

DEVELOPMENTS

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN IMMIGRATION LAW: THE PERMANENT MUSLIM BAN

SIRINE SHEBAYA*

On September 24, 2017, President Trump issued a Presidential Proclamation¹ indefinitely banning travel to the United States for most nationals from six Muslim-majority countries: Chad, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. The Proclamation banned all immigrants from the six countries, and had varying restrictions on non-immigrant travel, from a complete ban in the case of Syria to additional scrutiny and vetting in the case of Somalia.² It also banned all immigrant and non-immigrant travel from North Korea, along with some non-immigrant travel for certain government officials and their family members from Venezuela.³ Almost everyone affected by the Proclamation is from the six Muslim-majority countries, which collectively are almost 95% Muslim and have a combined population of around 150 million.⁴

On October 24, 2017, President Trump also suspended refugee processing from eleven countries for an additional 90 days. Over the last two years, those countries had collectively accounted for over 80% of the total

* Sirine Shebaya is a litigator and advocate who works on civil rights and immigrants' rights matters. She is currently the Senior Staff Attorney at Muslim Advocates, where she leads the legal team's work in several areas including the Muslim Ban, border searches, surveillance, and immigrants' rights. She sits on the board of the National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers' Guild and is a founding board member of the Dulles Justice Coalition, a group of volunteer lawyers, organizers, and translators who came together in January 2017 to assist travelers affected by the ban. She also co-chairs the American Bar Association's Criminal Justice Section Immigration Committee. © 2018, Sirine Shebaya.

1. Proclamation No. 9645, 82 F.R. 45161 (Sept. 24, 2017).

2. *Id.* (All non-immigrants from Syria are banned; business and tourist visas are banned for Chad, Libya, Iran, and Yemen, and all but student visas are banned for Iran).

3. Proclamation No. 9645, *supra* note 1.

4. Central Intelligence Agency, *The World Factbook, Country Comparison: Population*, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2119rank.html>.

Muslim refugees resettled in the United States.⁵ In addition, he indefinitely suspended the follow-to-join (“FTJ”) program, a family reunification program that allows refugees who were resettled in the United States within the last two years to bring their family members to the United States more quickly.⁶ Most refugees who come in through the FTJ program are Muslim.⁷ On January 29, 2018, the Administration announced that it has rolled out new vetting measures that will apply to all refugee processing, but has not released any details about what those measures are.⁸

The history and effect of these orders has led advocates to refer to them collectively as the “Muslim Ban.” Their most obvious purpose has been to fulfill a campaign promise Trump made well before he became President: to paint Muslims as a threat and to ban them permanently from entering the United States.⁹ What remains to be seen is whether he will ultimately succeed, or whether the courts will—as they have so far—continue to strike the bans down as unlawful, unconstitutional, or both.

I. BACKGROUND: EXECUTIVE ORDERS SUSPENDING TRAVEL FROM SEVERAL PREDOMINANTLY MUSLIM COUNTRIES

The Proclamation and the refugee ban represent the third round of Trump administration policies aimed at banning Muslims from entering the United States. The two previous iterations were enjoined in significant part by several district courts and, in the case of the second and third versions, by the U.S. Courts of Appeal for the Ninth and Fourth Circuits.¹⁰

While on the campaign trail, Candidate Trump made several well-documented and well-publicized statements expressing hatred of Muslims, painting all Muslims as terrorists, and promising to ban all Muslims from the

5. Exec. Order No. 13815, 82 Fed. Reg. 50055 (Oct. 27, 2017); see also Memorandum from Rex W. Tillerson, Sec’y, Dep’t of State, et al., to Donald Trump, President of U.S. (Oct. 23, 2017); see also Dahlia Lithwick & Jeremy Stahl, *Sneak Attack*, SLATE (Nov. 10, 2017), http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/jurisprudence/2017/11/trump_is_trying_to_secretly_sneak_through_another_muslim_ban.html.

6. 8 C.F.R. § 207.7(d) (current through 83 Fed. Reg. 9817) (FTJ program available for family members of refugees who entered within last two years); see also Lithwick & Stahl, *supra* note 5.

7. Lithwick & Stahl, *supra* note 5.

8. Press Release, Dep’t of Homeland Sec., DHS Announces Additional Enhanced Security Procedures for Refugees Seeking Resettlement, January 30, 2018.

9. See generally Brief for the Roderick and Solange MacArthur Justice Center as Amicus Curiae Supporting Plaintiffs-Appellees, *Hawaii v. Trump*, 878 F.3d 662 (9th Cir. 2017) (collecting Trump’s anti-Muslim statements).

10. See, e.g., *Int’l Refugee Assistance Project (“IRAP”) v. Trump*, Nos. 17-2231, 17-2232, 17-2233, 17-2240, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513 (4th Cir. Feb. 15, 2018) (three separate lawsuits against the ban were consolidated at the Fourth Circuit and therefore will hereinafter be referred to as “*IRAP/Iranian Alliances Across Borders (“IAAB”)/Zakok v. Trump*”); see also *Int’l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir. 2017); see also *Hawaii v. Trump*, 878 F.3d 662 (9th Cir. 2017); see also *Int’l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, 265 F. Supp. 3d 570 (D. Md. 2017); see also *Darweesh v. Trump*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13243 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 28, 2017); see also *Aziz v. Trump*, 234 F. Supp. 3d 724 (E.D.Va. 2017).

United States.¹¹ On January 27, 2017, as one of his first actions as President, he signed an Executive Order that was widely interpreted as putting this promise into action. The order banned, effective immediately, all nationals of seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States for a period of 90 days. It also suspended all refugee processing indefinitely for Syrian refugees and for 120 days worldwide.¹² The order had a built-in exception for refugees who are members of a minority religion in their home countries.¹³ The President described it as “talking territory instead of Muslim” because “[p]eople were so upset when I used the word Muslim.”¹⁴

The implementation of the order caused chaos at airports across the country, as nationals of those countries landed in the United States only to find themselves detained, questioned, or summarily deported. Even returning lawful permanent residents of the United States found themselves detained for prolonged periods of time before eventually being allowed into the country. Many who were turned away had left their lives, homes, and jobs to come to the United States.¹⁵ Others were fleeing violent circumstances to which they could not return.¹⁶ Many found themselves stranded at airports abroad, prohibited from boarding flights to the United States because of instructions U.S. government officials had provided to the airlines.¹⁷ Thousands of lawyers, translators, organizers, and demonstrators flooded the airports to protest the ban, which was quickly enjoined by several district courts.¹⁸

11. See Brief for the Roderick and Solange MacArthur Justice Center as Amicus Curiae Supporting Plaintiffs-Appellees, *supra* note 9.

12. Exec. Order No. 13769 at §5(a), 82 Fed. Reg. 8977 (Feb. 1, 2017).

13. *Id.* at §5(b). This was widely understood to mean Christian refugees, as evidenced by contemporaneous statements made by the President in connection with the ban; see generally Brief of Amici Curiae Muslim Advocates and The Roderick & Solange MacArthur Justice Center in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction, *Jewish Family Service of Seattle v. Trump*, Case No. 2:17-cv-00178-JLR (filed December 5, 2017).

14. Interview by Chuck Todd with Donald Trump, President of the U.S. (July 24, 2016), <https://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press-meet-press-july-24-2016-n615706>.

15. Lyric Lewin, *These Are the Faces of Trump’s Ban*, CNN (Jan. 29, 2017), <http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2017/01/politics/immigration-ban-stories/>.

16. Michael D. Shear and Helene Cooper, *Trump Bars Refugees and Citizens of 7 Muslim Countries*, NY TIMES (Jan. 27, 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/us/politics/trump-syrian-refugees.html?mtref=www.google.com>.

17. See, e.g., Mary Emily O’Hara, *Yemeni Brothers at Center of Immigration Lawsuit Finally Allowed to Enter U.S.*, NBC (Feb. 6, 2017), <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/yemeni-brothers-center-immigration-lawsuit-finally-allowed-enter-u-s-n717281>.

18. See, e.g., Peter Baker, *Travelers Stranded and Protests Swell Over Trump Order*, N.Y. TIMES, (Jan. 29, 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/politics/white-house-official-in-reversal-says-green-card-holders-wont-be-barred.html?mtref=www.google.com&gwh=6739DF89F12689880F954CEC8CA20240&gwt=pay> see also Jeremy Diamond & Steve Almasy, *Trump’s immigration ban sends shockwaves*, CNN (Jan. 30, 2017), <https://www.cnn.com/2017/01/28/politics/donald-trump-executive-order-immigration-reaction/index.html>; see also Dara Lind & Andrew Prokop, *Federal judge halts Trump’s immigration order—but only for those already here*, VOX (Jan. 28, 2017), <https://www.vox.com/2017/1/28/14427656/trump-ban-lawsuit-stay>; see also Ryan Devereaux, Murtaza Hussain, & Alice Speri, *Trump’s Muslim Ban Triggers Chaos, Heartbreak, and Resistance*, THE INTERCEPT (Jan. 29, 2017), <https://theintercept.com/2017/01/29/trumps-muslim-ban-triggers-chaos-heartbreak-and-resistance/>.

On March 6, 2017, the President issued a second Executive Order to replace the first, now-enjoined ban.¹⁹ It was substantially the same in content, banning travel from six predominantly Muslim countries, but this time excluding Iraq and explicitly excluding lawful permanent residents. It also allowed persons with visas that had already been issued prior to the effective date of the ban to enter the country, likely to avoid the first round of airport chaos and public outrage.²⁰ That order was enjoined by district courts in Hawaii and Maryland before its effective date of March 16, 2017, and as a result did not go into effect. However, on June 26, 2017, the Supreme Court allowed it to move forward against persons who lack a “bona fide relationship” with persons or entities in the United States.²¹ At that point, the travel ban went into effect against nationals of the six countries who did not have close family members or a formal relationship with an institution in the United States, such as an offer of employment or admission to a university.

The second order also directed several federal agencies to undertake, during the period of suspension, a “worldwide review” process in order to recommend to the President a list of countries whose nationals should be banned from traveling to the United States.²² The Proclamation was ostensibly based on the results of that process—although as described more fully below, the rationale and the outcomes are less than convincing, and the results appear to have been pre-ordained by the second order itself.²³ The Proclamation was issued on September 24, 2017, the date the temporary travel ban expired. The refugee ban was issued on October 24, 2017, the date the temporary refugee suspension expired. Both the Proclamation and the refugee ban are currently being challenged in separate court actions in Maryland, Hawaii, and Seattle.

II. LEGAL CHALLENGES UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AND THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE

To date, courts considering legal challenges to Trump’s bans have almost uniformly found them to be unlawful under the Immigration and Nationality Act or unconstitutional under the Establishment Clause or both.²⁴

The Ninth Circuit has found both the temporary ban of the second Executive Order and the indefinite ban of the Proclamation unlawful under the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”).²⁵ As an initial matter, the Court found that the ban on immigration explicitly violates the

19. Exec. Order No. 13780 at §2, 82 Fed. Reg. 13209 (Mar. 9, 2017).

20. *Id.*

21. *Trump v. Int’l Refugee Assistance Project*, 137 S.Ct. 2080 (2017) (per curiam).

22. Exec. Order No. 13780, *supra* note 20.

23. See *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, *infra* note 34.

24. See *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513; see also *IRAP*, 857 F.3d 554; see also *Hawaii*, 878 F.3d 662; see also *IRAP*, 265 F. Supp. 3d 570; see also *Darweesh*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13243; see also *Aziz*, 234 F. Supp. 3d 724.

25. *Hawaii*, 878 F.3d 662.

INA's non-discrimination provision.²⁶ In 1965, Congress reformed a system that had banned Asian immigration and restricted entry from parts of Europe in order to maintain "the ethnic composition of the American people."²⁷ In response, Congress decided to move away from a nationality-based quota system and enacted a provision specifically banning discrimination on the basis of nationality in the issuance of immigrant visas, now codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A). The Proclamation, like its predecessor travel ban, by its plain terms violates this requirement.

The Ninth Circuit also found that the Proclamation exceeds the President's delegated authority under the INA, and that it fails to provide an adequate basis for the sweeping entry restrictions it puts in place.²⁸ The government invoked a provision that gives the President the authority to suspend entry of noncitizens for a period of time if he finds that their entry "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States."²⁹ It argued that this provision gives the President essentially limitless authority to ban travel to the United States. The Ninth Circuit was not convinced by this reasoning. As the parties challenging the ban argued, this clause cannot be used to rewrite provisions of the INA that explicitly ban nationality discrimination and that provide carefully delineated criteria for admission into the United States—particularly when that suspension is indefinite, not tailored to its specific purpose, and sweeping in its scope.³⁰

Although the government has relied heavily on the worldwide review process that led to the current Proclamation, national security experts have disputed the validity of the process and the resulting recommendations.³¹ In litigation against the travel ban, dozens of former national security officials submitted amicus briefs and a declaration explaining that the ban is both "unnecessary" and would "cause serious harm" to national security.³² The Department of Homeland Security's own report found that banning nationals from entire countries does not advance national security.³³ Moreover, the outcome of the review process was essentially pre-ordained by the review

26. *Id.*

27. H.R. Rep. No. 98-745, at 9 (1965).

28. *Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d 741, 776 (9th Cir. 2017).

29. 8 U.S.C. § 1182(f) (current through Pub. L. No. 115-122).

30. See Brief of Plaintiffs-Appellants, *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*.

31. The ban also includes on its face a number of inconsistencies relating to that process. It states that countries were assessed against a set of baseline criteria, but then proceeds to ban countries that did satisfy the criteria and leave out countries that did not. See *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513, at *25.

32. See *IRAP*, 265 F. Supp. 3d 570 at 610; see also *Trump v. IRAP*, Brief of Amici Curiae Former National Security Officials, https://law.yale.edu/system/files/documents/pdf/scotus_formernationalsecurityofficials.pdf.

33. Vivian Salama & Alicia A. Caldwell, *AP Exclusive: DHS report disputes threat from banned nations*, ASSOCIATED PRESS (Feb. 24, 2017), <https://apnews.com/39f1f8e4ceed4a30a4570f693291c866/dhs-intel-report-disputes-threat-posed-travel-ban-nations>; see also Jordan Fabian, *DHS analysis found no evidence of extra threat posed by travel-ban nations: report*, THE HILL (Feb. 24, 2017), <http://thehill.com/policy/national-security/321108-dhs-analysis-found-no-evidence-of-extra-threat-posed-by-travel-ban>.

criteria the second order mandated.³⁴ These criteria are a remarkably poor fit for assessing whether travel from certain countries should be *banned*, and were instead designed only to assess whether applicants from certain countries should be *required to apply for visas* to establish their eligibility for admission on an individual basis.³⁵ Thus, the review process even on its face does not provide justification for a sweeping ban that covers more than 150 million individuals. As the Fourth Circuit found in its latest order upholding the district court injunction against the Proclamation, the national security justification is not legitimate on its face, and is nothing more than a pretext for unconstitutional animus against Islam.³⁶

The backdrop of the review process and the resulting ban has been a steady stream of comments by the President—both before and since taking office—that cast the policy as inextricably tied to anti-Muslim animus,³⁷ in a manner that denigrates Muslims and disfavors their religion—something the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment prohibits.³⁸ The Fourth Circuit has twice found the ban likely unconstitutional under the Establishment Clause. In so doing, the Court cited the long history of statements showing explicit anti-Muslim animus. It also highlighted the President’s failure to clearly disavow those statements and distance his policies from them.³⁹ In considering the second order in context, it found that the order “drips with religious intolerance, animus, and discrimination” against Muslims and Islam as a religion.⁴⁰ In ruling on the Proclamation, it found that President Trump’s statements—even those he has made since taking office—show animus against Islam and expressly tie that animus to the travel ban.⁴¹ It also noted that although the President could have distanced himself from previous anti-Muslim remarks, he chose not to do so and instead continued to denigrate Islam while he was President.⁴² In short, the Court concluded, “the Proclamation is unconstitutionally tainted with animus towards Islam.”⁴³

As of this writing, the status of the various legal challenges is as follows:

- On October 18, 2017, a district court in Maryland issued a nationwide preliminary injunction barring implementation of the Proclamation’s travel ban against nationals of Chad, Iran, Libya,

34. See, e.g., *IRAP*, 265 F. Supp. 3d at 624 (noting that the Proclamation arose directly from second Executive Order’s criteria for banning countries and its requirement that the review process yield a list of countries to be banned); see also *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513 at *171 (noting the many deficiencies in the review process itself).

35. See generally *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, Fourth Circuit Appellants’ Brief at 34-36 (ECF 45-48).

36. See *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513, at *33.

37. *IRAP*, 265 F. Supp. 3d at 627; see also *IRAP v Trump*, 857 F.3d 554, 575-77 (4th Cir. 2017).

38. See *IRAP v Trump*, 857 F.3d at 605 (finding that Trump’s travel ban likely violates the Establishment Clause); see also *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513 at *264.

39. See *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513 at *183.

40. *IRAP*, 857 F.3d at 572.

41. See *IRAP/IAAB/Zakzok*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 3513 at *33.

42. *Id.*

43. *Id.*

Somalia, Syria, and Yemen who have bona fide relationships with persons or entities in the United States.

- On October 18, 2017, a district court in Hawaii issued a nationwide Temporary Restraining Order that was then converted into a preliminary injunction barring implementation of the Proclamation in full.
- On December 4, 2017, the Supreme Court granted the government's application to stay the district court decisions against the Proclamation, effectively allowing the government to proceed with implementation of the ban pending final resolution of the preliminary injunction motions.

On December 22, 2017, the Ninth Circuit upheld, on statutory grounds, the Hawaii preliminary injunction as to individuals who have bona fide relationships with persons or entities in the United States, but stayed its own decision pending resolution of the Supreme Court appeal.

- On January 19, 2018, the Supreme Court granted certiorari in *Hawaii v Trump*, and will hear arguments in the case on April 25, 2018.
- On February 15, 2018, the Fourth Circuit upheld, on constitutional grounds, the Maryland preliminary injunction as to individuals who have bona fide relationships with persons or entities in the United States, but stayed its own decision pending resolution of the Supreme Court appeal. The plaintiffs in the three cases have sought certiorari so that their cases may be heard alongside *Hawaii*.
- On December 24, 2017, a district court in Seattle enjoined implementation of the refugee ban against persons with bona fide relationships in the United States. The government sought reconsideration and a stay of the injunction from the district court. On January 5, the court denied the motion for reconsideration.
- On January 30, 2018, the government announced that it has issued a new policy on refugee processing that supersedes the October memo, but did not share the content of the policy, and moved to dismiss the Seattle case. The plaintiffs cross-moved for discovery about the content of the new policy in order to determine whether it substantially mirrors the October 24, 2017 refugee ban. Those motions remain pending before the district court.

While these cases proceed, the ban is fully in effect against nationals of the countries listed in the Proclamation, barring family members from joining their spouses, parents, and children in the United States as well as a vast range of visitors and academics from entering the country on temporary visas. The

Supreme Court will hear arguments in at least one of the cases on April 25, 2018. A decision is therefore likely to be issued by June 2018.

III. EXTREME VETTING AND THE “BACKDOOR” MUSLIM BAN

Alongside the travel bans, federal agencies have quietly been implementing a number of “extreme vetting” measures that have collectively resulted in a significant decrease of travel from Muslim-majority countries, away from the spotlight of court cases and media coverage.⁴⁴

The same day he issued the second Executive Order, President Trump also directed relevant agency heads to implement procedures that would “enhance the screening and vetting of applications for visas”⁴⁵—a measure he has referred to in his tweets as “extreme vetting.”⁴⁶ Shortly thereafter, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson sent cables to consulates worldwide directing, among other things, that certain “populations” identified as “warranting increased scrutiny” be asked seven sets of invasive questions including, among other things, fifteen years of employment, travel, and address history; five years of phone numbers, email addresses, and social media handles; and a mandatory social media review for anyone who has ever been present in an ISIS-controlled territory.⁴⁷ The cable also specifically directed additional security screenings for nationals of the six countries named in the second travel ban along with Iraq, though that part of the cables was later rescinded after courts enjoined the ban.⁴⁸

While the directives did not specify that the populations subjected to additional screening are Muslim, they functionally appear to be targeting persons from Muslim-majority countries. For example, between March 2017 and May 2017, visa denials for applicants from Muslim-majority countries increased by almost twenty percent.⁴⁹ The Cato Institute also documented a significant and historic drop in travel from Muslim-majority countries.⁵⁰ The drop is likely due both to increased visa denials and a general deterrent effect,

44. Yeganeh Torbati, *Trump administration approves tougher visa vetting, including social media checks*, REUTERS (March 31, 2017), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration-visa/trump-administration-approves-tougher-visa-vetting-including-social-media-checks-idUSKBN18R3F8>.

45. Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security (Mar. 6, 2017), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/06/memorandum-secretary-state-attorney-general-secretary-homeland-security>.

46. See, e.g., David Choi, *TRUMP: Time to ramp up ‘Extreme Vetting Program’ after New York City attack*, BUSINESS INSIDER (Oct. 31, 2017), <http://www.businessinsider.com/nyc-attack-trump-extreme-vetting-program-terror-2017-10>.

47. Memorandum from Rex Tillerson, Sec’y of State, 17 STATE 24324 (Mar. 15, 2017), http://live.reuters.com/Event/Live_US_Politics/791246151.

48. Memorandum from Rex Tillerson, Sec’y of State, 17 STATE 24800 (Mar. 16, 2017), http://live.reuters.com/Event/Live_US_Politics/791249837.

49. Nahal Toosi & Ted Hesson, *Visas to Muslim-Majority Countries Down 20 Percent*, POLITICO (May 25, 2017), <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/05/25/trump-muslim-visas-238846> (citing U.S. Department of State visa statistics).

50. David Bier, *Muslim Ban? Fewer Muslim Refugees, Immigrants, and Travelers Enter U.S. in 2017*, CATO INSTITUTE (Dec. 12, 2017), <http://www.cato.org/blog/muslim-ban-fewer-muslim-refugees-immigrants-travelers-enter-us-2017-0>.

with fewer individuals from those countries seeking to travel to the United States because of fear of negative consequences including detention at airports, denial of entry, invasive questioning, or other adverse experiences.⁵¹

In parallel, the Department of Homeland Security is implementing its own enhanced vetting and surveillance measures.⁵² These include collecting and indefinitely storing an extremely broad range of information about social media activity and “associated identifiable information and search results” about visa applicants, lawful permanent residents, and even naturalized citizens of the United States.⁵³ President Trump has also ordered the establishment of a new National Vetting Center to screen and surveil immigrants on an ongoing basis.⁵⁴

Thus, even before the travel bans went into effect, extreme vetting measures implemented at the agency level have already resulted in significantly decreasing Muslim travel to the United States. These measures effectively function as a backdoor Muslim Ban, and will continue to do so even for travelers who are not from the countries covered by the Proclamation.

IV. CONCLUSION

When he was campaigning for office, Donald Trump said repeatedly that he wanted to ban all Muslims from the United States. As soon as he became President, he and his Administration began using all avenues at their disposal to make that promise a reality. The resulting policies are having a chilling effect on Muslim travel to the United States in ways that, if left unchecked, could change the face of our country. The critical question now is whether the Supreme Court will strike this ban down, as numerous other courts have done, or whether it will allow the President to keep in place a permanent Muslim Ban.

51. *Id.*

52. Max Greenwood, *DHS planning to collect social media info on all immigrants*, THE HILL (Sep. 26, 2017) <http://thehill.com/policy/national-security/352421-dhs-planning-to-collect-social-media-info-on-all-immigrants>.

53. *Id.*

54. Ayanna Alexander, *Trump directive establishes new immigration vetting center*, POLITICO (Feb. 6, 2018), <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/02/06/trump-immigration-vetting-center-395925>.