side effects from the drugs and/or procedures that included death, cancer, life-threatening urinary infections, depression, heavy bleeding, and perforations of the uterus, pregnancies associated with birth defects, ectopic pregnancies, and spontaneous septic abortions (Scully 114-116). In case after case, researchers have found that women did not sign consent forms, they were not given sufficient information about the drugs or procedures, and were not provided with options to help them make a decision about the ways in which and types of (if any) family planning would be best for them (Scully 114-116). These same arguments can be made about the distribution and use of QS. International guidelines--including The Nuremberg Code (1949), the Helsinki Declaration (1964), and the International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects (1983) have contributed to establishing a set of guidelines to regulate experimentation on human beings. The voluntary and informed consent of all participants is clearly at the forefront of all international guidelines.

In addition, they recommend both the equitable choosing of participants and distribution of burdens and benefits associated with the research, the protection for vulnerable peoples, and the need for independent ethnical review committees. The 1983 International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects, in fact, stipulates that research subjects from developing communities not be used in research that could be carried out with subjects from developed countries (Guideline 8). None of these are legal mandates but they do establish a way of analyzing quinacrine sterilization from the rights based approach. Within the rights framework, we need to ask why poor women in developing countries and not middle class women in developed countries are being targeted for QS. The link of QS with the restrictionist movement leads to a troubling potential answer to that question: have over 200,000 women been sterilized with quinacrine in developing nations in order to reduce the population of potential immigrants to developing nations? It sounds far-fetched on one hand, but support for QS fits nicely (and frighteningly so) with the goals, mobilizing strategies, and writings of restrictionist leaders. We also need to think about medical rights and whether they are universal for all people, poor or rich living in developing and developed nations. Do poor women in developing countries deserve the same access to safe options to family planning as middle class women in developing nations? QS Supporters often argue that poverty, the existence of poor medical facilities, and the general subordination of women in some countries must necessarily allow for a different valuating system. Dr. Naseem Rahman in Dhaka, Bangladesh, an advocate for QS, expressed this sentiment to Alix Freeman, "First, let these women be accepted as humans and then let's talk about human rights. As it is, they're going to die, so what do the long-term complications of quinacrine matter?" (Freedman A1).

If we accept Rahman's ideas, often repeated by QS supporters (Suhadi and Soejoenoes 968), we are then accepting that someone other than the woman being sterilized is best able to calculate whether the benefits of the procedure will outweigh the costs to the individual patient.

In his argument for passive eugenics, recall that John Tanton similarly argued that passive eugenics would have "the beneficial demographic effect of limiting the size of the human community [to] assure that more resources are available to nurture each child that is born" (Tanton 4). This line of reasoning disembowels women and completely runs counter to a rights based agenda and practices. The link between key advocates of quinacrine sterilization and leaders within the immigrant restrictionist movement is troublesome. While it is an understandable association given the origins of the restrictionist movement, the movement's simultaneous support for a reduction of immigrants to the U.S. and the sterilization of poor women in developing nations, is disconcerting.

Ultimately, the scenario smacks of eugenics all over again. Tanton, Mumford, Kessel, Collins, and Epstein would most surely disagree, as would other QS supporters, some of them health professionals and former patients in developing countries.²⁵ Still, the rights approach is firmly based in the belief that every individual has the right to the information and resources that will help her make and realize an informed decision about her reproductive needs. This requires accurate information, options, and the empowerment of women, poor as well as wealthy and women living in developing as well as developed nations. Stephen Mumford has argued that abuses in the implementation of QS—particularly the lack of consent or information, or the failure to apply two applications of quinacrine at the proper time to ensure fallopian tube closer—should not be blamed on the drug or its U.S. supporters, but on the health professionals in developing countries (Freedman June 1998). For Mumford, thus technology is neutral. The rights approach, however, views technology as inseparable from the context within which it is entrenched. The use of quinacrine for sterilization would consequently be perceived "as embedded in the historical, socio cultural, and political structures and histories that influence research, development, introduction, and delivery of reproductive technologies" (Reproductive Health Technologies Project, 6). If we take into account the contexts within which quinacrine sterilization has originated, distributed, and implemented, we necessarily must come to the conclusion that the founders, funders, and implementers have chosen to reject the rights based approach in general and the rights of poor women specifically in favor of biopolitical control.

Environment-Population-Immigration: The Narrative That Just Won't End

Today, Donald Trump's anti-immigration narrative and his movement "To Take America Back" resonate with the arguments made by John Tanton and other restrictionists starting in the 1970s. They argued then and now that population growth—led by immigrants from the global south—threatened American exceptionalism and were destroying American core values. According to Tanton, the solution is the management and control of immigrant bodies—physically excluding immigrants from the United States and reducing the birthrates of poor women from developing nations. Today, not so dissimilarly, presidential candidate, Donald J. Trump wants to build the wall to keep immigrants out and expel all so-called "illegals," but he also supports Planned Parenthood and birth control, while excoriating "illegal aliens" giving birth to "anchor babies" on U.S. soil.

The knowledge base and its narrative formations built by the Tanton network rely on the triggering of old narratives of fear of foreigners, class biases, misogyny, and American exceptionalism. In doing so, the network built up a knowledgebase that blames immigrant bodies for threatening resources, jobs, culture, and the very "greatness" of the United States. The Trump campaign has been able to tap into these discourses, and their related organizational networks, to build support for his presidential bid. Ultimately, the restrictionist narrative tells a binary tale, one side ("us") is moral and "great" and the other side ("them") is composed of rapists, drug dealers, and criminals.

²⁵See: Jack Lippes. "Quinacrine sterilization: time for reconsideration." *Contraception* 92 (2015), 91-95. R. B. Whitney, MD. "Quinacrine Non-Surgical Female Sterilization (QS) in a Private American Office Practice." Report given at F.I.G.O. Conference (November 2003), Santiago Chile; Do Trong Hieu, et al. "31,781 cases of non-surgical female sterilization with quinacrine pellets in Vietnam." *The Lancet* 342 (July 24, 1993), 213-217; Deborah Randazzo Barbosa de Magalhaes, et al. "Quinacrine sterilization for human immunodeficiency virus-positive women." *Fertility and Sterility* 92:1 (July 2009), 108-115; Agung Suhadi and Ariawan Soejoenoes. "Quinacrine pellets non-surgical female sterilization in Wonosobo, Indonesia." *Fertility and Sterility* 67:5 (May 1997), 966-968.

As illustrated by the Trump phenomenon, the narrative allows for the survival of only one side; it is a zero sum game. It is thus urgent to halt immigration to ensure "American greatness" and the security of both nation and values. In tracing the ways in which the Tanton network links and triangulates environment, population growth, and immigration to mobilize immigration restrictionist advocacy, it has become clear that the movement uses a rhetoric that is both emotive and perilous and often times relying on deceptive tactics such as prolepsis, dissimulation, and bad science the apotheosis of which appears to be the Trump candidacy and its wild claims.

As we have seen, the philosophical basis of the restrictionist argument that blames population expansion--rather than socioeconomic structures---for environmental devastation, quite easily sets the stage for narratives that flirt, if not outright flaunt, nativist and racist ideologies, mobilizing a group of Americans dissatisfied with developments of the post-civil rights movement. The Southern Poverty Law Center and others have accused John Tanton of being racist. Not surprisingly, he and his supporters have rejected such a notion. The argument laid out here, however, tries to turn the conversation away from a debate over whether John Tanton is racist or not and instead focuses the query on the ways in which a conservationist project that is founded within a population perspective can almost seamlessly lead to narratives and policies that violate individual and group rights. The restrictionist narrative has led to the spread of a nasty native's rhetoric, openly on display at Trump rallies that dehumanizes and hierarchically ranks humanity. It has also led to policies that violate the reproductive rights of women, as well as denigrates them as a class. Ultimately, restrictionist narratives and the actions that they imply run counter to the development of policies and programs that respect a rights based framework, the fruits of which we are watching unfold before us.

Works Cited

- ADL. "Jason Richwine Has Ties To More Extreme Elements of Anti-Immigrant Movement" May 10, 2013. (<http://blog.adl.org/civil-rights/jason-richwine-has-ties-to-more-extreme-elements-of-anti-immigrant-movement>) downloaded May 12, 2013.
- Angus, Ian and Simon Butler. *Too Many People?: Population, Immigration, and the Environmental Crisis*. Chicago: Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2011.
- Betts, Katherine. "A Interview with Jean Raspail," *The Social Contract* 5:2 Winter 1994-1995, 84-86.
- Borjes, George J., Jeffrey Grogger, Gordon H. Hanson. "Immigration and African-American Employment Opportunities: The Response of Wages, Employment, and Incarceration to Labor Supply Shocks." *NBER Working Paper 12518* (September 2006).
- Card, David. "Is the New Immigration Really So Bad?" NBER Working Paper 11547 (August 2005).
- Carignan, Charles S., MD., Deborah Rogow, and Amy E. Pollack, M.D., M.P.H. "The Quinacrine Method of Nonsurgical Sterilization: Report of an Experts Meeting." *AVSC Working Paper 6*: July 1994
- Center for New Community. *Hostile Takeover: Race, Immigration and the Sierra Club*. February 2004, downloaded 6/13/2012 www.newcomm.org.
- Center for New Community. *The Quinacrine Report: Sterilization, Modern Day Eugenics, and the Anti-Immigrant Movement*. Chicago, Illinois: Center for New Community, 2013.
- Center for Research on Population and Security. *Curriculum Vitae Stephen Douglas Mumford*. Downloaded May 20, 2013. http://www.population-security.org/mumford_CV.html
- Collins, Donald A. "Ignoring Climate Change, Immigration, and Their Root Cause, Population Growth." Progressives for Immigration Reform. November 4, 2012. Downloaded May 22, 2013. <http://www.progressivesforimmigrationreform.org/ignoring-climate-change-immigration-and-their-root-cause-population-growth/>.
- Collins, Donald. Attachment to 990 for International Services Assistance Fund. 2003, 1-7. Downloaded May 31, 2013. http://990s.foundationcenter.org/990_pdf_archive/561/561149048/561149048_200406_990.pdf
- Collins, Donald A. and Sarah G. Epstein. "How a Rural Ophthalmologist's (sic) Vision Changed Our Lives." *The Social Contract* Spring 2010, 220-222.
- Crawford, James. *Hold Your Tongue: Biligualism and the Politics of English Only*. Lebanon, Indiana: Addison-Wesley, 1993.

- Dasgupta, Rajashri. "Quinacrine Sterilization in India: Women's Health and Medical Ethics Still at Risk." *Population and Development Program at Hampshire College??* 34 Spring 2005. Downloaded May 20, 2013. <http://www.global-sisterhood-network.org/content/view/237/59/>.
- Declaration of Helsinki. (June 1964). Visited May 15, 2013 . <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/>.
- Ehrlich, Paul R., Loy Bilderback, and Anne H. Ehrlich. *The Golden Door: International Migration, Mexico, and The United States*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1979.
- FAIR. "Gang of Eight Bill Would Unleash Unprecedented Wave of Immigration Finds Analysis by FAIR." Downloaded 5/10/2013 <http://www.fairus.org/news/gang-of-8-bill-would-unleash-unprecedented-wave-of-immigration>.
- Freedman, Alix. "Population Bomb: Two Americans Export Chemical Sterilization to the Third World—More than 100,000 Women Undergo the Procedure; Cancer Risk Is Feared—Secret Doings in Vietnam." *Wall Street Journal*. 18 June 1998: A1.
- Freedman, Alix M. "Chile Bans Quinacrine Sterilizations in Latest Setback to U.S. Distributors." *Wall Street Journal*. July 10, 1998: A4.
- Fulford, James. "The Barton Case: Waking the Sleeping Giant?" October 24, 2001. Vdare website. Downloaded May 28, 2013. <http://www.vdare.com/articles/the-barton-case-waking-the-sleeping-giant>
- Gutiérrez, Elena R. *Fertile Matters: The Politics of Mexican-Origin Women's Reproduction*. Austin: Texas: University of Texas Press, 2008.
- International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects (1993) Visited May 15, 2013. <http://www.codex.uu.se/texts/international.html>.
- International Services Assistance Fund. Federal Tax Form 990 (2001-2010). Available from the Foundation Center. Downloaded 5/31/2013 http://990finder.foundationcenter.org/990results.aspx?990_type=A&fn=International+Services+Assistance+Fund&st=&zp=&ei=&fy=&action=Find.
- Larsen, Solana. "The Anti-Immigration Movement: From Shovels to Suits." *NACLA Report on the Americas*. 40:3 May/June 2007, 14-19.
- Lippes, Jack. "Quinacrine sterilization (QS): time for reconsideration." *Contraception* 92 (2015), 91-95.
- Lippes, Jack. (a) "A Birth Control Alternative." *Science* 297(August 16, 2002), 1121.
- Lippes, Jack. (b) "Quinacrine sterilization: the imperative need for American clinical trials." *Fertility and Sterility* 77:6 (June 2002), 1106-1109.
- Lippes, Jack. "Quinacrine Sterilization Safety and Efficacy." Presented at the American Public Health Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois. November 8, 1999.
- Luibhéid, Eithne. *Entry Denied: Controlling Sexuality at the Border*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 2002.
- McCullough, Marie. "Polarization on Sterilization Advocates Say the Drug Quinacrine Is a Cheap, Safe and Easy Means for Women to Permanently Prevent Conceptions. Others Want More Study and Question the Motives of Its Main Backer." *Philadelphia Inquirer* February 28, 2000: F1.
- Mercieca, Jennifer. "The rhetorical brilliance of Trump the demagogue." *The Conversation* (12/11/2015). <https://theconversation.com/the-rhetorical-brilliance-of-trump-the-demagogue-51984>.
- Mumford, Stephen. *Letter to the Editor. The Social Contract* 6:2(Winter 1995-1996), 84.
- Mumford, Stephen and Elton Kessel. "Sterilization Needs in the 1990s: The Case for Quinacrine Nonsurgical Female Sterilization." *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 167:5 1992, 1203-1207.
- Nuremberg Code: Directives for Human Experimentation. Visited May 15, 2013. <http://ori.dhhs.gov/education/products/RCRintro/c03/b1c3.html>.
- Ordovery, Nancy. *American Eugenics: Race, Queer Anatomy, and the Science of Nationalism*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Population Research Institute Review. "Warren Buffett Ends Support for Population Control Programs." 13:4 (July/August 2003), Downloaded May 29, 2013. <http://www.pop.org/content/warren-buffett-ends-support-for-population-1817>
- Reimers, David M. *Unwelcome Strangers: American Identity and the Turn Against Immigration*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1998.

- Reproductive Health Technologies Project. (Or do I put under the names: Amy Allina, Sheila Clark, Valerie DeFillip, Jodi Jacobson, Kristen Moore, and Shira Saperstein) *The Quinacrine Debate and Beyond: Exploring the Challenges of Reproductive Health Technology Development and Introduction* (Washington, D.C.: Reproductive Health Technologies Project, 2002).
- S.744: Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act. Downloaded May 27, 2013. <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/113/s744/text>
- Schrag, Peter. *Not Fit for Our Society: Immigration and Nativism in America*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2010.
- Sokal, David, D. TrongHieu, Debra H. Weiner, et al. "Long-term follow-up after quinacrine sterilization in Vietnam." Parts 1 and 2 *Fertility and Sterility* 74:6(December 2000), 1084-1101.
- Sokal, David, Alfredo Dabancens, Rene Guzman-Serani, and Jaime Zipper. "Cancer risk among women sterilized with transversicalquinacrine in Chile: an update through 1996." *Fertility and Sterility* 74:1 (July 2000), 169-171.
- Sorg, Lisa. "Duke removes four anti-immigration groups from Fred Stanback Internship Program." *Indy Week*. April 10, 2013. Downloaded May 28, 2013. <http://www.indyweek.com/indyweek/fred-stanback-philanthropist-and-environmentalist-sponsored-anti-immigration-groups-at-duke/Content?oid=3536151>
- Southern Poverty Law Center. "The Puppeteer." *Intelligence Report* 106 (Summer 2002). <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-report/browse-all-issues/2002/summer>
- Southern Poverty Law Center. *Pioneer Fund*. Downloaded June 2, 2013. <http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-files/groups/pioneer-fund#.Uat0OZUhOB8>
- Suhadi, Agung and AriawanSoejoenoes. "Quinacrine pellets non-surgical female sterilization in Wonosobo, Indonesia." *Fertility and Sterility* 67:5 (May 1997), 966-968.
- Tanton, John. "The Case for Passive Eugenics." 4/24/1975.
- Tanton, John. "Memo to the Fred Stanbeck File." November 2, 1995, 1-7. http://www.indyweek.com/pdf/041013/1995_tanton_stanbeck_aicf.pdf
- Tanton, John, Denis McCormack, and Joseph Wayne Smith. *Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies*. Aldershot, UK: Avebury/Ashgate Publishing, 1996).
- Tanton, John and Mary Lou Tanton. Resumes. Posted on the website of *The Social Contract Press* http://www.thesocialcontract.com/answering_our_critics/tanton_resume.html
- The Colbert Report*, The Word (4/26/2012) Downloaded May 10, 2013 <http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2012/04/26/colbert-global-warming-caused-by-immigrants/People of the State of Michigan v. Janice Barton, State of Michigan Courts of Appeal, File 234277, September 11, 2001.>
- Veteran Feminists of America. *Sally Epstein*. (nd) Downloaded May 5, 2013. <http://www.vfa.us/Sally%20Epstein.htm>
- Volpp, Leti. "Engendering Culture: Citizenship, Identity, and Belonging." In Rogers M. Smith, ed., *Citizenship, Borders, and Human Needs*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011, 177-191.
- Whitney, R. B. website drwhitney.org.
- R. B. Whitney, MD. "Quinacrine Non-Surgical Female Sterilization (QS) in Aa Private American Office Practice." Report given at F.I.G.O. Conference (November 2003),
- Zipper, J. and E. Kessel. "Quinacrine Sterilization: A Retrospective." *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics* 83:2 (2003) S7-S11.
- Zipper, J. and V. Trujillo. "25 Years of Quinacrine Sterilization Experience in Chile: Review of 2,592 Cases." *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics* 83:2 (2003) S23-S29.