



The families and victims of the September 11, 2001
terror attacks and other violent crimes committed by illegal aliens
www.911fsa.org

9/11 FSA NEWSLETTER

MAY 5, 2007

REAL ID IS IN DANGER
LOBBYING IN THE STATE LEGISLATURES IS ESSENTIAL TO SAVE IT
HERE'S WHAT YOU CAN DO

By Peter Gadiel

You may be aware that extremists from both the left and the right (ACLU, Cato Institute and Americans for Tax Reform, among others) have engaged in a massive effort to get Congress to repeal the REAL ID Act of 2005. These groups have been lobbying in many state legislatures and have succeeded in fooling many legislators about what REAL ID is and what it will do.

From April 9 to 12 I was at the Missouri Legislature in Jefferson City to lobby in support of REAL ID. From April 16 to 18 I was in Springfield, Illinois for the same purpose.

What I learned was that despite the massive lobbying by the ACLU and others in the last year against REAL ID, many legislators are not fooled by the lies spread by these two open borders groups. Many legislators are eager to hear from our side and can be persuaded, but they need to hear from you and all supporters of REAL ID.

Following is a summary of my experiences in Missouri. I think this can be a model that can be used in other states, and I hope that 9/11 FSA members and supporters will make the effort to lobby their legislatures.

IF WE ARE GOING TO PRESERVE REAL ID WE MUST ACT NOW.

If you would like to lobby in your state I can provide a point by point list of the lies that the ACLU/Cato Institute lobbyists have been spreading about REAL ID and a rebuttal of each lie with the facts.

It is evident that Missourians are aware of the problems resulting from issuance of licenses to "undocumented" aliens. This is considerable progress. Until quite recently, not many Americans knew that "undocumented" aliens were eligible for drivers' licenses and it would have been necessary to inform them of the fact that there is a debate over whether to issue licenses to such applicants. The process of educating them would have begun with explaining what the term "secure ID" means, the role played by licenses in the events of September 11, the 9/11 Commission recommendations, and the dispute over whether to the Commission recommendations and the REAL ID Act. The reason for Missourians' familiarity with these issues is clear.

Missouri has a legal presence requirement and additional enforcement measures in its statutes or regulations which make it among the better states on the CSDL rating scale. (It is unlikely that it approaches NY State's high standards.) Until about two years ago the state was reportedly quite lax in its ID requirements for license applicants. Several major accidents with high death tolls which were caused by drunken "undocumented aliens" who possessed Missouri licenses enlightened state residents about the meaning of "secure ID" and "legal presence." This resulted in sudden conversion of politicians to the cause of legal presence verification of identity. Typically, those who support lax license procedures were not defeated until the death count reached a level that could no longer be concealed by the state's major media outlets.

Support for secure licensing provisions in a particular state does not necessarily translate into support for REAL ID. This is because since REAL ID was signed into law in May 2005 the open borders lobby has been engaged in a massive campaign of misrepresentation against REAL ID. This effort has been led by the ACLU and the Cato Institute. (The individuals most involved in this campaign have been one Barry Steinhardt of the ACLU and Jim Harper of CATO.)

The falsehoods about REAL ID asserted by the ACLU and CATO Institute include the following:

1. That it creates a "mandatory national ID card" which will turn into an "internal passport."
2. That this "national ID" will contain much personal information about the holder, including health history, political affiliation, religious practices, gun ownership, etc.
3. That the REAL ID law requires use of an RFID chip in licenses in order for them to meet federal standards.
4. That the cost will be \$11 billion. In 2005 the NCSL/ACLU estimate was one half billion and this has increased in response to a failure of those costs to inspire public resistance to the law. On this trip to Missouri we heard for the first time the estimate of "fourteen billion."
5. There will be massive inconvenience for Americans when they first renew their licenses after the law becomes effective.
6. That there will be a single national database containing all the information gathered
7. That identity theft will INCREASE because of REAL ID.
8. The ACLU even claims on its website that "identity based" methods ofare not effective in fighting terror. (The corollary must be that maintaining anonymity for all is the most effective method of defeating terrorists.)
9. Of great importance is the issue of whether the law violates the Constitution's Tenth Amendment which reserves to the States those powers which the Constitution does not grant to the federal government. (Though the question is a legitimate one, the law is clearly drafted to avoid violation.

Given the sophistication of the ACLU and CATO Institute and the enormous gap between their claims about REAL ID and the *facts* the only possible conclusion is that these groups are intentionally deceiving the public. Their campaign has been very effective, and in many states the nine claims listed above are considered beyond dispute. This is the case in the Missouri House of Representatives where House Resolution 20 which prohibits the state from complying with REAL ID passed 146 to 4.

The reason for this lopsided vote was quite clear. Until this visit it appears that no one had lobbied the legislature to make the case for REAL ID, with the result that the ACLU/Cato misrepresentations have been accepted as fact. Interestingly, much the same situation existed in legislatures until a few years ago over whether to require legal presence of applicants and verification of applicants' identity documents. In both situations there is a great deal of opportunity

presented in being virtually the first to present an opposing view. Past successful experiences in lobbying for legal presence and document verification shows that being late is not necessarily a severe disadvantage in obtaining a favorable outcome.