

**THE
ETHICS
OF**



**IMMIGRATION
POLICY**

Ethics of Immigration Policy

A Collection of Essays

John F. Rohe, Editor

ISBN: 978-1-881780-27-9

(You can order copies of this pocket-sized booklet from
The Social Contract Press)

Funding provided by the
Weeden Foundation

Published by
The Social Contract Press
445 E. Mitchell Street
Petoskey, MI 49770-2623
231-347-1171
800-352-4843
www.TheSocialContract.com

Cover art used by permission of:
The Estate of the
late Gary Williams

Table of Contents

Introduction – John Rohe	2
Courting Cheap Labor – Joan Molinaro	3
Immigration and Income Disparity – Vernon Briggs, Jr.	4
Living Wage – Richard Lamm	5
“Jobs Americans Won’t Do?” – Edwin Rubenstein	6
Overpopulation – Dave and Marcia Pimentel	7
Overpopulation in California – Diana Hull	8
History of Immigration Reform – Otis Graham, Jr.	9
Intergenerational Ethics – Fred Elbel	10
Two White Hats – Lindsey Grant	11
Illegal Alien Amnesty – Ira Mehlman	12
Displaced Americans – Rob Sanchez	13
Language Discrimination – Rosalie Porter	14
‘Cheap Labor’ Is Not Free – John Vinson	15
Immigration and Fertility – Frosty Wooldridge	16
Status of Women – Brenda Walker	17
What of Those Left Behind? – John Tanton	18

Introduction

Borders are a fixed line of geography and sovereignty. Borders also connote ethical values.

Borders uphold the living wage. If the U.S. employment market became a global job fair, wages would plummet to the lowest common global denominator. Protecting job prospects for unemployed minorities is a matter of national ethics.

Borders connote stewardship. They impart sensitivity to a nation's environmental limits. They promote a conservation ethic. Borders mediate a delicate balance between people and resources.

Borders connote freedom. More congestion means more laws. That's a brief summary of our legal history. Laws restrict freedom. There is little room to kick up our heels in a crowded phone booth.

Borders facilitate self-determination. They enable a community to agree upon shared principles of justice and ethics to be perpetuated by civic institutions.

Immigration policy influences economics, but more importantly, it is about ethics. Before the Civil War, John C. Calhoun's views on equality were nurtured with a mint julep on the veranda of his plantation home while overlooking the "jobs that Americans won't do." This leading South Carolina Senator, and Presidential hopeful, pointed out the economic advantages of southern slavery. The slave driver's disdainful view of inferior beings was unethical. Fortunately, ethics trumped economics at the time.

The halls of Congress are still lined with cheap labor lobbyists hailing the economic benefits of immigrants doing the "jobs Americans won't do." In fact, Americans have thrived on these jobs over the centuries. They don't have to look different from others. The "jobs Americans won't do" adage seems harmless on its face, but it carries a hefty price tag. The appeal to our sense of pride is a front for the sweatshop lobby's quest for cheap labor.

Are we still harboring Senator Calhoun's fantasy on the veranda? Mint julep anyone?

As the 6 1/2 billion people on the planet drift toward 9 to 12 billion this century, responsible ethical choices must be exercised with greater care than at any prior time. The weight of humanity demands it.

This collection of short essays confronts a defining challenge for ethics and compassion. Both must remain shared attributes for members of the human family. One of today's most urgent questions is how to honorably discharge ethical compassion in the global village. Hopefully, the thoughtful and thought provoking essays in this booklet will offer a framework to address the pressing ethical issues.

John F. Rohe, Editor

The Ethics of Courting Cheap Labor

On September 11, 2001 my son, Carl, paid a supreme price. Carl proudly served as a New York City Firefighter. The newsworthy events of that day will never be outlived by his family. The light of my life was extinguished.

Carl's needless murder, and the loss of 3,000 others, has empowered us to foster a safer place for the precious children they left behind.

As a mother, I am haunted by how we could have allowed 9/11 to just happen. I learned that it didn't "just happen." The terrorists were only 19 of about 11 million illegal aliens. With multiple pieces of counterfeit ID and numerous aliases, they were not "undocumented," but "over-documented."

Business owners, instead of paying a living wage to fellow citizens, have derived a competitive advantage by hiring cheap laborers wielding fake IDs. The consequences of doing this to our middle class families are easily ignored when profits loom. Corporate interests retain lobbyists to minimize the risk of employer sanctions while attempting to erase our borders.

Apologists for illegal aliens claim they are "honest, hard working people hoping to make a living." Some say they are just "doing the jobs that Americans won't do." Unemployed Americans, however, are not echoing that cry.

Mass immigration is not simply about economics. It's about ethics, or rather the lack of ethics, by the corporate world. We cannot ignore stakeholders in the corporate quest for cheap labor. My son became a major stakeholder in the cruel hoax played on the middle class worker by big business. Let's open a national dialogue on ethics. We have the ethical right to know who and what is crossing our borders. We owe our children and grandchildren a safe and secure America.

Joan Molinaro, mother of Carl Molinaro who
was lost in the World Trade Center Disaster.

Joan is now a Board Member of
"9/11 Families for a Secure America."

www.911fsa.org

Mass Immigration and the Ethics of Income Disparity

Mass immigration was revived with the Immigration Act of 1965. It went into full effect on July 1, 1968. In 1965, the foreign-born population of the United States totaled 8.6 million persons, or 4.4% of the nation's population. This was the lowest percentage in American history. By 2005, the foreign-born population soared to 35.2 million persons, or 12.1% of the nation's population. This percentage is approaching the highest in American history – 14.8% in 1890. The record rate may actually already have been exceeded due to the undercount of illegal immigrants.

The explosive increase in the immigrant population over these same years has paralleled a widening disparity in family incomes. The distribution of family income in the U.S. from 1947 to 1968 had been moving toward greater income equality. This was the only period in which this has ever happened. Since 1968, however, the distribution of family income has steadily widened. Since 1968, the average family real income of the top 10% of the nation's families has increased by 57% as compared to a 40% decline in real income for the families in the bottom 10%.

Explanations for the rising income inequality are many, but a key is the disparate impact of mass immigration on the labor supply. The 2000 Census reported that 57% of the adult foreign born population had only a high school education or less (compared to 49% of the native-born population). Worse yet, 33% of the foreign-born adult population had less than a high school education (compared to only 16% of the native-born population).

The Council of Economic Advisers to President Clinton has reported that "immigration has increased the relative supply of less-educated labor and appears to have contributed to the increased inequality of income." A study conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics confirmed this finding. Wages are not increasing for the lower half of the income distribution, where increases in labor supply have been most pronounced.

The nation's immigration policies need significant reforms, especially the massive abuse by illegal immigration. The adverse impact on the country's income distribution should be reason enough.

Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., Ph.D.
Professor of Labor Economics, Cornell University

The Ethics of a Living Wage

Public policy only makes sense if we have a special moral relationship to those in our polity. As an American, I have a higher duty to those I share a country with than people in India, Guatemala, etc. I can (and do) wish the whole world well, but my fellow citizens have a special moral claim on my sympathy and resources. I have a citizen's duty to provide roads, sewer systems, clean water, public health to those who I share a country with, but no such duty to everyone in the world.

Liberals should love borders because that is the only way that liberal programs can exist. I will never cover America's uninsured with health care (or any other social program) if I have to include the world. If everybody is my "brother and sister," then no one is my brother or sister. We can respect and honor other people in the world, we can voluntarily give them aid, but we have a special social contract, and special duties, to our fellow citizen that does not include the rest of the world.

We have a duty to not undercut their wages through excessive immigration. Every employer seeking his or her own rational economic interest and having access to an almost infinite pool of cheap labor has the ability to create harm to that community and to that country's Social Contract. There is no restraint, in a world of open immigration, on an employer's ability to increase profits from Capital at the expense of labor. In a world of 6.2 billion people, there will always be someone to undercut an American living wage.

Each nation is a separate economic unit while also being part of a global economy, but wages are relative to each nation's economy. A living wage in Bangladesh or Mexico is not a living wage in the U.S. Open or lax immigration laws sets up a spiraling race to the bottom, and allows any employer to beggar their fellow citizens by a new source of low-cost, desperate labor.

Richard D. Lamm, LLB, CPA
Former Governor of Colorado
Executive Director, Public Policy Institute
University of Denver

Looking (in vain) for “Jobs Americans Won’t Do”

When unveiling his guest worker proposal, President Bush urged Americans to “legalize the process of people doing jobs Americans won’t do.” Illegal immigrants, in this view, are essential to the country’s economic growth.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

There are an estimated 7 million illegal aliens working in the U.S. – about 4.5% of the civilian labor force. Certain occupations have abnormally high concentrations of illegals: drywall/ceiling tile installers (27%), gardeners (26%), maids and housekeepers (22%), and construction workers (20%). Obviously millions of Americans are doing precisely the same jobs, and countless others were working in these fields before being displaced by foreign-born workers.

Undocumented immigrants work for less, are less likely to have medical insurance, and are often paid “off the books.” They are a boon to employers, ranging from the neighborhood tree service to Walmart. Similarly, people of means spend less on nannies and other household help thanks to the presence of illegal alien workers.

But most Americans are worse off. An analysis by Harvard economist George Borjas finds that each 1% increase in the labor force due to immigration lowers the average wage of native-born workers by approximately 0.35%. Accordingly, illegal alien workers reduced the wages of U.S.-born workers by 1.6 percent – a loss of about \$90 billion in 2005.

Moreover, because illegal immigrants pay less taxes than they receive in benefits, they increase the fiscal deficits of federal, state, and local governments. Eventually native workers will be called upon to finance those deficits with higher taxes.

What if the borders were sealed and the supply of illegal immigrants ceased to grow? There would be labor shortages in some sectors – fast food, cleaning services, seasonal agriculture, and lawn care, for example. Employers in these sectors would lobby Congress and gullible journalists. Eventually they would offer higher wages to the remaining pool of U.S.-born workers, while looking for ways to substitute new technology for labor.

The end result would be a rise in labor productivity, income, and living standards for most Americans.

Ed Rubenstein, Ph.D. (Public Finance)

President, ESR Research

Economic Consultants

www.esrresearch.com

(Director of Research at the Hudson Institute 1997-2000)

The Impact of Overpopulation on Future Generations

Many citizens in the United States are concerned about overpopulation and how shortages of our vital natural resources will affect their children. Energy shortages, particularly oil and natural gas, leave this nation vulnerable now and in the future.

The world population is projected to double from 6.5 billion to 13 billion in about 50 years, based on the current rate of growth. The present high rate of legal and illegal immigration plus current birthrates, results in the yearly addition of 3.3 million people to the U.S. population of 300 million. The U.S. population is growing nearly twice the rate of China! Do we want a population similar to China in 140 years along with the serious environmental and health problems China is experiencing?

Signaling the seriousness of the human population explosion is the recent World Health Organization report that more than 3.7 billion people are now malnourished. This is the largest number and proportion of malnourished ever in history. Malnourishment increases the human susceptibility to other major diseases, like TB, diarrhea, and AIDS.

More than 99% of U.S. food comes from the land, and less than 1% from oceans and other aquatic ecosystems. Each person added to the U.S. population requires an additional 0.4 ha (1 acre) of land just for highways and urbanization. California, with one of the highest rates of immigration, is losing 380,000 acres of its valuable farmland each year, and is fast losing its distinction as one of the most productive states.

All productive agriculture requires ample fertile cropland, water, and sunlight. It also requires both renewable and fossil energy for cultivation, fertilizers, pesticides, and irrigation. As the U.S. population expands, its many activities spread and diminish farmland. More people will require more food, more water, shelter, energy, and jobs.

Americans must recognize that their rapidly expanding population is damaging their vital resources of cropland, water, and fuels. This spells disaster for the lives of future generations of Americans.

David Pimentel, College of Agriculture
and Life Sciences
Marcia Pimentel, Division of
Nutritional Sciences
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853

The Ethics of Adding Another Californian Every Eight Seconds

Americans take pride in feeding the poor, caring for the sick and offering public education for all. It's an ongoing commitment to the national family consistent with our values and worth. But it's also a promise California can no longer keep.

Overcrowding has taken a terrible toll on our major institutions, stretched past their limit by demands of 500,000 more people each year. Schools are failing and hospitals are closing, swamped by open-ended immigration that has doubled our numbers and will double them again by mid-century. There were 36.8 million Californians in 2005 and 73.6 million are projected in 2052.

Schools and hospitals in California's immigration-congested cities and their environs are so strained, they put lives and the future of children at risk and we are unable to serve our own citizens at previous levels of competence and excellence. Some estimates claim it would take \$18 billion to build enough classrooms. Our educational system, once the best in the nation, and the path to upward social mobility, now struggles with alarming declines in academic achievement.

The state's hospitals are themselves on life support. Eighty-four have shut down and 6 more emergency rooms in LA have closed in the last 18 months. In one year alone, the state's public hospitals provided \$1.6 billion in un-reimbursed care to the uninsured, many of them illegal aliens. Many private hospitals are also out of business.

Once grand historic buildings, museums and libraries that reflect our cultural and scientific achievements, are shabby; once-beautiful public parks are surrendered to gangs. Amenities, built by our forebears, need to be treasured, but most Californians understand that our institutions and surroundings have changed for the worse.

There is hubris in believing that compassion can be boundless. It needs to be limited now to ensure fulfilling our primary obligations. Endless supplies of anything are an illusion. Scarcity limits ethical options and must be faced. Decisions about lowering population appeals to those who grasp the value of constraints on both compassion and carrying capacity, and that California's environment and major institutions must be saved for our children, while there is still time.

Diana Hull, Ph.D. (Behavioral Science)

President of CAPS

Californians for Population Stabilization

www.capsweb.org

The Core Values of Immigration Reform: A View From History

America has experienced mass immigration only twice, the “Great Wave” arriving from the 1880s to the 1920s, and now the second “Great Wave” starting in the 1960s, still gaining momentum today. The first time, concerns over wage depression, urban crowding, and enfeeblement of assimilation brought together a coalition anchored across the political spectrum, from labor leaders and socialists on the left over to cultural conservatives. Immigration restriction became one of the central goals of the progressive reform movement, which saw mass immigration as a major force (along with the growth of monopolies) threatening to reduce the middle class and move America toward a two-tiered society. After four decades of struggle, reformers defeated the open border coalition of employers and ethnic lobbyists. In the 1920s, they pushed through measures curbing immigration to about one-third of earlier levels (which had reached one million per year). Immigration restriction was widely popular; as lower levels of immigration permitted American workers’ wages to rise and gave the nation’s assimilative forces a chance to strengthen both national unity and inter-ethnic tolerance.

Another bipartisan, left-center-right coalition for a reformed, smaller immigration flow selected for the national interest ought to be possible today, since mass immigration, again, brings Third World manpower into competition with American workers, and especially minorities, drives environment-damaging population growth, threatens societal balkanization, and facilitates terrorist penetration. For four decades, the multicultural elites governing labor-ethnic-environmental-patriotic-religious interest groups have betrayed their constituents and either stood on the sidelines, or supported open borders. We reformers, however, need to remember that when the broad public behind these organized interest groups is polled on immigration, it invariably, and by wide margins, wants less legal immigration and no illegal immigration at all – as it did a century ago when the first Great Wave was ended. Let history encourage us: there is an American people, and they will tolerate betrayal by their “leaders” only so long. There are contemporary signs of another political upheaval in which the national interest is common ground for another winning reform coalition.

Otis L. Graham, Jr., Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, University of California, Santa Barbara,
Visiting Scholar, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Most recent book:
Unguarded Gates; a History of America’s Immigration Crisis, Rowman &
Littlefield Publishers, 2004. See also www.otisgraham.com.

Intergenerational Ethics

Terms like "social justice," "environmental justice," and "immigrant rights," connote an immediate sense of compassion. Sadly, they compromise compassion for the future.

The line between "justice" and illegality is often blurred by migrant advocacy organizations. Ethical issues lurk beneath the definitions. The rights of one illegal immigrant come at another person's responsibility to provide. We are learning the hard way that compassion, like other cherished values, is subject to outside limits. Schools are failing and hospitals are on their death beds. This harsh reality forces us to confront humbling constraints to our generosity.

Mass immigration will double U.S. population within the lifetimes of today's children. Virtually every city will become twice as large. Demands on our surroundings will also double. Imagine twice the sprawl, twice the gridlock, congestion, school overcrowding, pollution, farmland imposition, aquifer depletion, and twice the fossil fuel consumption. Our legacy is vividly projected.

Intergenerational justice – a commitment to the well-being of future generations – weighs against the construct of "social justice." Ethical principles require us to consider the future stakeholders in daily actions. America's succeeding generations become the silent stakeholders in the competition between "social justice" for today and justice for tomorrow. Business interests clamoring for cheap labor are the only winners at this table. Yet, our ethical responsibility to children and grandchildren reigns supreme over corporate greed.

For generations, Americans have endeavored to leave their country better than they found it. Americans today may be the first to fail this legacy. By ignoring explosive population growth, we are sacrificing the future on the altar of short-term economic gain.

Porous borders cannot solve poverty in other countries. We can only absorb a minuscule fraction of the 4.5 billion needy people in the world who have a claim upon our collective conscience. Realistic solutions must necessarily involve strategies to offer help where help is needed.

America has an ethical obligation to provide for future generations. To shirk this vital responsibility issue is functionally equivalent to committing a hate crime against future generations. They merit our every effort to ensure a sustainable future.

Fred Elbel, computer consultant,
active in immigration
reform politics in Colorado.
www.DesertInvasion.US

Two White Hats

There has been a debate for years between those who argue that the United States should not limit immigration and those who point out that such limitation is imperative if we are to stop U.S. population growth.

There is a generational aspect to the debate, with many younger people – believing fervently in one world – arguing that we should succor the stranger, and that we owe him or her the opportunity we have had. Immigration restrictionists argue that our first obligation is to avoid further impoverishing our own poor and to preserve a viable country for future generations.

I have used the phrase "two white hats" (from the old cowboy movie imagery) to characterize the debate. Both positions are moral, but they are not symmetrical. The United States cannot rescue the Third World from over-population by absorbing the excess, and we would ruin our country if we tried. We can play only a limited role in other countries' demographic future, but we have an obligation to pursue sane policies concerning our own population, and some hope of saving the country if we do. Our first obligation is here. The nation is presently heading past a half billion in this century, and immigration is the major driver of U.S. population growth.

The choice is not absolute. For over a decade, I have argued for "the two-child family" (e.g., stopping at two in order to stop and reverse U.S. population growth), and in those calculations, I have provided for net annual immigration of 200,000.

Moreover, I do not propose that we ignore others' plight. In the U.S. population policy I advocate, we would revise U.S. aid priorities to give top priority to family planning aid, providing as much help as recipient countries want and can effectively use. Such a policy would be good for them and, over time, for us.

Perhaps I can claim that my hat is the "whiter" one. To advocate immigration limits is to propose that we stop driving the earnings of U.S. labor downward, which will mean that we may have to pay more for some goods and services. But the nation is a community, and we destroy that community if we keep widening the growing gulf between the living standards of the rich and the poor.

Lindsey Grant, writer and former
U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for
Environment and Population. © 2006

An Illegal Alien Amnesty Will Undermine the Bonds of Society

The “buy-in” factor distinguishes the United States and other functional societies from most of the rest of the world. America works because the overwhelming majority of the population has bought into the idea that working hard and playing by the rules serves their interests.

When people cease believing that there is anything to be gained by playing by the rules, civil society breaks down. We are in danger of irreparably destroying the perception that society will protect the interests of ordinary Americans. We are hemorrhaging middle class jobs as corporate interests, with the approval of the government, send American jobs overseas. Those jobs that must remain are being filled by cheaper imported labor.

Millions of illegal immigrants cut in front of millions more who applied to come legally. They hope to be rewarded with a massive amnesty for not playing by the rules. The ethical consequence of amnesty is the undermining of legal immigration. It creates the perception that to get ahead in America is to ignore the rules.

Even the elite have a great deal to lose once we lose the buy-in factor. They will not lose their wealth, but their freedom. They will continue to live spectacularly well, but behind guarded gates, like the wealthy in Latin America and Africa.

We are already on the precipice of becoming an “opt-out” society. A massive illegal alien amnesty will send this nation over the edge and irrevocably break the bonds of civil, law-abiding society. Americans of today owe an ethical obligation to posterity to ensure that that does not occur.

Ira Mehlman, Media Director for Federation for American Immigration Reform
and a frequent writer and radio and TV commentator on immigration topics.

Morality of Displacing American Workers

Who has the ethical right to balance the supply of labor with the demand for jobs? The United States government? Other nations? Employers? Or immigrants looking for jobs?

A study by the Center for Immigration Studies shows that immigrants are hired for a disproportionate 66% of U.S. jobs, yet they are only 15% of the adult labor force.

Illegal aliens comprise about 50% of the annual immigration into the U.S. They displace minorities and unskilled workers at the bottom end of the pay scale. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, black adults suffer twice the unemployment rate of whites, while black teens register 35%.

Riots in France were sparked by the hopeless despair suffered by teens and minorities when unemployment rates approached 20%. Paris burns because France allowed large-scale immigration of “guest workers” for cheap labor. Rising joblessness swelled because the labor market couldn’t absorb the influx of family members and children. The United States is demonstrating the same indifference to its needy citizens.

For the most part, legal immigrants largely compete for middle-class jobs. As the available labor pool expands, wages drop. It’s the law of supply and demand. Tragically, middle-class Americans displaced by legal immigrants are next forced to compete with illegal immigrants for still lower wages.

U.S. citizens cannot continue to lose jobs to immigrants at the current rates and expect to maintain their lifestyles. During 2000-2004 the number of unemployed Americans swelled by 2.3 million while almost the same number of immigrants gained employment. The U.S. economy has not created meaningful employment opportunities for both citizens and all others.

Pitting American workers against immigrants for jobs is morally reprehensible. Controlling immigration is not only the moral thing to do; it is mandated by our Constitution. Our government must constitutionally ensure the financial security of its citizens and protect our borders from invasion. Regulating immigration to serve the needs of our most deserving citizens is the only ethical choice.

Rob Sanchez, author of the "Job Destruction Newsletter"
at www.jobdestruction.info.

The Ethics of Language Discrimination

My involvement with state and national policies affecting the education of immigrant children in U.S. public schools spans three decades. This parallels the life cycle of the bilingual education experiment. Once having witnessed the failure of programs that leave immigrant children at a double disadvantage – unable to master English and unable to gain access to an equal educational opportunity – I advocated for legislative reforms, which have been successful in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts. Delaying the learning of English not only imposes limits on each immigrant child’s future opportunities, but it is ethically wrong, socially divisive, and economically draining on our country’s resources.

Earlier groups of immigrants believed in striving for improvement through education and facility in English. Academia and our public schools have more recently encouraged each ethnic group to retain its native language and to resist assimilation. Language is the single most essential element in assuring that immigrants will adapt to their new land, be included in mainstream society, and take advantage of opportunities for upward mobility.

Our parents and grandparents accepted the imperative that they needed to learn English in order to become U.S. citizens, to vote, and to obtain a driver’s license. Today, the impetus for developing English fluency and literacy to enjoy these benefits has been substantially diminished, thanks to the availability of bilingual voting ballots and drivers’ license tests in other languages.

As an immigrant child who mastered English in a Newark, New Jersey, classroom when no special help was given, I am entirely sympathetic with the aspirations of the parents of non-English speaking children. They want their children to be taught English as quickly as possible. Denying them this opportunity is a form of blatant language discrimination.

Rosalie Pedalino Porter, Ed.D., author of
Forked Tongue: The Politics of Bilingual Education
consultant to public schools across the country,
and former bilingual teacher of Spanish/English.

Subsidized ‘Cheap Labor’ Is Not Free Enterprise

Business interests for mass immigration claim that hiring the cheapest labor is the American Way of free enterprise. But just how free, or ethical, is this enterprise, when taxpayers have to pick up the tab for immigrants’ public costs? For example, when immigrants use medical facilities – at public expense – because they make too little to afford health care, the taxpayer is subsidizing their presence as a “cheap labor” workforce. Federal, state and local taxpayers also pick up the tab for other immigrant-related expenditures, including education, welfare and criminal justice expenditures.

The most extensive and authoritative study, to date, on the costs and benefits of immigration was the National Research Council’s *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. It found that immigration enriches better-off Americans (some of them business owners) from between \$1 and \$10 billion dollars a year, while lowering the wages of lower-income Americans. Also, the NCR study found that the public costs of immigration were a net loss to taxpayers of between \$15 and \$20 billion a year. Subsequent studies have helped to confirm the negative fiscal impact of immigration.

Business interests demand “guest worker” programs, which would legalize illegal aliens already here and admit additional foreigners to take jobs in the U.S. None of these commercial interests suggest, however, that they might have an ethical obligation to pay adequate wages and taxes to prevent their foreign-born workers from becoming a public burden. Not carrying this burden themselves, these businesses reap a competitive advantage over competitors who hire native-born citizens.

Paying your own way is the real meaning of free enterprise. Under this system, business owners have the right to reap profits when they depend on – and risk – no other expenditures than their own. Open-border free enterprisers often style themselves as self-reliant people who face the hard realities of the market. But their dependence on public money for profit tells a far different story. Tax-subsidized “cheap labor” is corporate welfare.

John Vinson, M.A. (Historic Preservation)
President, American Immigration
Control Foundation
www.ImmigrationControl.com

Silent Assertion of Legal and Illegal Immigration

In the mid-1960s, average fertility rate for U.S. women stood at 3.5 children. It plummeted to 1.7 by the mid-1970s. In other words, our numbers were almost doubling in a single generation in the '60s. Within a decade, however, we were no longer filing our shoes from one generation to the next.

The decision by Americans, particularly women, to reduce fertility would have stabilized U.S. population at 255 million. The immigration law adopted in 1965 changed that. The 300 million people in the U.S. will double later this century. Human pressures on the environment will be irreversible.

Immigration was a vital aspect of American history. However, a century ago, only 75 million Americans were riding horses and traveling in trains. Additional persons then left a softer footprint. The 300 million Americans today rely on cars while burning 20 million barrels of oil daily. Times have changed along with accelerating environmental impact.

We add 1.2 million legal immigrants and 1.5 to 3.0 million illegal migrants annually, according to Time Magazine, September 20, 2004. This drama promises an overpopulation catastrophe for future generations.

Mark Twain said "silent-assertion" stood as the "shabbiest of lies." In 1855, northern leaders and intellectuals refused to speak against slavery. That "silent assertion" was unethical. Today, "silent-assertion" continues with immigration, while America suffers in every sector. Citizens and leaders silently stand by as educational standards degrade, medical systems collapse, diseases spread, welfare fraud grows, language chaos explodes, and tax systems are defrauded.

The rate of immigration exceeds the assimilative capacity of our nation. For sobering examples, Paris, France was burning. Rioting and death in Amsterdam, Holland; London, England; and Sydney, Australia offer clues to America's future.

When the number of human beings outstrips the "carrying capacity" of the available land as well as "cultural carrying capacity" of a society, brutal consequences can be expected to follow. While awaiting the judgment of future generations, we stand to be seen as painting the deck chairs on the Titanic. Ethics call upon us to change course for a more sustainable future. Importing unprecedented numbers of people from an unending line that grows by 85 million annually is no longer sustainable or ethical for the United States or her future citizens.

Frosty Wooldridge, a U.S. citizen

The Ethics of Reducing the Status of Women

Not all diversity is equal, particularly regarding women. Many cultures are deeply hostile to women's rights and safety, yet all are welcome to America under the current immigration policy.

Warning signs arise among the growing Islamic population in Europe. Increasingly, women suffer "honor" killings, as males seek to punish Muslim women seeking western freedoms.

Islamic hostility toward women is not confined within immigrant enclaves. Scandinavia is suffering a rape epidemic as gangs of Muslim males attack European women. The pattern has been repeated in Australia.

Some Americans see Mexican and other Hispanic immigration as less culturally alien than Muslim. Latin culture, however, is also misogynous. "Violence against women is epidemic in Mexico," according to news reports. The social status of women in some rural areas is only marginally better than under the Taliban, where females have no civil rights and are essentially slaves for men. A kidnap-for-sex custom ("rapto") remains legal in Oaxaca. In 19 of Mexico's 31 states, statutory rape charges must be dropped if the rapist is willing to marry his victim.

Indian and Chinese immigrants have imported sex-selection abortion, as reported by The New York Times in "Clinics' Pitch to Indian Émigrés: It's a Boy."

Polygamy is an accepted custom among Hmong immigrants. Thousands live in polygamous families.

Female genital mutilation (FGM), a form of child abuse and torture, occurs among 98% of the Somalia population. In 2002, when a group of Somali refugees in Kenya learned that FGM was not permitted in America, they rushed to perform the brutal ritual on their girls before entering this country.

Polygamy and FGM are not harmless lifestyle choices: they are felonies under American law. We do not welcome individual human rights abusers, yet Washington permits entire cultures that violate the law and deeply insult our values. How ethical is that?

Have we passed the peak of women's rights and safety in America? Misogynous immigration threatens hard-won gains and transforms the celebration of mass immigration into a cruel joke for women.

Brenda Walker reports on immigration and crime at:

www.LimitsToGrowth.org and

www.ImmigrationsHumanCost.org

Out of Sight, Out Of Mind

In thinking about immigration, we often lose sight of those left behind. Emigrants are often not the poorest of the poor, but those with some education and resources, and the vision of a better future. Dissatisfied with the present, they could and should be "change agents" at home. What happens to their fellow countrymen if this vital human resource is lost?

About 4 billion people live in the less-developed world. If the United States accepts one million immigrants per year, that's one for every 4000 persons, many of whom live in dire circumstances. We then proceed to lavish concern and resources on the individual immigrant, doing little or nothing for the 3999 left behind where our generosity would spread further and do much more good. About half of those remaining behind subsist on less than a dollar per day.

I recall a Korean who toyed with emigrating to the United States, but stayed home to start an electronics factory. He succeeded, providing employment for over 100 of his countrymen. How do we tally this in a cost/benefit analysis of migration?

Adam Smith, in *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) tells how he knew little of circumstances in China. He admitted he would be more concerned about the fate of his little finger than of a million Chinese he didn't know. What we don't know, we cannot miss. Today we cannot plead ignorance attributable to isolation. So what is our excuse for concentrating so heavily on the few who come, while discounting those left behind?

But we must not discount the future. Massive, seven-figure immigration will generate demographic, resource, environmental, social and economic problems with which our successors will have to deal, and for which they will not likely bless us.

Let's extend our moral and material support to the overwhelming majority of people who will never be able to migrate. They will have to stand and fight the conditions into which the accident of birth has thrust them. They will not be able to "cut and run," seeking better conditions for just themselves. They will have to "bloom where they were planted."

These people constitute the bulk of mankind, and are the proper object of our concerns.

John H. Tanton, M.D., Publisher
www.TheSocialContract.com