

As we put this issue of **THE SOCIAL CONTRACT** to bed, the California vote on Proposition 187 is a few days away. The vote at bottom is on whether to cut off social services (including schooling) to those illegally residing in that state. We await the results with trepidation, whichever way the vote turns out.

If the initiative passes — and we support it — it seems likely that the result will be the same as with Proposition 63 in 1986 — the one that made English the official language of California. As with 187, nearly all state officials opposed it, while the public voted for it 74% to 26%, one of the biggest landslides in California initiative history. But public officials declined to enforce it, as will likely be the outcome with 187 if it passes.

The supporters of 187 will then go rapidly through the four stages in the development of any new idea that doesn't work out: (1) wild enthusiasm when it is adopted, (2) bitter disappointment when it is not implemented, (3) a search for the guilty, and, (4) punishment of the innocent.

The opponents of 187 will doubtless be whipped into a frenzy if it passes. The looser lips among them have already talked about "burning the state down," forgetting the World War II counter-espionage dictum: loose lips/sink ships.

In contrast, if the initiative fails, some proponents — if one can judge from the many personal communications this writer has had — will give up on the state. Those who can afford to lose \$50,000 or \$100,000 on their homes will leave for (temporarily) greener pastures; those who are stuck will not likely take it gracefully. One of the chief differences between Yugoslavia and California over the last five years has been that disgruntled Golden Staters have been able to leave, whereas the Bosnians had no place to go. Having a populace that feels trapped is not a pleasant prospect.

If the initiative fails, it will be its opponents who will be ecstatic (initially); this will shortly fade when they learn that the defeat has only hardened the opposition, stiffened its resolve, and broadened its objectives to include *legal* immigration. The opponents will then mount their own search for the guilty, before they punish the innocent.

Where is the Federal Government in all of this? Are they waiting for Rostock, the city in the former East Germany where violence against immigrants

finally forced the government to act?¹ Is it bloodshed for which the politicians are waiting?

It didn't *have* to be this way. Ever since we began working on the immigration question in 1969, it was readily apparent to anyone with a sense of history and human psychology, that if the issue was not resolved early by reasonable people, it would end up in the streets ... as it has, with 70,000 opponents marching in Los Angeles. My physician's perspective: it is usually easier, less expensive and painful, and the prospects for success are better, to treat a problem early, rather than wait until the patient is moribund.

Let's not wait for Rostock.

In this issue we explore the phenomenon of irredentism, the desire to regain lost territory. It is common enough around the world ... in the Middle East, the claims go back thousands of years. We have been spared it in North America, except in the southwest. Brent Nelson briefs us on the escalating rhetoric and possible forms and degrees of separation that its proponents envision. Next, we reprint the famous (infamous?) article on the topic from *Excelsior*, a leading newspaper in Mexico City. Odie Faulk writes that the Mexican claims do not have much legal or factual substance, and K. L. Billingsley questions whether there was an Aztlán. Gerda Bikales comments on the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and Sam Francis then briefs us on a forthcoming study of the Ford Foundation's role in funding opposition to immigration control. Wayne Lutton closes this section by reviewing the book, *Gringo Justice*.

Next, we present critiques of our Spring 1994 cover article, "End of the Migration Epoch?," and responses by the author.

Finally we call your attention to a proposal for Chinese enclaves, first in Arkansas, but then in six other locations around the United States. This promises to be a hot issue, as was a similar proposal in Australia several years ago. We round out this issue with a number of insightful articles and reports, original and reprinted, and reviews of important new books.

We wish you some good late fall reading.

John Tanton
Editor and Publisher

¹ See our editorial, "We Told Them So," Fall 1992, p. 3.

Letters to the Editor

Editor:

Much as I dislike doing so, I must complain about the title and some of the contents of my good friend Roy Beck's lead article in the Summer 1994 issue. The title, "The U.S. Congress and U.S. Population Growth" is misleading. The same incorrect implication is noted throughout the article.

The author is carried away with the impact of immigration on population size. It is an important ingredient but so is fertility. To label a legislator as responsible for population growth because he or she has voted for continued high levels of immigration is grossly unfair, particularly if such legislators have worked diligently over the years to assure Americans access to family planning and abortion services.

Fertility is barely mentioned and then only to argue (incorrectly, in my view) that "Congress could set the nation on the road to stabilization tomorrow with the simple passage of a single immigration bill with low enough numbers" (p.241). But even if immigration was reduced to zero, the population would still rise to well above 300 million before peaking if fertility remained at current levels. However, even a slight decline in fertility would have a tremendous impact on future population size. According to the latest Census Bureau projections, gradually reducing fertility from 2.1 to 1.8 [births per woman] would mean a difference of 42 million people by 2050.

I do not minimize the importance of reducing immigration. This is crucial if the nation is to stop population growth and perhaps even reverse its path. Both, immigration *and* fertility, must decrease if we are ever to attain such a goal.

I repeat: to criticize legislators solely on the basis of votes on immigration and label them responsible for population growth is incorrect and unfair. It results in ridiculous groupings of such true advocates of population limitation as Anthony Bielsen with a right-wing anti-family planning congressman like Robert Dornan!

To his credit, the author does point out that some "guardians of population growth" have stellar environmental records and are in the forefront of advocacy for family-planning. However, he never names these legislators. Given the overwhelming importance of lower fertility on both the individual

and societal level, isn't it time that we praise those legislators who have long fought the good battle against the positions held by the two previous administrations?

May I suggest that Roy delve deeper into the records of our legislators to see how they have voted on family planning expenditures; on various abortion bills; on environmental issues; and, yes, on immigration legislation. Then, and only then, can he argue that legislator A is more or less favorable to population growth than legislator B.

Sincerely,
Leon F. Bouvier
Lady Lake, Florida

Roy Beck Responds:

Leon Bouvier helpfully reminds us that we cannot keep our 260-million population from expanding to above 300 million through immigration reduction alone. Therefore, even though Americans long have maintained an environmentally responsible fertility rate of below-replacement level, there is need to lower it still further, especially by trying to prevent unplanned pregnancies to women who say they want no more children, and to lower the very high fertility of immigrant women. Nonetheless, I stand by my central analysis that the members of Congress listed as "Guardians of Rapid Population Growth" — regardless of how aggressively they support birth control efforts — indeed are forcing population congestion and expansion on the American people through their support of present immigration policies. I concede Leon's argument, however, that my "Supporters of Population Stabilization" charts give too much credit to those who are trying to limit immigration but continue to oppose efforts to prevent unwanted fertility. I accept the challenge to create a measure for the next Congress that takes that into account. Any suggestions, readers?

Editor:

I agree with you that it is foolish to invite people from all over the world to migrate to the United States as a means of solving their problems. The problems of Haiti need to be solved in Haiti, not in the U.S.A. The problems of Mexico need to be solved