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Abstract

Immigration has had a long history in Wisconsin and since the 1600s, the push and pull factors have remained essentially the same. Today, the immigrant population in Wisconsin is largely Hispanic and there are Latino communities in every county. The Latino communities, in both rural and urban areas, continue to be relied on as a workforce in the dairy and agriculture sectors and in the processing and manufacturing sectors. In 2011, after the Republican takeover of the legislature and newly elected Governor Walker introduced his contested “Budget Repair Bill,” State Representative Donald Pridemore took advantage of the polarizing political climate and tried to gain support for anti-immigration legislation in Wisconsin.

Voces de la Frontera (VDLF) is a Milwaukee area organization dedicated to educating workers on their rights and protecting and improving the quality of life for low-wage and immigrant workers in Wisconsin. The case study format of this Capstone provides the recent political context of immigration policy in Wisconsin, describes VDLF’s campaign to stop the proposed anti-immigration legislation, evaluates the efficacy of the campaign, and provides guiding principles that can be applied to future policy advocacy work.
Introduction

This paper is a case study of the Wisconsin-based organization, Voces de la Frontera (Voices from the Border), and their successful campaign to stop Assembly Bill 173, a major anti-immigrant rights bill. Our main assignment in Jeff Unsicker's Spring 2011 Policy Advocacy class was to examine a specific advocacy campaign or initiative conducted by one or more organizations, coalitions, networks and/or movements in enough depth to learn lessons that can be effectively applied in other contexts. For my paper, I decided to investigate immigration policy in Wisconsin because 1) I wanted to use the assignment to learn about immigration policy 2) before coming to graduate school I was a global development policy intern for an organization in Washington DC, but I had never done any policy research on Wisconsin and I wanted to use this opportunity to learn about my home state, and 3) Governor Walker had just proposed his Budget Repair Bill and it was causing major rifts in families and communities statewide; his legislation and the issues surrounding it caused conflict within my family as well, so naturally I was interested in further investigation of the political climate in Wisconsin.

I discovered Voces de la Frontera (VDLF), a Milwaukee, Wisconsin based immigrant rights group and I analyzed their campaign to stop anti-immigration legislation in Wisconsin. At the time, while I was on campus in Vermont, I only had the internet as a source of data. I continued to
examine Voces de la Frontera for my Course-Linked Capstone Case Study and I was able to diversify my data sources to provide a deeper analysis of VDLF's successful campaign to defeat AB 173.

My sources for data and methods for data collection include interviews with the Lead Organizer for VDLF and the State Organizer for both VDLF and the Wisconsin Network for Immigration and Refugee Rights. I am grateful for the time and energy they gave me, especially considering how busy they were with an intense election campaign to recall the governor. I also participated in VDLF's annual May Day March on April 29th, 2011 in Milwaukee, WI. My other data sources consist of secondary literature, observations of the VDLF May Day March, personal photographs, and primary documents which include press releases, messaging pieces, and websites. This paper is based on my research and the inside VDLF information I was able to learn through my interviews. The conclusions and evaluations I made throughout the paper are based on this information.

The structure of this paper follows the guidelines for the Policy Advocacy Course-Linked Capstone Case Study and examines the policy advocacy work of Voces de la Frontera and how the organization campaigned to defeat AB 173. I continue to use Jeff Unsicker's “Advocacy Circles” as the framework to guide my analysis. The paper will begin by examining: 1) Context- of anti-immigration legislation in Wisconsin 2) Advocates- who the advocates are, 3) Policy- what policy solution they are advocating for, 4) Politics- who needs to be influenced and involved to create policy change, and 5) Strategy- how the advocates attempt to accomplish their short term goals and objectives and what methods and tactics they
use to work toward their long-term goals and objectives. Then in the following section, I offer my own analysis and evaluation of VDLF’s campaign to address the overarching question, *How effective has the advocacy been in terms of process and outcomes?*. And finally, the paper concludes with my own lessons learned.

**Context**

Immigration has had a long history in Wisconsin and since the 1600s, the push and pull factors have remained essentially the same. Immigrants from North and Western Europe, South and Eastern Europe, and finally Asia and Latin America have been coming to Wisconsin for similar reasons. They left their own countries because of poverty, population pressure and displacement, political oppression or instability, and/or religious intolerance, and arrived in Wisconsin to search for land and farming opportunities, employment opportunities, education, and/or family unification.
According to the Wisconsin Historical Society, Latino communities date back to 1910, when early Mexican immigrants settled in Wisconsin following the outbreak of the Mexican revolution. Census reports show only 200 Latino community members in Wisconsin in 1940 and only about 1,000 in 1950, out of a total population of more than 3 million. These figures are misleading, however, since they omit seasonal and temporary workers recruited by Wisconsin manufacturers and agricultural firms. By 1925, for example, a fluid community of about 9,000 Mexican Americans lived in Milwaukee, and from then until the 1970s thousands of Hispanic workers and their families moved into Wisconsin every year. By 1970 more than 40,000 Latino residents called Wisconsin their permanent home - the majority living in Milwaukee and Racine counties and working in factories alongside their German, African-American, Polish and Scandinavian neighbors (Wisconsin Historical Society, 2006).

Today, the immigrant population in Wisconsin is largely Hispanic and there are Latino communities in every Wisconsin county. The Latino share of Wisconsin’s population grew from 1.9% in 1990, to 3.6% in 2000, to 5.9% (or 335,772 people) in 2010 (American Immigration Council, 2012). Also, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, Latinos accounted for 2.3% (or 66,000) of Wisconsin voters in the 2008 elections. The Latino communities, in both rural and urban areas, continue to be relied on as a workforce in the dairy and agriculture sectors and in the processing and manufacturing sectors. The push and pull factors for immigration in Wisconsin have remained constant over several hundred years. However the perception of
immigration is dynamic and fluctuates with the ever-changing political-economic climate.

In 2011, as part of the “Tea Party” movement that influenced elections in many states, there was a Republican takeover of the Wisconsin legislature and governorship. After nine years of having a Democratic governor and 13 years of having a Democratic legislature, Wisconsin elected a Republican-majority Assembly, Senate and Republican Governor Scott Walker. It was the first time one party won both houses since 1938.

After being in office for a month and a half, Governor Walker introduced what he called a Budget Repair Bill to address the $136.7 million deficit. This bill, 2011 Wisconsin Act 10, proved to be polarizing for the state of Wisconsin because, in addition to requiring public employees to contribute more to their pension and health care, it stripped unions of their collective bargaining rights. The bill incited mass protests from unions and allied opposition which eventually escalated to societal and political division in Wisconsin.

In 2011, after Governor Walker was elected, and the Assembly and Senate were Republican-controlled, Wisconsin State Representative Donald Pridemore (99th Assembly District-R) took advantage of the political climate and began circulating and trying to gain support for LRB (Legislative Reference Bureau)\(^1\)-1116

---

\(^1\) By law, a bill must be drafted by the Legislative Reference Bureau (LRB) before it is introduced in the legislature. The LRB is a nonpartisan legislative service agency responsible for providing research, library, and bill drafting services to the legislature. Restricting the drafting of bills to a professional agency within the legislative branch ensures that the statutes are worded and organized in a uniform and consistent manner and that they carry out the requester’s intent. This means that the laws the legislature passes will be more easily understood by the public and by those responsible for interpreting and applying them, such as governmental agencies, attorneys and judges. (Roe, 1994)
which is legislation similar to Arizona’s highly contested S.B. 1070 anti-immigration bill.

**Advocates**

Voces de la Frontera (VDLF), a non-profit, grassroots, membership organization in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, advocated to defeat AB 173. VDLF is dedicated to educating workers on their rights and protecting and improving the quality of life for low-wage and immigrant workers in Wisconsin. They promote grassroots leadership, community, and workplace organizing as their main strategy. The organization has 11 people on staff and is funded by membership dues, donations, and foundations.

In order to participate in political activities, VDLF is organized with a 501(c)(3) and a 501(c)(4) arm. Each part of the organization has an advisory board. The 501(c)(3) board has 14 members and enforces policy within the organization and has the ability to hire and fire the Executive Director. The 501(c)(4) board consists of at least three lawyers. In addition to lobbying, candidate education, and endorsements, the 501(c)(4) arm of VDLF files lawsuits against unjust and discriminatory legislation. According to their website, VDLF started as a bilingual newspaper in Austin, Texas. The paper championed immigrant rights and wider social justice issues. It was edited by Christine Neumann-Ortiz and allied itself to the
Coalition for Justice in the Maquiladoras (multinational factories in Mexican border towns).

In 1998, both Neumann-Ortiz and the newspaper relocated to Milwaukee, where they continued to turn the spotlight on injustice and steadily helped build the emerging immigrant rights movement in that area. By 2000, Voces de la Frontera initiated a statewide campaign to fight for the legalization of undocumented workers in the United States.

These organizing efforts also called attention to the need for services that could respond to the immediate problems that confronted low-wage and immigrant workers. VDLF’s Milwaukee Workers’ Center opened its doors in 2001 and was initially run by volunteers. Rosa Rivera, VDLF’s first paid worker, was appointed to a part-time role coordinating the center in 2002. In 2004, VDLF grew significantly with the opening of an additional office in Racine and the formation a student chapter, Students United for Immigrant Rights.

In 2005, VDLF expanded funding and appointed additional staff, including Christine Neumann-Ortiz as the organization’s first Executive Director. Later that year, Voces de la Frontera mobilized tens of thousands in a campaign against the “Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005” (HR 4437), otherwise known as the “Sensenbrenner Bill.” The legislation, introduced by U. S. Representative Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI), sought to address illegal immigration by strengthening interior enforcement of immigration laws and enacting additional border security measures.
In 2006, against the backdrop of local immigration raids, Voces de la Frontera led three high profile marches: 30,000 took to the streets to call for immigration reform in March, more than 70,000 mobilized for “A Day without Latinos” on May 1, and 25,000 joined the Milwaukee Labor Day Parade in a powerful demonstration of worker solidarity. These actions, and others around the country, made a peaceful yet powerful statement for the immigrant rights movement.

In the 2006 fall elections, Voces de la Frontera’s “Voto Latino” campaign helped convert the energy of the mass marches into a 32% increase in voter turnout in target areas of Milwaukee and a 20% increase in Racine.

In 2007, as the fight for comprehensive immigration reform continued, over 80,000 people from across Wisconsin marched a second time for “A Day without Latinos.” More than 120 local businesses closed their doors in solidarity.

During 2008, VDLF continued their efforts to increase the Latino turnout in Milwaukee and Racine, launching a massive registration drive. Additionally, their May 1st demonstration, again the largest in the country, carried a clear message for President Barack Obama on the urgency of immigration reform during his “First 100 Days.”

Voces de la Frontera is a membership organization, has an active constituency and prominent leadership from many different sectors. Two of the leaders highlighted in a 2010 press release on their website are Maria Morales and Father Bill Brennan. Ms. Morales is the current Racine Coordinator for Voces de la Frontera, and a civil rights leader, in Racine, with deep roots in the community. Morales is the daughter of farmworkers and worked with Cesar Chavez on boycotts,
marches and strikes in Racine. In the mid-1980s she served as the first Latina president of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) Labor Council of Racine County and also served as President of the Spanish Center in Racine. Morales was honored as an Unsung Hero by the City of Racine in 2007 and with the Humanitarian Award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 2008.

Father Brennan is a 92-year-old Jesuit priest of Irish descent. He has been a prominent leader for social justice; especially in Latin America where he lived for many years during the period of US supported military dictatorships. He is a strong leader in the current immigrant rights struggle. He is a civil rights leader and works with VDLF as a church leader and a widely known advocate for equal rights and international social justice. Often, Father Bill Brennan attends VDLF’s events and publicly stands in solidarity with them (Voces de la Frontera, 2009).

**Policy**

The LRB-116 became Assembly Bill (AB) 173 and on June 6, 2011 it was introduced to the committee on Homeland Security and State Affairs by six legislators who were not members of the committee: Representatives Pridemore, Wynn, LeMahieu, Kleefisch, Steineke and Jacque; it was cosponsored by Senator Laseeas (Chief Clerk Staff, 2011-2012). The bill would require law enforcement officers to detain an individual suspected of committing a crime for 48 hours if that person is unable to produce an identification document that establishes “proof of legal presence” in the state. Failure to produce such proof within 48 hours would require law enforcement to contact the Department of Homeland Security.
immigration and customs authorities. It would also require the law enforcement to transfer the individual over to federal custody and possibly out of state.

Voces de la Frontera argued that supporting AB 173 would have significant short-term and long-term costs for the state of Wisconsin and it must be opposed on moral, legal, and economic grounds. First, the bill was morally indefensible because it promoted racial discrimination. Second, due to its unconstitutional nature, the bill would certainly stimulate strong opposition, and similar to the SB1070 Arizona Anti-Immigration Bill, it would inevitably lead to costly litigation for Wisconsin taxpayers. Finally, the bill would deter immigrants from coming to Wisconsin and also cause immigrants, both naturalized citizens of the U.S. and those that are not, to leave the state which would harm Wisconsin’s economy. The data to support these three arguments are discussed below, in each case including a summary of the arguments that VDLF made in, Questions about the Proposed Arizona Type Bill and in one case with additional data from my own research.

**Moral Implications**

The legislation would increase the likelihood of racial profiling and arbitrary arrests and detention. Similar to Arizona SB1070 law, Pridemore’s legislation claimed it will not be based on racial profiling, but as it would require every law enforcement officer to interrogate detainees about their immigration status if they have a “reasonable suspicion” that the person is undocumented. It would encourage police officers to base their judgment on people’s appearance and characteristics as race, ethnicity, language, and social class (such as if the person drives an old car and is Latino). At the same time, Republican politicians were trying pass Senate Bill 15,
legislation that would repeal a law passed in 2009 which would require law enforcement training designed to prevent racial profiling or race−based discrimination as a basis for detaining, searching, or arresting a person. As a result of AB 173, people of color would be disproportionately affected by discrimination and they would be more likely to be interrogated; which also violates their rights to be treated as equals under the law. Americans include people of all races, cultures and ethnic origin and AB 173 would mean reverting back to times prior to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, returning people of color to second class citizenship status. (Voces de la Frontera, 2009).

**Legal Implications**

The legislation would violate the US Constitution in several ways. Among these is the denial of 14th Amendment equal protection guarantees; it illegally encourages racial discrimination against Latino people and other people having foreign appearance or who “sound foreign.” By interfering with the federal government's authority to regulate and enforce immigration law, it would also oppose the Supremacy Clause of the US Constitution.

This legislation would go far beyond federal laws by mandating that every police officer and state law officer request documents from the persons they detain and consider to be in the country without proper immigration status. There is no such requirement under federal law. This law would go against the presumption of innocence by mandating law enforcement officers to demand, from people on the street, proof of US citizenship or their immigration status even when they have done
nothing wrong. By setting a 48 hour limit for the individual to prove legal status, this bill would clearly violate the Fifth Amendment which guarantees due process.

This legislation would make Wisconsin a police state where all Latino residents and others who “appear or sound foreign” would be treated as possible crime suspects. Federal immigration regulations are complex and entail both civil and criminal penalties. Congress has chosen not to consider the sole presence in the United States without a permit to be a crime.

Representative Pridemore claims this proposal would only be applied to people convicted of serious crimes. However, realistically, this law would affect innocent persons who have been charged of civil violations. VDLF provided eleven examples to demonstrate the limited nature of such violations: jay-walking (section 101-9 of the Milwaukee City Code of Ordinances); extreme noise (80-63); barking dogs (78-29); not having dog or cat licenses (78-17); public spitting (80-15); skateboard/roller skate violations (105-19); leaving keys inside parked vehicle (101-30); public smoking violations (105-48); playing baseball outside designated areas (105-20.5; 20.52); street auto repair (105-66); and youth curfew violations (106-23) (Voces de la Frontera, 2009).

As it has been recognized by several law enforcement officers, AB 173 would greatly harm the trust authorities need from the public to protect Wisconsin residents and would create mistrust towards law enforcement officers in the communities they serve. The law would also compel law enforcement officers to assign scarce resources to investigate false threats instead of clarifying serious crimes. The criminal judicial system would be weakened because crime victims
would become more vulnerable and would not be willing to report crimes, and witnesses would be afraid of cooperating, fearing their legal status investigation (Voces de la Frontera, 2009).

**Economic Costs**

A recent study from the Center for American Progress reports that cities or states that have tried to pass anti-immigrant laws have spent millions of dollars trying to defend unconstitutional laws in court and have had a negative impact on their economies. For example, Arizona will have a $388 million loss due to the boycott impact over the next two or three years and a $133 million in lost wages due to unemployment for thousands of workers. The town of Farmers Branch, Texas has already spent more than $4 million on a legal claim since 2006, trying to defend its anti-immigrant law and Hazelton, Pennsylvania has spent $2.8 million defending its anti-immigrant ordinance. Additionally, the anti-immigrant climate causes Latinos, with or without legal status, to leave the state creating loss of tax revenues and forcing business closures, abandoned houses, and reducing the value of other houses when more people leave the neighborhoods (Voces de la Frontera, 2009).

Additionally, the bill would deter immigrants from coming to Wisconsin and also cause immigrants, both naturalized citizens of the U.S. and those that are not, to leave the state which would harm Wisconsin’s economy. According to the survey “New Americans in the Badger State” by the Immigration Policy Center:

- In 2009 the purchasing power of Asian and Latino populations in Wisconsin totaled $5.7 billion, a 627.4% increment since 1990. Additionally, Latino businesses had an income of $975.5 million and employed 9,011 people in 2002.
• Immigrant workers are more than 40% of the Dairy workers (one estimate is 5,316 workers).
• Immigrant workers spend around $14.9 million per year in Wisconsin and pay $8.7 million in tax revenues to the state.
• If all undocumented workers left Wisconsin, the state would lose $2.6 billion in economic activity, a total of $1.2 billion in state income, and approximately 14,579 jobs.
• Unauthorized immigrants in Wisconsin paid $94.5 million in state and local taxes in 2010, according to data from the Institute for Taxation and Economic Policy, which includes:
  -$21.8 million in state income taxes
  -$6.1 million in property taxes
  -$66.6 million in sales taxes

  (American Immigration Council, 2012)

Moreover, the immigrant workforce on dairy farms is not substitutable because dairy farmers do not control milk pricing and therefore are not able to increase wages to employ a local workforce. According to Mark Stephenson, Director of Dairy Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin, Madison:

  “An individual farm has some ability to influence his or her milk price but it is limited. Usually, the only thing that can be done is to change the level of components (butterfat, protein and other solids) in their milk or to produce milk of a higher quality or some special characteristics such as organic, kosher, grass fed, etc. Sometimes a volume premium is paid to larger dairy farms. Individual farms are not in a position to dictate an increase in their milk price. There are many sellers of this commodity (about 53,000) in the U.S. and that usually implies that they will be "price-takers."

Pridemore’s legislation would decrease the immigrant workforce which would weaken the Wisconsin’s dairy industry, currently an estimated value of $26.5 billion, the state’s largest agricultural sector and one of the nation’s largest exporters (Lu, 2011).
Politics

*If you like laws and sausages, you should never watch either one being made.* -Otto von Bismarck

On June 6, 2011, AB 173 was introduced in the Assembly by Representatives Pridemore, Wynn, LeMahieu, Kleefisch, Steineke and Jacque; cosponsored by Senator Laseeas, and it went directly to the Committee on Homeland Security and State Affairs. In the Wisconsin Legislature all bills are referred to a committee. Committees can have hearings, bills can die, or bills can be passed on to the Assembly. If the committee passes the bill, it goes to the full Assembly for a vote, then it goes to the Senate, and finally the Governor signs the bill into law. VDLF and their allies understood the importance of preventing the bill from going to the full Assembly because it was understood that it would be difficult to defeat it there or in the Senate, and the Governor had already stated that he would sign the bill.

Republican State Representative Donald Pridemore was one of the advocates’ primary targets. He was the author of the AB 173 and he campaigned for public support and co-sponsorship for the anti-immigration legislation. The other primary target was Republican State Representative Karl Van Roy, the Chair of the Committee on Homeland Security and State Affairs. The secondary targets, persons...
who were able to influence the primary targets, were the other Republican
legislators on the eight-member Committee: Representative Kuglitsch (Vice-Chair),
Representative Ballweg, Representative August, and Representative Kooyenga.

Voces de la Frontera and other advocates had an ally on the Committee on
Homeland Security and State Affairs, Democratic Representative Zamarripa.
Democratic Representative Peter Barca, who is not on the committee, was also a
main ally within the legislature.

Voces de la Frontera had many other allies in opposition to AB 173 and due
to the divisive political climate it appeared that some of the allies’ support was
based on building political clout and/or building numbers for the movement against
Governor Walker and the Republicans’ political agenda. The following elected
officials and public figures made statements of solidarity: the Democratic mayors of
Milwaukee, Madison, Racine, and Kenosha; U.S. Representative, Jon Richards (D-
Milwaukee); U.S. Representative, Sandy Pasch (D-Whitefish Bay); U.S. Senator, Herb
Kohl (D-WI); NAACP President, James Hall; Wisconsin AFL-CIO President, Phil
Neuenfeldt; Professional Fire Fighters of Wisconsin President, Mahlon Mitchell; and
AFT Local 212 President, Michael Rosen. VDLF also is a member of several
coalitions focused on securing economically and socially just policies for
undocumented immigrants living in the U.S., including: Wisconsin Network for
Immigrant and Refugee Rights (WNIRR), Wisconsin Legalization Coalition, Coalition
for Safe Roads, One Wisconsin Now, Fair Immigration Reform Movement (FIRM),
Coalition for Comprehensive, Immigration Reform, Interfaith Worker Justice, and
Coalition for Justice in the Maquiladoras.
Voces de la Frontera is a part of WNIRR, a state-wide network with a diverse membership. An unlikely ally, but another member of the WNIRR, is the Dairy Business Association (DBA). The DBA is an industry organization comprised of dairy producers, cheese makers and allied corporate industries and businesses. DBA promotes the growth and success of all dairy farms in Wisconsin by fostering a positive business and political environment (Dairy Business Association, 2012). The DBA is generally a politically conservative organization and their policy goals do not always align with VDLF’s. For example, the DBA does not support in-state tuition for undocumented students in Wisconsin while VDLF is currently campaigning for in-state tuition after Governor Walker’s budget repealed access for undocumented students in the University of Wisconsin-System and at state technical colleges.

Voces de la Frontera’s opposition in advocating against AB 173 included U. S. Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI), Corrections Corporation of America, M&I Bank, Governor Scott Walker and because of the highly partisan environment and party-line votes, all Republican legislators were considered opposition. Several of the members of the opposition seemed to have wanted to move this legislation forward due to business interests, political clout, and pushing a political agenda.

Even with the significant short-term and long-term costs for the state of Wisconsin clearly laid out, there were still advocates for AB 173 to move forward. According to documents on VDLF’s website, the largest corporate interest was Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), which makes money criminalizing immigrants and filling prisons.

“It has been acknowledged that CCA, in a meeting of the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) a club where large corporations pay millions to
have access to legislators, wrote the Arizona SB1070 legislation and is promoting it among legislators of other states. Some Wisconsin Republicans are part of this club. The same as with public employees or low income families, politicians representing the largest corporations and the wealthiest people are using different groups of workers—such as immigrants—as scapegoats to continue with the same policies that make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Racist groups, such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) and its networks, that have been designated as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), have been actively involved in the drafting and efforts to pass such laws” (VDLF, Questions about the proposed Arizona Type Bill, 2009).

Also, State Representative Don Pridemore, the author of AB 173, gave several interviews about his legislation. When asked about the reason or cause for the anti-immigrant bill he said the following: “the state has very above average entitlement programs that might attract some of these criminal types to Wisconsin. I don’t want Wisconsin to be a magnet for people leaving Arizona, looking for another destination.” (Sorgi, 2011) It appears Pridemore viewed undocumented immigrants as people in the U.S to take advantage of the public services. He conjured images of the violence around the U.S and Mexican border to create fear in the Wisconsin public and gain support for his bill.

**Strategy**

**Strategy to stop AB 173**

Voces de la Frontera worked with the WNIRR to stop AB 173 from proceeding to the Assembly floor. Because of the Republican Assembly, Senate, and governorship, if the bill would have passed to the Assembly floor it easily could have been voted into the Senate and passed onto Governor Walker to sign. Governor Walker made a public statement that he supported the legislation and would sign the bill into law if it ended up on his desk.
It appears that Voces de la Frontera, Representative Peter Barca, Representative Zamarripa, and the Dairy Business Association all played key roles in the strategy to stop AB 173.

From what I understand from both of my interviews, VDLF with the help of others, did background research on Representative Pridemore and all of the members on the Committee on Homeland Security and State Affairs. VLDN educated the public about the bill and made public statements opposing it.

VDLF also went to Pridemore’s church and with the cooperation of his priest, held a vigil in solidarity with families affected by immigration detention and deportation.

At the same time, the DBA targeted Representative Van Roy, the chair of the Committee on Homeland Security and State Affairs, by mobilizing his constituency of farmers who rely heavily on immigrant labor. The DBA took Van Roy on over 10 farm tours with his constituents and each farmer delivered the same message to him, “If you attack immigrants, then you attack me, and if you attack me then you attack Wisconsin.”

This tactic was successful and Van Roy shelved the bill with the message that it was not the right time to focus on immigration policy because it was necessary to focus on the economy and jobs. Pridemore did not concede Representative Van Roy’s decision and he continued to campaign for support for the bill and scheduled four or five town hall meetings. From what I understand through my conversations with the organizers at VDLF, it was through inside informants that VDLF found out about the town hall meetings and they were able to fill each one with Pridemore’s
farmer constituency. At the town hall meetings, the farmers also sent a message that they opposed AB 173. Finally Pridemore also shelved the legislation and sent a message that it was time to focus on the economy and jobs.

Additionally, VDLF’s tactics to stop AB 173 included: hosting a town hall style meeting for U.S. Congressman Gutierrez (D-IL) on his National Tour on Deportation under Obama, organizing a boycott of M&I Bank because it's employees and executives contributed funds to Governor Walker and they refused to publicly oppose AB 173, and circulating petitions and a state organizational sign-on letter that opposed the legislation. Also, Christine Neumann-Ortiz, VDLF's Executive Director, gave several print and TV interviews regarding VDLF’s views on the legislation.

Voces de la Frontera’s strategy, which included a variety of tactics, was successful; and on March 23, 2012 Assembly Bill 173 failed to pass in committee and never made it to the Assembly floor.

**Long-term strategy**

Voces de la Frontera is working to secure just and comprehensive legalization for undocumented workers and their families living in the United States. It also seeks to provide accessible education regarding the existing rights of undocumented workers and current immigration law reform legislation, and to expose those entities that attempt to obtain monetary gain through fraudulent promises of securing legal status for undocumented immigrants. Defeating anti-immigration state policies like AB 173 was a short-term goal for VDLF. Other campaigns they are working on in order to achieve their long-term goals are:
Immigration Reform - each year since 2006 they have mobilized thousands for "Day Without Latinos" marches calling on politicians to fix the broken immigration system.

Driver's Licenses - in 2009, they renewed their efforts to win a reverse in state legislation that made Wisconsin’s roads less safe by denying licenses to undocumented drivers.

Education Rights - they have been working for both state and federal legislation to open up higher education to immigrant students.

E-Verify - they have strongly opposed this controversial work verification system, as with their successful campaigning efforts against the 'No Match' rule.

New Sanctuary Movement - they have been central to local faith-based organizing to defend family unity against the threat of deportation.

Workers’ Rights - they support low-wage and immigrant workers in getting their rights and entitlements - and offer regular 'Know Your Rights' trainings.

Civil Rights and Policing - they have begun a campaign to document violations of civil rights, such as fourth amendment constitutional violations.

Anti-War Movement - they joined with a coalition of local organizations in opposing the Iraq War and the War on Immigrants that was waged alongside.

Citizenship Class - in 2008 they started a program to promote understanding of civic and educational rights, and to improve communities to build resilient cultures. The
citizenship program has been very successful- in 2011, 50 lawful permanent residents became US citizens.

Youth Empowered in the Struggle (YES!) – they have a youth-led, multicultural social justice group, which evolved from SUFRIR, that struggles for student, immigrant, and worker rights with chapters at 12 high schools and 3 universities (Voces de la Frontera, 2009).

In addition, to all of VDLF’s local and state-wide work, the organization is also part of a strong, nationwide coalition called Fair Immigration Reform Movement (FIRM). FIRM is national coalition of grassroots organizations fighting for immigrant rights at the local, state and federal level. Every week, VDLF participates in a teleconference with 200 other organizations that represent 40 states. The coalition strategizes with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and they also have lobbyists working on Capitol Hill. VDLF’s strategy and messaging is guided by both statewide and nationwide issues.

**Messaging**

In 2011, VDLF’s communication in opposition to AB 173 was largely based on messaging that “Wisconsin is not Arizona!” This message was used on the website, on primary documents, and on protest signs. It is a useful message when communicating with allies or prospective allies because it evokes the moral, legal, and economic arguments VDLF was using to oppose AB 173.

Communication that evolved from the divisive political climate in Wisconsin was the message of solidarity with the labor struggle against Governor Walker’s Budget Repair Bill that strips collective bargaining rights. VDLF adopted the
powerful solidarity symbol for their 2011 May Day march for worker and immigrant rights when they partnered with the AFL-CIO (See Appendix I). It was an intelligent strategic move to collaborate with the unions and publicly stand in solidarity. However, this messaging added to the palpable political discord and may have pushed potential conservative supporters away. In addition to the solidarity and “Wisconsin is not Arizona!” messages, another more inclusive message could have been used at the march (See Appendix II for my recommendation).

The goal of the “Wisconsin is not Arizona!” message was to frame the immigration argument within the context of Wisconsin. My messaging recommendation is based on using Wisconsin’s historical context to promote immigration as a tradition combined with ideas about framing from the Frameworks Institute and George Lakoff. VDLF’s message could have generated ideas about security, borders, and invasion, while my new recommended messaging piece is intended to frame immigration as a source of pride, a shared experience, and an asset to Wisconsin.

Voces de la Frontera used personal stories to convey their position on AB 173, but not enough. VDLF hosted a town hall style meeting for Congressman Gutierrez on his National Tour on Deportation under Obama. VDLF invited several local and state elected officials as well as their membership to exchange stories about how deportation has affected their lives and the lives of their friends and family. Due to their membership, VDLF had many opportunities to develop strategic personal stories in their mainstream messaging against the proposed anti-immigration legislation in Wisconsin.
In addition to crafting communication based on statewide issues, VDLF uses messaging from FIRM to stand in solidarity with other organizations and states on nationwide issues. For example, this year’s May Day March was called the “May Day Solidarity March Against Arizona’s SB 1070” because at the time, the US Supreme Court was beginning to hear arguments on Arizona’s controversial anti-immigrant law in United States vs. Arizona. The combination of VDLF’s state focused and federally focused messaging is visible on the 2012 May Day March poster (See Appendix III).

**May Day Marches**

One of VDLF’s most effective tactics is mobilizing their constituency to participate in annual, high profile, solidarity marches. Their largest marches are on May 1st and in 2011 they partnered with the AFL-CIO and attracted over 100,000 participants.

Voces de la Frontera organizes May Day Marches to advocate for immigrant rights and to stand in solidarity with workers worldwide. Their first May Day March was in 2006 and in addition to being about worker unity, it was organized to mobilize communities to publicly oppose the “Sensenbrenner Bill.” The May Day Marches also have local significance, they commemorate the May 5th, 1886 Bay View Massacre. On May 1st, 1886, building-trades workers joined with Polish laborers in Milwaukee, Wisconsin to strike against their employers, demanding an eight-hour work day. Workers continued to join the strike for four days and on May 5th, 1886 when they approached the Milwaukee Iron Company, National Guardsmen fired into the crowd and killed seven strikers.
Voces de la Frontera has a diverse membership and they use various ways to mobilize their constituency to participate in May Day Marches. According to the Lead Organizer at VDLF, the organization started mobilizing with a member to member program. VDLF chose 30 community leaders within their membership and provided 10 of them with leadership training. The member leaders are a part of a mobilization tree and this is how VDLF activates the first 3,000 people. Additional methods that VDLF mobilizes their membership include: working with 200 partnering businesses that will close if VDLF asks them to, phone banking, TV commercials, and their radio show at 10am every Saturday morning. They also get the message out through their own newspaper, which comes out monthly and is fully bilingual. VDLF organizes and provides “Know Your Rights” trainings and other activities in different parts of the state. Based on these working relationships with communities outside of Milwaukee, VDLF mobilizes people across the state to participate in the May Day Marches. This year, for the 2012 May Day March, VDLF bused in participants from Racine, Burlington, Kenosha, Lake Geneva, Madison, Whitewater, Beloit, and Manitowoc. They also provided buses at both major universities in Milwaukee, Marquette University and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Voces de la Frontera’s May Day Marches are day-long events and they include cultural performances and public statements of solidarity from faith, community, and political leaders. VDLF does not limit their invitations to selected leaders, rather they extend an invitation to all elected officials and community leaders.
Below is a draft of the program from the past May Day March, held on Sunday, April 29, 2012:

_Draft-May Day March Program and Rally Milwaukee, WI
Sunday, April 29, 2012_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm-12:20pm</td>
<td>Grupo de Danza Emaus, Mexican folkloric dance group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20pm-12:30pm</td>
<td>YES students, rap/spoken word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program (speakers: 2 minutes English w/2 min translation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30pm-12:45pm</td>
<td>Native American Coffee Ceremony &amp; Opening Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC Recognition of Interdenominational Faith Semi-Circle:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastor Walter Baires, Ascension Lutheran Church &amp; Lutheran Church of Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reverend Brisco, Milwaukee Inner-city Congregations Allied for Hope (MICAH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom, Heinen, Executive Director, Interfaith Conference of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father Alvaro, Old Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islamic Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rabbi Cohen, Jewish Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reverend Jorge Mayorga, United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45pm-12:50pm</td>
<td>Pastor Paulino Valle, Arizona refugee testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:50pm-12:55pm</td>
<td>James Hall (President NAACP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:55pm-1:00pm</td>
<td>Jose Salazar (Equality Wisconsin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00pm-1:05pm</td>
<td>Bob Peterson (MTEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of Semi-Circle Labor leaders: REA, Michael Rosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AFT 212) WEAC, John Eiden (UFCW), Bruce Colburn (SEIU), MCLC,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State AFLCIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05pm-1:15pm</td>
<td>Recognition Elected officials by State Representative Jo Casta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Perez, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC introduces candidates for governor’s race (pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15pm-1:20pm</td>
<td>March Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20pm-2:20pm</td>
<td>March to Veteran’s Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20pm-2:40pm</td>
<td>Mariachi Juvenil performing as crowd gathers in front of stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2:40pm-2:45pm  Welcome & Opening Remarks
2:45pm- 2:55pm  Jennifer Martinez testimony on family separation
2:55pm-3:00pm  Congresswoman Gwen Moore
   *Introduces Congressman Luis Gutierrez
3:00-3:15pm  Congressman Luis Gutierrez
3:15pm -3:20pm  Kinto Sol—Si Se Puede
3:20pm-3:30pm  YES Students!
3:30pm-4:00pm  Kevin Mulvena, labor folk song, member of AFT 212
   Kinto Sol

**End of Program**
(Voces de la Frontera, 2011)

**Evaluation**

I supported Voces de la Frontera’s policy position to defeat Pridemore’s AB 173. The blocking of AB173 was an important accomplishment, but was always understood as part of a much larger and longer-term strategy to ensure a just and equitable society for all.

Voces de la Frontera was especially effective in collaborating with other organizations to build more support and mobilize their diverse membership. However, there is always room for improvement and I have recommendations for future campaigns. When I did my initial case study research in 2011, I concluded that VDLF does not use social media enough. I understood they may use other ways to educate, organize, and mobilize, but I recommended that they assess their need for a social media campaign. If they are part of local, national, and international coalitions they could be tapping into a stronger support base. Additionally, they are based in Milwaukee and in Racine, the most urban areas in the state. If they had a
robust social media campaign they could reach rural areas where immigrant labor and dairy farms affect local economies directly. They could gain stronger support from the dairy industry or from an ally that could open workers’ centers in other parts of the state where there are large populations of undocumented immigrants. Also, a social media campaign could be used in a leadership development capacity for youth involved in their broader movement. I addressed this issue in my recent interview with the VDLF’s State Organizer because I noticed a drastic increase in the use of social media during 2012 and I learned that the staff person in charge of social media had just begun their job last year. Now, VDLF actively uses Democracy in Action email blasts, Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube mainly for press releases, organizing, and mobilizing. Their internal communication, to members and allies, is predominantly bilingual while their external messages seem to be in English more than Spanish.

In 2011, I exchanged emails with several members of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Agriculture and Applied Economics Department. Through those emails, I learned that there is empirical data on naturalized citizens’ and undocumented immigrants’ economic contributions to the state of Wisconsin, however there is no empirical data on what the economy would look like if their contribution was eliminated at the local levels. I recommend that VDLF find funding to commission a study or work with their student membership to design a study to produce specific county and regional economic profiles to illustrate how economies at each level would be affected by the loss of immigrants’ economic contribution (data disaggregated by sector, industry clusters, and based on the multiplier effect).
*Project: Dairyland* is a series exploring the growing role of immigrants on Wisconsin's dairy farms which was produced by a nonprofit investigative journalism organization called WisconsinWatch.org in 2009. Pictured below is part of the series, *Graphics: Changes in Dairyland*, which is a webpage with interactive data on county herd sizes, changes in farm numbers grouped by herd size, dairy worker origins, and statewide location of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO):
The changing landscape of Wisconsin dairy farms

Since 1995, the number of herds has dropped in every county

[Bar chart showing percentage change in number of herds, 1996 to 2010]

Fewer small dairies, more big ones
Change in number of farms from 1997 to 2007

[Bar chart showing change in number of farms in different size categories from 1997 to 2007]

Where are the workers from?
For herds larger than 500 cows, immigrant labor dominates

[Bar chart showing distribution of workers by size of herd]

Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, the largest farms, have blossomed

[Map showing distribution of CAFOs in Wisconsin]

What the dots mean
Size: Shows the number of animal units (1,000-pound cow = 1 AU)
Color: Shows how long the farm has been around (estimated from how many times it has reapplied for its permit)

How to use this map
Details: Click on a dot, or drag a box around several dots.
Zoom and pan: Use the mouse- arrow icons below. Click + to zoom in (Opt-click on Mac).
Filter map by herd size
511 to 8607
Find a farm
All
Filter by age
Click highlighter, top right, to view selected colors
Up to 5 years old
At least 6 years old
At least 10 years old
At least 16 years old

Sources for all data:
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Change in farm numbers, grouped by herd size: U.S. Census of Agriculture, 1997, 2007
Worker ages: “Overview of Immigrant Workers on Wisconsin Dairy Farms,” UW Program on Agricultural Technology Studies, 2005
Map data: Wisconsin DNR spreadsheet of currently permitted CAFOs, or farms with at least 1,000 animal units (equal to about 700 dairy cows)

Graphics: Kate Golden

(Golden, 2010)
VDLF could use these tools, the economic profiles study and the *Graphics: Changes in Dairyland*, for planning and strategy purposes, for lobbying, or for crafting messaging for VDLF’s opponents in the state of Wisconsin.

In 2011, VDLF’s communication in opposition to AB 173 was largely based on messaging that “Wisconsin is not Arizona!” This message was used on the website, on primary documents, and on protest signs. It is a useful message when communicating with allies or prospective allies because it evokes the moral, legal, and economic arguments VDLF was using to oppose AB 173. However, this messaging should not be used in all situations. Using the comparison of Wisconsin to Arizona is not effective when framing the message for VDLF’s opposition because it binds the argument into the Arizona situation and according to George Lakoff’s idea “don’t think of an elephant,” people already prone to thinking about the immigration issue as a security issue will only reinforce their perceptions.

*Voces de la Frontera* had many opportunities to develop strategic personal stories in their mainstream messaging against AB 173. I recommend they use more stories generated at town hall meetings, stories from their large and diverse membership base, stories from participants and service providers at their two workers’ centers, and stories from interviews with dairy farmers who participated in *Project: Dairyland*. In Jim Shultz’s chapter about messaging he refers to Robert Reich, the former secretary of labor, and his ideas about how conservatives in the U.S. use “mobs at the gate” to perpetuate the public fear of others threatening our way of life. “In ways both subtle and overt, social conservatives use this imagery to speak to issues and fan public fears on issues such as gay rights, youth crime, and
immigration. The only way to counter the image of the nameless mob is to replace it with real stories about real people (such as specific immigrant families and their struggles)” (Shultz, 2002).

Overall, I am impressed and inspired by VDLF’s work and I hope they continue leading the struggle for social and economic justice for all in Wisconsin.

**Lessons Learned**

Through my analysis of the VDLF case study to stop AB 173 I have learned valuable guiding policy advocacy principles:

(1) VeneKlasen and Miller (pp 166-167) suggest that when possible, strategies should “match the moment” – that is, plan actions so that they are timed around external events like elections, international events, and different stages of a law or policy formulation. VDLF clearly took advantage of the political “moment”, the reaction to Walker’s Budget Repair Bill, to build relationships with new partners, like unions, in organizing and mobilizing against anti-immigration policy in Wisconsin.

(2) Dignified, beautiful, and fun. Those were the words Gustavo Esteva, a well-known activist from Oaxaca, Mexico, used to describe his work. I remembered his words when I read VeneKlasen and Miller’s *Criteria for Designing Mobilizing Actions* (pg. 261), they suggest actions should: “present opportunities to learn new skills, offer practice in leadership, demystify politics and power, have a concrete and feasible aim, boost morale, and encourage people to try new things. Actions should also: be thoroughly planned, be fun, and take account of the political environment.” Part of VDLF’s long-term strategy is to develop community leaders and their
program YES! (Youth Empowered in the Struggle), was created to involve young people in activism and empower them as leaders within their schools and communities. At the May Day March this year, I noticed the heavy involvement of young people. They were passionate, articulate, and visible leaders.

(3) Regarding coalitions, Shultz writes, “Diversity is also an important priority in coalitions, as well as being a major challenge. Strong coalitions bring together a blend of people and organizations that cross all kinds of traditional boundary lines.” The idea of including unpredictable people and organizations in a policy advocacy campaign or a social movement is really exciting and while it can provide many challenges it is worth the effort. In the case of VDLF’s opposition to AB173, the coalition work that included DBA was probably one of the main reasons the legislation died in committee.

(4) Messaging is vital to a campaign’s strategy. According to George Lakoff in *Simple Framing*, “Communication itself comes with a frame. The elements of the communication frame include: A message, an audience, a messenger, a medium, images, a context, and especially, higher-level moral and conceptual frames. The choice of language is, of course, vital, but it is vital because language evokes frames — moral and conceptual frames. VDLF’s communication is based on local, statewide, and national issues. Their messages seem to be crafted to resonate with their allies and I think the messaging is effective, but it could be expanded to reframe the issues and target their opposition in a new way.

(5) It is extremely important to have a clear sense of your opposition. “Know your opposition well so that you can devise a (lobbying) strategy to weaken,
block, and undermine them (Shultz, pg. 163). In order to stop AB 173, VDLF did background research on members of the Committee on Homeland Security and State Affairs, which consisted of their primary and secondary targets, and they used that information to guide their strategy.

(6) In The Factors Shaping An Advocacy Strategy, as discussed by Veneklasen and Miller, risk is listed as a key factor in which is something I do not have a lot of practice in thinking about and analyzing. “Sometimes involving people who are usually excluded, like women or poor people, may cause family, social, and community conflict. Challenging relations of power tends to generate conflict, and organizers must have ways of dealing with this....Whatever the context, sometimes you will decide to take risks because there are no other options. In these cases, everyone involved must understand the implications of those risks” (p. 164). In the evaluation section of this paper, I recommended that VDLF should use more of their members’ personal stories and experiences in their messaging. When I made that recommendation, I considered the sensitive nature of some of their members’ stories and experiences with deportation and immigration detention. The use of these kinds of stories could be more harmful than helpful and I think VDLF is successful in empowering their members’ to safely use
their voices when appropriate. The following is an example from the VDLF May Day
March press release on April 30th, 2012:

At the May Day March this year Jennifer Martinez, a Manitowoc woman whose husband Jaime Martinez was deported to Mexico last month, gave an emotional testimony to the crowd about the cruel impact our immigration enforcement policies have had on herself and her four children when immigration ripped Jaime away from his family.
Appendix I
VDLF Messaging Piece, May 2011

MAYDAY!
Wisconsin Solidarity March for Immigrant and Worker Rights
Sunday, May 1st 2011 • Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Assemble 1:30pm at 5th & Washington Streets
We will then march to Veteran’s Park (1010 N. Lincoln Memorial Dr.) for a 3:00pm rally with
AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka & Voces de la Frontera Director Christine Neumann-Ortiz
Appendix II
My Proposed Messaging Piece

Immigration
A Wisconsin Tradition

Why Did Your Family Immigrate to Wisconsin?

Wisconsin Immigration Pull Factors 1600-2011
- Land and Farming Opportunities
- Employment Opportunities
- Education
- Family Unification
Appendix III

VDLF Messaging Piece, April 29th

MAY DAY
SOLIDARITY MARCH
SUNDAY APRIL 29, 2012 • 12:30 P.M.
ASSEMBLE AT VOCES DE LA FRONTERA (5TH ST. AND WASHINGTON, MILWAUKEE)

★ STOP SEPARATING FAMILIES! STOP THE DEPORTATIONS!
★ GOOD JOBS, NOT CUTS TO BADGERCARE AND PUBLIC EDUCATION!
★ RESTORE DRIVERS LICENSES AND IN-STATE TUITION FOR IMMIGRANTS!
★ DEFEND VOTING RIGHTS!

FOR MORE INFORMATION, VISIT VDLF.ORG
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“Any society that would give up a little liberty to gain a little security will deserve neither and lose both.”

—Benjamin Franklin

VDLF May Day March, 2012