

the immigration of parents to situations where all or more than half of their children are living in the U.S.A. Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation proposes exploring a "guest" visa program which would admit parents on a permanent basis but deny them the right ever to become immigrants or citizens and thereby the opportunity to qualify for government assistance.

NO MORE ANCHOR BABIES? Many parents-to-be enter our country in order to bear a child on American soil. Obviously, this method for gaining the prize of American citizenship for one's child should be discouraged. For one thing, the numbers are potentially astronomical. There is much argument over whether denying such citizenship would require a statute or a constitutional amendment. One thing we can do is to deny these "anchor babies" the right (at age 21) to legalize the status of their parents and siblings. Who knows? These secondary benefits might turn out to be the main incentive for such births.

POPULATION. Like all other categories, extended family immigration adds greatly to our population. Large marginal increases have a massive impact on our schools, our environment, our physical infrastructure, and our opportunities for solitude. All such increases portend additional government and consensual regulations and consequent reductions in our freedom.

III. Conclusions and Recommendations

Irish: The Great Emigrants

But not so keen on receiving outsiders

by Kevin Rafter

DUBLIN
Resentment is growing in Ireland against foreigners seeking asylum here.

The antagonism has become so public that Irish President Mary Robinson has warned of the danger of racism "rearing its

ugly head" unless people learn to deal with the issues surrounding refugees and immigration.

The number of asylum-seekers in Ireland has grown from 39 in 1992 to 1,179 last year. Ireland, which has for the last two centuries exported its own people to the four corners of the globe, is now the

Extended family reunification is one of the least justifiable of all the huge flows that make up our current immigration policy. Like much of that policy it is out of control, associated as it is with mounting backlogs and the encouragement of illegal immigration.

Since no skills are required, extended family members almost by definition will compete with American workers who can least afford such competition and of whose meager grasp on the ladder of success we should be most protective.

And since immigration is basically disunifying, extended family immigration is justified upon a false premise — it does not and cannot reunify families. We can reunite, reunify, and rejoin the extended family best by not separating, fracturing and breaking it apart in the first place.

Family reunification therefore can only sensibly mean nuclear family reunification — granting immigrant status to the spouse and minor children of U.S. citizens and legal immigrants with no affidavit of support required. This is real family values! **TSC**

NOTE

¹ Under current law these include adult sons and daughters of U.S. citizens and their spouses and minor children; brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens and their spouses and minor children; and the unmarried adult sons and daughters of permanent resident aliens.

destination for refugees from the Third World and Eastern Europe. It's said that not since the Celts were driven westward by the Romans has Ireland seen such a large influx of refugees.

Ironically, statistics from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development show that among all the Western

European countries, Ireland actually has the lowest proportion of foreigners in its population. In 1992, just 2.7 percent of the Irish population were non-citizens. This compared with 3.5 percent in Britain, 6.3 percent in France, and 8.5 percent in Germany.

Why has Ireland attracted so many refugees? Many have found it an easier place to gain entry following a recent tightening of immigration procedures in other European countries, such as Britain and Germany.

Many leading European nations also have been experiencing economic difficulties. With little economic growth in places like Germany and France, there are fewer jobs for foreigners.

Ireland's economy, on the other hand, has been booming for five years. With almost nonexistent inflation, and nearly 1,000 new jobs being created every week, Ireland has become a magnet for refugees.

The largest number of refugees has been from Romania, followed closely by Congo (formerly Zaire), Somalia, and Algeria. Irish refugee agencies have been ill-prepared for the increase. The ease with which refugees can

enter the country has only added to the numbers.

So far, Ireland has resisted introducing restrictive immigration procedures. But the reception refugees are receiving

***“The reception
refugees are receiving
has been far from the
‘100,000 welcomes’
for which the Irish
are famous.”***

has been far from “100,000 welcomes” for which the Irish are famous.

Many refugees were appalled by the anti-immigrant comments of several candidates in the recent Irish general election. Several leading politicians warned of “floods” of immigrants coming into Ireland, many of whom were “professional beggars.”

This attitude is “both cheap and shallow,” says Drazen Noznic, a Serbo-Croatian from the former Yugoslavia who obtained refugee status four years ago.

A former government minister with responsibility in this area, Joan Burton, says that “Irish people have been taken by surprise by the cultural differences between them and refugees.” Partly in response to these attitudes, refugees are now trying to establish an association to represent their interests.

Not all the comments about

refugees are bad. Jon Bennet, who runs Dublin's Hill Top Hostel, describes them as the “most polite, appreciative, graceful, and well-mannered people. It's horrifying to hear the things being said about them.”

The majority of refugees coming to Ireland are like Mr. Noznic: they have no place to go home to in safety. He fled the war in the former Yugoslavia after friends were killed and family members were beaten up.

Many countries have fast-tracked procedures for asylum-seekers. In Austria, a decision on an asylum application takes only a few hours. In Ireland, it takes on average three years to process each application.

At present, almost 2,000 refugees in Ireland await decisions on their cases. They exist in legal limbo. They live in temporary accommodations and are prohibited from working or pursuing an education.

In an attempt to defuse the debate, President Robinson has appealed to the Irish people to be receptive in their attitudes toward refugees. She drew a parallel between the treatment of refugees in Ireland today and the reception afforded Irish emigrants to North America in the past. Just as the Irish crossed the Atlantic Ocean in search of their fortunes, many now see Ireland as a haven.

As Sean Love of the Irish section of Amnesty International says, “The least we can do is offer these people a fair hearing and fair treatment.”

TSC

*Kevin Rafter writes from Dublin.
© 1997, The Christian Science
Publishing Society. All rights
reserved. Reprinted by
permission.*

It Can't Happen Here, N'est-ce-pas?

Confronting the forces of dissolution

Book Review by Gerda Bikales

The title of a much-talked about new book by Jean-Claude Barreau asks a provocative question: *Will France Disappear?* Right there the subtleties of the French language come into play, for “disappear” is the accepted euphemism for death, while it also retains the meaning of fading away. The American reader is left to wonder whether we are talking about a definitive end or a slow evaporation into insubstantiality.

The inspiration for his book's title, Barreau tells us, comes from a 1970 book by Soviet dissident Andrei Almarik, *Will the USSR Survive until 1984?* At the time the question seemed absurd — the power of the Soviet Union seemed quite beyond dispute. Yet Almarik did not miss by much. The Berlin Wall crumbled five years later.

Jean-Claude Barreau is hardly an apocalyptic right-wing crank wishing to raise anxiety about French survival. For many years the author was a worker-priest in the slums of Paris, an engaged social reformer in daily contact with the struggles of newly-arrived immigrants. Eventually he left the church, but not his faith. He married and raised a family, wrote novels and essays, and became an advisor to political leaders of both the left and the right. He was an advisor to President François Mitterand, a socialist, and later worked for two center-right cabinet ministers closely associated with immigration reform — Charles Pasqua and Jean-Michel Debré. In

Gerda Bikales is a member of the advisory board for THE SOCIAL CONTRACT. Formerly the first executive director of U.S.English, she writes from France where her husband is on government assignment.

this book, Barreau often reveals himself to be a man of the left, though one often at odds with others who define themselves as such.

If the author's political stance defies labeling, his national identity is clearly French. His historical references tend to be obscure events in French history, not always easy to unscramble. His heroes are Joan of Arc, the young Napoleon (in his “First Consul” period), and Charles de Gaulle. His overarching loyalties are to the spirit of the

Revolution of 1789, born of the Enlightenment, and to the secular Republic it so painfully established.

Barreau's understanding of the State is built upon a Hobbesian social contract. Given man's violent nature, the State is an artificial construct for channeling violence. It is not expected to

deliver a terrestrial paradise, but merely to keep life from being hell. For the system to work, affective ties must bind the governed to the State and to each other. Likewise, the State must care for and about the people it rules, striving to govern wisely to keep their support. In each generation, the majority must consent to be ruled, or the State falls. Minorities can be suppressed, if the majority doesn't care about them but the majority can't be suppressed indefinitely. What Almarik sensed in the USSR in 1970 was bad governance and a loss of popular consent. What Barreau senses today in France is growing disaffection among the governed and between the rulers and its people.

Nation-States, we know, are unraveling everywhere. Still, it is startling to find the forces of dissolution working so effectively in that most classic of Nation-States. France is perhaps the oldest one, created by some accounts in 843 in the treaty formalizing the break-up of Charlemagne's empire.

**La France
Va-t-elle
Disparaître?**

by Jean-Claude Barreau
Paris: Editions Bernard Grasset

