

# Exacting Concessions

By J.P. Zmirak

President Bush's amnesty plan deserves decisive defeat. But if immigration realists can't stop it outright, they should seek to blunt its worst consequences. Here's a short list of reforms that our leaders might try to tack onto the Bush amnesty bill—either to make the legislation so unpalatable to Democrats that it will fail or to make the result less destructive.

- Phase out family reunification as a basis for legal immigration. Our immigration law now allows U.S. residents to sponsor adult siblings, parents, and grown-up children, giving them preferential treatment in applying for residency. Skills, education, employability—all criteria for admitting immigrants—are trumped by nepotism. Any immigrant admitted to the U.S. after the amnesty bill should no longer be able to offer his foreign relatives, excepting spouses or children under 15, an advantage. To make this politically palatable, leave a “grandfather” provision giving current U.S. residents two years to sponsor whatever relations they wish, then close that window too.
- Militarize the U.S. southern border. The entire border with Mexico is an open door through which terrorists could walk at will. On Nov. 14, Reuters reported on a Mexican gang that specializes in helping Arabs enter the U.S. To cut down both on the influx of illegal immigrants from Mexico, and the deaths caused by “people smugglers” in the desert, we should re-deploy to the Rio Grande a significant portion of the American forces now guarding Germany from the defunct Soviet Union. We might also construct military bases along the border, conducting training of future soldiers in a desert environment—as our policymakers seem determined to continue deploying them throughout the Middle East.
- Tie acceptance of immigrants from a particular country to its policies in the War on Terror. The State Department should be required to certify annually whether a given country is co-operating with the U.S. in apprehending and prosecuting terrorists. Countries that do not should find themselves unable to export their excess population, political dissidents, or radical clerics. Of course, the usual background checks should be applied to make sure that countries aren't “solving” their problems with terrorists by sending them here.
- Instruct the Attorney General that Congress expects criminal prosecutions of illegal aliens to be followed by civil suits against employers who break the law—using the Racketeer Influenced Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act to obtain triple damages.
- Offer immediate amnesty and legal residency (after a background check) to any illegal immigrant who reports his employer to the U.S. government, resulting in a successful prosecution. This should drain the swamp of corporate greed that is one of the causes of our immigration problem.
- Link future immigration totals to the U.S. birthrate. Our nation's population growth is fueled exclusively by immigration. A rise in the U.S. birthrate should result in a proportional reduction in the immigration totals for the next decade, aiming not at population stability, but at a manageable rate of growth—instead of the migration-fueled population explosion we are witnessing.

*J.P. Zmirak writes from New York City.*

Rove's strategy of wooing Hispanic voters by pandering to Mexico. (Vicente Fox has boasted in Mexico that the latest Bush proposal is actually his idea.)

Another is a desire for campaign funds from businesses hungry for cheap labor and eager to undercut the going American wage rates.

A third: President Bush is a sincere multiculturalist with a special affection for Mexico—which he sees an ally on par with Great Britain and Canada, a sentiment, incidentally, that is hardly grounded in American historical experience.

Should President Bush's proposal become law, what would become of America? Population growth, already fueled largely by recent immigrants and their children, would explode. The guest-worker program has no limits or quotas—it is open to the world. As wage levels are largely driven by supply and demand, the wages of Americans would drop as new “temporary workers” pour in to work for minimum-wage jobs. The Bush plan would accelerate the demographic transformation of the United States that has already begun and very likely fuel racial and ethnic tensions whose shape we can't even imagine. In social norms, America would resemble less and less a middle-class society and more and more a kind of multiethnic strife-torn Brazil, with its upper classes protected in gated communities with armed guards. Driven further from its roots, the social consensus that made our federal republic possible could fast unravel.

But spouting rosy Ellis Island rhetoric, Bush plunges forward. One thing is certain: no conservative would advocate such a leap into the dark, but we have long known that George W. Bush is no conservative. ■

*Howard Sutherland is a lawyer in New York.*

[original intent]

# Fathers Knew Best

The founders' words refute the "nation of immigrants" myth.

By Thomas E. Woods Jr.

IMMIGRATION, PERHAPS MORE than any other issue today, reveals the chasm that so often exists between "democracy" and the actual will of the people. Polls consistently find solid majorities of Americans in favor of immigration reductions, yet the problem grows more severe and out of control each year.

Every morning on my way to work, I drive by a 7-Eleven in Farmingville, N.Y., where a large group of, um, "undocumented" Mexicans can be found waiting to be hired out for day jobs. Perhaps 50 feet down the road is a small group holding signs reading "Deport Illegal Aliens." Drivers wave and honk in support, but still those who profess to govern us do absolutely nothing to secure our borders.

One of the ways in which pro-immigration propagandists have sought to attain the moral high ground is by the implicit suggestion that the right of immigration is a hallowed national principle that no loyal American can consistently oppose. Yet this usually unexamined premise is actually false. The Founding Fathers were generally wary of immigration, a phenomenon that they did not wish to exclude altogether but that they saw no particular need to encourage, especially among migrants whose cultural backgrounds were significantly different from their own.

Consider Benjamin Franklin, that

well-known cosmopolite and child of the Enlightenment. Franklin, it turns out, said quite a few politically incorrect things about non-British humanity. On one occasion he asked, "Why should Pennsylvania, founded by the English, become a colony of aliens, who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us, instead of our Anglifying them, and will never adopt our language or customs any more than they can acquire our complexion?" Thus immigrants of sufficient number and concentration could radically change the cultural landscape in ways that the native population may not want.

We can already hear the modern liberal laughing at Franklin, pointing triumphantly to German assimilation in America as proof that the Pennsylvanian's concerns were utterly without merit. But the point here is simply this: if unrestricted immigration had really been a traditional American principle, someone must have forgotten to tell Benjamin Franklin. And he was speaking of people who, as fellow heirs and architects of Western civilization, shared a great deal in common with the original settlers of British America. One can only imagine what Franklin would have had to say of the Third World onslaught caused by our current immigration policy.

Thomas Jefferson's warning in his *Notes on Virginia* would doubtless

come as a surprise to most Americans, since most American history textbooks for some reason choose not to highlight it. Jefferson asked, suggestively, "Are there no inconveniences to be thrown into the scale against the advantage expected by a multiplication of numbers by the importation of foreigners?"

"It is for the happiness of those united in society," the sage of Monticello went on to explain, "to harmonize as much as possible, in matters which they must of necessity transact together. Civil government being the sole object of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by common consent." Our government was "a composition of the freest principles of the English Constitution, with others, derived from natural right and reason." Nothing could be more opposed to the principles of our government than those of absolute monarchies, said Jefferson. But it was from such regimes that we could expect the most immigrants.

Such immigrants, Jefferson feared, would "bring with them the principles of the governments they leave, imbibed in their early youth; or, if able to throw them off, it will be in exchange for an unbounded licentiousness, passing, as is usual, from one extreme to another. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty." The effects of a large influx of population