

Democracy in Danger S6 E2: "Rights of Passage"

[THEME MUSIC]

[00:00:03] **Will Hitchcock:** Hello, I'm Will Hitchcock.

[00:00:04] **Siva Vaidhyanathan:** And I'm Siva Vaidhyanathan.

[00:00:06] **WH:** And from the Nau Hall Auditorium at the University of Virginia, this is *Democracy in Danger*.

[APPLAUSE]

[00:00:13] **SV:** Thank you. We're back in the classroom with our students in the audience, and we're going to bring them in on a conversation that our guest, Liz Varon, teed up at the end of the last episode.

[00:00:23] **WH:** Yeah, Siva, you remember one of our students asked Liz how the outcome of the Civil War affected the fate of democracy, government by the people, in the rest of the world. And she took the question in an interesting direction. She said the Civil War was a cautionary tale about how fragile democracy can be. But at the same time, the country remained a beacon for immigrants from around the world after the Civil War. And despite our troubles, millions of people still wanted to come here and did come here in the late 19th century. And ever since, immigration has been one of the biggest political arguments in the United States.

[00:00:59] **SV:** And as our listeners know, immigration history is really complicated. The feel-good part of the story, of course, is that America is a refuge. But there is a darker side of the history as well, and it keeps coming back to haunt the democratic project. So, we've invited a guest this time who is steeped in the twists and turns of this history and of course, in immigration law. She is our colleague, Amanda Frost. Amanda is a law professor here at the University of Virginia. She joined us on the show once before in season two. And then she talked about the controversial practice of citizenship stripping, which is still used sometimes today. And her new book, due out this year, is called *Born in the USA: Birthright Citizenship and the Making of America*.

[00:01:46] **SV:** Amanda, welcome to our class and welcome back to *Democracy in Danger*!

[00:01:50] **Amanda Frost:** Thank you for having me.

[00:01:51] **SV:** Amanda, political leaders and public figures used to embrace immigration. Even Ronald Reagan saw immigration as a positive. He signed a major law that gave citizenship to many people who would come here without visas. The narrative was that democracy and freedom would transform new arrivals in America, and our country would be the better for it. Now, my own family, like so many families, has prospered thanks to this vision and the policies behind it. But is that view out of fashion now? I mean, how does the contemporary rhetoric about immigration compare with the actual state of immigration and immigration policy?

[00:02:30] **AF:** Yeah. So, we’re in this moment of intense debate and conflict over immigration, and it’s cyclical. This country throughout its history has had this kind of debate. So, you said, do we still embrace being a nation of immigrants? Well, a full 25 percent of the United States is either foreign born—that’s close to 15 percent are foreign born—and then another 11 percent are the children of immigrants. So, they’re that first generation. That means that our immigration laws and policies have directly affected 25 percent of the people living in the United States today. Their families were shaped and formed by those immigration laws and policies. So, every generation, we remake ourselves as a nation in response to these laws and policies.

[00:03:16] There’s an agency called the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, which grants benefits like Green Cards and citizenship to immigrants. And it had, as part of its mission statement, the statement that we are a nation of immigrants. The United States of America is, quote, “a nation of immigrants.” But in 2018, under the Trump administration, I think very symbolically and very interestingly, the agency took that sentence away and out of the mission statement. A lot of news, a lot of headlines for doing that. And I will say it’s back in there now. The head of that agency under President Biden put it back in in her first day in office. But that shows you that we’re conflicted with that sense of what are we as a nation.

[00:03:55] So obviously as the United States has grown larger, we’ve had more immigrants coming in each year. In our early history, 1850s, ’60s, ’70s, ’80s, into the early 1900s. We bumped along around 15 percent of the nation was foreign born. Then it dipped in response to legislation. Today, it’s back close to 15 percent. And that’s part of the reason we’re having these debates about immigration. And I’ll say I think it’s very appropriate we have these debates because it’s very important to our nation’s history. I don’t always love the rhetoric, but I do think it’s appropriate that we talk about this issue publicly and discuss it as a matter of policy and politics.

[00:04:31] **WH:** Yeah, no, we have to dig into it as controversial and as uncomfortable sometimes as it can be, and the rhetoric only makes it worse. Now, you’re a law professor, but unlike a lot of law professors, you’re actually also a really good historian. And you’ve dug around in the historical arc of this story of immigration. So, remind us, take us back a moment to the founding when immigration was crucial to the survival of the American experiment. I mean, there was no other way for the country to expand, prosper and thrive. So, remind us a little bit about the attitudes of immigration in those very early days. But also, where do you see the moment when suddenly the immigration becomes a problem or a threat?

[00:05:09] **AF:** Yeah. So, and I know you’ve had Erika Lee on this podcast, who has a great book, and in part it’s what she describes, which is, you know, we’re a nation that’s a bundle of contradictions and maybe also hypocritical at times.

[00:05:19] So, at the start, we were very much a nation that embraced immigration. And in fact, it was a complaint in the Declaration of Independence. One of the many complaints against the king was that he was establishing policies that discouraged immigration. So, it was a pro-immigration document, the Declaration of Independence. And we have George Washington saying that the United States should be, quote, an asylum to the oppressed and needy of the earth, end quote. So that seems like we’re very pro-immigration.

[00:05:46] I will say, though, that even at that very early founding era, we had people like Benjamin Franklin complaining about the Germans who were coming and saying that we were going to be “Germanized.” It was sort of an oddly hostile point of view. And even Alexander Hamilton, like himself an immigrant — “Immigrants get the job done,” that line from Hamilton — but he said too many immigrants would change and corrupt the national spirit. So, there’s always been some hesitation, some fear. But I’ll say that early history of our country so starting from the establishment of our new nation to about the 1880s, we were very pro-immigration with almost no restrictions. And so, people could come if they could pay the money to get on a ship and come to the United States. They were allowed in. They were allowed to work. And so, there was very little federal regulation. I should also add here, of course, there was also forced migration until 1808 of slaves. And that was another part of our immigration story we shouldn’t forget.

[00:06:47] **SV:** Yeah. So, at what point did the mood and the laws change? Like what was the first example we can think of in American history where the government really cracks down on immigration from across oceans?

[00:07:00] **AF:** Yeah. So, the first real flashpoint when it came to immigration involved immigrants from China who were at first very much welcomed because there was the gold rush in California and there was the need for people not so much to dig for gold, although that too, but to support all the people who came to do that. There was just a need for labor. And so, at first Chinese immigrants were welcomed. But then there was a backlash. There was real hostility. You can see this is one cartoon I put now up for the students to see of Uncle Sam being pushed off the map of the United States by this invading group. And that’s often how the rhetoric of immigration goes, anti-immigration goes. It’s invasion. It’s the idea that we will be displaced, that we will be pushed off, we being the people already here. And there’s almost always a racialized component to that as well.

[00:07:48] You see as well, this is an advertisement saying, you know, hip, hip, hooray, Chinese are excluded. So, in 1882, the federal government, responding to this very strong anti-Chinese animus, passed a law that started to bar immigrants from China. And this was the beginning of the immigration system we have today. Because with this exclusion law was the need for people to check, to get documents, to prove who they were and whether they could come in, people to screen them. There was need for detention facilities like Angel Island in California and Ellis Island in New York. So, we see the immigration bureaucracy develop in response to this anti-Chinese animus and this exclusion of the Chinese.

[00:08:27] **SV:** So, in 1882, we see this first major, very specific, very racialized restriction on immigration. But immigration doesn’t stop right from Eastern Europe, especially Jewish people from Eastern Europe, from Southern Europe, Italian Catholics are coming. This is, of course, 50, 60 years after a big influx of Irish Catholics. There must have been a lot of changes in America between 1882 and, you know, right through World War One. That changed the rhetoric, changed the pressure, and did the conversation get less, more, or differently racialized? And what happens next in our story?

[00:09:04] **AF:** Yeah. So, as I said, it started off with this focus on Chinese immigrants, but it wasn’t limited to them. And there was enormous influx of immigrants from lots of different parts of the world. I read recently that one quarter of the Irish population came to the United States over a ten-year period in response to the potato famine in the mid 1800s. We saw, of course, immigrants from Italy, immigrants from Eastern Europe, as you were stating. So, this

became a massive political issue. And I’ll point out here, as I’ve said, it was anti-Chinese animus, but it wasn’t limited to the Chinese. We see here a political cartoon that shows a very racialized view of an Irish immigrant with a bottle of alcohol, plus a torch sitting on a barrel that says “gunpowder” and then “Uncle Sam.” So, the idea is, he’s going to blow up the United States of America —

[00:09:56] **SV:** He looks subhuman. He doesn’t actually look like a human being.

[00:09:58] **AF:** Not at all. The Irish were racialized in the same way that Ben Franklin did for the Germans, that we saw with the Chinese, that we’ve seen with many groups. So, if you look at the features, it’s really a horrifying cartoon. This response to this group of immigrants was obviously trying to treat them as subhuman or dehumanizing them. And here’s another example of a cartoon showing the sense of invasion by groups that include obviously Italian immigrants as well. So, there was a strong anti-immigrant animus that was rising in the beginning of the 20th century.

[00:10:32] **SV:** And here the Italian immigrants are not just subhuman. They’re rodents. They’re rats. They’re rats escaping one ship and landing in the United States.

[00:10:40] **AF:** Yeah. So often immigrants, when there’s this rhetoric, anti-immigrant rhetoric, often focuses on crime and disease and the sense that they do not share democratic values that the United States of America stands for. The argument was they couldn’t assimilate. They would undermine the country. They would drive out the values, the people who were already here. And of course, we can see with each of these groups that didn’t happen.

[00:11:02] **WH:** You know, your wonderful image also shows anarchists and socialists coming aboard the ship of state, and that’s an ideological threat. They’re going to bring foreign ideas and there’s a spectral figure up on the left-hand corner of this poster, which is, I assume, William McKinley, President McKinley, who was killed, shot dead, by an anarchist in 1901. So, this is vivid imagery that would have resonated in a very powerful, contemporary way. We’ve gone through this horrific experience of the president being murdered by an anarchist whose last name is very difficult to pronounce. So, this picture conjures up all the possible fears.

[00:11:38] **AF:** Yeah, absolutely. And I’ll say one other thing, because we have a lot of political cartoons that sort of, you know, the YouTube of the day. There is this cartoon, which I like because it shows that the debate was not the cartoons, and the political dialog was not all anti-immigrant. It sometimes pointed out the hypocrisy of the United States. It’s entitled “A Skeleton in His Closet”. It shows the Uncle Sam figure opening a closet, and he’s holding a document that says the United States is protesting against Russian exclusion of Jewish Americans. The U.S. is protesting it, and then it opens the closet, and it sees that the United States of America has excluded the Chinese — racialized exclusion. So, this was a cartoon pointing out the hypocrisy of the United States and showing that this debate was an active one, not just hostile to immigrants but a debate about the value and importance of immigrants and the need not to be discriminatory in our policy.

[00:12:26] **SV:** And, of course, there were a lot of big, powerful interests that wanted higher immigration, right? Industrialists wanted cheaper labor. There were politicians who wanted their own ethnic communities to grow in population and strength and thus electoral strength.

Right? So, it wasn't like everybody in the United States was against immigration. There were these distinct interest groups, both for and against immigration and for and against migration within the United States during this whole time, right?

[00:12:55] **AF:** Yeah. And the business community part of this is really interesting. So, there's a case that I've written a lot about Wong Kim Ark, where it established that if you're born in United States, you're a citizen. Even if — I have to say, “even if” because that's how the court put it — you were a child of Chinese immigrants. And the lawyer who argued and won that case was a lawyer for the railroad. And he took a little sabbatical from that job to argue this case. And of course, it was perfectly aligned with the railroad's interests. They wanted immigrants to come. They wanted these people to come and work. And actually, the Chinese immigrants were essential to building the transcontinental railroad. So absolutely, there were people fighting for immigrants. There was also a lot of people who sort of said it was “great that *I* came, but I want to freeze it now.” And we see that again and again. Or maybe more accurately: “20 years ago, America was its best. Let's freeze it then. We like it. We liked how it used to be.”

[00:13:43] **SV:** So right after World War One, we see this this country in a bit of a conflagration, right? You see this sort of backlash against suspected communists, Bolsheviks or the Russian Revolution has just happened. So, in the late teens and early '20s, you know what was going on? It seemed like that was another high point for anti-immigration sentiment and what happens next.

[00:14:03] **AF:** Yeah. So, immigration was reaching that 15 percent and hovering at that 15 percent number. And the United States was having that strong backlash for the reasons you've just given. And so, there was finally a legislative response. And it was — we saw the Chinese Exclusion Act earlier — but this was a more across the board significant restriction on immigration, the Johnson Reed Act of 1924. And so, this was a massive piece of legislation and immigration dropped off because what it did is that before this, we'd had almost free and open immigration with the Chinese Exclusion Act as an important exception. But then the Johnson Reed Act said we're going to limit immigration to 2 percent of the total number of people of each nationality in the United States as of 1890. So, it passed in 1924. But they go back to the census of 1890.

[00:14:53] **WH:** There's your thing. Things are always better 30 years ago.

[00:14:56] **AF:** It's always better in the past. “My childhood was when it was best.”

[00:14:58] **SV:** Well, music was, definitely.

[00:15:02] **AF:** *[Laughing.]* “Make America Great Again.” There's a subtext of that. And like, that was when it was good. All these new people that came and changed my world I don't like. So, this idea was, OK, well, look at the population in 1890 and will limit immigration to 2 percent of the people who were in the country then. First of all, by the way, this was very difficult to do logistically, and it wasn't really — they couldn't really accomplish it. You can't kind of unwind things like that or figure out who people's descendants were or what the percentages were in 1890. But it did have a massive effect. So, first of all, entirely excluded immigrants from Asia — the Asiatic barred zone — that was referred to. Almost no immigrants from Africa. And then it changed the level of immigrants to decreasing Southern and Eastern Europe. And also, just a reduced number of immigrants

overall, the numbers went down. But here's the kicker. So, this is a page from The New York Times. If you look at the title: "America of the Melting Pot Comes to an End". The chief aim being to preserve the racial type as it exists, actually not today, but in 1890. That's the headline. That was the goal, the Johnson Reed Act. And it absolutely reshaped our country for the next 40 years. It was in place until 1965.

[00:16:16] **WH:** Amanda, this is a long, centuries long, complicated story. But there are these moments where we have a sudden shift and 1965 is yet another one. Remind us a little bit about the significance of that breakthrough. And it's part of a civil rights movement that's happening in the country for sure. But it also completely reshapes the makeup of the country, doesn't it? Tell us a little bit about the consequences of the 1965 Immigration Act and how has it changed our attitudes? And is it embattled?

[00:16:45] **AF:** Yeah. So, as you just mentioned, the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act revamped, rewrote our immigration systems. The context was the civil rights era. So, we've got the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And this should be understood as part and parcel of that civil rights movement. And it is fundamentally still in place today. I have this big immigration nationality statute book that my students bring to class. And that's what we look at today.

[00:17:12] So, what did this law do? It did a couple of things. First of all, it got rid of those national origin quotas. We set new worldwide quotas on immigration. We gave every country 20,000 slots and we created a couple of different buckets that people could come into the United States. Number one was the family-based immigration. And actually, the evidence shows that the legislators in 1965 didn't realize how massive this family-based immigration would grow. So, if you have a spouse or parent or a child under 21 is unmarried, that person comes in outside of the quotas. And so that's a massive amount of immigrants that come to the United States every year. Their immediate relatives, very close family of people already in the United States who sponsor them. Then you can have more distant family as well. Two thirds of the immigrant flows today are based on family. There's another smaller percentage, about 15 percent based on employment, another about 15 percent based on the refugee or asylum status.

[00:18:10] **WH:** So just to ask a follow up, the family component of the '65 act is still more or less in place. It still governs a great deal of current immigration.

[00:18:19] **AF:** Yes. And we're different from other countries in that way. There are other countries that don't prioritize family-based immigration, that prioritize employment and skills, and that don't limit immigration in the same ways that we do. In the United States if you don't fit within that family-based bucket or you don't get an employer to sponsor you, which is very difficult, you have no pathway — almost none — with the exception of asylum, which is partly why we see such pressure on that system.

[00:18:43] **WH:** And asylum is something you have to demonstrate. You have a legitimate fear of persecution.

[00:18:47] **AF:** Absolutely. So, you hear a lot of talk about the southern border and the crisis there. We also have refugees coming from various countries, including, of course, Afghanistan and Ukraine. But in order to qualify for asylum or refugee status, you have to show that you've been persecuted on one of the protected grounds. So, there's no pathway for

someone who’s just, you know, a good worker needed in our economy, but it doesn’t have a family or doesn’t have an employer who’s willing to spend all the money and jump through all the hoops to get them into the United States.

[00:19:16] **SV:** So definitely the asylum seeking, and refugee phenomenon is one of the big current flashpoints about migration, immigration. But the other big issue that we’ve been discussing for nearly a decade now is the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or DACA program. What should our students know about that and what’s the current status of that program?

[00:19:37] **AF:** So just to quickly give the background for anyone who may not know, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or DACA, was something put in place by President Obama after he was unable to enact comprehensive immigration reform because it was — it came close. We forget about ten years ago. We came close to passing comprehensive immigration reform and legalizing a lot of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. and making more pathways to entry. It wouldn’t have been a perfect piece of legislation, but it would’ve been better than what we have now. But we didn’t do it. And so, after he failed with that, Obama said: OK, I’m by executive order, going to give this very sympathetic group of people — people brought to the United States under the age of 16, so it was not on their own volition, they’re not culpable in the same way that you might view an adult immigrant who comes in without permission as culpable, *and they are culturally American*, they are fully embedded in our society and often have no memory of a home country — so, he said: If you qualify, and there’s some hoops to jump through, you can get a very temporary liminal status. It is not a right to remain. It is not a pathway to citizenship. It’s not even any guarantee that tomorrow the government won’t change its mind and deport you. But for a two-year period, they say we will give you some safety and we will give you work authorization, which is the most important component of this. And of course, people can do things like attend college. And I certainly have students who’ve been on DACA status.

[00:21:00] So where does it stand today? Well, of course, Trump tried to rescind it. The Supreme Court said you failed to do so properly under the Administrative Procedures Act. Then we get Biden saying: I’m no longer trying to rescind it. And the most recent thing that’s happened is that a court in Texas said that DACA is illegal because it violates that 1965 law we were describing and discussing earlier. And at this moment, it’s still being litigated. The court said: I will allow people who have DACA today to keep it, but no one new can apply for it. So, a little over 600,000 people currently have this status. It’s been enormously beneficial to them in their lives, but they live in limbo and in fear that it will end tomorrow.

[00:21:39] **SV:** OK. Well, it’s time to turn to some of our students. Our first question comes from Michael. Michael is a fourth-year foreign affairs major from Bethesda, Maryland.

Michael, welcome to the show!

[00:21:50] **Michael:** Thank you. So, my question has to do with the Irish and other Catholic immigrants earlier in American history where they faced a lot of discrimination but kind of gradually gained acceptance, like partially by piling on discrimination against other groups. And I was kind of wondering how that relates to today, because with politicians like Senator Ted Cruz and Marco Rubio, like how do they rationalize their anti-immigration stance if like they have Cuban backgrounds?

[00:22:22] **AF:** Yes. So, I hear a couple of different things from people who it certainly seems like they benefited from our immigration system and now they want to put an end to the system that ended up bringing them and or their families to the United States. One is, they say the system as it worked 20, 30 years in the past was great. It's the system today that's the problem. It's the immigrants coming today that's the problem. So that's the same old rhetoric that we've seen throughout our nation's history. It is that dehumanizing and racializing of the other, the immigrant who we fear.

[00:22:55] And I have to say here a plug for the U.S., because I'm quite critical of the United States in many ways in its policies. But I will say that as a nation, we have integrated new immigrants better than much of Europe has done. And so, I wish we would look at that history and think we can do this. You know, we have done a terrific job of within a generation or two, bringing groups that come new to the United States and fully integrating them into our society. And we can look back and see how the fear of the Germans, the fear of the Irish, the fear of the Chinese, the fear of the Italians was so misplaced. So, I think that's one key point I want to make.

[00:23:28] The second point I'll make in response is you'll often hear politicians — and I think a lot of them know better — they'll say things like, “Well, these people should wait in line and do it legally, just like my ancestors did.” But that is not true because, as I've explained, their ancestors usually came at a time when there was very few limits on immigration. Certainly before 1924. And today, if you don't qualify for either the family-based bucket or you get an employer to sponsor you, which is difficult and expensive, you have no pathway. So, we should just be honest. There *is no line* for most people to wait in. And even for those with a line, it's a 20-year wait.

[00:24:03] **SV:** It's also important to note that there has always been a special status for immigrants from Cuba as opposed to other sources of immigration.

[00:24:10] **AF:** Absolutely.

[00:24:11] **SV:** Because of our special relationship with Cuba, which is, you know, since 1898, been quite complex.

[00:24:17] **AF:** Absolutely.

[00:24:18] **WH:** And communist countries in general have also had a unique status during the Cold War so that it would be embarrassing to the Soviet Bloc if people wanted to flee, say, Hungary in the '50s and come to the United States. So that's just another subplot.

But anyway, there's another question in the audience. Please introduce yourself and let us know where you're from.

[00:24:36] **Sidney:** Hi, I'm Sidney. I'm from Orlando, Florida, and I'm a second year history major. My question is, how do you balance maintaining a legal system of immigration at the border while also showing empathy to people who have fled hardship?

[00:24:51] **AF:** Yeah, so that is such a difficult and good question, because when I when I teach immigration law, I spend the first, like, half an hour talking about, well, could we have open borders? I say at some point in the class, always I say: “Can we have a border without

violence? Can we maintain a line where we say you cannot cross and your life on one side of the line is significantly worse and perhaps in peril than if you cross that line?” It is deeply troubling to me.

[00:25:18] I think that question that you asked is a sign that what we need to do is balance three things. We need to balance enforcement. I believe in borders at this point in time, and so I believe in enforcement. I have to acknowledge that. But with it also legal pathways that 1965 law that I mentioned is a sea change and an important one. And what I like, for the most part, didn't have enough room for unskilled labor. And we need that pathway. We need it as a country. That's why they're coming. They're all working. They're American employers, employing all of these people, who, by the way, could be prosecuted under federal law. But no one ever does that. We never enforce immigration law against employers. Almost ever, Republicans and Democrats. So, if we did enforce those laws, we might see a difference.

[00:25:59] But we don't want to. You know why? Because they're doing vital work. So over half in fact, I think it's close to 70 percent of the people that farm our crops are undocumented immigrants. Think about that. I just find that fact extraordinary. And that means that if we tried to deport them all and succeeded, which we couldn't do, we would starve. Or we'd have to pay far more for our food, which wouldn't work either. And I think we need a humanitarian component like asylum. But right now, asylum is doing all the work of the extra pathways we need for people to come and work. We want and need these people. We just haven't given them a pathway.

[00:26:33] **SV:** Right. But also, I mean, there is real violence and threats in Central America that is driving thousands of people.

[00:26:41] **AF:** Absolutely.

[00:26:41] **SV:** To not just the states, but to parts of South America and Central America as well.

We have time for one more question. Let's go now to Will. Will is a third-year government. Major from Richmond, Virginia. Will, thank you for joining us.

[00:26:55] **Will [student]:** Thank you. Hi, Professor Frost. I have a question about the future of immigration. Given all the history we've been discussing, looking ahead, do you think it's more likely that the United States will become more welcoming or more unwelcoming of new immigrants? And what factors may play a role in pushing that in either direction?

[00:27:14] **AF:** Yeah, so great question. And it's part of the cyclical nature of immigration. So, I'll show one more slide here. On the left, it shows the effect of that 1965 law in terms of the composition of the United States. On the right, it shows looking forward — what's happening. And so, we see 72 million more people in the United States today. It's actually 2015 is when my facts end, but certainly more today. And going forward, in response to your question, we see this potential for enormously increased immigration. So, your question is, how will the public respond to that? I think, more openly and generously than in the past.

[00:27:51] The world is beginning to realize how valuable immigrants are because we are not — we being the United States and many other developed countries — are not reproducing ourselves. So, the birthrates are falling everywhere, including in the United States. We are

having an aging population. We see this in the United States, also China, Japan, Europe. Immigrants are the people that will harvest the crops, the people that will work to support Social Security. They are the people who can bring in those numbers that are needed for our nation to continue to function economically and socially and to be a vibrant democracy. So, I think the future is brighter because we will begin to recognize that immigrants are not a group to be feared and excluded, but in fact that we’re going to start competing for them with other countries who need them too.

[00:28:36] **WH:** Wow Amanda we’ve covered an awful lot in a very short period of time. This has been a great conversation, but we have to wrap things up. Thanks again to all of you who are very bright and attentive students. And thank you, Amanda Frost, for joining us. Once more on Democracy in Danger.

[THEME MUSIC]

[00:28:49] Amanda Frost is the John A. Ewald Jr. Research Professor of Law at the University of Virginia. She’s written for wider audiences in the Atlantic, the New Republic, the Washington Post and elsewhere. And she’s the author, previously, of *You are Not American: Citizenship Stripping from Dred Scott to the Dreamers*.

[APPLAUSE]

[00:29:21] **SV:** That’s it for this episode of *Democracy in Danger*. We have a lot of things coming your way, including stories of perseverance under authoritarian rule.

[00:29:31] **WH:** Don’t be a stranger. Follow us on Twitter [@DinDpodcast](https://twitter.com/DinDpodcast) — that’s at D-I-N-D podcast. And hey, we just passed 300,000 listens. Help us reach the next milestone... a million! Subscribe to the show today.

[00:29:44] **SV:** There’s a lot more you can learn about our subjects and our guests on our webpage: dindanger.org. Included there are all of the images that Professor Frost referred to during this episode — and so much more.

[00:29:57] **WH:** *Democracy in Danger* is produced by Robert Armengol and Rebecca Barry. Elie Bashkow engineers the show. Our interns are Eva Kretsinger-Walters, Ellis Nolan and Bea Webster. Special thanks again to Audrius Rickus, Jake Calhoun, Preston Godfrey and all the staff who help make this lecture hall sound great.

[00:30:14] **SV:** Support comes from the University of Virginia’s College of Arts and Sciences. The show is a project of UVA’s Karsh Institute of Democracy. We are members of the Democracy Group Podcast Network, and we’re distributed by the Virginia Audio Collective of WTJU Radio in Charlottesville. I’m Siva Vaidyanathan.

[00:30:33] **WH:** And I’m Will Hitchcock, and we’ll see you next time.

[APPLAUSE]

[00:30:41] **SV:** Cool!