

"I asked him: 'Can you name anything Buchanan has said on immigration that's racist and dangerous?' He replied that he didn't have any quotes at hand, but that Buchanan was an anti-Semite. This was changing the subject. Joseph Fallon who was at the meeting pointed out to me afterward that if Steinlight really knew Buchanan to have said something so awful, he would have remembered it and been able to quote him."

I particularly want to clear up this mistake since, as I wrote in an article at Front Page Magazine this past April, Buchanan's recent articles in which he has demonized Israel for defending itself from suicide bombers and has made

other leftist-style arguments against Israel that he would despise in other situations have persuaded me, to my great sadness, that Buchanan is indeed (as others have insisted for years) driven by an anti-Jewish animus. However, though I had not yet come to that definite conclusion as of November 2001, I still would not have challenged Steinlight on that point, given the many well-known charges of anti-Semitism that have been made against Buchanan over the past ten years.

Sincerely,
LAWRENCE AUSTER
New York City

Letters to Other Editors

The *Washington Post* on March 24 featured an article by staff reporter Hanna Rosin, framed by the title, "Snapshot of An Immigrant Dream Fading." It seemed to this writer that throughout the compassionate article was the underlying notion that one may be selective with respect to which laws one will obey.

In the case of Ansar Mahmood, the Pakistani immigrant who had broken a law by helping an undocumented friend from Pakistan obtain an apartment, reporter Rosin passionately implied that because such an action is a "common favor" in the immigrant network, Mahmood should not have been charged with breaking the law. An interesting, empathic point of view, especially in the case in point, so touchingly presented by the writer.

However, given that Mahmood's predicament as presented in the article was heart-rending, it should not be easily dismissed [since] it raises the larger issue of selective enforcement and obedience of the law.

Is it OK to break the speed limit because most other drivers "commonly" do so; to run caution lights because most other cars commonly do so; to break North Carolina's law against unmarried co-habitation because so many other heterosexual couples commonly do so; to shelter alleged bomber Rudolph because he is against abortion and meets the criteria of a sub-cultural "good ol' boy"; or to drink and drive because so many other drinkers commonly do so; and on and on ad nauseam?

Regardless of what one thinks about the apparently pathetic plight of Mahmood and other immigrants who break our laws, one must nevertheless place these and other violations ... into the larger context of selective obedience or enforcement of the law. This has become a grave issue in today's multicultural society where millions of new arrivals have not been brought up on traditional American values.

If "peace" in the social sense, as Benito Juarez once said, is *respecting another's rights* then however

contradictory some of them may seem, all laws on the books must be obeyed — even the ones we believe to be heartless, stupid, unfair, or all of the above.

People cannot arbitrarily choose which laws they will obey and which they will not. Even in the pitiable case of Mahmood, one must reluctantly come down on the side of enforcing the law, regardless of who you are or where you come from. [This is] a street maxim which should apply equally to law-breakers and law-enforcers.

DENOS P. MARVIN
Laurel Springs, Maryland

[The following Letter to the Editor was published in the Fort Collins *Coloradoan* on June 30, 2002:]

Re: U.S. Workers In A Bind

Hewlett-Packard Co., has cut 10,000 jobs and plans 15,000 more. Agilent has cut 8,000. Motorola has laid off 43,000. Yet while all this is going on, Congress has a special program, H- 1B, to bring in foreign high-tech workers: 195,000 last year; 195,000 this year; and next year, 195,000. So we're in a recession and the electronics industry has massive layoffs. Companies cutting jobs don't do much hiring. In addition to the normal unemployment levels there's lots of fresh-cut workers looking for jobs. Why then does Congress continue to bring in foreign workers under H-1B visas? This can only make the task of finding a new job more difficult for those who have been laid off. Is that what Congress wants? Perhaps Congress doesn't understand the impact of its own programs. More likely, they are simply indifferent to American workers. While Congress is embracing aliens, they've turned their back on Americans. They've even made it a crime to hire Americans exclusively. Watch on the Fourth of July, I bet Congress will pretend to be patriotic.

PERRY LORENZ
Fort Collins, Colorado

The Pimentels

Holism and science

by Guest Editor Lindsey Grant

Perhaps, years hence, the principal failure of twentieth century science will be recognized as its general failure to reconcile holism – the recognition that everything is connected, but frequently in vague and arcane ways – with the demand of the scientific method that lines of inquiry be sharply delimited and defined so as to permit scientific challenge

For the scientist, the path of caution (if not of enlightenment) is to stay within the narrow edges of his discipline. One can keep up with the literature and avoid the ultimate humiliation of publishing a paper that colleagues can attack for failing to take note of some recent development in his or her field. And, because the scientific literature is expanding fast, disciplines tend to become more and more narrowly defined.

The same process leads the cautious to offer solutions only within their discipline. Human population growth (my area of interest) is the most vivid illustration of the point I am making. Since its effects have been so pervasive, one might reasonably expect that it would be recognized as a cause of many of the problems scientists are investigating. And an effort to influence population growth might often be the solution to the problem, or part of it. Does it happen that way in most scientific research? Hardly. For some years, I kept an informal tally of scientific articles (mostly from *Science*) in which human population change was *prima facie* a source of the problem. I marked those articles “zip re pop” that either (a) failed to identify it as a cause or (b) having

identified it, failed to suggest that action on population growth could be part of the solution. My plan was to write “pop!” on articles that made both connections, but I literally almost never had the chance to bestow that accolade. Scientists, like many others, seem compelled to treat population growth as an independent variable to which they must adjust rather than as a human activity that can be addressed.

The price for this insularity is irrelevance. Reality does not observe disciplinary boundaries. Timidity has sidelined scientists when governments, in their rare moments of lucidity, have undertaken to deal with the real problems they face. Under President Nixon’s leadership, the U.S. Government addressed the implications of population growth in the United States and in the less developed countries (LDCs). The domestic effort fizzled out, but in the following decades (with setbacks in the Reagan years and the 1990s), the United States played a major role in educating others about the problem, convincing them of its importance, and helping them to promote family planning. Human fertility has indeed declined in much of the third world, and with that decline comes the beginning of hope. The United States can claim some of the credit for the progress. But U.S. scientists were not leading that charge. A review of U.S. scientific demographic literature in the past forty years would lead us through mind-numbing mountains of detailed and inconclusive studies of the reasons women have children, and very little about the ramifications of population growth itself.

The general insularity of scientific research defies the advice of scientific leaders. Several leading scientists, including at least two Presidents of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), have pleaded for more interdisciplinary research, and specifically for a willingness to take on population growth. All the major national and regional multi-disciplinary research organizations in the world have identified population growth as a central danger to human welfare. I think that the

*Lindsey Grant is a former U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Environment and Population and author of several books including *Elephants in the Volkswagen*, *Juggeranut: Growth on a Finite Planet*, and *Too Many People: The Case for Reversing Growth*.*