

It may seem odd or at least unusual for one magazine to tout another, but we would like to call attention to the fine job *The Atlantic Monthly* is doing in raising the immigration topic for its approximately 475,000 readers. It seems that every three or four months an article appears bearing on the subject.

Going back just two years: in May and June of 1992, the editors published William Langwiesche's two-part article, "The Border," laying out the situation along the U.S.-Mexican frontier and the difficulties of controlling traffic across it. Then, in August of the same year they ran Robert Kaplan's "Tales from the Bazaar" on the people at the Arab desk at the State Department, a topic not unrelated to immigration policy. Jack Miles's seminal essay "Blacks vs. Browns" appeared in October. It opened new channels of thought and communication on the role played in the Los Angeles riots earlier that year by conflict between long-resident blacks and Hispanic and Korean newcomers.

In February, 1993, Charles C. Mann's "How Many is Too Many?" appeared, highlighting the key population question. James Fallow's three-part economics series ran in the November/December 1993 and January 1994 issues. These articles presented the differences in culture and economic philosophy between East and West.

In February, 1994, Robert Kaplan was back in print with his powerful "The Coming Anarchy." This article has been widely noticed and lays out in chilling fashion the coming disorder in the Third World and what it portends for migration pressure.

We have understandable pride in *The Atlantic Monthly's* April issue of this year. It includes "The Ordeal of Immigration in Wausau" written by THE SOCIAL CONTRACT's Washington Editor, Roy Beck. This essay explores the effects on a small midwestern town of a heavy immigrant influx — a story with which many other similarly situated communities will be able to identify. (See Wayne Lutton's review of the Beck article on page 231.)

*The Atlantic Monthly's* editors have been performing a public service by illuminating a difficult topic. We hope they will persist.

\* \* \*

In THE SOCIAL CONTRACT our focus this month is on the population "push" pressures underlying international migration. The lead article "End of the Migration Epoch?" asks how much longer massive international migration can go on, and then sets forth a new paradigm and a set of ethical principles to govern migration policy. Next, Philip Martin writes about the importance of immigration "networks," and lays out his "Grand Bargain." Douglas Massey also discusses networking and analyzes other migration push and pull factors.

Malcolm Browne, a Pulitzer Prize-winning correspondent for the *New York Times*, paints a threatening picture of the Third World. It is reminiscent of Kaplan's *Atlantic* article, "The Coming Anarchy," which I again recommend for your reading list (the one you *will* get to, not the never-to-be-read list!)

We close the feature section with an excerpt from Samuel Huntington's response to the critics of his Summer, 1993, *Foreign Affairs* article, "The Clash of Civilizations?" (also highly recommended reading) and with Vernon Briggs's call for transferring INS administration back to the Labor Department. As a final tidbit, we offer a listing of the Ford Foundation's grants over the past 25 years to organizations opposing immigration control.

Together with gleanings from other publications and a book-review section designed to help *shorten* your reading list, we hope you will want to spend an evening with this issue.

John Tanton  
Editor and Publisher

## Letters to the Editor

Editor:

I would like to clarify some statements ascribed to me in Mr. Robert McConnell's article, "Conference: Ethics of Immigration," (*THE SOCIAL CONTRACT*, Winter 1993-94), and amplify upon others.

- While my remarks did include my opinion that "the American family needs time to heal itself," and while I oppose the current high levels of immigration, I do not support a moratorium on immigration.

- While I did say that over 100 million people today live in countries other than those in which they were born, I did not mean to suggest that they would all move here if they could (though several million would).

- While the United States takes in many refugees, I stated that this country annually resettles more immigrants and refugees than the rest of the world combined.

- While I suggested that the U.S. should emphasize the skills of newcomers, and reduce the emphasis on family reunification, I believe that the reunification of immediate family members — spouses, sons and daughters, — should be retained.

My reference to the present policy generating a "false sense of entitlement" referred to other than immediate family members who are caught in a vast backlog. Specifically, immigration experts have suggested that their technical eligibility to immigrate legally in the distant future may encourage them to immigrate illegally today.

Sincerely,  
Richard Estrada  
Irving, Texas

\* \* \*

Editor:

[Re: Mark Wegierski's review of *Population Versus Liberty* (1971) and *Population Fallacies* (1977), *THE SOCIAL CONTRACT*, Vol. IV, No. 2, Winter 1993-94, pp. 149-152]

Although both of these books are still in print and selling slowly it is not every day that works over twenty years old are re-reviewed at all — let alone favorably. For these reasons I acknowledge at the outset my deep gratitude to the editor, Dr. John

Tanton, for bringing this about, and to Mr. Wegierski for the prompt, fair-minded, and scholarly way in which he has discharged the assignment. However, I also welcome the opportunity to comment on two important points which I seem to have failed to get across clearly enough. First a quick one on the inevitable end of economic growth.

The reviewer says that "influenced ... by the 1970s mindset ... [the author] over-optimistically suggests that economic growth will have to stop at the stage where everyone is a millionaire." (p.151). I did say this but I meant stop at this level *at the very latest*, and not "continue until everybody gets there." I added, (p. 237); "Of course the 'millionaire barrier' is an arbitrary concept ..." and in my first publication of the thesis (of which this brief section of the book had to be a potted version) I spelled out; "If we all did reach the millionaire's standard of living ... it is interesting to speculate who would generate the goods and services we would all want to consume. Would they be generated by machinery? Would differentials increase so much that even at that average level of income enough people were kept in sufficient poverty to make them work? Or would we be able to persuade the mass of people to go on working more or less as they do now, regardless of how multi-multi-millionaire they become?" [Parsons, J. *The Economic Transition* (1975, pp.11-12). In the book I hoped it was clear — though I must admit I didn't spell it out — that this was a *reductio* ..., a thought-experiment conducted tongue-in-cheek, and that the exponential never-never land demonstrates the utter absurdity of the "growthmanship" mentality.

On the even more fundamental issue of population control versus liberty, Mr. Wegierski appears to go along with my analysis of the complex relationships between population growth, control, and individual liberty until very near the end, where he then states: "[I do not] really accept the [Parsons] thesis combining population control and individual liberty. The situation is simply too far gone today." (p.151).

As my theory was intended to be universalistic in both time and space I am naturally rather perturbed by this and so try to justify it by restating the bare bones, as follows: