

cheap, nor I suspect is the citizenship of most any other country.

The injustice done to Japanese Americans in World War II, when they were assigned to camps in California and elsewhere during the war, derives from the fact that most were U.S. citizens. If they were not loyal U.S. citizens, but rather citizens whose loyalty was to their country of origin, there was no injustice in their being distrusted for concerns about spying and subversion during war. In that case, they might likely have worked here to further the interest of their country, then an enemy of the United States.

To change citizenship is no light matter. Consider the oath each new citizen takes to become a U.S. citizen:

I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, of whom or which I have heretofore

been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America against all — enemies, foreign and domestic...

The idea that a new American citizen, after having taken such an oath, would then seek to vote for a foreign leader is an offense to the oath and to the United States.

If, in the case of Mexico, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) were to lose a close three-way race for the presidency in 2000, after 70 years of uninterrupted power, it might dispute the election results. It could easily allege in these presidential elections that the Drug Enforcement Agency or the CIA covertly and decisively tampered with the outcome by influencing the votes from the United States. There is, after all, a history of Mexican distrust concerning interference by its powerful neighbor to the north.

However implausible the

accusation, it might well reverberate powerfully in Mexico and topple an incoming government. The same accusation of tampering could be leveled in the Baltics through votes cast or influence generated from America, or Russia for that matter.

America is now becoming increasingly accepting of new Mexican American citizens. That is a good thing. And it is a fine thing that individual Americans seek to help the nations of their origin, as in the case of many Baltic Americans.

However, in this rapidly changing world, the obligations and interests of citizens should not be allowed to float so easily between nations. Such a situation invites questions of loyalty. The oath of citizenship is one that is not taken lightly, anywhere. The U.S. Congress should pass a law prohibiting all citizens of the United States from voting in foreign elections. **TSC**

A New American

Ex-Soviet dictator's son passes U.S. citizenship test

by Terrence Petty

PROVIDENCE, R.I.
Sergei Krushchev breezed through the U.S. citizenship test and next month will swear loyalty

Terrence Petty is a writer for the Associated Press. This report appeared June 24, 1999.

to a country and way of life that Soviet leader Nikita Krushchev — his father — had promised to bury.

"We both passed," Krushchev said with a smile as he and his wife left the Providence office of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service on Wednesday.

"Our heart is here. We will be

good citizens," said the 63-year-old Krushchev, an engineer who once designed rockets that were aimed at the West.

Krushchev missed one out of twenty questions on the citizenship test. His wife, Valentina Golenko, got all of them right. They'll take their loyalty oath on July 12, the final step for citizenship.

Back during the Cold War, when Nikita Krushchev was in power, his son's decision to become an American would probably have been seen as an act of treason. So is Nikita Krushchev spinning in his grave?

Sergei Krushchev doesn't think so.

"The world has changed" since the times when his father was in power, he said. But then he added, "I hope he would approve."

Krushchev has said his father's "we will bury you" remark was misunderstood. The remark meant that capitalism would die and that the Soviet economic system would bury it.

Krushchev was besieged by reporters after taking the citizenship test. All wanted to know why he had decided to become an American citizen.

"When you are living in a country, it is natural to become a citizen," replied Krushchev, who moved to the United States in 1991 and teaches at Brown University.

Krushchev argued there was no irony in him becoming an American citizen — because his country of birth and the United States are no longer enemies.

"There's no Cold War," he said.

Still, Krushchev conceded that there might be Stalinists back in his homeland who would view him as a traitor.

"But you find crazy people everywhere," he said.

Sergei Krushchev came to the United States as a visiting professor. He got his green card in

1993. By law, he had to wait another five years before he could apply for citizenship.

His attorney, Dan Danilow, called Krushchev last year to ask if he wanted to take the citizenship test.

"I told him I needed to think about it," said Krushchev. "I needed to decide what was better, to return to Moscow or stay here."

Krushchev and his wife decided they belong here.

They live in a suburban ranch house. He drives a Buick. They shop at the Rhode Island Mall.

He's published three books in the United States, and a fourth comes out next year.

Krushchev has something like celebrity status at Brown University, an Ivy League school. And he says he's received no job offers from Russia that could dissuade him from giving up his cozy life.

"I have the opportunity to express my views, to write my books, to lecture, to teach," he said.

All of the corruption and turmoil in his homeland do

Re: Citizenship

Even though this Krushchev will be an American as of July 12, he says, "Of course, I'm Russian." — Associated Press report

The statement points to one of the greatest dilemmas we have — becoming an American citizen does not mean becoming an American. Rather it means granting the American lifestyle with the cushy living, the cars, the vacations, squeaky clean schools and hospitals, and the little house with the white picket fence. While they accept these things with obvious delight, they know they can distance themselves from other responsibilities and maintain their foreign identity and their national loyalty. At that point, American citizenship is not a responsibility but a freebie bestowed with no personal compensation expected.

No need for any cover-up on their part because they are well aware of the vigorous support by our government for this opportunism. The thinking of our government seems to be that their presence here is compensation enough because just their foreignness and unfamiliarity with our values will lead us to a higher level of functioning. This is especially true of Latin Americans who have been lavishly funded both by public and private sectors to be the Americans of the 21st century.

So far there is little opposition from the American people at large who seem resigned to their alleged inadequacies and their dependence on Mexicans, Cubans, and Central Americans for future leadership.

— Robert Simmons
Immigration Control Advocates
San Rafael, California

nothing to add to Russia's appeal Krushchev blames much of the trouble on Russian President Boris Yeltsin: "Russia needs new leadership."

But Krushchev isn't completely turning his back on

Mother Russia.

He still has an apartment and a large country house in Russia. And he'll keep visiting his three grown-up sons.

Krushchev reads Russian newspapers every day. Russian

novelists are among his favorite writers, and he listens to Russian music.

Even though this Krushchev will be an American as of July 12, he says, "Of course, I'm Russian."

TSC

How Not to 'Solve' the Social Security Problem

Mass immigration is the wrong answer

by Gene A. Nelson

Political conservatives have been advocating a substantial increase in immigration as a means of postponing the predicted date of bankruptcy of the U.S. Social Security system. Conservatives claim that the recruitment of younger, new workers from abroad will infuse the system with abundant Social Security tax revenues, and therefore, support the retirement of American workers presently contributing to the Social Security system.

Examination of the careers of present U.S. science and engineering (S&E) professionals as a sub-population demonstrates that these "rescue" claims are fraudulent. The likely outcome is denial of adequate Social Security retirement payments to American S&Es as they are being permanently displaced by the younger, overseas S&E professionals. The older S&Es, regardless of their national origin, are forced to take lower paying, lower security positions such as "help desk" work merely to survive. The older S&Es are informed that they are "overqualified" when they seek available S&E positions that they could fill, based on their training. Employers prefer to fill the open S&E positions with "fresh (inexpensive) young blood." Employers of S&Es have succeeded with this illegal age discrimination because

they have vigorously lobbied for conditions that guarantee that there is a huge glut of S&Es seeking a much smaller pool of available positions. "Walk through" tours of many "high tech" firms demonstrate the prevalence of younger professionals, rather than showing substantial employment of those above approximately 40 years of age.

While S&E employers have continuously and loudly lamented about a predicted "shortfall" or "looming shortage" of S&Es since at least the late 1960s, these crises have never materialized. (The only "shortage" has been of pliant professionals willing to work under undesirable conditions, such as being forced to work substantial unpaid hours of overtime.) However, these shortage claims have lured hundreds of thousands of impressionable young people to obtain a S&E degree. Science and engineering degree production in the United States at the bachelor's degree level has been remarkably stable at above 300,000 per year for multiple decades. Researchers such as Braddock et. al. in the U.S. Department of Labor projected net S&E job replacement and growth requirements in 1992 to be in the neighborhood of only 55,000 per year (if real GNP growth was at least "moderate.") With domestic S&E degree production alone, there are roughly 6 applicants chasing each available position. Immigration further tilts the balance in favor of S&E employers. With only the H-1B and S&E permanent resident visa programs being considered, over 200,000 more S&Es are being imported each year. That implies at least 10 applicants pursuing

Gene A. Nelson, Ph.D. has been active in high tech workforce issues for about two decades. He can be reached at au195@cleveland.freenet.edu.