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I am currently exploring two ideas for this project.

**First idea:** What do counties or county-equivalents risk when they declare themselves to be immigration “sanctuaries?” Does declaring itself a sanctuary jurisdiction open counties and county-equivalents to increased ICE monitoring and/or ICE raids?

The Trump Administration has unabashedly announced a campaign targeting so-called sanctuary cities for raids and removal operations. A four-day campaign in September 2017 designated “Operation Safe City” by ICE explicitly targeted jurisdictions, such as Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, DC, and Los Angeles, which have pushed back on local law enforcement collaboration with federal enforcement agencies. Sanctuary cities understand themselves as “jurisdictions [that] have adopted formal or informal policies limiting cooperation with federal immigration authorities” (Davidson 2014). Elements of this approach delink local and federal collaboration in a variety of locations, including at traffic or pedestrian stops, at crime scenes, in jails, and in prisons. In a public statement, ICE announced that its agents would target cities, "where ICE deportation officers are denied access to jails and prisons to interview suspected immigration violators" (<https://www.ice.gov/news/releases/ice-arrests-over-450-federal-immigration-charges-during-operation-safe-city>). Meanwhile, recent reporting by ProPublica indicates that the Philadelphia ICE office has adopted aggressive removal tactics relative to its peers elsewhere, reporting the highest numbers of “at-large” arrests without criminal convictions nationally. Observers speculate that the aggressive approach may have been triggered by Philadelphia’s sanctuary city policy  [(https://www.propublica.org/article/pennsylvania-ice-undocumented-immigrants-immigration-enforcement](https://www.propublica.org/article/pennsylvania-ice-undocumented-immigrants-immigration-enforcement)).

Using data from the Department of Homeland Security’s removal statistics reporting from 2013-2017 (https://www.ice.gov/removal-statistics/2017), this paper will examine connections between ICE target areas and sanctuary jurisdictions. I will use rankings from the January 2018 Immigrant Legal Resource Center report, “The Rise of Sanctuary,” to categorize jurisdictions along a sanctuary spectrum (<https://www.ilrc.org/rise-sanctuary>). My dependent variable (Y variable) will be drawn from the ICE data. My independent variables (X variables) will be the range of sanctuary categories (1-8 from least immigrant friendly, i.e. anti-sanctuary to most immigrant friendly, i.e. sanctuary). I will regress Y variables on the X variables to test if there are statistically significant relationships between the rankings along the sanctuary spectrum and areas in which removals may have increased. Through a literature review, I will identify possible covariables to hold constant in the regressions, such as political or economic upheaval in common sending countries or the shift from the Obama to the Trump Administration.

**Second idea:** The questions are two-fold: Has public opinion grown more polarized on immigration? If so, how does the polarization help to explain the rise of both and pro- and anti-sanctuary sub-federal laws?

Inspired by the religiously-inspired Sanctuary Movement of the 1980s, over the past ten years—and particularly in the past two--so-called sanctuary cities have emerged in increasing numbers. Rationales for sanctuary city policy or status include arguments for local control of law enforcement according to the norms and needs of the municipality, the desire for robust communication between immigrant community members and police to achieve public safety goals, public health concerns, and address worries of racial profiling and police misconduct (Davidson 2014). Over the same timeframe, local policies that deputize local law enforcement to enforce immigration policies, criminalize unauthorized immigration, mandate that public employees determine legal status in the course of their work, and even penalize individuals “sheltering” or transporting unauthorized immigrants have spiked (Campbell 2011).

First, I will use General Social Survey (GSS) data on public opinion on immigration to ask if public opinion on immigration has grown more polarized over the past twenty years. Examples of variables and their questions include:

* letin1a: *Number of immigrants to America nowadays should be* (scale of increase to decrease); data collected in 1996, 2004, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016;
* immameco: *There are different opinions about immigrants from other countries living in America. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? B. Immigrants are generally good for America''s economy;* data collected in 1996, 2004, 2014;
* excldimm: *How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement?   
  America should take stronger measures to exclude illegal immigrants*; data collected in 1996, 2004, 2014;
* immideas: *There are different opinions about immigrants from other countries living in America. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? D. Immigrants make America more open to new ideas and cultures*; data collected in 1996 and 2014.

Next, I will use rankings from the January 2018 Immigrant Legal Resource Center report, “The Rise of Sanctuary,” to categorize jurisdictions along a sanctuary spectrum (<https://www.ilrc.org/rise-sanctuary>). I will examine any increase in level to the right (conservative and generally anti-immigration) or left (liberal and generally pro-immigration) in anti-sanctuary (ranking of 1-2 on the sanctuary spectrum) and in pro-sanctuary (ranking of 6-8 on the sanctuary spectrum) to determine whether there is any correlation between increased measurement of public opinion on immigration topics and a jurisdiction’s sanctuary policy.