

THE SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER:
MANUFACTURING HATE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2026

Serial No. 119-69

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



Available via: <http://judiciary.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2026

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JIM JORDAN, Ohio, *Chair*

DARRELL ISSA, California	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Member</i>
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	JERROLD NADLER, New York
TOM McCLINTOCK, California	ZOE LOFGREN, California
THOMAS P. TIFFANY, Wisconsin	STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky	HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
CHIP ROY, Texas	TED LIEU, California
SCOTT FITZGERALD, Wisconsin	PRAMILA JAYAPAL, Washington
BEN CLINE, Virginia	J. LUIS CORREA, California
LANCE GOODEN, Texas	MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania
JEFFERSON VAN DREW, New Jersey	JOE NEGUSE, Colorado
TROY E. NEHLS, Texas	LUCY McBATH, Georgia
BARRY MOORE, Alabama	DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina
HARRIET M. HAGEMAN, Wyoming	BECCA BALINT, Vermont
LAUREL M. LEE, Florida	JESÚS G. “CHUY” GARCÍA, Illinois
WESLEY HUNT, Texas	SYDNEY KAMLAGER-DOVE, California
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
KEVIN KILEY, California	DANIEL S. GOLDMAN, New York
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
BRAD KNOTT, North Carolina	Vacancy
MARK HARRIS, North Carolina	
ROBERT F. ONDER, Jr., Missouri	
DEREK SCHMIDT, Kansas	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	
MICHAEL BAUMGARTNER, Washington	

CHRISTOPHER HIXON, *Majority Staff Director*

ARTHUR EWENCZYK, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2026

OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
The Honorable Jim Jordan, Chair of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Ohio	1
The Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Maryland	3

WITNESSES

Dr. Carol M. Swain, Author, Commentator, Former Professor, Vanderbilt University, President, Family Research Council	
Oral Testimony	8
Prepared Testimony	11
Tony Perkins, President, Family Research Council	
Oral Testimony	15
Prepared Testimony	17
Tyler O'Neil, Author and Senior Editor, The Daily Signal	
Oral Testimony	25
Prepared Testimony	27
Maya Wiley, President, CEO, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights	
Oral Testimony	36
Prepared Testimony	38

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC. SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

All materials submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary, for the record	100
Materials submitted by the Honorable Zoe Lofgren, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of California, for the record	
An article entitled, "The Jan 6th Rioters Who Were Pardoned by Trump Only to Offend Again," May 18, 2026, <i>Byline Times</i>	
A staff report entitled, "One Year Later: Assessing the Public Safety Implications of President Trump's Mass pardons of 1,600 January 6th Rioters and Insurrectionists," Jan. 2026, <i>House Judiciary Committee Democrats</i>	
Materials submitted by the Honorable Andy Biggs, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Arizona, for the record	
A series of letters from various members entitled, "Personal Impact Statement Regarding the Southern Poverty Law Center's Designation of Moms for Liberty," May 15, 2026, <i>Moms for Liberty</i>	
An article entitled, "Southern Poverty Law Center education materials surprisingly common in red states, probe finds," May 16, 2026, <i>Just the News</i>	
An article entitled, "SPLC Curriculum in K-12: Learning for Justice/Teaching Tolerance tracker," May 12, 2026, <i>Defending Education</i>	
Not provided at the time of publication	
An article entitled, "Arizona School Resource Pushed SPLC 'Hate Map' Audit," May 9, 2026, <i>The Daily Signal</i>	

Materials submitted by the Honorable Andy Biggs, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Arizona, for the record—Continued

A press release entitled, “Federal Grand Jury Charges Southern Poverty Law Center for Wire Fraud, False Statements, and Conspiracy to Commit Money Laundering,” Apr. 21, 2026, *U.S. Department of Justice*

An article entitled, “Southern Poverty Law Center is a scam, not an arbiter of justice,” Aug. 18, 2019, *USA Today*

An article entitled, “The SPLC Is a Hedge Fund with a Dumb Anti-Racist Newsletter,” Apr. 23, 2026, *The Federalist*

An article entitled, “Exposing the SPLC, and Celebrating Their Future Demise,” May 18, 2026, *AM Greatness*

An article entitled, “Biden DOJ Was In Cahoots With SPLC As It Funded Extremist Groups, Former Official Admits,” May 7, 2026, *The Federalist*

Not provided at the time of publication

An article entitled, “SPLC’s wealth raises questions despite controversial activities,” Sept. 4, 2025, *The Hill*

A 990 filed in October 2024, by SPLC

Not provided at the time of publication

An article entitled, “America First Legal Reveals Explosive Documents Exposing Biden Department of Justice’s Partnership and Coordinated Campaign with the Southern Poverty Law Center to Weaponize Civil Rights Enforcement,” Oct. 3, 2025, *America First Legal*

A statement from Awake Illinois, May 20, 2026, submitted by the Honorable Mark Harris, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of North Carolina, for the record

Materials submitted by the Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Maryland, for the record

An article entitled, “‘We Knew They were Paying Informants’: SPLC Donors Reject Trump DOJ Fraud Claims,” Apr. 24, 2026, *The Intercept*

A letter to Members of Congress, from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and coalition of other organizations, May 20, 2026

A statement entitled, “Campaign Legal Center Responds to Attacks on Civil Rights Organization” from Trevor Potter, Campaign Legal Center, May 20, 2026

An article entitled, “US lawmakers say DOJ rushed Southern Poverty Law Center indictment, citing whistleblower,” May 1, 2026, *The Guardian*

A letter to Aakash Singh, Associate Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, from the Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Maryland, and the Honorable Mary Gay Scanlon, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Pennsylvania, Apr. 30, 2026

An article entitled, “Massacre at Pittsburgh Synagogue Tied to Anti-Refugee Sentiment,” Oct. 29, 2018, *American Immigration Council*

An article entitled, “Buffalo Shooter’s Manifesto Promotes ‘Great Replacement,’ Theory, Antisemitism and Previous Mass Shooters,” May 14, 2022, *Anti-Defamation League (ADL)*

An article entitled, “What’s a ‘Black Job’? Trump’s Anti-Immigration Remarks Are Met With Derision,” Jun. 28, 2024, *The New York Times*

An article entitled, “Walmart gunman attacked El Paso ‘because that’s what his president was telling him,’ defense attorney says,” *El Paso Matters*

Materials submitted by the Honorable Lucy McBath, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Georgia, for the record

An article entitled, “Justice Department moves to toss seditious conspiracy convictions of Oath Keepers and Proud Boys,” Apr. 15, 2026, *AP News*

An article entitled, “Several TN House Democrats stripped from committees after last week’s special session,” May 13, 2026, *Local 3 News*

Materials submitted by the Honorable Jefferson Van Drew, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of New Jersey, for the record

An article entitled, “SPLC Exposed: After years of targeting Moms for Liberty, and many others, justice could be on the way,” *Moms for Liberty*

An article entitled, “Opinion | Democrats Beclown Themselves by Defending SPLC Amid KKK Funding Scandal,” Apr. 23, 2026, *Daily Signal*

An article entitled, “Opinion | However Bad You Think Biden’s DOJ Was, New Documents Show It Was Even Worse,” Oct. 12, 2025, *Daily Signal*

Materials submitted by the Honorable Mary Gay Scanlon, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Pennsylvania, for the record

An article entitled, “Leaked Stephen Miller emails show Trump’s point man on immigration promoted white nationalism, SPLC reports,” Nov. 13, 2019, *The Washington Post*

A Presidential Memoranda entitled, “Countering Domestic Terrorism and Organized Political Violence,” Sept. 25, 2025, *The White House*

An article entitled, “The Justice Department Sides With the Ku Klux Klan,” Apr. 23, 2026, *The New Republic*

An article entitled, “Big Finance Might Be Dooming the SPLC—Even Before Its Day in Court,” May 8, 2026, *The Intercept*

Materials submitted by the Honorable Sydney Kamlager-Dove, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of California, for the record

An article entitled, “Todd Blanche tells appropriators payouts for Jan. 6 rioters are possible,” May 19, 2026, *Politico*

An article entitled, “What we know about the San Diego shooting victims, suspects, possible motive and more,” May 19, 2026, *NBC News*

An article entitled, “Multiple Republicans in Congress post openly anti-Muslim statements,” Mar 13, 2026, *NBC News*

An article entitled, “The Second Wave: Return of the Militias,” Aug. 1, 2009, *Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)*

An article entitled, “Pentagon Tightens Ban on Supremacist Activity After Years of Denying Problem,” Apr 13, 2010, *Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)*

An article entitled, “DOJ lawsuit a ‘wake-up call’ to end Mississippi’s school-to-prison pipeline,” Oct. 25, 2012, *Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)*

An article entitled, “SPLC Report Reveals the High Price of Florida’s Incarceration of Black Children,” Sept. 30, 2024, *Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)*

An article entitled, “Fifth Circuit Rules Against Unlawful Debt Collections Targeting Hurricane Katrina Survivors,” Apr. 3, 2024, *Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)*

A report entitled, “Overcoming the Unprecedented: Southern Voters’ Battle Against Voter Suppression, Intimidation, and a Virus,” Mar. 16, 2021, *Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)*

An article entitled, “SPLC Announces New Campaign, Poverty Is Not a Line, During Poverty Awareness Month,” Jan 13, 2026, *Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)*

An article entitled, “The United States of Political Violence,” Nov. 4, 2022, *Politico*

An article entitled, “Right-wing extremist violence is more frequent and more deadly than left-wing violence—what the data shows,” Sept. 17, 2025, *The Conversation*

An article entitled, “The Black Jobs Deficit Cost Black America \$87 Billion in 2025,” Jan. 14, 2026, *Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR)*

An article entitled, “Black People’s Responses To Trump’s Notion Of ‘Black Jobs,’” Jun. 29, 2024, *Forbes*

An article entitled, “The ‘Both Sides’ Political Violence Narrative Completely Debunked: They Cooked the Books,” Apr. 30, 2026, *LifeZette*, submitted by the Honorable Harriet M. Hageman, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Wyoming, for the record

VI

Page

A letter to Kevin P. Davidson, Acting United States Attorney, from Addy Schmitt, Kropf Moseley Schmitt, Apr. 17, 2026, submitted by the Honorable Daniel S. Goldman, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of New York, for the record

APPENDIX

A grade sheet from Charity Watch regarding the Southern Poverty Law Center, submitted by the Honorable Andy Biggs, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Arizona, for the record

An article entitled, "DOJ quietly removes study showing right wing attacks 'outpace' those by the left," *The Hill*, submitted by the Honorable Mary Gay Scanlon, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Pennsylvania, for the record

An article entitled, "The United States of Political Violence," Nov. 4, 2022, *Time Magazine*, submitted by the Honorable Sydney Kamlager-Dove, a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of California, for the record

VOTES

RC 1, Motion to table, Ayes: 18; Nays: 17

THE SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER: MANUFACTURING HATE

Wednesday, May 20, 2026

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Washington, DC

The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, the Hon. Jim Jordan [Chair of the Committee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Jordan, Issa, Biggs, McClintock, Tiffany, Massie, Roy, Fitzgerald, Cline, Gooden, Van Drew, Nehls, Moore, Kiley, Hageman, Lee, Hunt, Fry, Grothman, Knott, Harris, Onder, Schmidt, Gill, Baumgartner, Raskin, Nadler, Lofgren, Cohen, Johnson, Swalwell, Lieu, Jayapal, Correa, Scanlon, Neguse, McBath, Ross, Balint, Garcia, Kamlager-Dove, Moskowitz, Goldman, and Crockett.

Chair JORDAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Nehls, to lead us all into the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NEHLS. Please stand and join me in honoring our Nation's flag.

ALL. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. NEHLS. Thank you.

Chair JORDAN. I thank you, sir, for leading us. We will begin with opening statements. The Chair is recognized for an opening statement.

They call them field sources. Individuals that the Southern Property Law Center pay to gin up hate, the very hate that they told their supporters they were fighting. Field source No. 37, F-37 coordinated transportation and attended the 2017 rally in Charlottesville. The Southern Property Law Center paid him \$270,000. It is \$270,000 to the guy who helped put together the event where a young lady was killed. Field source No. 9, he got \$1 million over nine years. F-unknown, we don't know what number this guy was. We do know he was the Imperial Wizard of the Klan, whatever that means. He was on the Southern Poverty Law Center payroll. F-27, the Southern Poverty Law Center paid him \$300,000 in six years. What did he do? He ran the Aryan Nation Motorcycle Club. F-43, he was President of some crazy group, and he was previously convicted of cross-burning. The Southern Poverty Law Center thought he was worth \$19,000 of their donor's money.

All told \$3 million, \$3 million to manufacture hate. Remember when Rahm Emanuel said, “never let a crisis go to waste.” The SPLC took it a step further. They went one better. They said, “we are going to create the crisis. We are going to manufacture the crisis.” By so doing, they became the standard, “the source” for determining who is a hate group and who isn’t.

Of course, they labeled good profamily organizations, conservative organizations, hate groups, like the Family Research Council, who is with us today, like Moms for Liberty, like Turning Point USA. Even the Alliance Defending Freedom has argued numerous cases, won numerous cases in front of the Supreme Court. They labeled them all hate groups.

Not Jane’s Revenge, nope. Even though Jane’s Revenge firebombed and vandalized churches, crisis pregnancy centers in the aftermath of the *Dobbs* decision, they never made the Southern Poverty Law Center’s list.

The Biden Administration, they helped make the SPLC the standard. They consulted with the Southern Poverty Law Center. They had quarterly meetings with them. Lisa Monaco, the Deputy Attorney General, the lady who runs the Justice Department during the Biden Administration, had quarterly meetings with the Southern Poverty Law Center. They gave the SPLC first look at FBI data, and they used them to train their prosecutors.

It all paid off. It all paid off. Just asked Mark Houck, what happens when you train the prosecutors? They kicked in his door at six in the morning in front of him and his seven kids and arrested him. Of course, the jury found him not guilty. They couldn’t just go talk to him even though his lawyer said, “he will meet you wherever. Come, we will meet you in the courtroom.” Nope. Kick in his door, harass him in front of his wife and family.

On January 23, 2023, the now famous memorandum from the Richmond FBI field office. We know how it paid off, because in that memorandum, they cite the Southern Poverty Law Center as the source. Of course, that memo says, if you are a prolife Catholic, well, you are an extremist, you are dangerous.

Yeah, the SPLC became part of the weaponized effort of the Garland/Biden Justice Department against the American people. Now, here is what is interesting, the Biden DOJ knew all about it.

They had opened an investigation. They were looking into this group. They knew the Southern Poverty Law Center was running a scam, but they dropped the case. They dropped the case, because when you meet with them, consult with them, have them train your prosecutors, well, guess what? You are not going to prosecute them. Nope, you are not going to prosecute them. They are too valuable politically. You have got to use them for your political advantage.

That is exactly what the Biden Administration did. Here is the scariest part of all, it worked. Field source 37, again, he was the first one I mentioned. He was part of the planning group for the Charlottesville rally. He was paid to coordinate transportation. He was paid to attend.

After the event, again, after the event where a young lady is killed, the Southern Poverty Law Center almost tripled their income. It all worked. They went from \$51 million annual income to

\$133 million. Turned out for them, creating hate was more profitable than fighting it. That is exactly what they did. They ran a scam. They became the standard and, they didn't get prosecuted and they made a ton of money. They made a ton of money.

They are sitting on \$800 million in assets, \$700 million endowment fund, such a deal. Such a deal. Here is the good news, because there is some good news. Here is the good news. President Trump got elected. Todd Blanche is Attorney General, Kash Patel is the FBI Director, and guess what? They are prosecuting these guys for running a scam, ripping off their donors, falsely labeling all kinds of good organizations like the Family Research Council, Moms for Liberty, Alliance Defending Freedom, falsely labeling them hate groups, but they got caught. Thank goodness they did.

I want to commend the Attorney General and the work he has done, the FBI. Most importantly, President Trump for being the guy who put these guys in those positions. We look forward to hearing from our witnesses today.

This is something, and we look forward to bringing in the head of the Southern Private Law Center. We are in discussions with them about having, we wanted him here today, he couldn't make it. We are working on it, and we will do whatever it takes to get him on that witness stand to answer our questions about the scam that they run, the lies they told, and the things they did.

With that, I yield to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Welcome to all our witnesses.

For decades, the Southern Poverty Law Center shared information about racist terror plots with the FBI, gleaned from their informant program. The FBI was happy to receive it and this practice frequently led to the disruption of dangerous conspiracies by the KKK and neo-Nazi groups to commit violence against synagogues, churches, African Americans, Jews, and other targeted minorities.

Why is the Department of Justice under Trump and Todd Blanche now prosecuting the Southern Poverty Law Center? The DOJ says that the SPLC defrauded its donors by paying undercover informants to infiltrate and collect intelligence on these racist groups.

Where are all the donors complaining about having been defrauded? Where is the evidence of the fraud? Where are the civil lawsuits that always follow in the wake of a fraud, a scam, or rip off?

The DOJ has offered no evidence that anyone was actually deceived or defrauded by this perfectly lawful, well-known, and accepted practice that the FBI itself approved of for many years. Using informants and undercover agents was indeed the basis for the FBI's own efforts to investigate racist extremist groups when that was a priority, before the targets of the FBI became instead the perceived political foes of Donald Trump.

In fact, what its donors love about the Southern Poverty Law Center, is how effective it has been getting on the inside of extremely dangerous racial terrorist groups, to find out what is going on to try to stop the reign of terror of bombings, assaults, lynching,

and arson, the violent price of White supremacy that goes back centuries in our country.

Why are there no civil fraud lawsuits? Why has no one sued the Southern Poverty Law Center? From my experience as a former State Assistant Attorney General and a Congressman who deals with constituents who get defrauded frequently, and now I am the Cochair of the bipartisan Stop the Scams Caucus, I can assure you that victims of fraud are usually enraged, after a period of being embarrassed, and they come forward to complain and to sue the fraudsters.

What does a real fraud case look like? How do the victims respond? Well, let's take this well-known long-running fraud case called Trump University, which was shut down by the New York Attorney General's office when it determined that Trump University was systematically deceiving and ripping off its students, and cheating them of a real education they paid for.

Over 8,000 swindled students brought three different class action lawsuits that were certified by the courts against Trump. They tried for years to recover the lost tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars in tuition for a completely bogus education. They finally won a massive settlement for \$25 million. That was more than 8,000 desperate young people who told their stories to the world.

To my knowledge, there is not a single donor to the Southern Poverty Law Center who has come forward to say that he or she was defrauded, much less thousands of them. They have many thousands of donors.

Everybody can see what is happening with this outrageous, scandalous prosecution in Alabama, an outrageous scandalous persecution here on Capitol Hill. If anyone has flipped sides to join the racist extremists, it is not the SPLC, it is the FBI itself. If a fraud is being perpetrated on the public right now, it is not an SPLC fraud. SPLC has been an enemy of the Klan and neo-Nazi groups for more than a half century. It has been unswerving and steadfast, which is why their offices were bombed, and why they get an unending stream of violent death threats, something which makes this prosecution and persecution all the more appalling.

No, what we are witnessing, is a Trump Administration fraud on a vast and shocking scale. President Trump has coddled and cultivated the extreme right for as long as he has been in politics. After the infamous Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville in August 2017, when Neo-Nazis marched on a synagogue and the University of Virginia chanting, Jews will not replace us, when a homicidal extremist drove his car into peaceful counter-protestors and killed Heather Heyer, Trump could only bring himself to say that there were some very fine people on both sides.

In 2020, when he was directly asked in a nationally televised Presidential debate to condemn White supremacists, he told the Proud Boys to stand back and stand by, which they immediately adopted as their official motto and emblazoned on their T-shirts.

In office, the Trump Administration has dismantled the antidomestic terror infrastructure at the FBI, at DOJ, at the Department of Homeland Security, constantly shifting resources away from monitoring racially motivated violent extremism into immigration enforcement.

He has gutted the Civil Rights Division, which is charged with prosecuting hate crimes. Defunded the Center for Prevention Programs and Partnerships, which had helped prevent more than a thousand violent terror plots since 2020, and installed a 22-year-old with zero national security experience, except for model United Nations his junior year of college, to run what remains of our terrorism prevention office.

He has redirected the Civil Rights Division to focus on so-called antiwhite discrimination, instead of the actual hate crimes devastating communities across America. He fired the Federal prosecutors and FBI agents who investigated and convicted the extremists who attacked the Capitol on January 6, 2021. Just this month, the Trump Administration released a new national counterterrorist strategy that literally erases Right-wing violent extremism from the record. The strategy identifies drug cartels, Islamist terror, and violent Left-wing extremists as the Nation's top threats.

Makes no mention whatsoever of far-Right extremism, White supremacist violence, or domestic neo-Nazi terror. This despite a decade of data from the nonpartisan Center for Strategic and International Studies showing that Right-wing extremists carried out 152 attacks in the United States and killed Americans, compared with 35 attacks and 13 deaths attributed to Left-wing extremists.

Again, he just blames his enemies for what his side is doing. Trump's real relationship to the extreme Right was on full display January 6, 2021, when the Proud Boys, Oath Keepers, and Three Percenters, all in Roger Stone's sphere of influence, led the violent assault on the Capitol and our police force, as Trump exhorted a crowd of thousands to go out and fight and fight like hell or you won't have a country anymore.

That mob not only chanted hang Mike Pence, referring to Donald Trump's then Vice President, and tried to shutdown the peaceful transfer of power for the first time in American history, but brutally assaulted our police, wounding, injuring, disfiguring, and disabling more than 150 officers, terminating many careers in the process.

What has President Trump done to support, praise, or even just thank the police officers who saved Members of the House and Senate and his own Vice President from the rampaging mob he had incited? Nothing.

What has he done to help Sergeant Gonnell, whose brutal injuries forced him to retire from the Capitol Force? Nothing.

What has he done to help Officer Harry Dunn, who was taunted with racial slurs throughout the day of January 6th? Nothing.

Officer Michael Fanone, who wasn't even on duty, but came down to join his brothers and sisters in the blue to defend our democracy and was nearly ripped to shreds by the mob and had a heart attack. What has he done for him and his family? Nothing.

No, Trump praises the J6 criminals, calling them heroes, martyrs, patriots, even hostages. He pardoned and commuted the sentences of more than 1,500 of them on his first day in office. Both the violent felons who attacked our officers with Confederate battle flags, baseball bats, and steel pipes, and the organizers behind the scenes who were convicted of seditious conspiracy, the deliberate

and coordinated effort to put down and overthrow the government of the United States.

Trump wasn't interested in the specific criminal backgrounds of any of the criminals he pardoned, whether they were child abusers, armed robbers, or drug traffickers. Nor was he interested in whether they had shown any contrition or remorse for the worst mob attack on the Capitol and the police in the history of the Capitol city. Nor was he interested in whether they paid off their fines or restitution for the millions of dollars in damages inflicted. He just pardoned them all en masse, overriding the pardon attorney in the DOJ, and liberating his private militia from jail.

Many of these pardoned convicts have already gone out to commit more crimes since Trump let them out. Take, for example, Andrew Paul Johnson, who Trump let out of jail and then promptly went out and sexually attacked and molested two 12-year-old children, one boy and one girl. He is now back in prison for life. Trump's stupid, blundering decisionmaking, forever altered the lives of those children.

Oh, by the way, last year Andrew Paul Johnson, in a desperate bid to get these children not to turn him into the police, told them that because he had stormed the Capitol on January 6th, he was going to be "awarded \$10 million for his work and would be able to split the money with them if they agreed not to talk to the police."

Now, that brings us to the real fraud underway this week. Donald Trump has withdrawn his bogus \$10 billion lawsuit against the IRS, because the Judge in the case, Kathleen Williams, doubted there was even a case or controversy and whether Trump had proper standing to bring it.

There was clearly no adverse relationship between Trump and the IRS. In any event, he withdrew it. He knew he was going to lose. Now, Trump is claiming that he and IRS have a so-called settlement, which is not possible, because the case was dismissed. This fraudulent settlement involves not only an agreement by the IRS and the DOJ not to investigate or prosecute him, his family, and his businesses forever for tax frauds that he may have committed in the past, but the establishment of a \$1.776 billion political slush fund in the DOJ called the antiweaponization fund that will be used to reward his friends and foot soldiers.

This is lawless. To begin with, Trump doesn't establish Federal programs and appropriate money for them. We do that. That is the power of the purse, which belongs exclusively to Congress. We never set up this political slush fund to be ran out of the DOJ, and we never would. We have a judicial system to hear authentic cases and controversies.

Not a single J6er has had charges thrown out because of a false, malicious, or retaliatory prosecution. Not a single one has had their criminal conviction reversed on appeal because of a false, malicious, or retaliatory prosecution.

The idea that they were falsely or maliciously prosecuted, has not been found by a single judge, Republican, Democratic, or independent appointee. This is a defamatory slur on law enforcement and the serious civil servants at the DOJ who have been under at-

tack since this nightmare of MAGA weaponization began in January of last year.

False, malicious, and retaliatory prosecutions are how Donald Trump and his DOJ operate, not real law enforcement, not real prosecutors. We would never set up a political slush fund to compensate the J6ers for their imaginary injuries, because it is blatantly unconstitutional.

Section IV of the 14th Amendment, which I commend to all my colleagues, it is in the Constitution, provides that the United States shall not assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States. All such debts, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Everybody who thinks they are getting a big payoff this week, \$1 million per J6er, is the word on the street, should understand this, this payment is illegal and void. Meaning that the money belongs only to the taxpayers of America, the people of the United States. We will get that money back if any insurrectionist gets any.

My friends, the Southern Poverty Law Center is not perpetuating fraud. Today the Trump Administration is perpetuating a fraud against America by taking nearly \$1.8 billion of our money from the U.S. Judgment Fund for the payment of actual court judgments and damages, and without any legal authorization from Congress, purporting to use it to pay off his once and future private militia.

No one is fooled by all the counterfeit outrage about the SPLC and finger pointing at the people who have actually been combating violent racism in America. Mr. Chair, the threat is not the SPLC. The real fraud is coming from the White House. Just yesterday, *The New York Times* reported that the career lawyers and the IRS Chief Counsel's office believe that Donald Trump's lawsuit is deeply flawed and could be easily defeated.

They drafted a memo advising the DOJ to dismiss it. Of course, instead, the DOJ entered into the \$1.8 billion settlement instead. The General Counsel for the Treasury Department, Brian Morrissey, the top lawyer, resigned on the same day this settlement was announced. We have got many questions for everybody involved in this brazen and corrupt transaction.

Mr. Chair, pursuant to Clause 2K(6) of Rule 11, I move that the Committee now immediately subpoena those involved in the creation or execution of the nearly \$1.8 billion slush fund, Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward, Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent, IRS Chief Executive Officer Frank Bisignano, and Treasury Department General Counsel Brian Morrissey. Mr. Blanche orchestrated this outrageous slush fund as part of the settlement with Donald Trump, which was also signed by Mr. Woodward. Mr. Bessett will oversee the payout of these funds.

Mr. Bisignano signed off on this settlement for the IRS, and Brian Morrissey remarkably resigned as this deal was being announced. These individuals all possess critical insights into Trump's self-dealing scheme with his own agencies, to create this fund and reward his supporters and friends.

I move that they be subpoenaed right now.

Ms. SCANLON. I second.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman has not been recognized for that purpose. We will hold any motions to subpoena in abeyance until the conclusion of today's hearing.

Without objection, all the opening statements will be included in the record. We will introduce today's witnesses.

We are pleased to have with us Dr. Carol Swain.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I just want to request a recorded vote on that, if that is all right.

Chair JORDAN. Well, we will do that when it is time for that. It is not time for that now, and we are holding it in abeyance.

Dr. Swain is an author and former Professor at Princeton University and Vanderbilt University. She has served on various government commissions, including the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Tennessee Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. She graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Roanoke College, and received a master's degree from Yale, and her Ph.D. from North Carolina.

Mr. Tyler O'Neil is a Senior Editor at *The Daily Signal*, where his reporting focuses on nonprofit organizations. He previously was an editor at *PJ Media* and *Fox News* and is the author of two books.

Mr. Tony Perkins is the President of the Family Research Council, a nonprofit organization that advocates for family centered policies. He is an ordained minister and previously served as the Chair and Vice Chair of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. Mr. Perkins has also previously served as a member of the Louisiana House of Representatives.

Ms. Maya Wiley is the President and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. She previously served in the Civil Division of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York and worked at the ACLU and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

We welcome our today's witnesses and thank them for appearing today. If you all please stand, we will begin by swearing you in.

Raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm under penalty of perjury that the testimony you are about to give is true and correct to the best of your knowledge, information, and belief so help you God?

[Affirmative response.]

Chair JORDAN. Let the record reflect that the witnesses have answered in the affirmative. Thank you and you can be seated. Please know that your written testimony will be entered into the record in its entirety. Accordingly, we ask that you summarize your testimony in five minutes.

We will start with Dr. Swain. Just make sure you hit the microphone and hit that button and try to stay as close to five as you can, although I won't cut you off right at five. After all, we gave Mr. Raskin 15, so.

TESTIMONY OF DR. CAROL M. SWAIN

Dr. SWAIN. Good morning. Chair, Ranking Member, and the distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify today on this very important subject.

I am Dr. Carol M. Swain, a former tenured Professor of Political Science and Law at Vanderbilt, and I was also tenured at Princeton. I am a woman who rose from rural poverty in Southwest Virginia, earned five degrees, and built a career as a scholar of race, politics, and representation.

My 1993 book, "Black Faces, Black Interests," won three national awards and was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court. Starting in 2009, I became the target of a sustained smear campaign by the Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization once respected for fighting real hate, but which, I believe, has become a weapon against conservatives, Christians, and dissenting voices.

In September 2009, I found myself in the SPLC's crosshairs after I published an article in the *Huffington Post* titled, "Mission Creep and the Southern Poverty Law Center's Misguided Focus."

I argued that the SPLC had drifted from its original mission of monitoring genuine hate groups such as the KKK and the Neo-Nazis, toward targeting mainstream conservatives, immigration reformers, and anyone challenging progressive ideas on race and immigration.

I specifically criticized the SPLC's attacks on figures like Lou Dobbs and organizations like the Center for Immigration Studies. I concluded my article with the line, "rather than monitoring hate groups, the Southern Poverty Law Center has become one."

Within weeks of my article, the Southern Poverty Law Center retaliated. In October 2009, SPLC spokesman Mark Potok publicly labeled me as an apologist for White supremacists.

This stemmed from my endorsement of a documentary film, "A Conversation About Race," directed by Craig Bodeker," which I recommended for classroom use, because it offered perspectives rarely heard on university campuses.

This attack on me was not an isolated incident. The Southern Poverty Law Center has used guilt by association, cherry-picked quotes, and fabrications to damage and destroy reputations and organizations. There was long-term professional harm to me. Offers from other universities dried up. Speaking opportunities declined. I became kryptonite in certain academic and media circles.

My experiences with the Southern Poverty Law Center exposed a powerful tax-exempt organization with enormous influence over media, corporations, law enforcement, and government that can chill speech and academic freedom without any meaningful accountability.

The Southern Poverty Law Center's tactics, the mission creep, because it has lost sight of its original purpose, guilt by association, weaponized hate labels have broader consequences. They distort public discourse and equate policy disagreements with bigotry. They influence tech companies, public and private schools, and Federal agencies in ways that marginalize conservative and religious voices. Their smear tactics undermine individuals and organizations that are fighting for the public good.

I urge this Committee to examine the Southern Poverty Law Center's practices, its financial operations, its influence on government partnerships, and the lack of transparency and accountability surrounding its hate group designations.

Real civil rights work, real civil rights work, real civil rights work, require truth telling, not retaliation against scholars who challenge orthodoxies, and certainly not the alleged financing of the hate the organization claims to fight.

I hope Congress will deal with the Southern Poverty Law Center appropriately. Both political parties need to address this. This is a bipartisan issue. They should use all available means to hold this organization accountable, as you do, or as you proclaim to do, with other organizations. Let's hold everyone to the same standard.

Thank you for your time and I will be ready to answer questions at the appropriate time.

[The testimony of Dr. Swain follows:]

Congressional Testimony**Dr. Carol M. Swain****Prepared Statement for House Judiciary Congressional Hearing on The Weaponization of “Hate” Labels and the Influence of the Southern Poverty Law Center****Date: May 19, 2026**

Chairman, Ranking Member, and distinguished Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I am Dr. Carol M. Swain, a former tenured professor of political science and law at Vanderbilt University. I am a woman who rose from rural poverty in southwest Virginia, earned five degrees, and built a career as a scholar of race, politics, and representation. My 1993 book *Black Faces, Black Interests* won national awards and was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court. Yet, starting in 2009, I became the target of a sustained smear campaign by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) — an organization once respected for fighting real hate but which I believe has become a weapon against conservatives, Christians, and dissenting voices.

In September 2009, I found myself in the SPLC’s crosshairs after I published an article in the *Huffington Post* titled “Mission Creep and the Southern Poverty Law Center’s Misguided Focus.”

I argued that the SPLC had drifted from its original mission of monitoring genuine hate groups — such as the Ku Klux Klan and neo-Nazis — toward targeting mainstream conservatives, immigration reformers, and anyone challenging progressive orthodoxy on race and immigration. I specifically criticized the SPLC’s attacks on figures like Lou Dobbs and organizations like the Center for Immigration Studies. I concluded: “Rather than monitoring hate groups, the Southern Poverty Law Center has become one.”

Retaliation: The Smear Campaign

Within weeks of my article, the SPLC retaliated. In October 2009, SPLC spokesman Mark Potok publicly labeled me an “apologist for white supremacists.” This stemmed from my endorsement of the documentary *A Conversation About Race* (directed by Craig Bodeker), which I recommended for classroom use because it offered perspectives rarely heard on university campuses and could spark productive debate. My photo appeared on the front page of *The Tennessean* with Potok’s quote. Potok’s justification for attacking me was

based on racist comments that Mr. Bodeker had allegedly made at some point in his life. The story went viral.

The attack on me was not an isolated incident. The SPLC has used guilt by association, cherry-picked quotes, and fabrications to damage reputations and organizations.

Crucial Early Support

At a time when I had very few resources to fight back and mainstream outlets were silent, James Taranto's October 26, 2009, *Wall Street Journal* article "In Defense of Carol Swain" was one of the first major pieces to present my side of the story. Taranto directly challenged the SPLC's smear tactics and helped bring national attention to its unfair attack on a prominent black scholar. Taranto's piece was a lifeline that allowed my perspective to reach a broader audience when institutional power was stacked against me.

Long-Term Professional Harm

In my September 11, 2017, *Wall Street Journal* op-ed, "What It's Like to Be Smeared by the Southern Poverty Law Center," I detailed the real-world consequences. Offers from other universities dried up. Speaking opportunities declined. I became "kryptonite" in certain academic and media circles. Being called an apologist for white supremacy was particularly damaging — it undermined my credibility on race issues and isolated me from institutions that might otherwise have valued my perspective.

The SPLC seems to focus its arrows on groups and individuals who are outspoken advocates of traditional family values as well as the rule of law. My experiences with them have exposed how a powerful, tax-exempt organization with enormous influence over media, corporations, law enforcement, and government can chill free speech and academic freedom without any meaningful accountability for its actions. Hopefully, that will change.

Broader Implications

The SPLC's tactics — mission creep, guilt by association, and weaponized "hate" labels — have broader consequences. They distort public discourse and equate policy disagreements with bigotry. They influence tech companies, public and private schools, and federal agencies in ways that marginalize conservative and religious voices. Their smear tactics undermine individuals and organizations that are fighting for the public good. Individual targets have included Dr. Benjamin Carson and Dr. Charles Murray, among others. Targeted organizations include Alliance Defending Freedom, Liberty Counsel, Focus on the Family, D. James Kennedy Ministries, and many others.

The SPLC smears institutions and individuals with the label of hate group that are not aligned with its progressive agenda. Its mission creep has now been dramatically exposed.

Decades ago, the SPLC could have declared victory after having helped stamp out the virulent hate groups it once targeted — such as the Ku Klux Klan and Aryan Nations. However, it became a victim of its own success. Its continued existence and massive fundraising apparatus required an endless number of new bogeymen. Legitimate mainstream groups were smeared. We are here today because of the revelation that the SPLC secretly financed leaders of the kinds of groups it once sought to dismantle.

I urge this Committee to examine the SPLC's practices, its financial operations, its influence on government partnerships, and the lack of transparency and accountability surrounding its "hate group" designations. Real civil rights work requires truth-telling, not retaliation against scholars who challenge orthodoxies — and certainly not the alleged financing of the hate the organization claims to fight. I hope Congress will deal with the SPLC appropriately, using all available means to hold accountable this once-vital institution.

Thank you for your time. I stand ready to answer questions and provide any additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Carol M. Swain

May 19, 2026

Citations / Sources

1. Carol M. Swain, "Mission Creep and the Southern Poverty Law Center's Misguided Focus," *Huffington Post*, September 10, 2009. (PDF archive: https://splcexposed.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Swain_SPLC-and-Mission-Creep_Huffington-Post_2009.08.10.pdf)
2. Carol M. Swain, "Guilt by Association: The Southern Poverty Law Center Hurls a Punch," *Huffington Post*, March 18, 2010.
3. Mark Potok (SPLC), quoted in *The Tennessean*, October 17, 2009 (front-page story labeling Dr. Swain an "apologist for white supremacists").
4. James Taranto, "In Defense of Carol Swain," *The Wall Street Journal*, October 26, 2009. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704335904574496250622719022>
5. Carol M. Swain, "What It's Like to Be Smeared by the Southern Poverty Law Center," *The Wall Street Journal*, September 11, 2017. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/what-its-like-to-be-smeared-by-the-southern-poverty-law-center-1505171221>
6. Mark Potok, "After Debate With SPLC, a Professor Offers a Bizarre Take," SPLC Hatewatch, February 24, 2012.
7. U.S. Department of Justice, "Federal Grand Jury Charges Southern Poverty Law Center for Wire Fraud, False Statements, and Conspiracy to Commit Money Laundering," April 21, 2026. <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/federal-grand-jury-charges-southern-poverty-law-center-wire-fraud-false-statements-and>

Chair JORDAN. Thank you, Doctor. Mr. Perkins, you are now recognized for five minutes.

TESTIMONY OF TONY PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Chair Jordan, Ranking Member Raskin, and the Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify. I am Tony Perkins. I have served as the President of the Family Research Council here in Washington since 2003.

Americans once associated Southern Poverty Law Center with fighting the Ku Klux Klan during the civil rights era. That reputation gave the SPLC enormous moral credibility.

In November 2010, SPLC shifted its focus beyond violent groups, and began targeting Christian organizations opposing efforts to redefine marriage and human sexuality. Family Research Council was among the most prominent of that first wave.

In August 2012, FRC joined Governor Mike Huckabee in supporting Chick-fil-A Appreciation Day after the company was boycotted because its leadership publicly affirmed traditional marriage.

Two weeks later, on August 15th, LGBT activist Floyd Corkins entered FRC headquarters, carrying a 9 mm pistol, 50 rounds of ammunition, and 15 Chick-fil-A sandwiches.

According to his later confession, his intent was to kill as many as possible and stuff the sandwiches into our mouths. As he entered the building and pulled the gun out of his backpack, our building manager, Leo Johnson, confronted him.

Though seriously wounded, Leo stopped the attacker and prevented a mass casualty event. After multiple surgeries and months of rehabilitation, Leo returned to work and remains today affectionately known as Leo the Hero. He is here with us today. Leo, thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. The following day, investigators confirmed Corkins confessed to selecting FRC, because of SPLC's website and hate map.

Following the attack, FRC appealed publicly, privately to SPLC to remove mainstream Christian organizations from its inflammatory classifications. Those requests were rejected. The attack has cost FRC more than \$6 million in security related costs. The costs extend way beyond one act of violence.

SPLC's intelligence project and associated labels became deeply influential on banks, payment processors, and technology companies, increasingly relied on SPLC classifications to decide which organizations could maintain accounts, process transactions, and operate online.

Around 2016, the SPLC began pressuring financial corporations and technology companies to deplatform and defund organizations that it labeled extremists. Then, came Charlottesville. According to the recent Federal indictment, a member of the online leadership that planned Unite the Right rally in the direction of the SPLC, and helped coordinate transportation for attendees, was bankrolled by SPLC.

Charlottesville, don't miss this, Charlottesville was a catalytic event for SPLC. As major corporations like Apple, JP Morgan Chase aligned with SPLC contributing millions of dollars.

Shortly afterwards, the coalition known as Change the Terms was formed led by SPLC and the Center for American Progress, establishing standards that would encourage companies to deny digital access and financial infrastructure to organizations that SPLC labeled.

The timeline of Change the Terms closely parallels the acceleration of the efforts to debank and deplatform conservatives. FRC experiences from Truist Financial, B&B, BB&T, Fidelity Investments, GuideStar, mobile calls, and other technology related companies.

The SPLC officials openly acknowledged this strategy before Congress. In January 2020, SPLC official Lecia Brooks stated this, "we have lobbied internet companies one by one. A key part of this strategy has been to target these organization's funding." Brooks continued to describe the coordinated effort to pressure technology companies and financial institutions to restrict access for organizations SPLC opposed.

This Committee, the issue before this Committee is larger than SPLC fraud. SPLC was the hub, but there are many spokes that made up this wheel designed to crush Christians and conservatives.

The Congressional inquiry should not stop with SPLC. In America, citizens should not lose banking services, digital platforms, public credibility, and a sense of safety, because they believe in biblical marriage and sexuality.

When government related or regulated institutions can apply ideological labels in a coordinated fashion to silence, isolate, and financially cripple opponents, we have political targeting by proxy, and freedom is at risk.

[The testimony of Mr. Perkins follows:]



**Written Testimony of Tony Perkins
President, Family Research Council**

**Before the U.S. House Judiciary Committee
“The Southern Poverty Law Center: Manufacturing Hate”**

May 20, 2026

Chairman Jordan, Ranking Member Raskin, and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

My name is Tony Perkins, and I serve as president of Family Research Council (FRC) in Washington, D.C., a position that I have held since 2003.

The Indictment Beneath the Indictment

When federal prosecutors finally brought down Al Capone, it was not for murder, extortion, racketeering, or the violence that defined his criminal empire. It was for tax evasion.

The charge was real. The conviction was legitimate. But no serious student of history believes tax evasion told the whole story of Capone’s criminal empire. It was simply the charge prosecutors believed they could most readily prove.

Today, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) stands federally indicted on charges involving bank fraud, wire fraud, and money laundering.

Those charges are serious. However, for those familiar with the SPLC’s destructive actions, the indictment is just the tip of the iceberg of what appears to have been a much broader system of coordinated influence and institutional coercion.

First, I want to commend the FBI and the Department of Justice for their investigation and indictment.

For many years, the SPLC has been the Left’s vanguard in their attack on conservative organizations that stood in their way. But with this indictment, cowardly corporate figures who once kowtowed to the SPLC are starting to speak out. As a result, we are gaining new insights.

However, there are several realities to consider.

When it realized that traditional hate organizations like the Ku Klux Klan were drying up, the SPLC adjusted its business model by appointing itself the national arbiter of “hate.” Leveraging

Family Research Council

801 G Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20001 | frc.org | (202) 393-2100

its storied reputation from the civil rights era, the SPLC expanded its targets far beyond violent extremist groups.

The first reality we need to understand is this: although the indictment focused on the SPLC's money-raising scheme, the SPLC's real focus was its institutional influence on government, media, and corporate America. Its goal? Silencing and intimidating decent Americans who disagreed with its dystopian, racist vision for America.

Over time, the SPLC's hate and extremist classifications evolved into far more than media narratives. Its labels increasingly became a form of reputational risk assessment used by banks, payment processors, technology companies, financial compliance systems, law enforcement, media organizations, and even elements of the federal government.¹ The SPLC became embedded into the architecture of America's charitable giving financial system as a bad cop.

The jewel of the SPLC operation was its Intelligence Project, which became deeply influential as government bodies, media, and financial institutions used its biased data to determine which organizations were acceptable participants in the financial and digital marketplace.

In November 2010, the SPLC placed its first wave of Christian organizations on its hate list and hate map, with Family Research Council being one of the most prominent.²

In August 2012, a gunman entered FRC's headquarters in Washington, D.C., intending to carry out a mass shooting. He shot our building manager before being disarmed. He carried nearly 100 rounds of ammunition and 15 Chick-fil-A sandwiches, which he intended to stuff into the mouths of his victims. Why FRC? The gunman, Floyd Corkins, later confessed to federal agents that he selected FRC after using the SPLC website and hate map.³

Following the shooting at FRC, we requested that the SPLC remove organizations like ours from its hate list and hate map, as it had been linked to an act that was officially classified as domestic terrorism. However, the SPLC did not respond to our appeal.

Unfortunately, that was not the last shooting perpetrated by individuals linked to the SPLC. On June 14, 2017, House Majority Leader Steve Scalise was shot and critically wounded by a politically agitated activist, Roy T. Hodgkinson, who had "liked" the SPLC on Facebook. Hodgkinson was immersed in the online waters of agitation propaganda created by the SPLC and other leftist groups targeting conservatives and Trump supporters. He targeted Scalise and dozens of other Republican senators and House members while they were practicing for a bipartisan charity baseball game at a baseball field in Alexandria, Virginia. Scalise required multiple surgeries and almost died from his wounds, and hundreds of bullet fragments remain in his body.

Turning Point USA (TPUSA) was added to the SPLC hate map in May 2025. That same month, the SPLC released "The Year in Hate and Extremism 2024" and included a section called

“Turning Point USA: A case study of the hard right in 2024.” This report targeted Charlie Kirk and TPUSA. Tragically, later that same year, on September 10, 2025, Kirk was shot and killed.

It is clear that the SPLC was unwilling to remove these labels due to the institutional influence it had gained: the ability to silence the Left’s opponents.

Around 2016, the SPLC led an ad hoc coalition of left-wing activist groups that began pressuring technology companies and financial institutions to deplatform and defund conservative organizations. PayPal was among the early targets, although the initial success of these efforts was limited.

Then came Charlottesville.

Charlottesville was a catalytic event that rapidly accelerated the SPLC’s efforts, particularly its efforts to coerce corporations to deplatform and debank conservative and Christian organizations.

Charlottesville is referenced in the recent federal indictment, which identified one of the many extremist group members allegedly funded by the SPLC: the individual identified as F-37. According to the indictment:

F-37 was a member of the online leadership of the chat group that planned the 2017 “Unite the Right” event in Charlottesville, Virginia and attended the event at the direction of the SPLC. F-37 made racist postings under the supervision of the SPLC and helped coordinate transportation to the event for several attendees. Between 2015 and 2023, the SPLC secretly paid F-37 more than \$270,000.⁴

Following Charlottesville, major corporations publicly aligned themselves with the SPLC. Apple donated \$1 million.⁵ JPMorgan Chase and others followed.⁶

Was Charlottesville designed to be a catalytic event to further the SPLC’s efforts to move reluctant corporations?

Post-Charlottesville, in October of 2018, the ad hoc coalition formally organized into what became known as Change the Terms, led by the SPLC and the Center for American Progress.

The timeline of Change the Terms closely parallels the rapid acceleration of debanking and deplatforming directed at conservative and Christian organizations. BB&T, now Truist, notified FRC that, in accordance with our services agreement, they can “at any time, close an account . . . at [their] discretion” (See Exhibit 1).

It is a bit ironic that, according to the indictment, the SPLC’s bank let them operate known fraudulent accounts for over a decade.

Change the Terms sought to establish standards for technology and financial companies that would deny digital access and funding mechanisms to organizations targeted by the SPLC's purpose-driven definition of "extremist."

SPLC officials were explicit about this strategy.

In congressional testimony delivered on January 15, 2020, SPLC official Lecia Brooks stated:

For decades, the SPLC has been fighting hate and exposing how hate groups use the internet. We have lobbied internet companies, one by one, to comply with their own rules to prohibit their services from being used to foster hate or discrimination. A key part of this strategy has been to target these organizations' funding.⁷

Brooks continued:

On Oct. 25, 2018, the Change the Terms coalition – including the SPLC and other civil rights groups – released a suite of recommended policies for technology companies that would take away the online microphone that hate groups use to recruit members, raise funds and organize violence. In response to Change the Terms' advocacy, several Silicon Valley leaders have made promising changes that align with the coalition's vision for a safer online world.⁸

But Brooks went further, openly describing the pressure campaign:

The public exposure was half the battle. We conducted the other part of the campaign privately. SPLC officials held dozens of meetings with top Silicon Valley executives. Some companies acted. Some took half steps. Others did little or nothing. But eventually, the far-right extremists who depended on Silicon Valley were beginning to feel the pain.⁹

What the SPLC appears to have done, according to reports, is bully the cowardly corporations, leveraging its political connections, including regulators.

And finally, Brooks told the Committee:

Hate groups have clearly been damaged by the efforts of the SPLC and its allied organizations, including the Change the Terms coalition, to fight them and their funding sources online. But the fight is far from over.¹⁰

This brings us to another significant point.

The indictment paints a picture that the SPLC was propping up some of the very extremist entities it publicly claimed to be dismantling.

And the indictment makes clear these were not undercover informants or “snitches,” as we used to call them when I was a police officer. In some cases, these were individuals allegedly running or helping run operations.

The evidence appears to suggest that these extremist organizations served a larger purpose: providing potent imagery that immediately marginalized legitimate conservative and Christian organizations that were listed alongside these groups.

We need to be clear: this was not about the SPLC’s financial survival.

For anyone tempted to feel sorry for the SPLC and start a GoFundMe account for its legal defense, the SPLC’s 2024 audited financial statement shows an endowment fund of approximately \$734 million.¹¹

Nor should anyone assume this indictment marks the end of the SPLC. While many financial institutions that partnered with or relied upon SPLC classifications beginning around 2017 have begun distancing themselves from the organization, the SPLC still maintains enormous institutional reach.

Its school-based program, Learning for Justice, formerly Teaching Tolerance, still reportedly reaches roughly 450,000 educators.¹² Every public school system in America should be asked whether SPLC curriculum materials are being used in their schools.

The SPLC’s public labeling system became far more than a public list. Whether by design or evolution, it functioned as a strategic weapon against conservatives who stood in the way of the Left’s agenda. Behind it, SPLC designations were increasingly used by media organizations to marginalize or exclude targeted individuals and groups, while also influencing banking access, digital platforms, fundraising capacity, and overall public legitimacy.

The indictment may focus on bank fraud and wire fraud. But like Al Capone’s tax evasion case, there is much beneath the surface: a sophisticated system of influence designed to not only oppose ideas but also marginalize and economically destroy those who hold them.

The entities that collaborated with the SPLC and did real harm to individuals and organizations should also be held accountable.

If America is to remain a nation where freedom of speech, religious liberty, and political dissent truly survive, then the broader conspiracy facilitated and directed by the SPLC must be confronted and exposed. If illegal conduct occurred, those responsible should be held accountable. And finally, safeguards must be established to ensure such a system is never allowed to operate again.

¹ See Allen Mendenhall, “Turning the Tables on the SPLC,” The Heritage Foundation, November 5, 2025, <https://www.heritage.org/progressivism/commentary/turning-the-tables-the-splc>.

² See “Family Research Council,” Southern Poverty Law Center, accessed May 18, 2026, <https://www.splcenter.org/resources/extremist-files/family-research-council/>.

³ U.S. Department of Justice, “Virginia Man Sentenced To 25 Years In Prison In Shooting Of Security Guard At Family Research Council Defendant Targeted Organization In Planned Attack,” press release, September 19, 2013, <https://www.justice.gov/usao-dc/pr/virginia-man-sentenced-25-years-prison-shooting-security-guard-family-research>.

⁴ *United States of America v. Southern Poverty Law Center, Inc.*, No. 2:26-CR-00139, slip op. at 4 (M.D. Ala. Apr. 21, 2026).

⁵ David Choi, “Apple CEO Tim Cook’s message to his employees after the Charlottesville violence,” World Economic Forum, August 17, 2017, <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2017/08/apple-ceo-tim-cooks-message-to-his-employees-after-the-charlottesville-violence/>.

⁶ Emily Glazer, “J.P. Morgan Donates Up to \$2 Million to Organizations Following Charlottesville,” The Wall Street Journal, last updated August 21, 2017, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/j-p-morgan-donates-up-to-2-million-to-organizations-following-charlottesville-1503326740>; Charles Creitz, “SPLC saw revenue surge after Charlottesville rally as DOJ alleges informant ties,” Fox News, April 23, 2026, <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/splc-saw-revenue-surge-after-charlottesville-rally-doj-alleges-informant-ties>.

⁷ Lecia Brooks, “SPLC Testifies Before Congress on Financing of Domestic Terrorism,” Southern Poverty Law Center, January 15, 2020, <https://www.splcenter.org/resources/stories/splc-testifies-congress-financing-domestic-terrorism/>.

⁸ Brooks, “SPLC Testifies Before Congress on Financing of Domestic Terrorism.”

⁹ Brooks, “SPLC Testifies Before Congress on Financing of Domestic Terrorism.”

¹⁰ Brooks, “SPLC Testifies Before Congress on Financing of Domestic Terrorism.”

¹¹ Southern Poverty Law Center, Inc., Consolidated Financial Statements, October 31, 2024.

¹² “Learning for Justice,” Zinn Education Project, accessed May 18, 2026, <https://www.zinnproject.org/materials/learning-for-justice/>.

EXHIBIT 1

BB&T Now Truist
MC 200-99-01-50
PO Box 1250
Winston-Salem, NC 27102-1250



Via First Class Mail

June 24, 2021

FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL
801 G ST NW
WASHINGTON DC 20001-3729

Subject: Notice of Account Closure(s)

Dear Client:

We regret to inform you that we have made a decision to close your account(s) with us as outlined below. This decision is in accordance with our BB&T Bank Services Agreement, which states that we may, at any time, close an account you have with us at our discretion.

This decision is not based on credit reporting information or any other considerations related to your credit. We have made this decision because some or all of your account activity is not consistent with the intended purpose of the account.

This closing affects any deposit accounts, safe deposit boxes, debit cards and credit cards that you maintain with us. This notification does not currently impact your Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs), installment loans, mortgages, or home equity loans/lines and any credit card(s) attached to a home equity line. Certificates of Deposit (CDs) will stay open until their maturity date and will not be automatically renewed.

Please take action to close your deposit account(s) with us upon receiving this letter or they will be closed by us on **08/08/2021** (the "Effective Date"). Any related deposit or account services, including Online Banking, Bill Pay and Overdraft Protection, will also be discontinued.

If you lease a safe deposit box, you will need to make immediate arrangements with your local branch to secure all contents and close the box no later than the Effective Date. After that time, we will remove, inventory, and transport the contents of the safe deposit box to another safekeeping location.

You are responsible for repayment of all associated fees, overdraft balances, and items that are presented against your deposit account(s). For each account, we will mail a check to your address of record for any remaining balance.

If we can offer any assistance in closing your accounts or for information, you are welcome to contact your BB&T Relationship Banker or visit a local branch.

Sincerely,
BB&T Now Truist

Chair JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Perkins, for that testimony. Leo the Hero, thank you for your courage. We are now going to Mr. O'Neil.

TESTIMONY OF TYLER O'NEIL

Mr. O'NEIL. Chair Jordan, Ranking Member Raskin, and the Members of the Committee, I am honored to testify before you today.

I will argue that the Southern Poverty Law Center does not merely track hate, it systematically inflates it, profits from it, and according to a Federal indictment, may even have helped create it.

The first thing to know about the SPLC is that it has nothing to do with poverty. The Poverty Palace has an endowment, has assets of \$822 million. That is more than three times the assets of the national YMCA, and almost twice the sum of Planned Parenthood. That is why former employees have suggested mocking motots for the SPLC, such as making hate pay.

How did the SPLC become so wealthy? Cofounder Morris Dees, set up a lucrative fundraising engine by suing the Ku Klux Klan into bankruptcy. When the SPLC ran out of Grand Dragons to slay, the center needed to find more hate to justify the fundraising. It has a financial incentive to juice the numbers. The SPLC began to publish a hate map that plots mainstream conservative and Christian groups alongside Klan chapters. The map includes Moms for Liberty, PragerU, Turning Point USA, and even Focus on the Family.

The SPLC says the map reveals the infrastructure upholding White supremacy. This hate map kills two birds with one stone. It silences conservative dissent from the Left and the SPLC's agenda, and it exaggerates hate to keep the money flowing. The map also includes groups that barely exist, like a Confederate memorabilia shop and a convent.

In 2023, I analyzed the map and found that it exaggerated hate by at least 267 percent, by including mainstream conservatives, double counting groups, and mentioning defunct organizations.

Given this track record, is it really so farfetched to think the SPLC might be propping up some of the very White supremacist groups it claims it exists to oppose? A Federal grand jury indicted the SPLC on fraud charges, because it had funneled \$3 million to members of the Klan.

The SPLC didn't deny the payments but said it was funding informants who had tipped the center off to violent threats before they happened. That is not what allegedly happened in Charlottesville in 2017. According to the indictment, the SPLC paid an organizer and directed this person's racist postings. The indictment suggests the SPLC's involvement made Charlottesville larger than it otherwise would have been.

After Charlottesville, the SPLC's annual fundraising doubled. Social media companies volunteered to start silencing hate groups. CNN plastered the hate map on its website. Charlottesville was a payday for the SPLC, and this so-called informant may have been the SPLC's most cunning investment. Of course, if it became known that the SPLC had paid a Charlottesville organizer, that would be a massive scandal. No wonder the SPLC allegedly lied to

a bank, setting up shell companies to fund these informants. Why does this matter?

The SPLC staff have briefed DOJ prosecutors. Big tech companies have used the SPLC to blacklist conservative nonprofits. School districts across the country have adopted the SPLC's curriculum. Hundreds of companies systematically exclude conservatives from their charity programs because of the SPLC.

The SPLC also have offshoots that engage in similar efforts against conservatives. The Change the Terms Coalition banded together to pressure big tech to deplatform conservatives, and former SPLC staff have founded the Global Project Against Hate and Extremism.

If an organization can inflate threats, influence Federal policy, and conceal its role in allegedly fueling the very extremism it condemns, then Congress has a duty to investigate it and its offshoots.

[The testimony of Mr. O'Neil follows:]

**‘Making Hate Pay’: Why It Makes Sense the SPLC Was Funding the Very Hate It Claims
It Exists to Oppose**

The Southern Poverty Law Center: Manufacturing Hate

Testimony before
The Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives
Wednesday, May 20, 2026

Tyler O’Neil

Author, “Making Hate Pay: The Corruption of the Southern Poverty Law Center” (Updated
2026) and “The Woketopus: The Dark Money Cabal Manipulating the Federal Government”

‘Making Hate Pay’: Why It Makes Sense the SPLC Was Funding the Very Hate It Claims It Exists to Oppose

My name is Tyler O’Neil.¹ I write commentary and investigative reporting for The Daily Signal. I wrote two books, “Making Hate Pay: The Corruption of the Southern Poverty Law Center” (updated May 2026) and “The Woketopus: The Dark Money Cabal Manipulating the Federal Government.” The views I express in this testimony are my own.

Chairman Jordan, Ranking Member Raskin, members of the committee, I am honored to be invited to testify before you today.

This testimony argues that the Southern Poverty Law Center has strong financial and institutional incentives to exaggerate hate, such that the conduct alleged in the federal indictment against the SPLC is consistent with those incentives.

A federal grand jury indicted the SPLC on wire fraud, bank fraud, and conspiracy charges for a scheme to fund the very hate that the SPLC claims it exists to oppose. While fundraising on its mission of combatting hate, the SPLC allegedly sent \$3 million to members of the Ku Klux Klan and other groups.²

The indictment alleges that the SPLC misled donors and a bank about how it used donor funds, in order to deceive donors and raise more money.

My years of research and reporting on the SPLC have led me to suspect it is true—because it matches the SPLC’s modus operandi of exaggerating hate to scare donors into ponying up cash.

To be clear, the SPLC has not denied the payments in question. The group merely claims that it bankrolled Klan members as part of an “informant program,” to learn about potential threats ahead of time and prevent them. The SPLC has highlighted two federal prosecutions it claims resulted from the SPLC informant program.³

¹ The Daily Signal Institute is a charitable organization recognized as exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. It is privately supported and receives no funds from any government at any level, nor does it perform any government or other contract work.

The Daily Signal Institute is a broadly supported think tank in the United States. It received individual, foundation, and corporate supporters across the U.S.

Members of The Daily Signal Institute staff testify as individuals discussing their own independent research. The views expressed are their own and do not reflect an institutional position of The Daily Signal Institute or its board of directors.

² Indictment. United States v. Southern Poverty Law Center. Filed in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, April 21, 2026.

³ O’Neil, Tyler. “DOJ Responds to SPLC Claim That Todd Blanche Lied About Informant Program.” The Daily Signal. April 28, 2026. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2026/04/28/doj-responds-splc-claim-todd-blanche-lied-informant-program/>

The indictment suggests these “field sources” weren’t just informants, however, and the SPLC’s recent history lends credence to the idea that these payments may have helped the group exaggerate hate, to raise money.

The SPLC made its reputation by suing Ku Klux Klan groups into bankruptcy, and donors rightly flocked to this cause. When the center ran out of grand dragons to slay, however, it expanded the definition of “hate” to keep the donor money flowing.

Today, the SPLC maintains a “hate map” that plots mainstream conservative and Christian organizations—including Turning Point USA, PragerU, Alliance Defending Freedom, and Focus on the Family—alongside Klan chapters, suggesting they all form the “organizational infrastructure upholding white supremacy in the U.S.”⁴

I analyzed the SPLC’s “hate map” in 2023 and concluded that the center inflates “hate” by *at least* 267%. Considering the fact that the SPLC counts each “chapter” of an organization as a separate group, that it includes mainstream conservatives and Christians, and that it includes groups that no longer exist, I culled the list of 1,225 groups down to 459 groups that might plausibly be “hate groups.” I did not analyze each of those, however, so even that number is likely inflated.⁵

This nefarious strategy achieves two disparate objectives at one stroke: it systematically demonizes conservatives who disagree with the SPLC’s agenda, and it exaggerates “hate” by suggesting that Klan-style animus is more mainstream than it is.

Former SPLC staffer Bob Moser put it well when he recalled the group’s “hyperbolic fund-raising appeals, and the fact that, though the center claimed to be effective in fighting extremism, ‘hate’ always continued to be on the rise, more dangerous than ever, with each year’s report on hate groups.”

“The S.P.L.C.—making hate pay,’ we’d say.”⁶

⁴ “The Year in Hate and Extremism 2023.” Southern Poverty Law Center. June 4, 2024. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.splcenter.org/resources/guides/year-hate-extremism-2023/> Claim repeated in testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on Sept. 17, 2024. <https://www.splcactionfund.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/files/statement-hearing-stemming-tide-hate-crimes-america.pdf>

⁵ O’Neil, Tyler. “ANALYSIS: Just How Deceptive Is the SPLC’s ‘Hate Map’?” The Daily Signal. June 13, 2023. Accessed May 17, 2026. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2023/06/13/exposed-far-left-smear-factory-attacked-moms-liberty-exaggerates-hate-groups-267/>

⁶ Moser, Bob. “The Reckoning of Morris Dees and the Southern Poverty Law Center.” The New Yorker. March 21, 2019. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/the-reckoning-of-morris-dees-and-the-southern-poverty-law-center>

Hate pays rather well. As of October 2024, the SPLC had more than \$822 million in assets, with more than \$30 million in investments in Central America and the Caribbean.⁷

The SPLC pads the numbers by highlighting as “hate groups” entities that barely exist. The “hate map” previously included Wildman’s Civil War Surplus and Herb Shop, because it sold Confederate memorabilia. As of the 2024 version, the map still includes Catholic Apologetics International, which has reportedly dissolved. The map also includes Slaves of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in Town of Richmond, New Hampshire, a convent full of nuns.⁸

The SPLC also lists each chapter of an organization as a separate “hate group.” A full 251 of the 1,371 organizations on the “hate map” are chapters of Moms for Liberty, making up 18.2% of the map.

Nathan J. Robinson, the editor of Current Affairs and no conservative, noted that SPLC staff “have to know that they’re inflating the danger.” He wrote that the SPLC’s hate exaggerations are “a scam bordering on criminal mail fraud.”⁹

The Charlottesville Pay Day

Americans were rightly horrified to see marchers with tiki torches chant, “Jews will not replace us” at the 2017 “Unite the Right” rally in Charlottesville, Virginia. The event took place amid demands that Charlottesville remove its statue commemorating Confederate general Robert E. Lee.

Yet many of us suspected there was something fishy going on. The indictment against the SPLC alleges that one of the organizers of the “Unite the Right” rally was on the SPLC’s payroll. If so, this was probably one of the SPLC’s most lucrative investments ever.

According to the indictment, “field source” 37 helped plan the event “and attended the event at the direction of the SPLC.” This person “made racist postings under the supervision of the SPLC and helped coordinate transportation to the event for several attendees.” Between 2015 and 2023, the SPLC paid this person more than \$270,000.

⁷ Southern Poverty Law Center Form 990 for the year ending Oct. 2024. Part I, Schedule F Part I. EIN: 63-0598743 Accessed via ProPublica May 15, 2026.

<https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/630598743/202511199349300716/full>

⁸ O’Neil, Tyler. “FOREBODING: SPLC ‘Laying the Groundwork’ for Government to Silence Conservatives, Traditional Catholic Warns.” The Daily Signal. May 14, 2023. Accessed May 15, 2026.

<https://www.dailysignal.com/2023/05/14/hate-group-leader-condemns-fbi-memo-exposes-splcs-crusade-traditional-catholics/>

⁹ Robinson, Nathan. “The Southern Poverty Law Center Is Everything That’s Wrong With Liberalism.” Current Affairs. March 26, 2019. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.currentaffairs.org/news/2019/03/the-southern-poverty-law-center-is-everything-thats-wrong-with-liberalism>

Let's get this straight. The SPLC says it was paying informants to prevent violence, but in this instance, it not only allegedly paid one of the organizers of the most notorious white supremacist event in recent history but also *directed* the organizer's activities.

In the lead-up to Charlottesville, the SPLC also arguably enflamed tensions. It published a "hate map" of Confederate monuments, warning that these might spark "turmoil and bloodshed." The map included military bases, high schools, and middle schools. Antifa agitators had mobilized to knock these monuments down.

Carol Swain, a black former professor at Vanderbilt University who has studied white nationalist movements, told me that the SPLC likely knew that attacking these monuments would inspire an event like Charlottesville.

"Just the whole idea of taking down the monuments, that's like waving a red flag in front of a bull and it does incite a reaction, and some of it's being done for that purpose," Swain said in remarks for my book, "Making Hate Pay."

The investment paid off. In the wake of the rally, Apple's CEO pledged to give \$1 million to the SPLC.¹⁰ JPMorgan Chase also pledged \$1 million to the SPLC.¹¹ While the SPLC raised more than \$50 million in contributions and grants in the year before October 2016, donations spiked to \$132 million in the following year, and remained higher than \$111 million in the year following.¹²

Also following the rally, Facebook's board voted to crack down on postings from hate groups, Spotify pledged to take down music tracks with "hate lyrics," and Airbnb blacklisted hate groups.

Meanwhile, CNN uncritically published the "hate map" online.

The indictment also mentions that other "field sources" received SPLC cash while the SPLC featured them on "Extremist File" web pages.

¹⁰ "Apple CEO Tim Cook's message to his employees after the Charlottesville violence." The World Economic Forum. Aug. 17, 2017. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2017/08/apple-ceo-tim-cooks-message-to-his-employees-after-the-charlottesville-violence/>

¹¹ Cone, Allen. "JPMorgan pledges \$2M to anti-hate groups after Charlottesville." UPI. Aug. 21, 2017. Accessed May 15, 2026. https://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2017/08/21/JPMorgan-pledges-2M-to-anti-hate-groups-after-Charlottesville/625150333746/

¹² Southern Poverty Law Center Form 990 for the year ending Oct. 2017. Part I. EIN: 63-0598743 Accessed via ProPublica May 15, 2026.

<https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/630598743/201830739349300308/full> Form 990 for the year ending Oct. 2018. Part I. Accessed via ProPublica May 15, 2026.
<https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/630598743/201900309349301030/full>

The indictment also charges the SPLC with bank fraud. An SPLC staffer allegedly opened four bank accounts while stating that he or she was the “sole owner” of the company. A few years later, SPLC President Margaret Huang stated that the accounts in question “were opened for the benefit of Southern Poverty Law Center operations and operated under the Center’s authority.”

In other words, the SPLC set up shell companies to hide its payments to Klan members and allegedly lied to the bank in doing so.

The SPLC notes that its offices were firebombed in 1983 and claims the informant program “saved lives,” but it also ended the program.¹³

It stands to reason that the SPLC launched the program to monitor threats from potentially violent groups, but it also stands to reason that, once this program existed, the SPLC might use it to prop up the supposed strength of hate across America. The incentive structure to do so already existed.

SPLC’s Funding Sources

Morris Dees, the SPLC’s co-founder, created a massive donor network, in part utilizing the list of contributors to the 1972 George McGovern campaign. This makes the SPLC less dependent on large gifts from the Left’s mega donors, such as George Soros. Even so, some of the larger dark money engines on the Left have also contributed to the SPLC.

New Venture Fund, which previously worked with the company Arabella Advisors and now partners with Sunflower Services, gave the SPLC \$20,000 in 2022.¹⁴ The Proteus Fund directed \$30,000 to the SPLC between 2018 and 2021.¹⁵

Between 2018 and 2022, the Tides Foundation sent the SPLC more than \$1 million.¹⁶

¹³ O’Neil, Tyler. “SPLC Under Criminal Investigation for Paid Informant Program.” The Daily Signal. April 21, 2026. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2026/04/21/breaking-splc-under-criminal-investigation-paid-informant-program/>

¹⁴ “New Venture Fund.” Form 990, Schedule I for 2022, accessed May 1, 2024, via ProPublica. <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/205806345/202323149349302362/IRS990ScheduleI>

¹⁵ “Proteus Fund.” Form 990, Schedule I for 2018, 2020, 2021, accessed May 1, 2024, via ProPublica. [https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/43243004/201923199349310907/IRS990ScheduleI\(2018\)](https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/43243004/201923199349310907/IRS990ScheduleI(2018))
[https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/43243004/202103159349307825/IRS990ScheduleI\(2020\)](https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/43243004/202103159349307825/IRS990ScheduleI(2020))
[https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/43243004/202213199349310211/IRS990ScheduleI\(2021\)](https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/43243004/202213199349310211/IRS990ScheduleI(2021))

¹⁶ The precise figure is \$1,038,381. “Tides Foundation” Form 990 Schedule I for 2018-2022, accessed April 26, 2024, via ProPublica. <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/510198509/201913189349314251/IRS990ScheduleI>

The Foundation to Promote Open Society awarded the SPLC a \$75,000 grant to convene an “Anti-Hate Table” in 2016.¹⁷

Influence in the Biden Administration

Despite the SPLC’s many scandals, President Joe Biden’s administration welcomed this morally bankrupt smear factory with open arms.

My second book, “The Woketopus: The Dark Money Cabal Manipulating the Federal Government,” exposed much of this influence. The Biden White House had hosted SPLC leaders and staff at least 18 times; Biden nominated an SPLC attorney, Nancy Abudu, to a top federal judgeship; SPLC staff had a cozy relationship with leaders in the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division; and the FBI cited the SPLC in its memo targeting “radical-traditional Catholics.”¹⁸

Since I published the book last year, however, America First Legal and the Oversight Project have revealed even more SPLC ties with the Biden administration.¹⁹

Kristen Clarke, the assistant attorney general who led the Civil Rights Division, reached out to then-SPLC President Margaret Huang for a phone call in October 2022, seeking to hear from Huang “if there are federal civil rights matters of concern we should be tracking.”

Michael Lieberman, senior policy counsel for “hate & extremism” at the SPLC, met multiple times with Robert Moossy Jr., deputy assistant attorney general at the Civil Rights Division. Lieberman shared with Moossy an embargoed copy of the SPLC’s “hate map” ahead of its release in June 2023, and Moossy sent an embargoed copy of the FBI’s “hate crimes” report

I (2018)

<https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/510198509/202043149349304239/IRS990Schedule>

I (2019)

<https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/510198509/202133149349300708/IRS990Schedule>

I (2020)

<https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/510198509/202233189349313898/IRS990Schedule>

I (2021)

<https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/510198509/202400469349300305/IRS990Schedule>

I (2022)

¹⁷ Open Society Foundations Grants Database. Accessed May 15, 2026.

https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/grants/past?filter_keyword=Southern+Poverty+Law+Center&grant_id=OR2016-30974

¹⁸ O’Neil, Tyler. *The Woketopus: The Dark Money Cabal Manipulating the Federal Government*. New York: Bombardier Books, 2025. pp. 197-212.

¹⁹ O’Neil, Tyler. “However Bad You Think Biden’s DOJ Was, New Documents Show It Was Even Worse.” *The Daily Signal*. Oct. 12, 2025. Accessed April 30, 2026. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2025/10/12/biden-doj-sought-direction-splc-leftist-group-that-put-turning-point-usa-hate-map-shortly-before-charlie-kirks-assassination/>

to Lieberman in December 2023. Lieberman also appears to have taken part in a “Quarterly Civil Rights Meeting” with the DOJ.

Other documents showed that R.G. Cravens, manager of research and analysis at the SPLC’s Intelligence Project, spoke at a conference for Justice Department prosecutors on Nov. 7, 2023. A program for the event noted that Cravens would focus on “the anti-LGBTQ movement” and “help investigators and prosecutors identify potential evidence and motivations for bias crime.”

Under President Donald Trump, the FBI has officially distanced itself from the SPLC. FBI Director Kash Patel told The Daily Signal that the SPLC’s “disgraceful record makes them unfit for any FBI partnership.”²⁰

The True Threat of Violence in America

The SPLC provides a useful tool for the Left when it comes to demonizing the Right and suggesting the true threat of political violence comes from the Right. While some political violence does come from the Right, Americans have experienced a torrent of political violence from leftist causes in recent years.

The 2020 riots following the death of George Floyd, for example, caused an estimated \$2 billion in damage, as measured by insurance payouts,²¹ and took the lives of 26 people.²² President Trump has faced three serious attempts on his life in the last three years.²³

The SPLC had placed Kirk’s Turning Point USA on the “hate map” mere months before the assassination. In 2012, a since-convicted terrorist used the SPLC “hate map” to target the Family Research Council in an attempted mass shooting. A judge ultimately sentenced Floyd Lee Corkins II to 25 years in prison for the attack.²⁴

²⁰ O’Neil, Tyler. “BREAKING: Kash Patel’s FBI Cuts All Ties to Southern Poverty Law Center.” The Daily Signal. Oct. 3, 2025. Accessed April 30, 2026. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2025/10/03/breaking-kash-patels-fbi-cuts-all-ties-southern-poverty-law-center/>

²¹ Johansmeyer, Thomas. “How 2020 protests changed insurance forever.” World Economic Forum. Feb. 22, 2021. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2021/02/2020-protests-changed-insurance-forever/>

²² O’Neil, Tyler. “Say Their Names: 26 People Killed in the George Floyd Riots.” PJ Media. July 5, 2020. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://pjmedia.com/tyler-o-neil/2020/07/05/say-their-names-20-people-killed-in-the-george-floyd-riots-n592577>

²³ Justice Department Press Release. “Suspect in White House Correspondents’ Dinner Shooting Charged with Attempt to Assassinate the President.” April 27, 2026. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/suspect-white-house-correspondents-dinner-shooting-charged-attempt-assassinate-president>

²⁴ Justice Department Press Release. “Virginia Man Sentenced To 25 Years In Prison In Shooting Of Security Guard at Family Research Council.” Sept. 19, 2013. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.justice.gov/usao-dc/pr/virginia-man-sentenced-25-years-prison-shooting-security-guard-family-research>

CatholicVote has catalogued 395 attacks on Catholic churches²⁵ and 96 attacks on pro-life pregnancy centers and pro-life groups²⁶ since the leak of the Dobbs decision, which overturned Roe v. Wade in 2022.

The SPLC has not only turned a blind eye to the violence of Antifa and the pro-abortion vandalism of Jane's Revenge, but it has carried water for Antifa and worked with a researcher who passed along information to Antifa. An SPLC attorney also faces charges for his role in a Molotov-cocktail riot.²⁷

Conclusion

The SPLC derives much of its legitimacy, and a great deal of its financial success, from the idea that “hate” is on the march, and that it is almost exclusively a phenomenon of the Right. It has all the incentives to exaggerate “hate,” and since it was operating an “informant” program with members of the Ku Klux Klan anyway, it stands to reason that it may have used that program to bolster the Klan's image as a threat—to raise more money.

There is likely a great deal more evidence behind the indictment. The SPLC will get its day in court, and I hope the Justice Department plays everything by the book. I do not know whether the SPLC is guilty of wire fraud, but my experience covering this smear factory tells me that the SPLC had every incentive to exaggerate hate, so the Justice Department's argument aligns with the key takeaways from my years of research into the SPLC.

²⁵ Valentine, Tommy. “Tracker: 500 Attacks on U.S. Catholic Churches Since May 2020.” Catholic Vote. April 15, 2026. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://catholicvote.org/tracker-church-attacks/>

²⁶ CatholicVote. “Tracking Attacks on Pregnancy Centers & Pro-Life Groups.” June 9, 2022. Updated Jan. 21, 2025. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://catholicvote.org/pregnancy-center-attack-tracker/>

²⁷ O'Neil, Tyler. “The Disturbing Ties Between the SPLC and Antifa.” Sept. 22, 2025. Accessed May 15, 2026. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2025/09/22/splc-leftist-group-targeted-turning-point-usa-has-long-carried-water-antifa/>

Chair JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. O'Neil. Ms. Wiley, you are recognized for five minutes.

TESTIMONY OF MAYA WILEY

Ms. WILEY. Thank you, Chair Jordan, Ranking Member Raskin, and to the entire Committee for having me here today.

I would like to get right to the point. The attack on SPLC is nothing more than part of a larger, broader, coordinated attack on civil rights organizations, not for profits, ones that work to ensure voters can vote, that children can learn, and people can live without fear.

Multiracial democracy is something Americans value. As the Administration has gutted civil rights enforcement and the Supreme Court has gutted the Voting Rights Act, it is in danger.

Civil rights organizations like the Southern Poverty Law Center are fighting to protect all our rights. It has been done so for more than five decades. It helped bankrupt the violent White supremacist organizations including the United Klans of America. It has brought major voting rights cases, including to secure a fair representation for Black voters in Alabama.

It educates the public on threats from extremist movements before those threats turn to violence. Sadly, this work is critical. A San Diego mosque and the families of three brave fathers are mourning the apparently hate motivated killings from just Monday. No one should fear violence in a place of worship or anywhere else.

The SPLC has been targeted by extremists and their supporters for years, not because it is dangerous, but because it is effective. Today it is SPLC, but in a sense, we are all SPLC.

I won't spend much time picking apart the preposterous criminal charges, because I have complete confidence in SPLC's ability to do so in court. All Americans, no matter our party or beliefs, should not sleep on this hearing and what is happening, because Monday's murders at a mosque appears to be from two young people apparently espousing neo-Nazi and White supremacist hate and they took up arms.

We need to discuss hate ideologies and the groups that spread them, to understand how we can prevent the kind of violence that happened on Monday. Trying to distort SPLC's use of informants into some claim that engaged in manufacturing hate, is not only nonsensical, it is an effort to deny that hate exists.

Prosecution should never be tolerated as a weapon to silence disagreement or stop lawful activities that this Administration dislikes. In the past year, we have seen countless examples of weaponization against law firms, universities, media companies, advocates of basic rights branded as domestic terrorists, important nonprofits that had their grants cut off, protestors who faced violence.

The use of criminal prosecutions is consistent with this pattern. Our concern is that no organization seen as dissenting from any Administration's policy, large or small, should ultimately face this kind of abuse of power.

We are also concerned that some private financial companies, namely Schwab, Fidelity, and Vanguard, have joined in the Admin-

istration's efforts to cut off funds that donors have asked to be sent to the Southern Poverty Law Center.

In this case, it doesn't appear that conviction is the goal. Starving the SPLC of resources, tarnishing its reputation, and ultimately bullying it into compliance is more likely the point. Luckily, SPLC and civil rights organizations will not be intimidated. SPLC is continuing to fight against hate and to stand up for people's rights.

It just sued the Goyim Defense League for antisemitic and racist harassment of Jewish and Black residents in Nashville. It has sued to ensure that voters in Cobb County, Georgia, are getting their absentee ballots on time. It continues to educate us about the growth of hate and extremism in this country, which even Federal data has shown has doubled since 2015. It is real. The SPLC is far too busy fighting hate to manufacture it. You don't have to like or agree with all its strategies.

I wouldn't ask that. The fact that SPLC is being criminally charged for its work, only shows how much work it has to do. Thank you.

[The testimony of Ms. Wiley follows:]

The Leadership Conference
on Civil and Human Rights

1620 L Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC
20036
202.466.3311 voice
202.466.3435 fax
www.civilrights.org



**STATEMENT OF MAYA WILEY, PRESIDENT AND CEO
THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS**

UNITED STATES HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

HEARING ON THE SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER

MAY 20, 2026

Thank you, Chairman Jordan and Ranking Member Raskin. My name is Maya Wiley. I am the daughter of civil rights leaders, and I am president and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the nation's oldest and largest civil rights coalition, founded in 1950. Today, more than 240 organizations sit at our table fighting to protect and advance civil rights, one of which is the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC).

I'd like to get right to the point: we are experiencing a coordinated attack on civil rights non-profits that work to ensure voters can vote, children can learn history, and unions can protect workers. First the Trump administration attacked law firms that provided pro bono services to civil rights and civil liberties groups, foundations that support civil rights work, and colleges and universities working to advance civil rights principles.

Now the administration is going after SPLC. It is impossible to separate this dangerous attack on SPLC from the attacks that have preceded this illegitimate indictment. SPLC is one of the lead organizations standing in the way of the efforts to roll back civil rights in this country. The administration has already wiped out much of our federal government's civil rights enforcement offices and staff. It is trying to make it harder for voters to vote, especially people of color. It is making it harder for children to be safe from bullying and discrimination in schools, including students with disabilities and transgender students. And to make matters worse, the ideologically conservative Supreme Court majority gutted the crowning achievement of the civil rights movement, once again ignoring its own prior rulings and long-standing precedent on civil rights protections that, until recently, received strong bipartisan support: the Voting Rights Act.

Multi-racial democracy is something Americans value, and it is on the line. Civil rights organizations, including SPLC, have been fighting to protect all our rights.

For more than five decades, SPLC has provided free legal assistance, performed research to fight discrimination, protected voting rights, and engaged in public education to reduce hate and bias, including information for the public about hate and extremist movements.

Its record is not abstract. SPLC helped bankrupt violent white supremacist organizations, including through a historic verdict against the United Klans of America. It has brought major voting rights cases,



including litigation that helped secure fairer representation for Black voters in Alabama. It has worked to document threats from extremist movements before those threats turn into violence, and as I'll describe below, its work has also assisted law enforcement. Sadly, this work is imperative. We mourn for the families of the victims of the hate-motivated killings at a San Diego mosque on Monday. No one should fear violence in a place of worship.

SPLC is being targeted is not because it is dangerous, but because it is effective. It stands in the way of efforts to roll back civil rights, suppress voting rights, intimidate immigrants, and normalize hate.

Today it is SPLC. But in a sense, we are all the SPLC.

I won't spend much time picking apart the criminal charges, because I have complete confidence in SPLC's ability to do so in court. And if the DOJ's case wasn't so preposterous, I submit that it wouldn't need any help from allies in Congress.

After the Ku Klux Klan firebombed SPLC offices in 1983, it beefed up its work to expose and guard against dangerous extremists, in part – as has been reported – through a confidential informant program. Trying to distort this work into some claim that SPLC engaged in “manufacturing hate” is as nonsensical as saying that police departments that use informants are “manufacturing crime,” or financing criminal activities.

The government knew about SPLC's confidential informant program. The government used information gathered through SPLC's confidential informant program. And the government knows that lives were saved because of SPLC's confidential informant program.

For instance, SPLC's program helped lead to the conviction of a man who planned to bomb a synagogue in Las Vegas. It led to a criminal conviction of a member of the neo-Nazi extremist group Vanguard America, who sought a national security clearance in 2018 to work at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. And before the deadly Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville in 2017, the SPLC shared intelligence with the FBI on the potential for violence and that potential perpetrators may have weapons. And those are just the publicly reported examples shared with the government before it brought its indictment. SPLC's program helped to protect people from racism, antisemitism, and other forms of hate, violence, and discrimination.

But this case and today's hearing aren't about how to protect people from violent hate and extremist groups or better understand how we can prevent hate and bias. They are about using the powers of prosecution as a weapon, with the sole aim of stopping speech and activities that this administration dislikes and denying the real threats that we should all be concerned about. In the past year, we have seen countless examples of this weaponization. This administration is coercing law firms, universities, and media companies. It is threatening to brand advocates as “domestic terrorists.” It is cutting off billions in federal grants to non-profits that do important work to track and prevent hate and bias. It is letting law enforcement off the hook for systemic misconduct that violates rights of people who need protection. It is letting violence and even extrajudicial killings by federal agents go unpunished. In all of this and more, the President has not even tried to hide his motives. And for the past year, he has also been open about his



willingness to weaponize criminal law. So cases like this were inevitable. And our concern is that no organization seen as dissenting from administration policy, large or small, will ultimately be safe.

What is also alarming is the way some private financial companies, in this case Schwab, Fidelity, and Vanguard, have participated in the administration's efforts to cut off funds to civil rights organizations with which it disagrees. These institutions have stopped Americans who bank with them from giving charitable donations to the SPLC, on the basis of an indictment, not a conviction and, with no apparent transparency about their decision making. Over a dozen donors have said that SPLC spent their donations in ways they hoped it would. Former DOJ prosecutors and a whistleblower have flagged serious flaws in this indictment and the rush to get it. As in other politically motivated prosecutions, perhaps conviction is not its goal. Starving the SPLC of resources, tarnishing its reputation, and ultimately bullying it into compliance is more likely the point. Luckily, SPLC, along with many civil rights organizations and non-profit organizations, will not be intimidated into stopping our lawful and important work.

Instead, SPLC is continuing to fight against hate, and to stand up for people's rights.

In Nashville, SPLC filed two separate lawsuits in 2025 against a group called the "Goyim Defense League" for its targeting of Jewish and Black communities. This targeting included assaults on a Jewish man and a biracial man, and a ten-day "intimidation tour" throughout the city. The many targets of harassment included four Black children between the ages of 8 and 11.

In the 2024 election, SPLC and the ACLU sued Cobb County, Georgia because it failed – for the second election in a row – to timely send absentee ballots to thousands of citizens, jeopardizing their ability to return them by the statutory deadline.

This spring, SPLC was instrumental in waking people up to the disastrous SAVE Act, which would have kept millions of U.S. citizens from voting.

And earlier this year, Orange County, Florida tried to sell off to developers – illegally and behind closed doors – a property that served as the heart of the historic Black community of Eatonville. The SPLC sued on behalf of the residents there.

Each year, the SPLC issues a report on hate and extremism in our country. This report is so important because it tracks organizations promoting the ideologies that brought us the Charlottesville riot that left Heather Heyer dead, and the massacres at the Tree of Life synagogue, the Emanuel AME church, and the El Paso Walmart. It is sadly part of the reason SPLC is being targeted. It is uncomfortable for an administration that has backed away from and cut grants for tracking white nationalism, which the Department of Homeland Security in the first Trump administration defined as our greatest domestic threat.

The SPLC is far too busy fighting hate to "manufacture" it. You don't have to like or agree with all of its strategies for doing so. But the fact that SPLC is now being criminally charged for its work only shows how much more work it has to do.

Chair JORDAN. That concludes opening statements.

Before going to five-minute questions, the Chair recognizes the Ranking Member for some comments.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, thank you very much for this. I just wanted to note the very sad occasion of the passing of a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, Barney Frank, who succumbed to his illness and died just moments ago. I wanted to make sure that all Members knew about the passing of this great champion of civil rights and civil liberties.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield back to you.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, if I could just add.

Chair JORDAN. Sure.

Ms. SCANLON. Rep. Frank was obviously a huge advocate for civil rights, particularly LGBTQ rights. A big advocate for finance reform across our economic structures. His voice will certainly be missed. Thank you.

Chair JORDAN. I will just relate what I remember about, one of the things I remember about Representative Frank was, when I first got here, this was back when the motion to recommit was actually a debate. I may remember, five-minute debate. I was a freshman and for some reason leadership asked me to do the motion to recommit, said, "would I be willing to do the motion to recommit on a bill sponsored by Barney Frank?" I said, "no, are you crazy? I don't know, it was a financial services advice." I said, "I don't know the subject. Plus, I have seen the guy debate. I would rather not do that, particularly as a freshman."

He was very good at holding his own in any type of discussion or debate. We all have those memories of the late Representative.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair?

Chair JORDAN. Mr. Nadler is recognized.

Mr. NADLER. Barney was a great champion of all kinds of civil rights and civil liberties. I particularly remember the day in 2008, when he became the first Member to offer a motion to legalize transgender, to recognize transgender people.

Chair JORDAN. The Chair now recognizes—

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chair?

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. At the risk of piling on, we all have, that served with Barney, have some fond memories. I will just close out mine by saying, from the time I was a freshman, he was very good at coming up to me and saying, "Darrell, now you are probably not going to be for this, but you should be." Some similar ones. On occasions it was true. That was the thing about being incredibly smart, if you will, a happy warrior at times.

He wasn't always happy, but when he was, and on this Committee where I served with him, he was happiest when there was real debate, when he could use his wit to either change minds or at least embarrass those who had come half prepared.

Yes, he will be missed. I thank the gentleman.

Chair JORDAN. We now move to five-minute questions. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Wiley, the SPLC labeled a brilliant Black conservative, the woman sitting to your left, Dr. Carol Swain, an "apologist for White supremacist," simply for dar-

ing to disagree with them. Do you personally think Dr. Swain is a racist?

Ms. WILEY. I don't know, Dr. Swain. What I will say, is what is important about the Southern Poverty Law Center as far as—

Mr. BIGGS. I am asking you—

Ms. WILEY. Is that it identifies where and how we have problems.

Mr. BIGGS. I am asking you, I am asking you, you are choosing not to answer. Okay. You don't know her? Have you read any of her writings?

Ms. WILEY. I have not.

Mr. BIGGS. Okay. Dr. Swain, what was the impact of SPLC's radical, just unnecessary attack on you, what was the result of that?

Dr. SWAIN. It actually set in motion a series of events that led to my retirement in 2017. There are more things that happened. Once the Southern Poverty Law Center labels a Black conservative as an apologist for White supremacists, then people don't know how to process that.

I can tell you that James Taranto of *The Wall Street Journal*, wrote a 2,000-word article, "In Defense of Carol Swain." That is the title of the article, "In Defense of Carol Swain," Oct 26, 2009. That helped a lot.

That is why it hurt the Southern Poverty Law Center as well, because people knew that if they went after the author of a book on White nationalism, I published with *Cambridge Press* in 2002 a book, "The New White Nationalism in America: Its Challenge to Integration," they went after me and so I was—

Mr. BIGGS. You were a tenured Professor at Vanderbilt and Princeton—

Dr. SWAIN. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. It impacted your career.

Dr. SWAIN. It definitely impacted my career.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you for that information. Let's just cut to the chase here, SPLC is closing in on an \$800 million nest egg. I happen to have their 990 employees and how much they get paid, the President CEO from this filing from 2024, \$466,000 is the base salary. Total with perks, \$522,000.

You go on down the list and when the list closed for me, I didn't see anybody making less than \$285,000 per year from them. There is a reason that Charity Watch gives SPLC an "F" as a charity. The organization's recent Federal indictment for wire fraud alleged that it secretly took some of that money, for over \$3 million in donor funds, to informants tied to extremist groups like the KKK, Aryan Nations.

It only confirms what Mass Resistance is warned about for years, that the SPLC was never fighting hate, was manufacturing it to justify existence.

Mr. O'Neil was talking about Ison, who actually was one of the founders, who was attacking the KKK and then actually had to shift when they put them out of business, because they needed money. Then, it became this mission to attack people and falsely label them. Basically, gin up the basic money machine that they were doing.

I want to ask you, Mr. Perkins, your team was specifically targeted by SPLC, and as a result of their targeting you for having espousing traditional American and biblical values, there was actually an attempt at mass violence.

Can you describe that a little bit, and talk about Leo the Hero just a little bit more?

Mr. PERKINS. The gunman who is now serving prison for domestic terrorism, came into the building with a gun. Leo, who was the building manager, was actually standing at the front asking what he needed. He pulled the semiautomatic pistol out of the backpack. He began shooting. The first-round hit Leo in the arm shattering his arm. He was still able to take him down. More shots were fired. The bullet holes remained in the walls of our building. Leo was able to disarm him and take him down and even recover the weapon.

Following that, watching the footage with the FBI agents who were surveilling, it said, "why did he not, he was bleeding out," why didn't he fire the round into Corkins to make sure that he could not come back at him?

I didn't know the answer. As a former police officer, I would have, just as the FBI said, I would have defended myself, not knowing if I was going to pass out. I asked Leo when he came out of surgery that night, I went to the hospital about midnight. He came out of the hospital, and my first question was, "Leo, why didn't you shoot him?" He said, "because God told me not to." We are not here for revenge. We are here for justice. What they have inspired, not just to us, but to thousands of Americans who love this country and happen to believe the Bible as a definitive way to live, they want to silence us.

I stood on the street the day after the shooting and I will say it again, we will not be silent. We will not shrink back. We will not apologize for biblical truth. We will continue to stand for it.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. Thank you. Mr. Nadler, I recognize, the gentleman from New York, is recognized.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, we have heard a lot over the last few days about so-called weaponization, as Donald Trump rolled out his settlement slush fund to reward his friends and allies, including insurrectionists, White supremacists, and others within the MAGA faithful.

This hearing is among the worst kinds of weaponization. Using the power of the Judiciary Committee to further Donald Trump's personal vendetta against those who seek to hold him and his allies accountable.

He has weaponized the Department of Justice to stifle dissent, attacking law firms, universities, and members of civil society that they are challenging.

Now, this Committee is being pressed into service to join in his petty campaign of retribution. That is beneath the dignity of this Committee and which I have been proud to serve my entire career in Congress.

Since we have been called here, I want to talk about the important work that the Southern Poverty Law Center does to take on one of the most maligned forces in our society, and that is anti-

semitism. Unfortunately, antisemitism in America is not a relic of the past. It is a present and growing threat. The FBI has consistently documented Jewish Americans as the most targeted religious group for hate crimes year after year.

We have seen it erupt into mass violence, from the massacre at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, to the attack on Poway, California.

We have seen it spread through online spaces, and we have seen it increasingly seep into mainstream Right-wing politics, in conspiracy theories about Jewish financiers and Holocaust analogies deployed as political weapons, and in figures with well-documented ties to White supremacists ascending to positions of influence.

The Southern Poverty Law Center is on the front lines fighting antisemitism. In 2019, the SPLC won a \$14 million judgment against the founder of a neo-Nazi website, *The Daily Stormer*, who orchestrated a full-blown doxxing and harassment campaign against a local Jewish woman. She ended up getting more than 700 gruesome threats online, like being told that she should have died in a concentration camp and that she was “easy to find.” Someone even posted an image of her and her 12-year-old son and their rabbi, imposed on photos of the gates of Auschwitz.

One of our witnesses, Mr. O’Neil, has accused the SPLC of exaggerating hate. I wonder if he thinks that the hate against this woman was exaggerated or manufactured.

Last year, the Southern Poverty Law Center filed suit against the White supremacist extremist group, Goyim Defense League, an openly antisemitic group that calls for the return of the Nazi Party. SPLC sued, because in 2024, the GDL launched a coordinated campaign against Black and Jewish communities during a July 2024 “hate tour” in Nashville. These neo-Nazis were marching across the city assaulting people they believed to be Jewish, harassing groups of young Black children, and waving swastika flags. Another one of our witnesses, Mr. Perkins, has called the SPLC “a partisan smear machine.” I certainly hope he does not believe that it is a partisan smear to call out neo-Nazis and to make them pay for assaulting Jews and harassing Black children.

Fighting against neo-Nazis, neofascists, and White supremacists is not a partisan issue. It should be very simple to reject these tenets. Why is it so hard for Republicans to call out the antisemitism we see within the current Administration? President Trump has not only hosted, but also refused to condemn Nick Fuentes, a Holocaust denier and White nationalist.

Meanwhile, Republicans have remained silent as the Administration attempted to implement political litmus tests for synagogues to be deemed eligible to receive security grants, hired known antisemites like Kingsley Wilson, Ed Martin, and Sebastian Gorka, and gutted the agencies charged with preventing domestic terrorism.

Lip service about fighting antisemitism rings hollow when you staff your government with people who embrace it, no matter how many task forces or advisory committees you form. Now, they are coming after an organization on the front lines of fighting antisemitism and racism in all its pernicious forms.

Ms. Wiley, in the time we have left, I want to turn to you. What harm does it do to the Jewish community, or any targeted community, when Republicans spread false information against one of the few organizations actively fighting hate crimes and tracking extremist groups?

Ms. WILEY. Representative Nadler, you actually shared one of the examples I would share, which is the Goyim Defense League lawsuit. This is incredibly important for the Jewish community, because antisemitism and the Great Replacement Theory that we are seeing in so many of these ideologies that SPLC is identifying, actually comes for all of us. It comes for people who are Black, it comes for people who are transgender, and it comes for people who are Jewish. One of the things in the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights was cofounded with Jewish organizations and leaders. It is part of our roots and history as a civil rights coalition.

We have several of our Jewish groups have signed a letter that has been released today and sent supporting the Southern Poverty Law Center, because it even modeled some of the ways that more elevation of antisemitism could happen. One last thing I will point out, because the FBI was well aware of this despite the claim and the indictment.

The Southern Poverty Law Center gave a 45-page event threat memo to the FBI before the Unite the Right rally, because of the program we are talking about today, and identifying that there would be people there who were armed. As we saw in what turned out in that rally, it was critically important.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you. I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman yields back. Mr. O'Neil, they had an extremist file webpage, didn't they?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes.

Chair JORDAN. On this webpage, they would pick out some crazy hate guy and some bad guy, and it was like the extremist. Is that right?

Mr. O'NEIL. Exactly.

Chair JORDAN. The F-42 was one of the field sources, No. 42, the Chair of some crazy hate group. The Southern Property Law Center highlighted him on their webpage. He is bad, he is evil, send us money. Is that right?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes.

Chair JORDAN. Did they tell their prospective donors they were paying this guy?

Mr. O'NEIL. No.

Chair JORDAN. They didn't tell them. Did they tell them they were paying him \$140,000?

Mr. O'NEIL. No. Not to my knowledge.

Chair JORDAN. They said, let's stop the racist even though we are paying him to be racist. That was their pitch. They didn't tell them that, did they?

Mr. O'NEIL. No. They did not.

Chair JORDAN. Is that appropriate, Ms. Wiley?

Ms. WILEY. I am sorry, which part? Sorry.

Chair JORDAN. All of that. Is that appropriate to tell your donors, this is the extremist of the month? This hateful, racist guy is really

bad. Send us money. Not telling those donors who you are taking their money from, that we are paying this guy \$140,000. Is that appropriate?

Ms. WILEY. Well, we have public reporting that over a dozen donors actually said that they—

Chair JORDAN. A simple question.

Ms. WILEY. Actually, spent the money as intended.

Chair JORDAN. Field source 42 got \$140 grand from the Southern Poverty Law Center, was featured on their webpage as extremist of the year, or month, or whatever they call these bad guys. They were paying him and they were getting money. Is that appropriate? Simple question.

Ms. WILEY. Donors have supported it and they keep trying to send more money—

Chair JORDAN. Was it appropriate?

Ms. WILEY. —to the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Chair JORDAN. No, no, no. Answer the question. Is that technique appropriate? That is what I am asking.

Ms. WILEY. That is not unlawful to say that people have done X, Y, and Z.

Chair JORDAN. I didn't ask if it was lawful or unlawful. As you said earlier in your testimony, the court is going to determine when they go to trial. What I am asking you, is it appropriate?

Ms. WILEY. As I said, the donors have spoken. In fact, they are trying to send more money now and their financial institution is refusing to send the money.

Chair JORDAN. Is the Alliance Defending Freedom, is that a hate group?

Ms. WILEY. I don't know. I don't do designations.

Chair JORDAN. Well, they have argued 16 cases with the Supreme Court, won 16 cases before the Supreme Court. They stand for traditional values. The Southern Poverty Law Center has labeled them a hate group. Are they a hate group?

Ms. WILEY. I don't know them and I don't work on the designations.

Chair JORDAN. Well, here is one thing.

Ms. WILEY. I am here to talk about—

Chair JORDAN. Well, let me ask you this. Is Jane's Revenge, is that a hate group? Because of the ADF, they didn't firebomb anybody, but Jane's Revenge did. ADF is labeled a hate group. Jane's Revenge isn't. I want to know how you would label them?

Ms. WILEY. I am not here as a person who designates groups. I am here to talk about the impact on civil rights.

Chair JORDAN. Okay. Mr. O'Neil, you think any of these field sources were double dipping?

During the Biden-Wray-Garland Administration, the Justice Department paid a bunch of confidential human sources, a bunch of them. We know a bunch of them were at the Capitol on January 6th, four went in the Capitol. I am just wondering if the same entity, the Justice Department under President Biden paying these confidential human sources who were working with the Southern Poverty Law Center, having quarterly meetings with them, consulting with them, giving them FBI data before anyone else could see it, having them train their prosecutors. I am just wondering,

do you think it was out of the realm of possibility that the Justice Department was paying the same sources the SPLC was paying?

Mr. O'NEIL. I don't think it is out of the realm of possibility. I have no information or knowledge that they were double dipping. I would say that Steven J. Ross, *Bloomsbury Publishing*, who is the author of, "The Secret War Against Hate," which is about the history of informants that Jewish groups had placed in some of these violent groups back decades and decades before the SPLC ever existed, he said that neither the ADL, nor the American Jewish Committee, nor the Anti-Nazi League, did anything like highlighting informants online as in extremist profiles while also funding them.

Chair JORDAN. Yeah. Last question. I will come to you, Mr. Perkins. In your opening statement, you talked about how it was just worse than the SPLC, because how they put themselves out there or become the standard, or help from the government in becoming the source of the standard on evaluating and determining what groups are hate groups and what groups aren't. It is bigger and broader, and it has things. The real thing here is how closely, how closely they worked with the government to carry out what they were trying to do.

The reason the Biden Administration embraced them so fully was politics, simple politics. You agree?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, there are Members of this Committee that were endorsed by SPLC. They had a C-4 that was involved in elections. They were not just an umpire. They were a players on the field as well. How can they be objective in determining who is a purveyor of hate and who is not? They had a stake in this, but to your point about their engagement with government, it goes much further than the Federal Government, the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Defense, which their material was in briefing to the members of the military. They also continue to have their Learning for Justice, which is about 500,000 educators across America and bulletins to local law enforcement. I happen to know, because the agency I was with, the sheriff called me and said, hey, we got a bulletin that says you are a part of a hate group.

Chair JORDAN. Yep.

Mr. PERKINS. He was laughing.

Chair JORDAN. Yep.

Mr. PERKINS. That is the reach that they have had. This is the hub. They are the hub, but there are spokes that go out.

Chair JORDAN. No, I think that is an appropriate metaphor. My time has expired. With that, I recognize the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. O'Neil, have you ever heard the name Michael Donald?

Mr. O'NEIL. I have, yes. I am very familiar with the case.

Mr. JOHNSON. How about you, Mr. Perkins?

Mr. PERKINS. No.

Mr. JOHNSON. You don't know him? You have never heard of him? How about you, Dr. Swain?

Dr. SWAIN. No.

Mr. JOHNSON. You have never heard of Michael Donald before?

Dr. SWAIN. I am not sure. Why don't you—

Mr. JOHNSON. You can cut your mic on.

Dr. SWAIN. I am not sure. Maybe if you give a little more information.

Mr. JOHNSON. He was the 19-year-old African American, a Black boy down in Mobile, Alabama. He is the son of Beulah Mae and David Donald, the youngest of six children. He was in community college at the time, while working part-time for a local newspaper. On March 21, 1981, he was lynched. You have never heard of that before?

Dr. SWAIN. No. I have not. I don't recall—

Mr. JOHNSON. Then, you did not know that the SPLC was responsible for filing a lawsuit against the United Clans of America, whose members were responsible for lynching Michael Donald. You did not know that the SPLC had sued along with Beulah Mae Donald and received or obtained a judgment that ran the United Clans of America out of business. You weren't aware of that?

Dr. SWAIN. I was totally aware of it. In fact, I used that—

Mr. JOHNSON. Okay. Well, let me ask you this then. Let me ask you this. If you were aware of that they have been effective since then in running a number of Ku Klux Klan organizations out of business through lawsuits, correct?

Dr. SWAIN. In my—

Mr. JOHNSON. You are aware of it, Mr. O'Neil, aren't you?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes. I am actually very aware of that case.

Mr. JOHNSON. The SPLC—

Mr. O'NEIL. Because the SPLC etched out Michael Donald and wanted to make a video about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let me ask you this.

Dr. SWAIN. Well, I was going to respond.

Mr. JOHNSON. Hold on. Hold on now. You said that Charlottesville was a catalytic moment or a fundraising moment, both of you all have said, for the Southern Poverty Law Center.

You are aware of the fact that the Southern Poverty Law Center actually forwarded to the FBI, information about Charlottesville before it even happened. Before Donald Trump said that the Ku Klux Klansman down there and the anti-Jewish folks, antisemites were good people.

You were aware of the fact that SPLC provided information to the FBI about that. Isn't that correct, Ms. Wiley?

Ms. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. They have been very effective at suing organizations, antisemitism, and antiracism. They have been a thorn in the side of the racists, who I am sure sat up in their graves.

Robert E. Lee, Nathan Bedford Forrest, the former Confederate General, founder of the Ku Klux Klan, and others, Stonewall Jackson, I am sure that they stood up in their graves and saluted when Trump was elected and when he took office, because on the first day he eliminated all Federal efforts to remedy the impact of slavery and racism in America.

They call it DEI, diversity, equity, and inclusion. Trump has tried to stop that. The United States Supreme Court has gone along with him in ending enforcement or the ability to enforce the Voting Rights Act. Which is one of the ways that you, Dr. Swain, were able to get the right to vote. I don't understand it.

Dr. SWAIN. May I respond?

Mr. JOHNSON. Ms. Wiley, can you tell me why it is that folks today are claiming that we have no racism in America and the only extremism we have is through Left-wing groups like the SPLC, and they are targeting the SPLC? Can you tell us why?

Ms. WILEY. We have just seen an outright attack on all the gains of the civil rights movement for the past 60 years.

I can only say that I will never be able to explain it. At a time when hate crimes have doubled in this country, gone up 100 percent since 2015, where the rise in antisemitism, the rise in hate against transgender people, Black people still remain the number one largest racial group subject to hate crimes, that we have to talk about racism, transphobia, all of the violence that too many of our communities are experiencing. No one, including many of the groups here, should experience violence.

Mr. JOHNSON. Trump, I think—

Mr. ISSA. [Presiding.] The gentleman's time has now expired. Now, we go to the gentleman from California, Mr. McClintock.

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Eric Hoffer famously observed that every great cause becomes a movement, it becomes a business, it becomes a racket. That sums up precisely the matter before us today. SPLC is a private organization. They have a right to speak and influence the public policy discussion. No one questions that.

What they do to malign innocent groups like Turning Point USA and Family Research Council and others is despicable and hateful. That is freedom of speech. Freedom of speech does not include the right to defraud donors. It does not include the right to commit bank fraud.

Those are the allegations in the grand jury indictment. We have got a legal system that I trust will sort those charges out. It also doesn't include the right to slander. We have good laws and civil courts to hold them accountable for defamation.

That leaves two legislative concerns. First, the civil rights movement, of which SPLC was once a part, had made great progress in uniting our country and marginalizing racist ideology, and dramatically reducing racial strife between the 1950s and the 1990s. Over the past several decades, that progress seems to have reversed. In recent years, we have watched our country torn apart by growing racial strife.

The allegation at the heart of this matter, is that the SPLC was covertly fanning these flames for their own financial gain. A significant flashpoint, of course, was the Charlottesville riots, which had fatal results. I do need to call out the Ranking Member for deliberately perpetuating the Democrats' dishonest claim that Donald Trump praised the Nazis at Charlottesville, when he said there were "very fine people on both sides." What the Ranking Member knows, but chose to leave out, is that Trump then said, "I'm not talking about the neo-Nazis and the White nationalists, because they should be condemned totally." The Ranking Member knows this. The fact that he perpetuated that today speaks for itself.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chair, I take—

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Now, we have—

[Simultaneous speaking.]

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman will suspend. For what purpose does the gentleman interrupt?

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Which words does—

Mr. ISSA. Which words are you referring to?

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, he mentioned twice that the Ranking Member misled, deceived, and lied to this Committee. The gentleman—

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I didn't use the word deceived. I didn't use the word lied.

Mr. JOHNSON. He implied—

Mr. ISSA. Would both gentlemen please suspend? Would the recording clerk read back verbatim that passage that is being referred to?

Mr. JOHNSON. Both times.

Mr. ISSA. There is only one Chair here. I will take just one of them. It will be fine.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we need both—

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. JOHNSON. To put it in context, Mr. Chair. We have got to have both utterings.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman will suspend.

RECORDING CLERK. "I do need to call out the Ranking Member for"—

Mr. ISSA. We can't hear you, sorry.

RECORDING CLERK. I don't have a microphone.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Just as loud as you could, please.

RECORDING CLERK. "I need to call out the Ranking Member for deliberately perpetuating the Democrats' dishonest claim that Donald Trump praised the neo-Nazis"—

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. Thank you. Is that the passage, or one of the two times that you are referring to?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is the first passage.

Mr. ISSA. Excellent. Now, just one moment then, please. The Chair is prepared to rule. Although we would prefer that all people speak only to the facts and not to the previous statements of either side, it does not violate the rules of decorum to have an opinion as to the veracity of the other person's statement.

With that, I thank the gentleman, but I will not take you down the line.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chair, the second statement is the one that I asked then that the words be taken down.

Mr. ISSA. I have—

Mr. JOHNSON. I proffer that we hear the second—

Mr. ISSA. Okay. If the gentleman will suspend. I will be patient. Could you please read, or please read the second one and tell me, is there a difference?

RECORDING CLERK. "What the Ranking Member knows, but chose to leave out, is that Trump then said, 'I'm not talking about the neo-Nazis or White nationalists, because they should be condemned totally.'"

Mr. ISSA. Thank you.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chair the—

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman will suspend. Having heard both of these, and understanding them in context, they meet the requirement within decorum. Again, the Chair would caution individuals whenever possible, to refer to the specifics and not to the testimony or the statements of either side.

However, in context, it was not a violation for which the words may be taken down. With that, the gentleman from California may continue.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chair, I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ISSA. It is the gentleman's time. I will hear your parliamentary question after the conclusion of his time.

Mr. JOHNSON. Point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman will—

Mr. JOHNSON. Point of order, Mr. Chair. Point of order.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman will State his point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it within the rules—

Mr. ISSA. That is not how you State a point of order. Please State your point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON. My point of order is: It is incorrect for the Chair of the Committee to not hear argument on a motion.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman, if you are considering it "a point of order," then the answer to the point of order—

Mr. JOHNSON. It is—

Mr. ISSA. In answer to the point of order, a motion to have words taken down. The words speak for themselves. The gentleman had them heard. I am aware of what they were, and I have made my ruling.

The gentleman, I thank him for his point of order. We now go to the gentleman from California. I would ask that it be reset back to two minutes. We will conclude with three minutes, or three minutes remaining, please.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you. Mr. Chair, I am reminded of that old movie line, the gentleman can't handle the truth. Now, we have the revelation that the SPLC paid the chief organizer of this Unite the Right riot, \$270,000 while he was recruiting agitators and posting inflammatory rhetoric. To learn that this was part of more than \$3 million in such payments to such extremist groups, begs the question of whether the SPLC was financing the very extremist groups it was assuring donors was fighting with their contributions?

The terrible attack on the mosque in San Diego on Monday was inspired by neo-Nazi propaganda. Was this surreptitiously financed by the SPLC, or similar NGOs, or perhaps even foreign governments? That is a legitimate concern and one that we need to fully explore. The second legislative concern is that during the Biden Administration, the Attorney General and the FBI Director told this Committee that White supremacist groups were the greatest single threat that our country faced.

The SPLC was one of the primary sources of this testimony. Was this an attempt to mislead Congress? Were the officials responsible for this testimony victims of misinformation by the SPLC or were they active participants in this deception? We need to get to the bottom of that as well.

Now, Dr. Swain, you detailed the smear campaign against you that obviously caused you reputational damage and financial loss. Mr. Perkins, your organization suffered both financial loss and actual violence. Why haven't you sued the SPLC?

Mr. PERKINS. Partly because information was not available as is now coming forth. We did talk to some attorneys initially about the violence that was perpetrated. Because of really there were other suits that were brought against the SPLC. Their image was so strong until now that it was very difficult. We had suits that were brought in court that did not succeed. It is a different day now, and you may see some civil actions.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I would certainly hope so. Mr. O'Neil, is it possible the SPLC is not the only source of funds going to these extremist groups? Is it possible they are financed by other NGOs or even foreign governments? What reforms would you recommend?

Mr. O'NEIL. It is possible. I have no knowledge of that. What I know are the allegations claimed in the indictment. I would highly encourage Congress to consider adding to any rider of financial disbursements, that no taxpayer funds be directed to an organization that systematically slanders and defames mainstream conservatives and Christians, or frankly, those on the other side of the aisle in the way that the SPLC does.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you. Dr. Swain. May I answer the question about why I haven't sued the Southern Poverty Law Center?

Mr. ISSA. If that is a question, I will allow you to briefly answer if you would.

Dr. SWAIN. All right. Because I didn't have any financial resources. There is no way I could go up against an organization that had the types of resources as the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman yields back. We now go to the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Raskin, for his questions.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Just a footnote to that recent contretemps. I was not remotely offended by what the gentleman from California said, "because I am used to having all of my points misstated by him regularly."

It was interesting, he said that I had accused the President of praising the Ku Klux Klan and the neo-Nazis. I never said that. I said he just made himself perfectly clear when he said there were very fine people on both sides. The fact that you can find him contradicting himself immediately thereafter and in other subsequent statements, is just a reflection of how Donald Trump speaks.

Sometimes China is his biggest enemy in the world, and when he was over in China that he loved President Xi, and he adored him, and they are great friends, and so on. That is Donald Trump. I can't imagine any other President in American history finding very fine people on both sides of an antisemitic race attack like the one that led to the death of Heather Heyer.

I stand completely by what I said before. I reject completely your insinuation that I have misrepresented the reality. All I did was quote Donald Trump's own words. Ms. Wiley—oh, and I will say one other thing. Very fine people on both sides. To people in Charlottesville, that was a very painful thing. My sister and her family happen to live in Charlottesville.

The Ku Klux Klan and the neo-Nazis gathered at the local synagogue. That is where they kicked off their attack on Jews and African Americans in Charlottesville. Some people might be able to roll their eyes at that and say, oh, well, later he read a statement that his staff wrote for him saying that he denounces racist violence. He made himself perfectly clear.

Ms. WILEY, have you heard any of these witnesses today cite any evidence that anybody was deceived or defrauded by the Southern Poverty Law Center, which is the whole heart of this attack on them? Did you hear one iota of evidence being offered that anybody was deceived or defrauded?

Ms. WILEY. I have not. We know as a matter of fact, the donors continue to try to send money to the Southern Poverty Law Center and being blocked by—

Mr. RASKIN. In fact, haven't dozens of them stood up to say, no, they weren't defrauded in any way. That is why they are supporting the Southern Poverty Law Center, because they have been so effective in going undercover to blow the cover on these racist antisemitic plots.

Ms. WILEY. Yes. I just want to note that because there was a representation made about the SPLC, that it worked with the Donald Trump Department of Justice, providing information from its informant program in the first Trump Administration. That is why we were so concerned to hear that denial that they had knowledge that the acting Attorney General had to retract. This is something that should concern all Americans, because no Department of Justice should be behaving this way.

Mr. RASKIN. Yeah. Well, you know the not-for-profit sector very well. It seems like now one of the lines of attack against the SPLC is that the people who work there make too much money.

I just went online and checked out some of the salaried executives of the Right-wing groups that we are not having a hearing about today. Like the NRA, Wayne LaPierre was making \$1.2 million when he was there.

You could look at *The Heritage Foundation*, which in 2023, paid its President \$953,000. Three times what they are talking about there.

I imagine being the CEO of the Southern Poverty Law Center is a lot more dangerous than being the President of *The Heritage Foundation*.

Just very quickly on that, is there anything to this, the idea that the work of the Southern Poverty Law Center should be trashed, and derided, and dismissed, because the people who go to work there in Alabama are being paid too much money?

Ms. WILEY. Well, certainly not. The point is, the way in which the Southern Poverty Law Center is providing free legal services.

For example, to a Black community that has developers coming for land and they won't benefit from the land. For food assistance programs, to make sure that a mother who has a disabled child, five years old, is getting the disability services the law requires. That is what is happening with donations as well. We are not talking enough about the work that civil rights organizations do, including SPLC.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, then, let's talk about that. Because to listen to some of your copanelists there, you would think that there is no extremist hate violence taking place. What about the AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, where Dylann Roof, who was charged up on White supremacy, went out and killed nine people?

How about the Tree of Life Synagogue, the worst antisemitic attack in American history, where Robert Bowers, who was consumed with White genocide replacement theory, which we hear from even more mainstream conservative groups, killed 11 people. Is racist violence in fact some kind of myth made up by the Southern Poverty Law Center?

Ms. WILEY. No. The government's own data demonstrates that. Also, if you look at—

Mr. ISSA. The gentlelady can answer the question, but not go on beyond that. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. WILEY. Thank you.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. We now go to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Cline.

Mr. CLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate you holding this hearing.

The information that has come out in this indictment is truly disturbing. My district is adjacent to the district that includes Charlottesville. Many of my constituents have family in Charlottesville. Many of my constituents work in Charlottesville. To see that, well, let me ask you, Mr. O'Neil, the SPLC explicitly stated that they sought donations under the auspices that donor money would be used to help dismantle violent extremist groups.

By funding F-37, who was a member of the online leadership chat group that planned the 2017 Unite the Right event in Charlottesville, and attended the event at the direction of the SPLC, is that helping to dismantle these organizations?

Mr. O'NEIL. No. I would say the SPLC in subsequent filings did mention two cases where they claim information from these informants, these field sources led to Federal prosecutions. That is important context to add.

Mr. CLINE. Thank you. I want to continue to inquire about this funding. Given the SPLC's track record of partisanship and its direct link to real world violence, why did the FBI and DOJ during the Biden and Harris Administration maintain a close relationship with the SPLC?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yeah, my understanding is that the SPLC's bias and targeting of mainstream conservative and Christian groups aligned very strongly with the Biden DOJ and the Biden White House's preferences. That is why in my second book, "The Woketopus," I go through all the ways in which the Biden Administration solicited information on the domestic terror threat from the Southern Poverty Law Center. How we have this alignment with demonizing concerned moms and dads, that happened consistently.

Of course, when the SPLC released the hate map that included chapters of Moms for Liberty for the very first time, putting moms and dads who were concerned about their kids' education on a map with the Klan, they first gave the embargoed copy to their allies at the Civil Rights Division in the DOJ.

Mr. CLINE. The SPLC got special treatment, direct access to high-ranking officials in the Civil Rights Division, early access to FBI hate crime data, and invitations to exclusive events with DOJ leadership during the Biden and Harris Administration.

Mr. O'NEIL. Correct. In fact, they had one of their staffers by the name of R.G. Cravens, who spoke before DOJ prosecutors. This is the same man who when the Southern Poverty Law Center put Focus on the Family on the hate map last year, he defended putting Focus on the Family on the hate map by saying that it is both false and dangerous for conservative Christians to hold to biblical morality against the claims of the LGBTQ movement.

Mr. CLINE. In October of this year, FBI Director Patel terminated the FBI's relationship with the SPLC. The nature of the relationship prior to the termination, you discussed that. Isn't it true that the FBI relied on the SPLC's hate group designation when determining which extremist groups to monitor?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes. Specifically in the notorious memo from the FBI's Richmond office, which was coordinated with other FBI offices. They cited the SPLC's list of radical traditional Catholic hate groups.

Interestingly, that is where my anecdote about a convent comes from. One of those organizations on that list no longer existed and didn't exist at the time.

Mr. CLINE. Can you talk a little bit more about that FBI memo related to the Catholics in Richmond?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes. This memo was released by whistleblowers. It was not meant to be publicly disseminated.

Only after a whistleblower released the memo did the FBI, the national office, publicly come out and say that it didn't meet the FBI's standards. I would say that is an understatement.

It just took the SPLC's list of radical traditional Catholic hate groups verbatim and put it into the FBI's language in the memo. For background, this is a list of radical traditional Catholic groups that is extremely outdated according to my sources.

That was developed by Heidi Beirich, who now is leading the Global Project Against Hate and Extremism. She is no longer even at the SPLC.

Mr. CLINE. It is truly shocking. Thank you for being here. I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know there's talk about the Department of Justice's vindictive prosecutions of SPLC. I just want to remind all of us something else that the Trump DOJ just did.

On April 14th, this year, exactly a week before it targeted SPLC, DOJ asked a Federal court to vacate the convictions—convictions—of dozens of leaders of the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers. Now, who are the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers? Both are far-Right organizations that spout Islamophobic, misogynistic, and White nationalist ideologies, and both happen to be on SPLC's watchlist. Both groups, and others like them, took up arms for Donald Trump and attacked the Capitol on January 6th.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to put into the record two articles about the January 6th rioters and their later crimes.

Chair JORDAN. Without objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. People forget what happened in the weeks before January 6th, in December 2020, yet another pro-Trump rally. They rioted in the streets of D.C., vandalized historically Black churches, White nationalists supporting Donald Trump vandalizing African American places of worship—right here in the Capital.

For their crimes leading up to and on January 6th, these individuals, including Enrique Tarrio, Stewart Rhodes, and many others, were convicted of seditious conspiracy and other felonies and sentenced to more than 100 years in prison collectively.

Now, Donald Trump unleashed over 1,500 criminals on our streets, some of who have gone on to commit kidnapping, sexual assault, burglary, and death threats against elected officials. Now, the Department is trying to erase their guilt permanently and ensure they cannot be recharged. SPLC has been tracking these groups for years, long before January 6th, and designated them and others like them as hate groups. SPLC has continued to call out these groups for the danger they pose to our communities and our democracy.

The label has upset these groups, so much that Gavin McInnes, the founder of Proud Boys, who describes himself as a Western chauvinist and said Muslims are stupid, sued the SPLC in 2019 for defamation for designating them as a hate group, and that lawsuit failed.

Ms. WILEY, you have described the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers as the foot soldiers of January 6th. In your opinion, is documenting and naming these groups part of the reason why SPLC is now being punished by the Trump Administration?

Ms. WILEY. Sadly, because of the pattern of behavior and weaponization that we have seen, it's hard not to conclude that, particularly because of exactly the point you just raised, Representative Lofgren, that we're seeing pardoning of violence and violent insurrection from January 6th.

Ms. LOFGREN. Now, what does it say about this Administration that it's prosecuting the group that helped end the Klan, but, apparently, intending to give taxpayer money to violent White nationalists who vandalized Black churches in the Capital alike through this so-called settlement fund on a lawsuit that was bogus and barred by the statute of limitations?

That is what this Administration is: Donald Trump rewarding his foot soldiers for assaulting and beating up law enforcement in his name—to the tunes of billions of dollars—and punishing their common enemy, the organization that monitors and calls out their crime.

I would like to note this isn't about just coddling the criminals who tried to overthrow the government and who attacked police officers viciously, and I would add, were convicted in courts of law by juries of their peers, as the Constitution provides, but also an effort, perhaps, to make sure that, when a call goes out to violent extremists to overturn the government, to attack violently the government again, that those extremists will know a couple of things:

(1) That the President will pardon them for their crimes.

(2) That the President will reward them monetarily with taxpayer dollars for their violence and for their treason.

With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. The gentlelady yields back. Before recognizing the gentleman from North Carolina, I do have to step out for a minute—I wanted to just tell our witnesses that—but will be back shortly. I do think we have votes at 12:00 p.m. or 12:30 p.m. There may be a little break.

I should have mentioned this at the outset. If any of you need a break at any time—you have been there almost two hours; I have stepped out a few times—if you need a break, just please let us know.

Really quick, a UC?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. Yes, Mr. Chair, I have a series of letters from the Moms for Liberty, Tina Descovich, Judy Mock, and then, a whole series of additional letters from Moms for Liberty.

Chair JORDAN. Okay. Quickly, yes. Wonderful.

Mr. BIGGS. (1) “Southern Poverty Law Center education materials surprisingly common in red states, probe finds.”

(2) A school resource directing teachers to condemn Moms for Liberty, Turning Point USA, in the class.

(3) “SPLC Curriculum in K–12: Learning for Justice.”

(4) “SPLC Curriculum in Arizona,” a document.

(5) “Federal Grand Jury Charges Southern Poverty Law Center for Wire Fraud, False Statements, and Conspiracy to Commit Money Laundering.”

(6) “Southern Poverty Law Center is a SCAM, not an Arbiter of Justice.”

(7) “SPLC is a Hedge Fund with a Dumb Anti-Racist Newsletter.”

(8) “Exposing the SPLC and Celebrating their Future Demise.”

(9) “The Biden DOJ Was in Cahoots with SPLC as It Funded Extremist Groups.”

(10) “SPLC’s Wealth Raises Questions, Despite Controversial Activities.”

(11) A 990 filed in October 2024, by SPLC.

(12) “America First Legal Reveals Explosive Documents Exposing Biden Department of Justice’s Partnership and Coordinated Campaign with the Southern Poverty Law Center to Weaponize Civil Rights Enforcement.”

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Harris, is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chair, I would also like to submit into the record a letter from Awake Illinois to the House Judiciary Committee.

Chair JORDAN. Without objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I’m so grateful for all you witnesses for being here today.

I want to take just a few moments to talk about the shooting that took place at Family Research Council’s headquarters in 2012. That, obviously, hits home for me because I have followed and admired the great work of FRC, as both a pastor involved for a number of years, and now, as a Member of Congress.

In 2010, the SPLC, as we have talked about today, designated Family Research Council as an anti-LGBTQ hate group and placed it on its so-called "Hate Map." As I stated in our hearing last regarding the SPLC, there's nothing hateful about the Family Research Council.

The Family Research Council is a profamily, prolife group that promotes the Christian values held by many, many Americans. That didn't stop the SPLC from placing FRC on this map. What was, clearly, a politically motivated designation was intended to harm FRC, and it had dire consequences.

We mentioned it today. On August 15, 2012, Floyd Lee Corkins, II, entered Family Research Council's headquarters in Washington, DC, and opened fire. It was FRC's security guard Leo Johnson who heroically tackled Corkins to the ground and wrestled the gun out of his hand, despite being shot in the arm. Thankfully, no one was killed, and Corkins was sent to prison for a period of time.

However, I want to bring attention today to what Corkins told the police, which we happen to have on video right here. I would call your attention to Corkins' video.

[Video played.]

Mr. HARRIS. I did a little bit of research. Guess where he landed? There's no speculation here. There's no need for interpretation at this. The convicted shooter specifically cited SPLC as his source for finding out about Family Research Council. It speaks for itself. Mr. Perkins, what was your immediate reaction when you found out that the shooter learned about FRC through this SPLC Hate Map?

Mr. PERKINS. Congressman Harris, I actually anticipated that was the case. In fact, the day after, before the FBI acknowledged it, I stood before dozens of TV cameras on the street in front of FRC and said that, "FRC may not have pulled the trigger, but they inspired the gunman." I was mocked by the media, but then, the testimony and the confession came out.

I asked at that point that SPLC take down Christian groups from this list. They didn't and the consequences have been in 2017. One of your colleagues, one of my former colleagues, Steve Scalise, was shot. He was targeted by the SPLC. Then, of course, last year, Charlie Kirk, who also was targeted by SPLC, was assassinated.

There is culpability in knowing that this list, this ideological labeling leads to violence. No doubt. As of yesterday, when I looked up FRC on SPLC's Hate Map, your organization is still listed, despite this attack in 2012. What impact has this continued designation had on the organization and your staff?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, fortunately, we were large enough that we could sustain SPLC and their blood money that they've been raising to target conservative groups. It has hurt us. We spent \$6 million just to enhance our security. We've had—it's funny, they're crying, now that they're getting their own medicine, that Fidelity is not giving money to them. How about the thousands of conservative groups that were denied donor-driven funds because of SPLC's labeling? Is there fairness in that? I think not.

Mr. HARRIS. I will say, this may seem like a silly question, but following the 2012 attack on your headquarters, did SPLC ever reach out to apologize?

Mr. PERKINS. No.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, it is disgraceful that FRC has put such a Hate Map to begin within in place. They, SPLC, do not need to agree with everything that FRC says, does, or stands for. However, their actions of placing this organization on a Hate Map is, clearly, an attempt to cripple and socially ostracize a conservative organization. It cannot be allowed again and again. With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back. We now go to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania. I see next—okay, then, the gentlelady from Washington. I'm looking and seeing you came back. We are thrilled to have you with us.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Wonderful.

Mr. ISSA. The gentlelady is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. It is really a rich irony that Republicans want to argue that Donald Trump or this DOJ care about stopping hate. That is why they are going after the Southern Poverty Law Center. Donald Trump just set up an illegal \$1.8 billion slush fund of U.S. taxpayer dollars to pardon convicted insurrectionists who are tied to White supremacists from the Proud Boys, the Oath Keepers, and Nazi supremacists—oh, yes, and prohibit any action against his own violations or his family's violations of tax law.

You want to argue that Trump's DOJ is trying to stop hate? Give me a break. Trump ran his campaigns and these Administrations on stoking fear and racism against communities of color and promoting hate—enacted Muslim bans; kidnapped and disappeared immigrants of all immigration statuses, including U.S. citizens; forced universities to roll back their diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts; stripped voting rights from Black and Brown voters; disenfranchising women and rural voters with the SAVE Act that he wants to pass.

It is all a shameless plan to return America to single party control by a Republican Party who, unable to win on any sort of policy merits, turns to an old racism playbook that restricts the power of Black, Brown, and working class voters and goes after any political foes, just to hold onto power. That is what is happening. For decades, the Southern Poverty Law Center has sued and won jury verdicts against hate groups who conspire and facilitate violence against Black and Brown people.

The Center secured a verdict against the planners of the 2017 Charlottesville rally, the same rally that drew participants who Donald Trump called “very fine people on both sides.” Yes, I know what he said after that to try and defend it. The entire rally was organized by White nationalists.

Even after images and videos revealed that these participants put up their arms in Nazi salutes and violently injured counter-protestors, and cheered on the former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, he stuck by that. SPLC has been winning. That is why Donald Trump wants to target them. That is the problem.

Stephen Miller, angry that SPLC called him out back in 2016 for promoting White nationalism and Right-wing extremist ideas, has decided to take revenge with an outrageous indictment that is replete with mistakes of fact and law. It is a complete fabrication that any crime has been committed at all. In the words of one

former prosecutor, DOJ falls, quote, “egregiously short on alleging a crime.”

Ms. Wiley, the indictment and this entire hearing is premised on the theory that SPLC somehow manufactured hate by paying confidential informants. I want to set the record straight about these informants.

Based on what we know from public reporting, did one of the Center’s informants produce information that successfully prevented a White supremacist group’s planned terrorist attacks against a synagogue and gay bar in Las Vegas?

Ms. WILEY. Yes. Atomwaffen Division is the name of the extremist group.

I should say that, in addition to the work that SPLC did information it turned onto the Department of Justice during the Trump Administration. The suggestion that somehow SPLC only works with an administration based on the party is undermined by this very important fact.

What the FBI found was that this person had already bought the supplies for the attack on a synagogue and a bar where a lot of LGBTQ people frequently.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you. I’m going to go through a series of these. Just a yes or no would be great. Did another informant produce information that led to the arrest of a neo-Nazi individual who sought a national security clearance in Philadelphia Navy Yard?

Ms. WILEY. Yes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Did an informant produce information that the Center used to tip off the FBI about the 2017 Charlottesville rally?

Ms. WILEY. Yes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. The Center was using informants to root out hate and help the FBI prosecute that hate, not manufacture hate. Is that correct?

Ms. WILEY. Yes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I want to ask you the charges are also premised on the idea that donors were misled and they didn’t know what the funds were being used for, but *The New York Times* publicly reported there’s no donor that’s come forward, as Mr. Raskin said.

Based on your experience, is there anything different about how SPLC is operating than any other nonprofit?

Ms. WILEY. Not that I’m aware of.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you, Ms. Wiley. This seems to be a “Trumped-up” case, literally, just to continue to prosecute people who don’t agree. I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. The gentlelady yields back.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair?

Mr. ISSA. We now go to—

Mr. RASKIN. I just have a UC request.

Mr. ISSA. Of course.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much. First, is *The Intercept*, “We Knew They Were Paying Informants. SPLC Donors Reject Trump’s DOJ Fraud Claims.” Second, is a letter from the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, an nonprofits together and 442 civil rights organizations rejecting the criminal charges.” Third, finally, unanimous consent to introduce a statement from Trevor

Potter, President of the Campaign Legal Center, former Republican Chair of the FEC.

Mr. ISSA. Without objection, so ordered. We now go to Mr. Hunt for five minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The talking point for the Democrat hype today is that Jim Crow is alive and well in America. I am sure that some of the SPLC's actions have helped them make this argument.

My first question is for you, Ms. Swain. In the 2024 Presidential election, were you required to pay a poll tax before you voted?

Ms. SWAIN. No.

Mr. HUNT. I have another question for you. When you went to vote at the voting locations, were you intimidated in anyway with baseball bats, fire hoses, or dogs?

Ms. SWAIN. The only thing that intimidated me is that in my State, that you go in—if you have to ask for a Republican ballot or a Democrat ballot. If you are in a precinct that's predominantly Democrat, I think you would have a lot of fear.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you for answering that question, ma'am.

For my Democrat colleagues and everyone on the Left screaming, "Jim Crow 2.0," like I hear *ad infinitum*, let's take a moment to revisit what actual Jim Crow was. Jim Crow was a time when Black Americans could not sit in classrooms with White Americans. It was colored-only water fountains. It was beatings in the streets. It was lynchings. It was fear. It was public humiliation.

My own father who grew up in the segregated South in New Orleans had to walk around to the back of a restaurant just to order a sandwich in the French Quarter of New Orleans because of the color of his skin. That was Jim Crow. That is precisely why it is so offensive to compare that era of legalized discrimination and racial terror to showing a photo ID in a voting booth. It is just as offensive when groups and organizations like these manufacture faux hate and racial tension.

Requiring identification to vote is not oppression. It is not segregation. It is not racism. It is a basic standard that applies equally to every single American citizen, regardless of what you look like. You need an ID to board a plane. You need an ID to cash a check. You need an ID to buy alcohol. You need an ID to enter these very Federal buildings. By the way, attaining an ID in this country is an extremely low bar. Somehow, showing an ID to vote in America is now considered to be Jim Crow 2.0. This is not about civil rights. This is about political theater.

The Democrat Party survives on manufacturing grievance. Democrats invoke the pain of the past because they have nothing to offer for the present. They don't want an honest debate. They want emotional manipulation. They want outrage. They want division, as evidenced by our discussion in this very hearing today. They want Americans to fight each other because chaos is politically useful to them—words like "racism," "White supremacy," and "Jim Crow 2.0."

For the purposes of elucidating my colleagues on the other side of aisle, let's take a hard look at what real Jim Crow was. Check out this one behind me. You see, this is Jim Crow. This is what

Democrats call Jim Crow. Next slide, please. See, that is Jim Crow. For whatever reason, this is what Democrats call Jim Crow.

Next slide, please. That is Jim Crow. This is what Democrats call Jim Crow. I know that some of these images can seem to be very jarring to many of us that haven't experienced that. Over the course of the past 40 years of my lifetime, I never saw these things. I never experienced them personally. I have family members who have and who did.

That is why it is extraordinarily important for us to be very, very careful with what we compare to Jim Crow, because this country has come a very, very long way. I keep saying this over and over, and over and over again, until I am blue in the face. I represent a White majority district, along with three of my other Black colleagues here in Congress.

You know what? Nobody cares about what we look like. We are being judged not by the color of our skin, but by the content of our character, because we have come a long way from this. I don't want to go back to that. In fact, I want to continue on the path that America has set forward in the name of Jesus Christ. I want people to know that we don't need to be angry. We don't need to be divided. We want equality for everyone.

Let me be crystal-clear. This is not 1960 anymore. It is 2026. The fact that groups like these are willing to stroke the flames of hate by funding the KKK is absurd.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time. Thank you for being here.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman, and he yields back. We now go to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, Ms. Scanlon.

Ms. SCANLON. Thank you, Mr. Chair. As we heard earlier, in July 1983, the Ku Klux Klan firebombed the Southern Poverty Law Center's offices in Montgomery, Alabama. The Klan carried out its violent attack because the SPLC had stood up against it and has continued to stand up against hate in the following decades, whether it is racial and religious hate, hatred of immigrants, or the LGBTQ community.

This melted clock, which was frozen in time by the KKK firebombing, still hangs in SPLC's headquarters as a reminder of the very real danger of defending Americans' civil liberties from hate.

How grotesque is it, given that history, that the Majority has chosen to frame this hearing as an accusation that the Southern Poverty Law Center itself is in the business of manufacturing hate? With the increasing shamelessness of the Trump Administration and its Congressional allies, none of us should be surprised that they are desperately trying to manufacture a reason to attack one of the organizations standing up to their assault on American civil rights. They are trying to turn back the clock and drag America backwards into some of the darkest days of our past. What has changed is not the Southern Poverty Law Center, but the 2205 way that this Administration—with its embrace of White nationalist rhetoric and groups—has decided to rewrite facts and history.

In the past year, we have seen pardons of Proud Boys and Oath Keepers who orchestrated the violent January 6th attack; the DOJ hiding from the public government research confirming that Right-

wing extremism poses the biggest domestic terrorism threat to our Nation; the White House issuing NSPM 7 a directive that the Department of Justice and IRS target Left-leaning groups that the White House has declared—without evidence—are a threat to our national security.

The Members of the Administration making repeated statements that they intend to destroy nonprofit groups, like the Southern Poverty Law Center, that are a threat to their extremist agenda. This White House has engaged in a concerted attack on the pillars of civil society that would ordinarily hold it accountable—going after law firms, the courts, legacy media, universities, organized religion, and even the Pope.

We can all see a corrupt DOJ leveraging its power to attack the President's perceived enemies and protect his allies—prosecuting those who have tried to hold the Administration accountable; stealing taxpayer dollars to create a \$1.8 slush fund to make payoffs to Trump loyalists who have been convicted of serious crimes, and giving Trump and his family a gold-plated get-out-of-jail-free card with the settlement agreement that the President's lawyer just signed.

The Department of Justice's blatant political prosecution and this Committee's attacks against the Southern Poverty Law Center signal the revival of an old authoritarian playbook to vilify and discredit those working to combat hate and protect people from oppression. It is part of this Administration's whole-of-government attempt to shut down opposition to its lawless behavior.

This Administration and its MAGA allies are trying to rewrite facts and history, just as they have tried to whitewash the violent January 6th assault on our Capitol and our Constitution.

The facts have a way of being sticky. They get in the way of lies. Americans have always sought to bend the arc of history toward justice, to hold those in power accountable, and to spur our country toward a more inclusive and perfect union.

We're not going to stop now. We are not going to allow extremists and charlatans to turn back the clock and take our civil rights and repression and put them asunder with hate.

Ms. Wiley, the DOJ's indictment targets SPLC itself rather than individuals. Is the Administration's goal to take out the organization, and why?

Ms. WILEY. Well, I certainly can't speak for the Administration. That what is so concerning to us as a civil rights community is that the Southern Poverty Law Center has been attacked because it does work to ensure that Black voters can vote; because it does work to show and ensure that fair maps are drawn for places like Alabama and Louisiana, where, yes, because we still have racial segregation in this country, Black people have to be "packed or cracked" to take away the opportunity for them to decide who can represent them that will actually be accountable to them.

These are incredibly important for civil rights, but it's also incredibly important for people's ability to have voice and power, including to dissent and disagree with the policies of this Administration.

Ms. SCANLON. Do you think that SPLC—

Mr. ISSA. The gentelady's time has expired.

Ms. SCANLON. —might have been targeted because it published emails by Stephen Miller that were expressing White nationalist sentiments?

Mr. ISSA. The gentlelady may answer briefly.

Ms. WILEY. Possibly, yes.

Ms. SCANLON. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. I now recognize myself.

Ms. Wiley, would you agree with the statement that Charlie Kirk was a dangerous extremist?

Ms. WILEY. I can't answer the question that way. I can certainly say that—

Mr. ISSA. No, no—

Ms. WILEY. —statements that I am aware of that Mr. Kirk made were ones that I would consider to be dangerous.

Mr. ISSA. Would those be the ones that he took directly from the Bible repeatedly?

Ms. WILEY. I'm referring to the ones that he made about Black women and Black communities, the stereotyping that stereotyped a whole group of people.

Mr. ISSA. You would put him on a list of dangerous people that should—as the Southern Poverty Law Center did?

Ms. WILEY. I don't designate groups. I'm just answering your question.

Mr. ISSA. Well, you have had opinions on everything the Democrats asked for. I just thought you might have an opinion on that.

Ms. WILEY. I shared my opinion about some of the things I heard he said, yes.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Would you agree that a group could be good, have a great mission, do a lot of good things, but also commit crimes?

Ms. WILEY. Well, anything is possible. I think what we've been talking about today is a specific organization.

Mr. ISSA. Oh, no, no, it was kind of a yes or no, but —

Ms. WILEY. It's a specific organization. It's a specific organization we're talking about, though, which is Southern Poverty Law Center, and I think the thing is—

Mr. ISSA. Your opinion is they can't commit crimes because they do good?

Ms. WILEY. My opinion is that we see a prosecution where we know that the Southern Poverty Law Center offered evidence and is asking for accountability about whether that exculpatory evidence was shown to a grand jury. That should concern all Americans.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Mr. O'Neil, I'll ask you, essentially, the same question. Would you say that Southern Poverty Law Center does some good work, at least historically?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. ISSA. Having looked at the evidence, would you say that it appears to be overwhelmingly evidence of criminal activity?

Mr. O'NEIL. I would direct audiences to page 10 of the indictment, where there's a direct quote from an employee saying, "I certify that I am the sole owner of the above-named proprietorship." This is a statement to a bank in December 2016.

Then, the statement from then-Chief Executive Officer of Southern Poverty Law Center Margaret Huang, who said that, "The accounts below listed were opened for the benefit of the Southern Poverty Law Center operations and operated under the Center's authority."

Mr. ISSA. Okay. What you have is actual evidence of bank fraud?

Mr. O'NEIL. I'd say it's black and white.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Well—

Mr. O'NEIL. Long as the quotes from the indictment are accurate, I have not seen—

Mr. ISSA. Well, people will go to jail if it turns out that, in fact, it was true, but they have indicated them. Both sides are playing high risk, but it appears as though the evidence is overwhelming.

Ms. Wiley, did you ever hear of the Jewish Defense League? Are you familiar with them?

Ms. WILEY. I'm not familiar with them.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Anyone else familiar with them? You are? Mr. O'Neil, you are familiar with them? They go back to the days of New York City and going after, basically, White supremacist groups, anti-Semitic groups.

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. ISSA. Would it surprise you to know that Irv Rubin and Earl Krugel both went to prison for attempting to blow up my office in 2001?

Mr. O'NEIL. I was not aware of this, but it wouldn't surprise me.

Mr. ISSA. Yeah. Earl Krugel later died in prison. Earl died—or Irv died before being tried, but the other was convicted, and eventually, actually, confessed.

Mr. O'NEIL. I'm so sorry to hear that.

Mr. ISSA. Here's a group you know of. They have a history of fighting anti-Semitism, something that has been mentioned on the other side, and that, obviously, still exists in this country, as does racism.

You can be a good group, and yet, you could have criminal activity, and activity that flies in the face of what you say you stand for.

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. ISSA. Ms. Wiley, I asked you that question for a reason. Dr. Swain here has, in fact, a history of being falsely accused, a history of being gone after. Mr. Perkins has given these examples.

The other side has spent a lot of time here today trying to tell us that it is all motivated because, somehow, we are persecuting people in this Administration. Do you have any evidence—not anecdotally, that, oh, they picked them—do you have any evidence that, in fact, Southern Poverty did not, in fact, commit these crimes? Do you have any firsthand evidence of that? Yes or no, please.

Ms. WILEY. Well, the Southern Poverty Law Center has a motion before the court right now which actually says that the Department of Justice admitted that they knew that the banks knew Southern Poverty Law Center owned the accounts. That is evidence in the public record that will be tried in court.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. I will look forward to that in trial. I want to thank all the witnesses today for bringing out the fact that we

should, in fact—this Committee should be looking at these not-for-profits and whether, in fact, they have deviated from their mission.

With that, do we have—oh, you have another unanimous—

Mr. RASKIN. Just a couple of UCs, yeah.

Mr. ISSA. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly, Mr. Chair. First, *The Guardian*, “U.S. Lawmakers Say DOJ Rushed Southern Poverty Law Center Indictment, Citing Whistleblowers.”

Second, House Judiciary Democrats letter re: The targeting of Southern Poverty Law Center, to Deputy Attorney General Aakash Singh.

Mr. ISSA. Without objection

Mr. RASKIN. That’s it for now.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you. We now go to the lady from—the gentlelady from Georgia for five minutes.

Ms. MCBATH. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for our witnesses being here today.

My father was the President of the Illinois Chapter of the NAACP for many, many years. As a child, I learned how to fight for my rights before I even learned how to walk. I marched in protests, sat in meetings, and helped to organize. I want everyone in this room to understand what is happening right now. The Republican Party has launched an all-out assault against civil rights organizations founded to ensure the end of Jim Crow.

That is just one part of their strategy. Three weeks ago, the Supreme Court gutted Section 2 of the *Voting Rights Act in Louisiana v. Callais*, saying that—and I’m going to quote—“Race-neutral considerations,” that it could employ race-neutral considerations,” in redistricting. Within days, Southern legislatures, they rushed to wipe out Black representation in Congress.

Tennessee called an emergency session to repeal its own law against mid-decade redistricting. It then splintered Memphis, a city that is 60 percent Black, into three districts to dilute the voices of the Black voters there.

The State’s Black legislators protested, and in response, the speaker stripped every single one of them of their Committee assignments.

Tennessee is not alone in silencing Black voices. Alabama moved to reinstate maps a court previously struck down for intentional racial discrimination. Florida passed new racially gerrymandered maps. We are waiting in my home State of Georgia to see what happens with us on June 17th.

Ms. Wiley—and you can just answer yes or no—have you ever seen five States move simultaneously to dismantle Black representation in Congress in such a very rapid, short time?

Ms. WILEY. No.

Ms. MCBATH. While this Administration demands attacks on Black Americans’ voices with phone calls to governors, it is fighting hard for the Right-wing extremist groups who stormed the Capitol on January 6th—groups whose members are not all White supremacists, but doesn’t seem to mind White supremacists.

Trump’s DOJ has given \$1.8 billion of a slush fund, taken from taxpayers, to pay off the 1,600 Right-wing rioters who tried to steal

the election for him. That is one million for each rioter with \$100 million left over.

Ms. Wiley, what message does this send to the country that this Administration is prosecuting the organization that takes down White supremacists while stealing taxpayer money to give to White supremacists?

Ms. WILEY. I wish I had a word, and I don't have a word for that, except to say that the American public should be outraged.

Ms. MCBATH. The Southern States are tripping over themselves to eliminate Black representation in Congress; the President is doling out reparations to White supremacists, and DOJ has indicted the Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization built to defend the rights of Americans—on charges so flimsy that it would make Bull Connor and George Wallace blush.

Americans deserve a voice in our democracy, representation of their interests, and should not have to fight for their basic civil rights again and again and again. Race should not be a factor.

This is an attempt to roll back the progress made through the Civil Rights Movement and strip Black Americans of their voice and public life, using the same tactics as Southern segregationist States following the death of Reconstruction for the very same goal.

I am a child of the Civil Rights Movement. We have seen this before. If we needed a reminder or a wake-up call that Jim Crow is alive and evolved, these legislatures made sure that we got the notice.

Ms. Wiley, would you like to expand on any previous questions or statements that you weren't able to complete?

Ms. WILEY. I just want to remind us that the Federal agencies, FBI, DEA, and AFT, spent over \$548 million on informants for a reason—because they thought it was going to help them keep people safe.

We're talking about this attack on SPLC at a time when we are facing an Administration that cut funds to prevent gun violence; that cut funds to track where and how we might have violent White supremacist, neo-Nazi attacks; that cuts funds that was going to support public safety—all at a time when we've seen a White House directing Department of Justice about who it wants to prosecute. As someone who used to work for the Department of Justice, that is unheard of.

Ms. MCBATH. Thank you. I yield.

Chair JORDAN. [Presiding.] The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yeah, just a couple of comments to lead off. First, I would like to thank Congressman Hunt for his pictures up here showing what it was like in the days in which the Democrat Party just rode roughshod over the South.

I would like to point out that the criticisms of Stephen Miller, to believe to this day are because of the role he took in exposing the Duke lacrosse player hoax, in which three people almost were sent to prison for life. Steve had the braveness to stand up to the politically correct, and eventually, those three people were found innocent after going through absolute hell.

I also want to point out a book by Christopher Rufo called "America's Culture Revolution: How the Radical Left Conquered

Everything.” In that book, he clearly describes how a goal of the hard-core Left—and I think some Members of this Committee are Members of the hard-core Left—the degree to which they try to racialize everything—not just racialize Black Americans, but Hispanic, Asian Americans, everything; that their ultimate goal is the end of the United States as we have a breakdown. It should be mandatory reading.

When you talk about Joe Biden screaming about White supremacy all the time, I think a lot of us must wonder, what in the world was he talking about? What he is talking about is he is trying to divide America on racial lines, which is really just a horrible thing.

Finally, I don’t have time to look into it. I know, if you Google “Ann Coulter” and “Proud Boys”—and Ann Coulter is a many times *The New York Times* best-seller—you may get a different version of the narrative we have had today on the Proud Boys.

Okay. Now, we are going to start off with Mr. O’Neil. Given the SPLC’s long documented pattern of partisan activism, financial misconduct—by the way, the financial misconduct by itself is enough that nobody should ever be citing for anything—and its recent Federal indictment for secretly funneling millions of dollars to individuals tied to extremist groups, how do you explain the continued willingness of major press outlets to cite the SPLC as an authoritative source?

By the way, I think 12 years ago, 13 years ago, any reasonably well-educated American would have known the SPLC was just a disgusting and made-up group. I would think that any newspaper, magazine, online magazine that cites them should be considered totally discredited—anybody who has spent the last 12 years—but how do you, Mr. O’Neil, explain why so-called major press outlets, at one time prestigious outlets, still cite SPLC as an authoritative source?

Mr. O’NEIL. It’s because the SPLC positions itself as a weapon of the Left by demonizing the sorts of conservatives that many in the mainstream Left want to render irrelevant, and therefore, it is a weapon, a reputational weapon, against people who are inconvenient for the Left’s narrative.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yeah. Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, they leverage their relationship with government to be able to do that with the media, and then, they leverage the relationship with the government with the corporations. That’s how they were able to get the corporations to de-bank and de-platform conservatives—because of that relationship.

I go back to the illustration of the hub. They’re at the center of it, but they’re not alone.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Right. Yes?

Ms. SWAIN. I would also say that they leverage their relationship with universities, especially law schools, because of a lot of the law students will go and intern with the Southern Poverty Law Center.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Okay. Very good. It just still bugs me that they go after Stephen Miller for finding those three lacrosse guys innocent. Doesn’t it just bug you? You know that is what it is all about.

Well, we will go to Tony Perkins. Your organization has falsely been labeled a hate group—to me, you are about the most wholesome organization in the country—by SPLC for holding Main

Street and prolife, profamily positions. Man, they hate those proliferers.

Given that this designation was cited by the perpetrator of the 2012 attack, how do you assess the responsibility of the organization?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, again, we warned them to take down that label. We've had subsequent attacks on people who have been labeled by them, including the latest Charlie Kirk who was assassinated.

There is culpability here. That we need to look at the—going back to that government leverage that they've been using, they should never have a relationship with a government entity again.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Right. They just hate Christianity, don't they, just hate it? Dr. Swain, do you want to comment on that? Would you like to comment? Oh, I'm sorry.

Chair JORDAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. ROSS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. Just reminding people that many of the roots of antiracism and civil rights in the South came from the churches, very Christian people.

I suppose I need to remind some Members of this Committee of the long and blood-soaked history of the Ku Klux Klan in North Carolina—maybe even some of our witnesses. During Reconstruction, the Klan lynched and assassinated countless Black and White leaders who opposed them.

In the sixties, the Klan grew to more than 10,000 Members in North Carolina, more than any other Southern State combined, and they earned the nickname—and North Carolina earned the nickname—"Klansville USA." Klan members in North Carolina carried out coordinated terror campaigns, culminating in the 1979 Greensboro Massacre, where the Klan and their neo-Nazi allies shot and killed five people who were protesting against them.

The story doesn't end there. Only because of the bravery of those who fought back against the Klan, like so many of our Christian ministers, and the Southern Poverty Law Center, did we see some change.

In the 1980s, the Southern Poverty Law Center launched Klan Watch to monitor, track, and expose the activities of the Klan.

In 1987, the Southern Poverty Law Center won a groundbreaking lawsuit, securing \$7 million in a judgment against the United Klans of America after their members lynched 19-year-old student Michael Donald in Mobile six years earlier. I know that Mr. Johnson talked about that.

Mercifully—mercifully—the judgment bankrupted the United Klan of America. This verdict greatly weakened the Klan and sent them scurrying underground, though, of course, we are seeing many of them today. It didn't stamp out the last rotten remnants of the Klan throughout the South, and those remnants have been planting seeds that have been cultivated by this President. That is why the continued work of the Southern Poverty Law Center and its allies is so essential.

Now, Ms. Wiley, is paying for informants to disrupt a violent White supremacist organization like the Klan the same thing as supporting these groups?

Ms. WILEY. No, that's why I was citing the FBI's own use of informants.

Ms. ROSS. Actually, was there a book written about an undercover agent by an undercover agent who infiltrated the Klan, like maybe called Black Klansman? Could you tell us about that?

Ms. WILEY. I haven't read the book, but it's a great movie.

Ms. ROSS. It's a great movie. Given that the SPLC's incredibly successful history of fighting the Klan and other extremist groups, do you think the people who have been consistently donating to the SPLC were surprised that the SPLC was paying informants to monitor, report, and expose the violent activities?

Ms. WILEY. Well, the only things we've heard in the public sphere are donors saying that the SPLC did what they had hoped donors would do, and we know from the public record that they're continuing to try to give money to the SPLC to continue its work.

Ms. ROSS. I kind of hope this lawsuit, this specious lawsuit, results in more contributions to the SPLC. Might be a silver lining to the lawsuit and this ridiculous hearing. Even the amateur hour Trump lackeys at DOJ know that this is a specious lawsuit. They don't believe these cynical charges. They know it is wrong.

The SPLC is not funding the KKK or far-Right groups. The SPLC is taking them down. At the same time, the President of the United States is trying to use taxpayer money to fund people who have assaulted police officers and tried to disrupt the peaceful transfer of power.

We have to speak truth. We have got to tell the American people what is going on, and that might be the only good thing that comes out of this ridiculous hearing. Thank you, and I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. I'm not sure Leo thinks the hearing is ridiculous, oh, actually, I'm pretty sure he thinks it doesn't.

Ms. MCBATH. Mr. Chair?

Chair JORDAN. The gentlelady from Georgia is recognized.

Ms. MCBATH. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. I have a unanimous consent request.

First, I request unanimous consent to enter into the record an article from April 15, 2025, titled, "Justice Department Moves to Toss Seditious Conspiracy Convictions of Oath Keepers and Proud Boys."

Second, I have is, "Several Tennessee House Democrats Stripped from Committees After Last Week's Special Session."

Chair JORDAN. Without objection.

Ms. MCBATH. Thank you.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. VAN DREW. Thank you, Chair. I'm going to take the gentlelady from North Carolina's advice and get to what I believe is the truth here. I'm getting a little historic on you.

Anybody ever heard of Machiavelli? Remember that, when you learned that in school? When you can debate the exact wording of what it means; you can debate the exact argument, but the meaning is basic and it is simple, and it is as old as politics itself.

If you believe, according to Machiavelli, that your cause is important enough; that it is righteous enough; that you want to obtain certain goals; and that it is urgent enough, there are no rules, no

morals, and no ethics. Truth becomes flexible and there are no standards anymore.

People start telling themselves that anything is acceptable if they can win, if the outcome is important enough to them. This is about winning. This is about the Left-wing—I'm sorry—but it is about the Left-wing Democratic Party wanting to win and using the SPLC, using each other, as tools to make sure that they win elections and put out misstatements.

We have to ask, when did it become part of the philosophy? Well, in the last Administration, we remember, we saw a lot of things—an FBI of lies, an FBI of untruths, an FBI of injustice, and an FBI that Joe Biden was willing to rely on politically tainted information, some of which came from the SPLC—bad information. We know now that it was wrong; that it wasn't true at multiple levels.

Attorney General Garland told us that the greatest threat facing the entire country was domestic violent extremists. The real threat, the great threat, a great threat to freedom, was his own Department of Justice and his own FBI back then.

It was scary. If you had a different opinion—guess what, folks? I'm not trying to address this to you, Ms. Wiley. I have a right to be conservative. I have a right to a different viewpoint.

There is not one human being up here that supports the Ku Klux Klan; none of us like it. I bet you there's nobody in this whole damned room that supports the Ku Klux Klan.

Catholics saw the clearest example of this. It was hateful. It was harmful. They went after Roman Catholic churches. They were going to have undercover agents. Thank God we found the information. It would have been still going on.

They went after Hindus in my State of New Jersey—good, faithful, peaceful, and loving people. The FBI went in with guns drawn—from bad information that they got. SPLC supplied a lot of this. The FBI painted them as domestic terrorists.

The same thing with parents in school board meetings that were worried about the stuff their own biological children were being taught. It is wrong. Catholics aren't extremists. Concerned parents aren't extremists. Hindus aren't extremists.

We have seen the pattern before over and over again. We saw it in the abuse of FISA. We saw when, by the way, tax dollars, questionable sources, the FBI, and Igor Danchenko. Remember that? Hundreds of thousands of dollars paid to him for bad information.

We also got bad information from the Southern Poverty Law Center—all for politics to go after Republicans. That is the elephant in the room. That is what people don't want to talk about, but that is the real deal.

If you were conservative—no, Charlie Kirk was not a terrorist. He just sat and listened to what he said—you might not agree with it—but he was just a very faithful conservative person. It is his right.

Now, the worst of it, though, is that we find the Southern Poverty Law Center is just one more tool. It started out good. They wanted to do good things. There are still people in there that want to do good things. It has been used in a way that is perverse and

awful to get political goals of a political party accomplished—Machiavelli through and through. It is pretty damned amazing.

People donated money, believing they were helping good causes and helping vulnerable people. In the beginning, they were. Nobody wants racism. Nobody up here in this room wants racism. Nobody wants to hurt anybody. Nobody wants to hate anybody.

The Southern Poverty Law Center and the work that they have done in recent times has actually caused more hate, more hurt, and more problems. They gave money to the KKK. I don't give a hell how you approach it, what you say about it; it's a bad thing.

I have just got some really quick questions, and I know I'm running out of time. Mr. Perkins, should the Southern Poverty Law Center have had such a high level of influence in Federal agencies?

Mr. PERKINS. No.

Mr. VAN DREW. No. Mr. O'Neil?

Mr. O'NEIL. No. In fact, with the FBI memo, the SPLC has suggested that the catechism of the Catholic Church is itself a hateful document.

Mr. VAN DREW. Unbelievable. I'm a Roman Catholic. I resent that, Ms. Wiley. I'm not a hateful person. I would never hurt anybody. I resent that and so does a lot of Catholics, as a lot of people of faith, they have a right to—

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, if we are going to run over time—

Mr. VAN DREW. No.

Mr. RASKIN. —can we talk about the President's attack on the Pope?

Mr. VAN DREW. How does an organization—

Mr. RASKIN. Is that part of your presentation?

Mr. VAN DREW. Last question, and then, I'm done. How does an organization maintain credibility—

Chair JORDAN. I have been very lenient—the time of the gentleman from New Jersey controls the time. The gentleman can ask his last question.

Mr. VAN DREW. I'm losing my time here. How does an organization maintain credibility as an authority on extremism if there are serious concerns being raised about its own extremism, its own judgment, and its own activities? Really quick, Mr. O'Neil and Mr. Perkins. Dr. Swain, how do you—go.

Ms. SWAIN. I can say that they—by 2009, they had already deviated and started targeting conservatives. I would say that they were so effective at eliminating hate groups that they had to find new people to label, new organizations. That's the problem.

Mr. VAN DREW. You're right. Go back to your original mission. I have a few UCs.

Chair JORDAN. Okay. We will do UCs, and then, I think—

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, a point of order, just so we are clear. That was one minute over, as we moved into Ms. Balint's time.

Chair JORDAN. We have been very lenient with the time.

Mr. RASKIN. I just want to make sure we are doing it equally; that's all. Equal rights; that's all.

Chair JORDAN. We are moving to UCs for Mr. Van Drew, UCs from the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, and then, we are actually going to go vote. Then, we will come back once votes are completed.

The gentleman from New Jersey, a UC.

Mr. VAN DREW. I have a UC from *Moms for Liberty*, and it is entitled, "The Justice Department Announced Indictment Against Southern Poverty Law Center."

A UC from Tyler O'Neil on 2026, "Democrats Beclown Themselves by Defending SPLC."

Another one from Mr. O'Neil, "However Bad You Think Biden's DOJ Was, New Documents Show It was Even Worse."

Chair JORDAN. Without objection.

Mr. VAN DREW. Thank you, Chair.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman yields back. The gentlelady from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Ms. SCANLON. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a unanimous consent request to introduce an article from *The Hill*, dated September 17, 2025, "DOJ Quietly Removes Study Showing Right-Wing Attacks Outpace Those by the Left."

An article from *The Washington Post*, November 13, 2019, "Leaked Stephen Miller Emails Show Trump's Point Man on Immigration Promoted White Nationalism, SPLC Reports."

The White House Issued the National Security Presidential Memorandum 7, September 2025.

An article from *The New Republic*, April 2026, "The Justice Department Sides with the Ku Klux Klan."

Chair JORDAN. Without objection.

Mr. RASKIN. I have two here. First, "Massacre at Pittsburgh Synagogue Tied to Anti-Refugee Sentiment." Second, the article, "Buffalo Shooter's Manifesto Promotes 'Great Replacement' Theory, Anti-Semitism."

Chair JORDAN. Without objection.

The Committee will be in recess for a short period of time. The reason we have to leave now is I do know that there's one 15-minute vote, and then, the next five votes I think are two-minute votes. I don't want to miss that. We are going to recess. There's lunch for you in the back, and then, we will be back as quickly as we can.

The Committee stands in recess.

[Recess.]

Chair JORDAN. The Committee will be in order. The gentlelady from the great State of California is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I previously asked in this Committee why the DOJ took down the NIJ's Journal dedicated to domestic radicalization, violent extremism, and terrorism. In that Journal, the DOJ research found that, since 1990, far-Right extremists have committed far more ideologically motivated homicides than far-Left or radical Islamist extremists.

In spite of those facts, we held two hearings in this Committee committed to Islamophobia. Not a week later, yet another act of deadly violence from the Right occurred at a mosque in my home State.

Before I begin, I would like to respectfully ask our Chair, Mr. Chair, will you commit to holding a hearing on the White nationalists who violently shot at the mosque this week in San Diego?

Chair JORDAN. We will take that under the consideration. We have a number of hearings scheduled and markups scheduled coming up here in the next week. We are looking to deal with some-

thing on Act Blue. We are looking to get the CEO of Southern Poverty Law Center—

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, I'm going to reclaim my time—Chair JORDAN. —but he wouldn't agree to come yet.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. I'm going to reclaim my time from you, and hope that this long thing turns into a yes.

Now, I would like to talk about an organization which is, and has been, historically dedicated to stopping violence, the Southern Poverty Law Center, whose informant program has helped stop real acts of violence in this country.

SPLC shared intelligence gathered from informants directly with law enforcement agencies, including the FBI and DOJ. That information helped stop a neo-Nazi from obtaining a security clearance and helped thwart a planned terrorist attack targeting a synagogue and a LGBTQ bar in Las Vegas.

Mr. Tyler, if an organization helped stop a bomb attack, is that good or bad?

Mr. O'NEIL. Well, of course, it's good, but—

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Okay. Thank you. No, because I don't have a lot of time. Mr. Tyler, do you believe that law enforcement should ignore credible intelligence about violent extremist threats? Yes or no?

Mr. O'NEIL. No.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Okay. Thank you.

Chair JORDAN. The witness' name is Mr. O'Neil.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Oh, I apologize.

Mr. O'NEIL. Thank you.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Because from where I sit, those answers sound like public safety work. Yet, Republicans applauded when Kash Patel severed the FBI's information-sharing relationship with SPLC.

I cannot find a single instance where SPLC's cooperation with law enforcement made Americans last less safe. Maybe the real issue is simply SPLC has been effective at exposing

White supremacists and extremist organizations for decades—organizations that Republicans either condone or deny exist at all.

SPLC was founded during the Civil Rights Movement to fight racial terror and organized hate in the South, and for over 50 years, it has sued violent White supremacist organizations, monitored extremist groups, protected voting rights, and defended vulnerable communities. SPLC bankrupted factions of the KKK and fought racial intimidation campaigns.

Recently, they exposed abusive living conditions in juvenile detention centers and filed suit against school districts that failed to provide individualized services and reasonable accommodations for disabled students. How is that bad?

Let's talk about transparency for a moment. Republicans are accusing SPLC is wrongdoing because it did not public disclose donor-by-donor payout maps tied to confidential informants, but non-profits do not operate that way.

Are Turning Point USA or Moms for Liberty publishing donor-by-donor payout audits? Because I can't seem to find them. Somehow, Republicans want a completely different standard applied here.

The hypocrisy becomes even more obvious when you look at Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche. Mr. Blanche publicly attacked SPLC over its confidential informant program, while refusing to rule out taxpayer-funded payouts to January 6th rioters, including individuals convicted of assaulting police officers.

Why is secrecy suddenly unacceptable, when a civil rights organization uses confidential informants to stop violent extremism, but perfectly acceptable when this Administration creates a \$1.8 billion taxpayer-funded White reparations slush fund? Why are Republicans attacking SPLC while refusing to provide transparency about who could receive taxpayer-funded payouts tied to January 6th insurrectionists?

This hearing has nothing to do with oversight and nothing to do with public safety. It is about intimidating organizations that challenge White supremacy, defend civil rights, and refuse to bend the knee to this Administration. Mr. Chair, as you know me, I have some—

Chair JORDAN. UCs?

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Yeah, there we go, my friend.

Chair JORDAN. The gentlelady is recognized for unanimous consent requests.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you. I ask unanimous consent.

(1) An article entitled, “Acting Attorney General is facing bipartisan criticism about the DOJ’s so-called ‘anti-weaponization fund,’” May 19, 2026, *Politico*.

(2) An article entitled, “What we know about the San Diego mosque shooting victims, suspects, possible motive, and more.”

(3) An article entitled, “Multiple Republicans in Congress post openly anti-Muslim statements.”

(4) An article entitled, “The Second Wave: Return of the Militias.”

(5) An article entitled, “Pentagon tightens ban on supremacist activity after years of denying problem.”

(6) An article entitled, “SPLC DOJ lawsuit a ‘wake-up call’ to end Mississippi’s school-to-prison pipeline.”

(7) An article entitled, “SPLC report reveals the high price of Florida’s incarceration of black children.”

(8) An article entitled, “Fifth Circuit rules against unlawful debt collections targeting Hurricane Katrina survivors.”

(9) An *SPLC* Report, “Overcoming the Unprecedented Southern Voters’ Battle Against Voter Suppression, Intimidation, and a Virus.”

(10) An article entitled, “SPLC announces new campaign ‘Poverty is Not a Line,’ during Poverty Awareness Month.”

(11) An article entitled, “How the threat of political violence is transforming America.”

(12) The last one, “Right-wing extremist violence is more frequent and deadly than left-wing violence.”

Chair Jordan. Without objection.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I am looking forward to getting additional information—

Chair JORDAN. Yes, yes.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. —on when that possible hearing can—

Chair JORDAN. Just for the record, Republicans aren't upset when the Southern Poverty Law Center labels racist organizations "racist." We're upset when they label nonracist organizations, conservative organizations, "racist," and we are upset when they pay racists. That is why we are having the hearing.

The gentleman from South—the gentlelady is recognized, then the gentleman from South Carolina.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Thank you. The 11-count indictment of the Southern Poverty Law Center over wire fraud, false statements, and conspiracy to commit money laundering states that, between 2014–2023, the SPLC covertly funneled more than \$3 million in donated funds to individuals who were associated with several violent extremist groups, including the KKK, the National Socialist Movement, and the National Socialist Party of America.

Because the SPLC was instigating, rather than infiltrating, these hate groups, donor money was seemingly being used to create and prop up the very hate that SPLC claimed to be fighting against. More hate means more money for the SPLC, and this led to a transformation of this corrupt and divisive group, moving toward a creator of hate within America.

There is a fundamental difference between Federal law enforcement using paid informants and a nonprofit organization lying to financial institutions to compensate people to foment hate, racism, and anti-Semitism.

The SPLC's field sources were doing much more than gathering information. For example, the indictment notes that one field source, quote, "made racist postings under the supervision of the SPLC and helped coordinate transportation to the Charlottesville event for several attendees."

Mr. O'Neil, do you believe that SPLC's conduct crossed the line from infiltrator to instigator?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes, based on the information in the indictment.

Ms. HAGEMAN. In response to the indictment, we also found out that the SPLC was sharing information with law enforcement. I have got concerns about that because of how biased the SPLC obviously is, and the information that they were sharing with law enforcement was also biased.

You can tell that by the questioning, or at least the accusations that were just recently made, and even some of the articles that were identified by the woman from California. The articles themselves even accusing the folks this week of committing a horrible act at the mosque out in San Diego. Their own writings defy and disagree with what she was alleging over there.

Individuals on the Right and Left have long recognized that the SPLC is no longer the group that it was founded to be.

Mr. O'Neil, shouldn't we be concerned that our government and law enforcement are accepting information from knowingly biased sources?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes, we should be concerned that they were receiving information specifically from a group that systematically demonizes concerned parents, conservative Christian groups, and even groups of LGB people who oppose the sexualization of children.

Ms. HAGEMAN. If the SPLC were instigating criminal action, and then, reporting such information to law enforcement, would that not raise even more legally dubious conflicts? Mr. Perkins?

Mr. PERKINS. It would. SPLC was kind of—it was like they were hiring an arsonist to create a fire. Then, they were calling the fire department and ratting out the arsonist that they hired. Then, they wanted to get—

Ms. HAGEMAN. Accusing someone else. Accusing someone else of setting the fire.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, but they also wanted to get Citizen of the Year Award by calling in and turning in the arsonist that they paid.

This is conspiracy that goes way behind just money. This was about trying to demonize, silence, and completely eliminate any opposition to the left, when it came to their agenda.

Ms. HAGEMAN. That is what has played out today with the questioning and your testimony.

Now, we are finding out that the SPLC was not only engaged in this kind of behavior, but we have schools across the country that have included SPLC information in their curriculum.

Dr. Swain, what are the concerns that you have in that regard?

Ms. SWAIN. I have that the SPLC's program "Teaching Tolerance" is really intolerant. Many of the public and private schools use their materials, and because they have so many resources, they are able to get into the schools in a way that is very dangerous, because they're all about indoctrination of a very progressive agenda. That is my concern.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Okay. I appreciate that. I believe that this program, that it is the "Learning for Justice," is the community education program that I am referring to. Mr. O'Neil, do you have concerns about that program as well?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes. It's very telling, in my mind, that the program that was long known as "Teaching Tolerance," apparently, the SPLC has become too woke for tolerance. They changed the name to nix the tolerance and just go with "Learning for Justice."

Ms. HAGEMAN. Okay. All right. Interesting. Well, I'm just about out of time. I also have a unanimous consent.

Chair JORDAN. The gentlelady is recognized.

Ms. HAGEMAN. This is an article from April 30, 2026, from *LifeZette News*, "The 'both sides' political violence narrative completely debunked: They cooked the books."

An example being that all claims of anti-Semitism, they claim are Right-wing or conservative attacks. We know that is absolutely not the case. They do not count what happened on 9/11, and there are many other examples in this particular article where they have absolutely cooked the books; that they claimed Left-wing violence is Right-wing, when we know that this isn't true. They are even lying about that as well.

Thank you, and I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. Without objection. The gentlelady also yields back. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Vermont.

Ms. BALINT. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This President and his supporters in Congress want to turn the clock back. They are trying

to undo the progress of the Civil Rights Movement. That is what this is all about.

This is about White nationalism and a direct attack on Black Americans in this country, and it comes from the very top. That is why we need groups like SPLC, because the President is systematically taking us back to the darkest chapters of American history. Rather than face accountability from the voters, he is fully embracing authoritarianism. Sham indictments against nonprofits are just one part of this plan.

President Trump, his captured Supreme Court, and Republicans in this very room have supported attacks on law firms involved in civil rights litigation, dismantling the Federal civil rights offices, weaponizing the DOJ to baselessly attack the President's enemies, gutting the Voting Rights Act.

This is an effort to criminalize dissent. We are witnessing an intentional effort to intimidate any institution who will stand up for our rights—the rights of Americans. It is an intentional effort to silence Black voices and to undo our multiracial democracy.

The Majority claims that the SPLC manufactures hate. Here's the hard truth: There is no reason that the SPLC has to manufacture hate in this country, because the Trump era has supplied plenty of it. White supremacy, Christian nationalism, violence against women, Right-wing extremism, and bigotry against the LGBTQ community is flourishing.

The President just set up a corrupt slush fund to pay people who took up arms against our own government. Right now, hate is being cultivated, rewarded, and reinforced by those in power.

Ms. Wiley, thank you for being here. How do these attacks on SPLC, the Justice Department, and the civil rights of Black Americans enforce—civil rights enforcement affect the civil rights of Black Americans?

Ms. WILEY. Significantly. I just want to share one story we haven't talked about. Because the reality is Charles Murrell, III, a Black man in Boston, in 2022, was just walking down the street. The Patriot Front attacked him. The Patriot Front is listed on SPLC's Hate Map as a hate and extremist group. The importance of calling it out is so that Charles Murrell, III, can walk down the street and be safe.

At a time when we are talking about schools and education and children, and what happens within them, we see a broadside attack on even teaching history of slavery, history of the Civil Rights Movement that took permission away from hate and extremism and said:

This country, no matter your viewpoint, no matter your religion, no matter who you vote for, and no matter what you believe, is your country. That matters for all of us, and I say every American should be concerned, no matter who you are, if we Whitewash hate.

Ms. BALINT. I couldn't agree more. Because we see every day, when we turn on the news and we watch this President at press conferences, the bigotry and the hatred is coming from the top. It is a strategy; it is an electoral strategy, but it is also a cultural one.

The way President Trump has routinely insulted and demeaned women and people of color has permeated this country. When he casually calls women reporters "piggy" and "stupid" and mouths

the word “bitch” at a Black reporter; when he calls Haiti and African countries “shithole nations”; when he repeatedly and relentlessly spreads falsehoods about President Obama’s birth certificate, it spreads the hate.

As a former history teacher, I know there’s going to be a reckoning; there will. Our children and our grandchildren will ask us where we stood; what we said; what we did, when we had these microphones, when we had these platforms. They will ask us if we bowed down to a tyrant, to a bigot, to a man who spreads hate through his social media posts, through his appearances at press conferences. They will ask us this.

I will tell you I know where I am. I’m standing with the people and I’m standing with the Constitution. I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. FRY. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Hey, guys, I have a great idea. In 2016, we raised \$51 million. That is really good. We can do better, right? We can do just a little bit better if we just invest in the same thing that we are perpetuating—if we perpetuate the same thing that we are fighting against.

Let’s take, Mr. O’Neil, \$3 million. Does that sound about right? If we take that little bit of money and send it to informants and White nationalist groups, we can—two-and-a-half—we can double our money. Does that sound like a good business model?

Mr. O’NEIL. It is a deal for you. It is only \$270 to that particular Charlottesville informant.

Mr. FRY. Right. Let’s—I think that is a good investment, don’t you? If a year from now—

Mr. O’NEIL. Two hundred and seventy grand, and then—

Mr. FRY. If a year from now in 2027, we will see the fruits of our labor. Is that kind of what happened?

Mr. O’NEIL. According to the indictment—and I do need to preface, “according to the indictment,” because I haven’t seen the underlying evidence. Of course, this will work out in court. According to the indictment, that’s exactly what happened.

Mr. FRY. We take this organization, the Southern Poverty Law Center, that has had, let’s say, tremendous success decades ago in eliminating racism in our country, in fixing laws, and seen really a societal change in the way that we approach race, in the way that we deal with race.

They were doing pretty good in 2016, maybe even before. Isn’t that just crazy? Ms. Hageman talked about this a second ago. We are sitting in—we are perpetuating the problem and funding the problem that we are eliminating, right?

This is a “division for dollars” racket. Is that a fair characterization, at least according to the indictment?

Mr. O’NEIL. Well, that’s why I wrote this book in 2020, years before the indictment. Because I saw it when they put good people, like Tony Perkins’ organization, the Family Research Council, on the Hate Map. I’ve been screaming from the rooftops about this for years. When the indictment comes out, I say, yeah, that makes a lot of sense to me. I want to set a few, if you don’t mind, I want to set a few things straight.

The Southern Poverty Law Center wasn't founded until 1971. A lot of people in this room have been saying that it's a civil rights organization started in the middle of the Civil Rights Movement. It started toward the end of it.

They were almost ambulance chasing. Forgive me on this, but when they sued the Klan, their own lawyers said that suing the Klan was like shooting fish in a barrel. Their own lawyers quit because they said Morris Dees was so focused on suing the Klan to make money by going to donors, because he knew donors cared about this, that they were drifting away from their original mission, which, by the way, wasn't fighting White supremacy, but it was representing poor people in the South with legal representation, which is a noble mission.

I pray to God that they turn every effort that they have demonizing conservatives toward that effort, because that effort is noble. By the way, groups on the Hate Map, good conservative groups that provide legal representation to people who can't afford it, are demonized by the SPLC for doing exactly what the SPLC was founded—

Mr. FRY. Mr. Perkins, really quick, if the SPLC puts on their Hate Map a neo-Nazi group—that is kind of their mission, right? There's no objection to that, probably not. The transparency actually helps to eliminate groups like that. Would you agree?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. FRY. You are on the same list as a neo-Nazi group, and that is not really a fair characterization, is it?

Mr. PERKINS. No.

Mr. FRY. The Moms for Liberty, too, their only crime is being involved in their child's education, right?

Mr. PERKINS. Right, being moms.

Mr. FRY. Being moms.

Mr. PERKINS. Yeah. What they mean—

Mr. FRY. That is, apparently, a White supremacist thing, right? Like I don't understand this logic.

We are taking an entity and using an idea that we are going to go grow our influence. In the Biden Administration, in government, they are going to meet with us on a quarterly basis. We are going to go after people.

It became—and maybe this is fair to characterize—but the SPLC went from maybe an altruistic entity at its inception—on a good day—to really a racket of: Let's go grow our influence. Let's balloon our fundraising.

What is their foundation right now, \$700 million? Is it fair to characterize the mission creep of the SPLC in that way, sir?

Mr. PERKINS. Congressman Fry, it's more insidious than that. They needed the White supremacist groups, so that they could marginalize and demonize moms and groups that adhere to biblical teaching. They needed those groups.

That's why they're propping them up. This was not about money. Charlottesville was about coalescing corporations behind their initiative to marginalize and demonize conservatives, so the Left could march forward. It's much more insidious than what—this is like Al Capone. Does anybody believe that it was just tax evasion? Come on, he was a criminal. He killed; he murdered.

Mr. FRY. You use that to justify your existence. With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman from Florida is—shall we go on?

Mr. RASKIN. No, I was just going to note they were 36 seconds over, and that Ms. Crockett needs to be catching her plane. If she could go first—

Chair JORDAN. The gentlelady from Texas, and then, we will come to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. CROCKETT. Well, well, well. It is so hard to sit here and listen to this. That is one reason I watched the Majority of this and didn't actually sit in this room, because I'm sure my faces would have told everything that I was thinking.

Is there anyone that finds it odd—well, can we start here? I'm going to start with the entire panel. Are the Proud Boys a White supremacist organization, yes or no? Starting with Ms. Wiley.

Ms. WILEY. It is my view they are.

Ms. SWAIN. It depends on how you define it. I have a book—

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay, never mind. Next.

Ms. SWAIN. It depends on how you define it.

Ms. CROCKETT. It's a yes or no.

Ms. SWAIN. Oh—

Ms. CROCKETT. Proud Boys, how they define themselves? Are they White supremacists, yes or no?

Ms. SWAIN. I have not read a description of how they define themselves.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay, that's fine.

Mr. PERKINS. I'm not on their mailing list. I don't know.

Ms. CROCKETT. Are you only on the mailing list of White supremacists?

Mr. PERKINS. No, I'm not like the SPLC; I don't fund organizations that I'm—

Ms. CROCKETT. Oh, it just seemed like you were saying, because you haven't received their mail, you only receive the mail of White supremacists. Go ahead, the last witness.

Mr. O'NEIL. No, they're not White supremacists.

Ms. CROCKETT. You know what? I do believe that you all believe that. Let's try another one. Neo-Nazis? Ms. Wiley?

Ms. WILEY. Well, yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Neo-Nazis. Nazis is in their name. Neo-Nazis, Dr. Swain.

Ms. SWAIN. Is the question still about the Proud Boys, or is it about the—

Ms. CROCKETT. Neo-Nazis: We have moved on—Neo-Nazis.

Ms. SWAIN. Neo-Nazis are hate groups, and I have a book about hate groups.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Thank you so much. We're going to hate groups—

Ms. SWAIN. —that I suggest that you all read. It's a long one—

Ms. CROCKETT. I'm reclaiming my time. I'm reclaiming my time. Neo-Nazis, are they White supremacists?

Mr. PERKINS. Neo-Nazis, are they White supremacists?

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes or no?

Mr. PERKINS. What's that?

Ms. CROCKETT. Yes or no?

Mr. PERKINS. They're certainly antisemitic, which I would join with any Member of the Democratic Party. Mr. Nadler earlier was talking about standing up for the Jewish people.

Ms. CROCKETT. Okay. Reclaiming my time. Thanks.

Mr. O'NEIL. I'd be happy to do that. Yes, they're White supremacists.

Ms. CROCKETT. Whoo, thank God. Jesus Christ.

Mr. O'NEIL. Sure are.

Ms. CROCKETT. I didn't think we were going to get there. Oh, my gosh. Let me be clear. Proud Boys are freaking White supremacists. Neo-Nazis are, too. This President, who loves to coddle White supremacists, has decided that they should be given checks. The reason that I pointed to those particular organizations is because you can go and read I don't know how many articles, as Dr. Swain wants people to read up. I'm going to be clear. I've read my fair share of books. I do have my fair share of degrees.

It is clear that Neo-Nazis as well as Proud Boys joined in on January 6th, yet this slush fund that they keep talking about is specifically to give them money. How dare this Majority sit here and try to lecture—try to lecture this organization about money? Now, we're not talking about tax-paying dollars as we are in that slush fund, but you're telling me that \$2 billion in the same country that I'm sure some of y'all would struggle with whether or not the enslavement of Black people was good or bad—I'm not even going to go there and ask y'all the question because y'all struggle with defining that these people were White supremacists.

This country still hasn't thought that reparations made sense for Black folk in this country, but at the same time, they've decided that people that are in organizations that are absolutely White supremacy organizations should get our tax dollars because they decided to tear apart or attempt to tear apart our democracy. They are being rewarded. These are people that went through our criminal justice system. When people on that side of the aisle claim that they love law and order, they went through it.

They either entered pleas of guilty or they were found guilty, and this President, on day one, his priority was not around racism. It was around doing things like letting them go and now putting money in their pockets. We haven't had one hearing on White supremacy, yet when we look at things like the killing of Ahmaud Arbery, George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, the nine worshipers who were murdered at the Mother Emanuel AME Church, the 23 people murdered in 2019 during the shooting at Walmart in El Paso, the 10 people murdered during the 2022 shooting at a grocery store in Buffalo, New York, all these were murdered by White supremacists who are empowered by the Republican Party's racist rhetoric and policies. This is the same party that wants to drag us back to the Jim Crow era. Some say that there aren't poll taxes, and I guess it's because they're not listing the amount of money.

When you tell somebody that they've got to go and pay for something, say like a passport that costs over \$100 to be able to vote, that looks like a poll tax to me. Some of y'all need to read up on your history books, the very same ones that the Republicans have decided that people should not hear about, because you don't want

real history taught in our schools because you're afraid that it's going to hurt people's feelings to know that their ancestors were so savage that they would enslave Black folk. You don't want them to understand why the 14th Amendment mattered then, and it matters today. You don't want them to understand that when they draw these racist lines and tell Black folk that they shouldn't have representation in this country—that it is against the Constitution.

Chair JORDAN. Time of the—

Ms. CROCKETT. You want them to be ignorant?

Chair JORDAN. Time of the—

Ms. CROCKETT. That they can sit up here and do your talking.

Chair JORDAN. The time of the gentlelady has expired.

Ms. CROCKETT. For your mission. I yield.

Chair JORDAN. Well, you can't yield because you have run out of time. It looks like the Ranking Member wants to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, thank you. Walmart gunman attacked El Paso because that's what his President was telling him, his defense attorney says. I'd like to introduce that for the record.

Chair JORDAN. Without objection. Democrats would talk about a slush fund. I would just point out, was it a slush fund when Peter Strzok got \$1.2 million from the Garland Justice Department? Was it a slush fund when Lisa Page got \$800,000? Peter Strzok's the guy that said, "I'm in the Northern Virginia Walmart. I can smell the Trump supporters." The Biden Justice Department gave him \$1.2 million. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Wiley, I want to talk to you about the Charles Morrell case that you mentioned earlier. You said it happened where?

Ms. WILEY. Boston.

Mr. BISHOP. In Boston?

Ms. WILEY. Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. He was attacked by whom?

Ms. WILEY. The Patriot Front.

Mr. BISHOP. The Patriot Front: The SPLC did not give the Patriot Front any money, is that correct?

Ms. WILEY. I don't know.

Mr. BISHOP. You don't know?

Ms. WILEY. No.

Mr. BISHOP. How was he attacked? Pardon me, I'm just not familiar with this case.

Ms. WILEY. The Patriot Front had a march that they were engaged in without a permit, and he was attacked on the street.

Mr. BISHOP. Was he killed or just assaulted or—

Ms. WILEY. I don't know that it matters if we're talking about a hate crime which is what we're talking about.

Mr. BISHOP. I'm just trying to get the details, ma'am, and I'm leading up to this. Would you be willing to condemn the local leaders efforts to defund the police? Because I agree with you. We should have safe streets.

Ms. WILEY. I'm sorry. I'm not—what was the question?

Mr. BISHOP. Will you condemn Boston's local leaders trying to defund the police? They did that in their recent budget proposal.

Ms. WILEY. I don't live in Boston. What I will say is this was a hate crime.

Mr. BISHOP. Do you think that defunding the police helps or hurts public safety?

Ms. WILEY. The question that I was asked to come speak to—

Mr. BISHOP. Mm-hmm.

Ms. WILEY. Was the rise of hate?

Mr. BISHOP. Right.

Mr. WILEY. The critical importance of us addressing and protecting civil rights, and as a public plan—

Mr. BISHOP. Well, you said earlier that you respect Mr. Morrell's right to a free street, so I'm asking you: Will you condemn the local leaders efforts to defund the police?

Mr. WILEY. I will not make any comment about local decisions in Boston.

Mr. BISHOP. What about Mayor Wu's policy of offering sanctuary to people here illegally, regardless of their criminal history? Will you condemn that?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. BISHOP. It seems like your qualification on public safety is very limited, correct?

Mr. WILEY. No, I'm just here—

Mr. BISHOP. I think it is. I think it is.

Mr. WILEY. I'm just here on a hate crime.

Mr. BISHOP. Well, let's talk about the hate crimes. In terms of the neo-Nazis, I actually agree with just about every word that Jerry Nadler said. I'm working on a bill to promote safe places of worship, increase penalties for attacks on worshipers, and neo-Nazism is certainly on the rise. You would agree with that?

Mr. WILEY. I would.

Mr. BISHOP. Antisemitism—attacks against Jews, Christians, and members of other faiths—is on the rise.

Mr. WILEY. It is.

Mr. BISHOP. Do you know why it's on the rise?

Mr. WILEY. Well, that's why we've been so concerned about the cuts to grants and programs that are helping us understand the rise and exactly why we have young men like we saw in San Diego.

Mr. BISHOP. Yeah.

Mr. WILEY. Murder three men at a mosque.

Mr. BISHOP. Are you concerned at all?

Mr. WILEY. While we're concerned about the attacks on the Southern Poverty Law Center, which is also seeking to help us better understand the rise of—

Mr. BISHOP. I agree—I agree. Do you find it at all problematic that one of the leading candidates for United States Senate proudly commissioned and displayed a Nazi tattoo on his chest for almost 20 years? Does that concern you?

Mr. WILEY. I don't know who you're referring to. I would only say that antisemitism, neo-Nazism, hate always concerns me.

Mr. BISHOP. Would you condemn that, and that candidate? He's a United States Senate candidate who proudly wore a Nazi tattoo right on his chest.

Mr. WILEY. Well, certainly I don't agree with any support of neo-Nazism.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. Now, I'm detecting a little bit of—it seems like—viewpoint and partisan bias from the SPLC. Mr. Perkins, I want to talk to you a little bit about this. Do you know why there is such fervent resistance or, I would say, fervent hatred for traditional viewpoints, for Christians, for people like yourself?

Mr. PERKINS. I do because we have a fixed view of marriage, of human sexuality—

Mr. BISHOP. Mm-hmm.

Mr. PERKINS. That stands in the way of the Left's ideological push to transgender our children and to redefine marriage. To shut us up, knock us off the media, defund us, they have to label us alongside of these racist groups.

Mr. BISHOP. Right. Right. Ms. Wiley, do you think that biblical values are extreme?

Mr. WILEY. I don't even understand the question, sir. I'm sorry.

Mr. BISHOP. Very simple. Do you believe that biblical values are extreme?

Mr. WILEY. I believe that people have the right—

Mr. BISHOP. Sure.

Mr. WILEY. To have their beliefs, including their interpretations of religion, whatever their religion is.

Mr. BISHOP. Is Mr. Perkins belief in traditional biblical values what brought him to the forefront of the SPLC's hate group map?

Mr. WILEY. I can't speak for the SPLC's decision.

Mr. BISHOP. You are today.

Mr. WILEY. I am here to speak about hate and bias, and what I'm here to say is—

Mr. BISHOP. Do you think that belief in biblical values promotes hate and bias?

Mr. WILEY. That is way too broad a question to answer.

Mr. BISHOP. Well, I'm asking because—

Mr. WILEY. What I'm very clear on is that we have a Constitution that protects the—

Mr. BISHOP. Sure.

Mr. WILEY. —First Amendment rights, including freedom of religion. We support that as a civil rights community that includes almost every faith and an interfaith alliance.

Mr. BISHOP. Yeah. Well, let me just stop you there. I know Dr. Swain well. She's a scholar. She's independent. She's very well thought out. Why was she listed as someone to be concerned about?

Mr. WILEY. I'm here because we're talking about hate. I do not engage in the designations—

Mr. BISHOP. Is she a hateful person?

Mr. WILEY. I don't know her.

Mr. BISHOP. You're on behalf of the SPLC.

Mr. WILEY. I'm on behalf of civil rights, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

Mr. BISHOP. Is she anticivil rights?

Mr. WILEY. I don't know her.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. Well, I'm over my time, Mr. Chair.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, can we just clarify Ms. Wiley's organizational identification? There's some confusion here.

Chair JORDAN. Yeah.

Mr. WILEY. I am the President and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, which is the Nation's oldest and largest civil rights coalition of almost 250 national organizations.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to go back really quick to the questioning by Ms. Crockett, just because I thought it was actually an easy line of questioning, and I want to give everyone an opportunity just to clarify. Ms. Swain, the neo-Nazis are a supremacist group, right? I know you talked about your book, but—

Ms. SWAIN. May I—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Neo-Nazis are a supremacist group.

Ms. SWAIN. May I define a White supremacist? Because I have a Cambridge University Press book when I did my research, White supremacists.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Okay. Can you—but Ms. Swann, you're—I got to ask, you're doing what the university professors did with Elise Stefanik.

Ms. SWAIN. No, I'm telling you—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Talking about, well, what's the definition of this and what's the—

Ms. SWAIN. No, I'm giving you a definition—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No, but.

Ms. SWAIN. Because you all don't have one.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No, no, the neo-Nazis are a supremacist group. They believe they're supreme, right? That's why they wanted to put people in camps that they believed were not pure. Neo-Nazis are a supremacist group, right? This is not a trick question, Ms. Swann. I'm not trying to trip you up, and the fact that you are—

Ms. SWAIN. I would like to define a White supremacist, and when I did my research, it was White people who believed that because of their race they were superior to other groups. The Left redefined White supremacist so that it could include any White person as well including you all.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Okay, but Ms. Swann, Ms. Swann, that's a—hold on. That's a wonderful speech and a filibuster.

Ms. SWAIN. No, it's true.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Are neo-Nazis supremacists?

Ms. SWAIN. It depends on which ones. They are individuals.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No, I didn't ask you—

Ms. SWAIN. Some of them—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I didn't ask you which ones.

Ms. SWAIN. Some of them are plain old antisemites—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Ms. Swain, listen—I'm not reading your book if you literally can't answer this question. Are neo-Nazis supremacists?

Ms. SWAIN. They're individuals. Some are, and some may be just plain old antisemites.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No. Neo-Nazis are antisemites, okay? We're going to agree there.

Ms. SWAIN. Right. Okay.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. They're also supremacists, Ms. Swain.

Ms. SWAIN. Okay. If you agree—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No—no—no. You don't have to take my word for it, right? Like, they are. That's the whole reason they exist.

Ms. SWAIN. You all don't seem to—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Because they believe they are supreme.

Ms. SWAIN. You all don't seem to understand that a White supremacist—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Who are they all? I'm not a neo-Nazi. Who are they all? I'm a regular person asking another regular person—

Ms. SWAIN. Okay.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. If we can agree that neo-Nazis are supremacists.

Ms. SWAIN. Okay. I will agree with you.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Okay. I don't want you to be forced into it.

Ms. SWAIN. I would agree with you, but I suggest you all take the time and read my Cambridge University Press book—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yeah. Listen, I—

Ms. SWAIN. —that was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Ms. Swain, listen. Dr. Swain, I can promise you, there's no freaking way I'm buying your book when it took two minutes for you to look at me and had to convince you that—

Ms. SWAIN. Because I don't like the talking points that Leftist—

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. This is not a talking point. This is 100 years of history. Watch this. I'm going to show you how easy it is. Mr. Perkins, are Neo-Nazis supremacists?

Mr. PERKINS. They are supremacists.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, sir. Mr. O'Neil.

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Okay. Dr. Swain, that wasn't a trick question for them. I wasn't trying to trip them up. I wasn't using DNC talking points. This is part of the problem. I didn't even want to do this, quite frankly, because I'm not interested in making this stuff political, right? I got Democratic candidates in Texas coming out yesterday and saying that Jews belong in concentration camps again, okay?

Ms. SWAIN. It's terrible.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Like, we're in real bad times.

Ms. SWAIN. I agree.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. If we put these hateful conversations in our political box and we do the what about ism, this is just going to continue to spread hate.

Ms. SWAIN. I agree with you 100 percent. We agree on that.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Right. Right. That's why we have to be able to at least agree to a simple set of facts: That neo-Nazis are supremacists. Right? Okay. We've moved on. We've moved on. You're there.

Ms. SWAIN. You all use White supremacists as a broad statement.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. I didn't—I didn't —

Ms. SWAIN. That's not every White person.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Listen, I didn't say anything other than they're supremacists.

Ms. SWAIN. Okay.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. They are.

Ms. SWAIN. I apologize to you, sir.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Okay. No, you don't have to apologize to me. I just want you to understand, if we can't agree on a simple set of facts, then we can't solve real problems. Mr. Chair, this obviously was a specific topic that you had scheduled a couple weeks ago and invited these witnesses in.

I got to be honest the last week, the amount of anti-Semitic messages, voicemails, text messages I have gotten, stuff on my social media, an assassination plot, a couple months ago, someone serving 25 years in jail, and now watching someone running for office trying to join the greatest deliberative body ever created on this planet who thinks the way forward for America is to look at 1940s Germany. Okay. My grandmother was part of the Kindertransport out of Germany.

Her parents died at Auschwitz. My kids are not going to an internment camp, I can assure you. It's becoming so normalized. It is. We've gone from, oh, there's Americans who donate to elected officials that are APAC. Then it's, okay, Netanyahu. Then it's okay, maybe we shouldn't support foreign money. Then, okay, now we're going to call these people Zionists. Now, we're at concentration camps. By the way, we got to concentration camps much faster than I thought we would get, but here we are. It's real scary. People are scared. People don't want to show their Jewish stars anymore. They're moving into neighborhoods just to be around other Jews because they're concerned. One of my Republican colleagues—I know I'm over, Mr. Chair, I'm going to wrap it up.

One of my Republican colleagues asked: Do we know why it's spreading hate? All sorts of hate, not just antisemitism. Why? This is why it's spreading. It's all here. It's really here. Go poll young kids versus seniors. It's a dramatic difference in the amount of hate young kids have versus seniors. This is the difference. You're seeing it in voting patterns. You're seeing it in belief systems.

We've let foreign governments and bots just totally weaponize this. No countries can beat us militarily. We're stronger than everyone combined. They have gotten us fighting among ourselves, dividing us, at each other's throats. You asked me why things are so bad, just spend a couple minutes, go to my Twitter, go look at some happy things, like Happy Veterans Day or Happy Memorial Day that I posted, and look at the hate I get. It is out of control. Mr. Chair, I appreciate you doing this hearing in general, but hate—hate, real hate is spreading in this country in ways that my grandparents—they're gone, right? I can't imagine if they were alive to see what was going on here. I yield back. Thank you for the extra time, Mr. Chair.

Chair JORDAN. Well, I appreciate what the gentleman said, and one of the things I have personally made a commitment to do is keep it out of our—party I belong to. I know you are doing unbelievable amount of work trying to keep it out of your party. The once great party of FDR and JFK, we're seeing things there that are just not healthy for this great Nation. I'm committed to doing everything I can to make sure it doesn't get involved in the Republican Party. I appreciate your words because it is scary. Very scary.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. ONDER. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, Mr. Chair, I have to say I agree with a lot of what my colleague, Mr. Moskowitz just said,

a lot of the hatred and division is driven by social media, by this, especially since COVID, and I believe our foreign adversaries in many times are intervening, and I believe the algorithms are driving our young people particularly into more and more extreme views, and that's sowing social division, and that is not good for anyone other than our foreign adversaries. Mr. Chair, thank you for holding this Committee. It is truly astounding to me the lengths to which the Southern Poverty Law Center has gone to preserve its relevance. It's telling that our second hearing about the Southern Poverty Law Center, my Democratic colleagues have not called someone from SPLC to defend themselves. In fact, the previous Democrat witness, very similar to the witness today, just over and over again. Well, I don't speak for the SPLC. Well, why are you here then?

Look, an organization that was ostensibly committed to advancing civil rights should strive to make its own intervention less necessary by encouraging productive dialogue and fostering equal treatment under the law, rather than continually framing disagreements through the lens of racial animosity. If the SPLC were serious about dismantling hate, it would not be funding it, nor would it be engaging in conduct that promotes division for institutional or political gain. Mr. O'Neil, is it a common practice? You've written a lot about nonprofit organizations or NGOs. Is it a common practice for NGOs to channel money through intermediaries—entities in ways that obscure the ultimate recipient or purpose of those funds?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes, to some degree. There is dark money funding. This happens on both the Right and the Left.

Mr. ONDER. Sure.

Mr. O'NEIL. You have groups like 1630 Fund and the Tides Foundation that seem set up to hide which donors are funding which projects.

Mr. ONDER. Okay. Are there legal or ethical issues with this? This, I don't know, money laundering as well?

Mr. O'NEIL. That's a complicated question.

Mr. ONDER. Yeah.

Mr. O'NEIL. It is not money laundering.

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEIL. There is a very important First Amendment right established and upheld through *NAACP v. Alabama*, and most recently *AFP v. Bonta*, that Americans have the right to give to—

Mr. ONDER. Yeah.

Mr. O'NEIL. Causes they believe in.

Mr. ONDER. Yeah.

Mr. O'NEIL. That said, there are questions about this cloaking of dark money.

Mr. ONDER. Right.

Mr. O'NEIL. What is not covered in this is lying to a bank.

Mr. ONDER. Right.

Mr. O'NEIL. By saying you established an account for one purpose and then using it for another.

Mr. ONDER. Yes. Okay. Does the SPLC reveal what the criteria or metrics are to determine which organizations or individuals are included in their hate map?

Mr. O'NEIL. They claim to, yes. They have—

Mr. ONDER. Because when I look—

Mr. O'NEIL. Very weaselly language.

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEIL. They say when a group vilifies other people, typically by their immutable characteristics, but they use the word typically—

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEIL. Because they have anti-immigrant hate groups.

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Mr. O'NEIL. Your immigration status is not an immutable characteristic.

Mr. ONDER. FAIR, Center for Immigration Studies—

Mr. O'NEIL. Correct.

Mr. ONDER. I've studied their work quite a bit, and all I see is desire to enforce Federal immigration law, but somehow that makes you a hate group. Well, let's go to someone right here. Dr. Swain, are you an apologist for White supremacists?

Ms. SWAIN. I don't think so. I try to stand up for all Americans. I believe in the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. It applies to all races, and in America, we should not be discriminating for or against any group.

Mr. ONDER. You have a dream that someday your young children would be judged not by the color of their skin, but by the quality of their character?

Ms. SWAIN. Yes.

Mr. ONDER. I don't know. If someone says something like that, they would be labeled a hate group by the SPLC maybe.

Ms. SWAIN. Probably.

Mr. ONDER. Probably. I think you said it. You said it very, very well, Dr. Swain, that rather than monitoring hate groups, the Southern Poverty Law Center has become one.

Ms. SWAIN. That was 2009, and I had been a Democrat all my life, and so at that time, I was about ready to make a transition, but the—

Mr. ONDER. That was 2009.

Ms. SWAIN. It was my observation—

Mr. ONDER. Yes, 2009. In the last 17 years, has anything changed your mind about SPLC?

Ms. SWAIN. Oh, I was ahead of my time.

Mr. ONDER. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. Yields back. Gentleman from New York. We go. We go to—oh, okay. Sure. We'll go to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Thank you, Chair. Mr. O'Neil, I wanted to talk a little bit about this—the hate map concept, but isn't it true Southern Poverty Law Center began as a public interest law firm?

Mr. O'NEIL. Correct.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yeah. Actually, as a Member of the State legislature, we had some issues in which Southern Poverty Law Center had weighed in on. I was familiar with the group before this latest set of issues made us kind of more aware of what's going on internally. When did the organization start to kind of stray from that original mission or that original course?

Mr. O'NEIL. It strayed from that course in at least two ways, in two time periods. The first was in the 1980s when the lawyers all quit because they said that Morris Dees took the organization in a direction of fighting the Klan instead of representing poor people in the South. Then the more recent time was really starting in the late 1990s, but ramping up by, you know, 1,000 percent in 2010 when they had their hate map and they started going after conservative organizations.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let's talk about the hate map. First, can you explain the hate map?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yes. This is the SPLC is best known for suing Klan groups into bankruptcy, and so they had a program called Klanwatch. They expanded it to Hatewatch because they ran out of grand dragons to slay. Not to say that White supremacy doesn't exist anymore in America, there are some isolated groups, but by and large, not enough to justify the sort of money that the SPLC gets. They have this map that's supposed—and in their words, they say it reveals the infrastructure upholding White supremacy in America today.

This map now includes social conservative organizations like the Family Research Council, Moms for Liberty. It includes now Turning Point USA, PragerU. It includes Alliance Defending Freedom. It includes the Center for Immigration Studies, the Federation for American Immigration. I could just go down the list. It also includes a group of LGB people who oppose sexualized lessons for children in schools.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it—

Mr. O'NEIL. They call that group an anti-LGBTQ hate group.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it too far to say there's no Left-wing groups on the hate map?

Mr. O'NEIL. There are a few Left-leaning groups on the hate map, but nowhere. The overall bias is very clear against the right. They don't have Antifa. They don't have Jane's Revenge. They do have the New Black Panther Party, I believe, which they always reference when they're asked this question. By and large, the hate map is, well, not solely, but by and large, targeted on conservative organizations.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Very good. Thank you. Mr. Perkins, do you think the Southern Poverty Law Center is intentionally trying to draw a distinction between you and these legitimate hate groups? Do you think they're trying to maybe —

Mr. PERKINS. They're trying to conflate—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mold them? Yeah. Okay.

Mr. PERKINS. They use those organizations to marginalize and demean legitimate conservative Christian organizations.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Do you think they're purposely diverting money from your organization and reducing your operations, or do you think that's a target?

Mr. PERKINS. That was a part of their broader conspiracy with financial platforms and banks to debank us and other organizations to keep us from being able to get funds from donor-advised funds, yes. They're trying to bankrupt conservative groups.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Can I ask you further? Did they have any success in that adventure?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, they did.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That they launched? Okay. Okay. The last thing I would say is, do you have a relationship with, if there is,—with corporate donations? Is there any linkage between what they were doing to suppress further corporate donations to their organization or to you, either way?

Mr. PERKINS. I think most of the work was with corporations that had platforms or financial corporations that, like PayPal, that would facilitate funding for conservative groups. Most corporations were not giving to conservative groups directly, they were intermediates. They were the vehicles through which people would donate to conservative organizations.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yeah. It wasn't about the ideology of the corporation. It was more about how they facilitated the actual Movement of funds.

Mr. PERKINS. Correct. Well, I would say some of them willingly went along. Others were pressured by the SPLC using their government connections. Some in the tech world have suggested that there were threats about regulate regulators like in the banking industry.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yeah.

Mr. PERKINS. They used threats and bullying tactics.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Thank you very much. Chair, I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. Gentleman yields back. Jelani from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Ms. SCANLON. Yes. I seek unanimous consent to introduce an article from May 8, 2026 from the *Intercept*, which is entitled, "Big Finance Might Be Dooming the SPLC Even Before Its Day in Court," describing how some of these larger financial institutions have been blocking donor-advised fund donations to the SPLC.

Chair JORDAN. Objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Thank you.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. Goldman. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The hate map—you don't like it. I get it. The SPLC is not a government organization, and we have the First Amendment, so they're free to put what they want, and you, all of you, are free to speak out against it and to explain why they're wrong. As I think of my Republican colleagues, we believe in the First Amendment, except, I guess, when it's critical of far-Right groups or conservative groups who support these Republicans.

You are not free to use the government to criminally indict an organization based on a completely bogus charge. I want to dig into this indictment. On April 21st, hours after Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche and the FBI Director Kash Patel announced this indictment, Mr. Blanche went on *Fox* and said this:

MR. BLANCHE: No information that we have that suggests that the money that they were paying to these informants and these members of these organizations, they then turned around and shared what they learned with law enforcement. To the contrary, or else we would have known from their own words that they had given this money to these guys, and we didn't know it.

Mr. GOLDMAN. They had no idea that the SPLC was using informants and providing information to the government. Five days

later, Mr. Blanche was forced to acknowledge that that was a false statement. In fact, it was in a document filed by the Department of Justice where he said it is true. He went on TV and said, "it is true that over the years they have selectively shared information with law enforcement."

That's well documented and there is no dispute, but they aren't charged with any of that conduct. What the hell does that mean they aren't charged with any of that conduct? The entire premise of this fraud scheme is that SPLC was actually using the money given by the donors to support the hate groups, not to dismantle them as they represented. Any knowledge by the government that the SPLC shared information with them to dismantle these groups completely undermines and defeats the fraud claim. There's plenty of evidence that the

The FBI knew that the information provided to them by the SPLC to help the FBI dismantle these groups came from informants. In fact, two weeks before the indictment, the SPLC presented the US Attorney's office with evidence that showed that they had been sharing information from informants with the FBI dating back to 2018. Even Blanche's statement that none of the information shared with the FBI was charged in the indictment is false. It doesn't matter because that's not what the fraud claim is, but it is false because the Charlottesville Unite the Right movement is specifically mentioned in the indictment. The indictment does not mention the 45-page report that the SPLC sent to multiple FBI offices before the Unite the Right event that included information from their informants.

Now, we've established that. Now, we know this fraud claim is completely bogus, but it gets worse because it's not even part of the allegations. In paragraph 19 of the indictment, it explains the fraud scheme. It says that the SPLC represented to the victim donors that their money would be used to help dismantle violent extremist groups, but that they did not tell those donors exactly how they would do that. It actually charges fraud by omission, not representation—misrepresentation. To have fraud by omission, you must prove that the omission was material to the victims such that they would have acted differently if they had known about it. There isn't a single allegation in the indictment that any donor would not have donated if they knew about the payments to informants. In fact, everything we know is the opposite. Ms. Wiley has pointed out repeatedly about how donors are trying to continue to give.

That Intercept article that Ranking Member Raskin introduced cites 20 donors who now say that they either knew about the paid informants or they would have made their donations anyway. What is this really about? It is weaponizing and politicizing the Department of Justice, not any of your groups, to quash and squash free speech, to muzzle people that—because you are trying to protect far-Right investigations who are huge supporters of the Republican Party. They may not do any oversight into this indictment, but I guarantee you, when we take the Majority back in January, we will be doing that oversight, and they will be held accountable. I yield back.

Chair JORDAN. Chair yields back. Gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thanks for holding this hearing and thank you to the witnesses for taking the time to be here and testify before us. We certainly really appreciate that and appreciate your expertise. Ms. Wiley, I have a couple questions for you. Do you still believe in defunding the police?

Mr. WILEY. I believe in public safety, and that means driving dollars to where we're most likely to prevent crimes from happening and ensure that we have responsive law enforcement that doesn't violate people's rights, and it prevents crime.

Mr. GILL. Does that mean driving dollars away from law enforcement?

Mr. WILEY. It means making sure we're driving dollars to the things that support public safety.

Mr. GILL. Possibly away from law enforcement—

Mr. WILEY. That's a variety of things.

Mr. GILL. Possibly away from law enforcement.

Mr. WILEY. Well, I think we have law enforcement. We have talked about the need for law enforcement, particularly when we're fighting hate and biased crimes, which have—

Mr. GILL. I agree. We certainly do need law enforcement.

Mr. WILEY. More than doubled in this country since 2015.

Mr. GILL. Law enforcement is very important.

Mr. WILEY. I think I—

Mr. GILL. During your mayoral race a few years ago, you said, quote, "I'm going to take a billion dollars from New York City Police Department." Do you still think that's a good idea?

Mr. WILEY. Well, I'm here to talk about hate crimes, not my run for city—

Mr. GILL. I'm just asking if that's—I'm asking from a public—

Mr. WILEY. I stand by my run for mayor, and I appreciate the opportunity—

Mr. GILL. You stand by that statement?

Mr. WILEY. To try to drive dollars to public safety.

Mr. GILL. You have to cut the police budget and change what we mean by policing. Do you still stand by that statement as well?

Mr. WILEY. I stand by the need to invest in community safety, to ensure that we have—

Mr. GILL. By defunding the police—

Mr. WILEY. —a vibrant civil rights community that is able to participate and keep our community safe.

Mr. GILL. I just want to be clear, you believe in—

Mr. WILEY. From hate and bias.

Mr. GILL. Investing in community safety by defunding the police?

Mr. WILEY. I am here to say that I'm really grateful we have the Southern Poverty Law Center, because it is doing work, including with law enforcement—

Mr. GILL. You think defunding the police makes our community safer?

Mr. WILEY. —to prevent hate and bias crimes.

Mr. GILL. Okay. I've got another question for you. What is a Black job?

Mr. WILEY. You'd have to ask Donald Trump.

Mr. GILL. I'm not sure what that means. I'm referring to a statement that you made a year ago on your LinkedIn:

I was so honored and proud to be a New York State delegate for our next President with Vice President Kamala Harris ascending to her Black job.

Mr. WILEY. Donald Trump made a comment that was very stereotypical about Black people, and it was a joke about his stereotypical statement about Black people.

Mr. GILL. What is a black job?

Mr. WILEY. You'll have to ask Donald Trump.

Mr. GILL. Have to. Well, Donald Trump's not on the witness stand, so I'm asking you.

Mr. WILEY. Well, I'm here to talk about hate crime, which I hope you want to talk about as well.

Mr. GILL. Could Hillary Clinton—

Chair JORDAN. If you would, I can clarify that.

Mr. GILL. No, I'd like to hear from the witness, but I appreciate it. Could Hillary Clinton have filled that Black job, what you call a Black job?

Mr. WILEY. You'd have to ask Donald Trump.

Mr. GILL. Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it. Dr. Swain, I'd got a couple questions for you. Thank you again for being here. In your book, "The New White Nationalism," which is excellent, you wrote that in 2002 there were approximately 2,000 KKK members in the entire Nation. Sounds like you believe a large portion of them were paid informants. Do you think that the SPLC was involved back in 2002?

Ms. SWAIN. Well, there was a scholar named.

Mr. GILL. If you can turn the mic on, please.

Ms. SWAIN. There was a scholar named Laratt Wilcox that I referenced, and he did research and he was very critical of the Southern Poverty Law Center. He said at one point that there were more paid informants than actually KKK members. I will concede that the Southern Poverty Law Center was very successful as far as bankrupting the neo-Nazis and the KKK. I will concede that, but I will also argue that as early as 2009, when I wrote the article that triggered the Southern Poverty Law Center, at that time, the New Black Panther Party was patrolling the polls in Philadelphia.

They were intimidating White people and they had sticks in their hands, and the Southern Poverty Law Center had not labeled them as a hate group. In the blog, where I ended with instead of monitoring hate groups, the Southern Poverty Law Center has become one, instead of labeling or listing the New Black Panther Party, what they did, they went after Lou Dobbs, and they went after the Center for Immigration Studies and anyone who questioned liberal immigration policies.

Mr. GILL. Mm-hmm. We've got about 15–20 seconds left. Can you? To sort of close this out, what are the dangers of paying for these informants and extremist groups like the KKK?

Ms. SWAIN. You get biased information if you're paying people for information, and one of the dangers for our society is that the Southern Poverty Law Center has pretty much become an arm of the Democratic Party. They are very partisan. They should not have that 501 C3 status if they're going to take a side in—if they're going to be biased in how they monitor groups and how they destroy individuals like me.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Dr. Swain.

Chair JORDAN. Gentleman yields back. The gentleman from New York recognized.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, could I just do one UC?

Chair JORDAN. That's what I'm doing.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, I think they both want it.

Chair JORDAN. Okay, go ahead.

Mr. RASKIN. Oh, so sorry. This is in direct answer to the gentleman from Texas question. *The New York Times*, "What's a Black job? Trump's anti-immigration remarks are met with derision." Trump accused immigrants of stealing Black jobs during Thursday's debate, prompting criticism from Democrats and other social media users. I'm glad to see that the gentleman's on our side. Thank you very much.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. GOLDMAN. I have another unanimous consent motion.

Chair JORDAN. Motion to enter.

Mr. GOLDMAN. To enter into the record an April 17th, letter from the attorneys for the SPLC four days before the indictment, where the organization reminded him of his obligation as a Federal prosecutor to inform the grand jury of information that negates evidence of wrongdoing by SPLC, of which there is much.

Chair JORDAN. Without objection. Chair now recognizes gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BAUMGATNER. Well, thank you, Mr. Chair, and our distinguished panelists. I don't know what happened to the Southern Poverty Law Center. I know growing up in the Inland Northwest in Eastern Washington, I had some fond, at least favorable, memories toward the Southern Poverty Law Center when we had an Aryan Nations compound in the Coeur d'Alene area, and it resonated with me that the SPLC had played a role in getting those folks out of our communities, and it was generally viewed on favorably. I don't know how it went from that organization to what I think today could be accurately described as an almost militant, weaponized arm of a progressive Marxist political project here in the United States. I guess, Mr. O'Neil—I'm sure you're familiar with the phrase jump the shark in Happy Days —

Mr. O'NEIL. Yeah.

Mr. BAUMGATNER. When Fonzie jumped over the shark, and certainly the show went downhill from there.

Mr. O'Neil. Yeah.

Mr. BAUMGATNER. You spoke about the quest to start the focus on raising money from SPLC, but how did this organization, again, go from doing some good work against real racists like the Aryan Nations to suddenly targeting people trying to exercise their First Amendment rights and care about kids like Moms for Liberty? Where is that process?

Mr. O'NEIL. Yeah, The answer to that question is long and complicated, and that's what my book was trying to do.

First, there was Morris Dees, who was a consummate fundraiser, and he decided to take the SPLC in that suing the Klan direction. The lawyers said it was like shooting fish in a barrel. The real answer to your question, the substantive answer, is that we've seen on the Left this ideological drift, where it used to be that they would stand for your right to disagree and speak openly, and now

it is as though if you disagree with anything that the Left says, you must be a vile, racist hater. Like, this has always been a little bit of the rhetoric, but it got supercharged after 2020. One of the reasons why Moms for Liberty is on the hate map is because many people on the Left seem to work themselves into a lather and think that America is still systemically racist. Critical race theory is so deeply—their idea of critical race theory is that White supremacy is so deeply embedded in our institutions that you have to have a fundamental revolution on a systemic basis; otherwise, you are supporting White supremacy. That’s the main reason why the SPLC justifies calling conservatives the infrastructure upholding White supremacy.

Mr. BAUMGATNER. Do you think the SPLC is interested in racism being solved?

Mr. O’NEIL. I don’t have expertise on that particularly. I wish I could say that I do believe that, but I don’t know.

Mr. BAUMGATNER. Our colleague from Florida spoke very passionately Congressman Moskowitz, about really concerning rise in antisemitism. When we see these issues of hate that can manifest themselves online in the social media sphere, often with foreign actors—the area that I’m really concerned about is the conspiracy theory mindset and this kind of derangement in the fever swamps of the internet that can play upon these things.

That’s one of the reasons why what’s happened to SPLC is so concerning, because not only does their own activities of funding these informants—so-called informants—using donations to fund racism itself but just this whole project certainly is laden with fervor for conspiracy theories. We really do need some good think tank work, NGO work, and other work to focus on this issue across the board of fighting conspiracy theory. However it did happen, this jumping of the shark for SPLC really did some part of your law center, really did—was a detriment to society as a whole. I’ll just close by saying thank you to all the panelists, but for all the good work you do: Ms. Swain, Mr. Perkins, Mr. O’Neil, and Ms. Wiley. With that, Mr. Chair, I’ll yield back.

Chair JORDAN. Gentleman yields back. I want to thank our witnesses for being here today, for their great testimony, and I want to thank those members of the audience who are here with us for the entire hearing, particularly Leo. Thank you. We appreciate you all being here and what the Committee was able to gather from your fine testimony. You, the witnesses, are excused.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Chair, I’d like to offer an unanimous consent.

Chair JORDAN. The gentlelady is recognized. Thank you all again.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have two that I would like to enter into the record.

First, is from the *Center for Economic and Policy Research*, January 26th, “The Black jobs deficit cost Black Americans \$87 billion in 2025 because of strong anti-Black bias in hiring.”

Second, I would like to enter into the record: June 24th, *Forbes*, “Black Americans respond to Trump’s notion of Black jobs.”

Chair JORDAN. No objection.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair JORDAN. Gentleman, the Ranking Member's recognized for a motion. I understand.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, Mr. Chair, thank you. Pursuant to Clause 2K6 of Rule 11, I hereby move to subpoena Acting Attorney General Todd Blanche, Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward, Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent, IRS Chief Executive Officer Frank Bisignano, Treasury Department General Counsel Brian Morrissey to testify before the Committee at a hearing on Donald Trump's nearly \$1.8 billion slush fund to reward insurrectionist rioters and other alleged victims of weaponization.

Chair JORDAN. Ranking Member's made a motion.

Mr. KILEY. Mr. Chair.

Chair JORDAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. KILEY. I move to lay the motion on the table.

Chair JORDAN. Motion has been moved. There's been a motion to move and put the motion on the table. The motion is nondebatable. The question occurs on the motion to table. Those in favor say aye, Aye. Those opposed, No.

[Chorus of aye.]

Chair JORDAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and the motion is tabled.

Mr. RASKIN. Can we have a recorded vote please, Mr. Chair?

Chair JORDAN. Request for a recorded vote being asked for. A recorded vote is requested. The clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan.

Chair JORDAN. Yes.

THE CLERK. Mr. Jordan votes yes. Mr. Issa? Mr. Biggs? Mr. McClintock? Mr. McClintock votes aye. Mr. Tiffany? Mr. Massie? Mr. Roy? Mr. Fitzgerald? Mr. Fitzgerald votes aye. Mr. Cline? Mr. Cline votes aye. Mr. Gooden? Mr. Gooden votes aye. Mr. Van Drew? Mr. Nehls? Mr. Moore? Mr. Moore votes aye. Ms. Hageman?

Ms. HAGEMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Ms. Hageman votes aye. Ms. Lee? Mr. Hunt? Mr. Fry? Mr. Kiley?

Mr. KILEY. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Kiley votes no. Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes aye. Mr. Knott?

Mr. KNOTT. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Knott votes aye. Mr. Harris?

Mr. HARRIS. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Harris votes aye. Mr. Onder?

Mr. ONDER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Onder votes aye. Mr. Schmidt? Mr. Gill? Mr. Gill votes aye. Mr. Baumgartner?

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Aye.

THE CLERK. Mr. Baumgartner votes aye. Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no. Mr. Nadler? Ms. Lofgren?

Ms. LOFGREN. No.

THE CLERK. Ms. Lofgren votes no. Mr. Cohen? Mr. Johnson?

Mr. JOHNSON. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Johnson votes no. Mr. Lieu?

Mr. LIEU. No.

THE CLERK. Mr. Lieu votes no. Ms. Jayapal?
 Ms. JAYAPAL. No.
 THE CLERK. Ms. Jayapal votes no. Mr. Correa? Ms. Scanlon?
 Ms. SCANLON. No.
 THE CLERK. Ms. Scanlon votes no. Mr. Neguse?
 Mr. NEGUSE. Aye.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Neguse votes no. Ms. McBath? Ms. Ross?
 Ms. ROSS. No.
 THE CLERK. Ms. Ross votes no. Ms. Balint?
 Ms. BALINT. No.
 THE CLERK. Ms. Balint votes no. Mr. Garcia? Ms. Kamlager
 Dove?
 Ms. KAMLAGER DOVE. No.
 THE CLERK. Ms. Kamlager Dove votes no. Mr. Moskowitz? Mr.
 Goldman?
 Mr. GOLDMAN. No.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no. Ms. Crockett? Mr. Nadler?
 Mr. NADLER. No.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Nadler votes no.
 Mr. BIGGS. Am I recorded?
 THE CLERK. Biggs? Mr. Biggs, you're not recorded.
 Mr. BIGGS. Aye.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
 Ms. MCBATH. I didn't realize we were going next.
 THE CLERK. Ms. McBath.
 Ms. MCBATH. No.
 THE CLERK. Ms. McBath votes no.
 Chair JORDAN. Mr. Garcia and Mr. Correa. Mr. Garcia.
 Mr. GARCIA. No.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.
 Chair JORDAN. Correa?
 THE CLERK. Mr. Correa.
 Mr. CORREA. No.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Correa votes no.
 Chair JORDAN. Moskowitz? Mr. Moskowitz, did you already vote?
 THE CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no. Mr. Schmidt, you're not re-
 corded.
 Chair JORDAN. Mr. Schmidt, you're not recorded.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Schmidt votes aye. Mr. Issa?
 Mr. ISSA. That'll be yes.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Issa votes yes. Mr. Van Drew?
 Mr. VAN DREW. Yes.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Van Drew votes yes. Mr. Fry, you're not re-
 corded.
 Mr. FRY. Aye.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.
 Chair JORDAN. Clerk will report.
 THE CLERK. Mr. Chair, there are 18 ayes and 17 nos.
 Chair JORDAN. The motion is tabled. That concludes today's hear-
 ing. We thank our witnesses—well, the witnesses already left. We
 thank them now again.
 Without objection, all Members will have five legislative days to
 submit additional written questions for the witnesses or additional

materials for the record. Without objection, the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:13 p.m., the Committee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.]

All materials submitted for the record by Members of the Committee on the Judiciary can be found at: *<https://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=119311>*.

