

pick strawberries do good work, legal or illegal. They are as good people as the rest of us.

My objection is to the hypocrisy of our policy. We wink at the laws today, then turn against the immigrants at the first sign of recession. Proposition 187 was a disgrace because it was California's attempt legally and institutionally to discriminate against people we had willingly hired. No wonder the courts threw it out.

Congress deceives the nation. It pretends we have a tough immigration policy, when real policy is made with little winks and nods. When voter outrage gets too high, as during the 1991 recession, Congress fatuously provides more money to the INS, but never provides the tools — such as workers' ID cards — with which illegal immigration might

be stopped.

Economics should not be the only determinant of immigration policy.

If economics alone determined community policy, all cities would look like Houston, with no zoning, or Los Angeles, where zoning came too late.

If economics alone determined industrial policy, we would have no anti-pollution laws, no clean air and water laws, no endangered species laws; anthracite coal would still belch into the skies, cars would still get 10 miles to the gallon and tobacco companies would still buy our politicians.

So why allow economics alone to set immigration policy? Immigration should take into account communities, resources, pollution, population, poverty, infrastructure, schools, transportation. It should consider

both the long and short terms. It should bear in mind that while new workers are useful in a boom, they are the first to lose jobs in a downturn.

The downturn will come. The current boom already defies the Phillips Curve and Milton Friedman's natural rate of unemployment, which both show full employment leading to inflation, killing expansion. We have been at full employment for more than a year.

So let's not be too hard on the AFL-CIO. It held out longer than anyone else for sensible policy and only threw in the towel when it realized the game was rigged.

I wonder what song the union will sing when the recession comes, as it will, and the new members with no green cards are on the street. As the song says — will you still mind? ■

## Unions Desert Workers

by Samuel Francis

As Dr. Johnson commented about the prospect of being hanged, the announcement last week that the executive council of the AFL-CIO has unanimously approved a resolution

---

*Samuel Francis, Ph.D. is a nationally-syndicated columnist. © 2000, Creators Syndicate, reprinted by permission.*

calling for mass amnesty for illegal aliens ought to concentrate certain minds wonderfully. Not the least concentrated should be those of the libertarian and free marketeers, who have warbled for decades over the glories of immigration of all kinds, legal and illegal.

Libertarians and free marketeers also like to warble about the evils of labor unions even more than they do about the glories of immigration, of

course, so it might come as just a wee bit of a shock to them that the labor establishment is now making use of illegal aliens to resurrect its fading power in the American economy and politics.

One of the economic advantages of illegal alien labor for the people who use it is that such aliens are easily exploited. You don't have to pay them minimum wage, provide health benefits, worry too much about safety measures on the job-site, or be concerned about strikes.

The aliens are here illegally, and they can't go to the government or a union to complain or file lawsuits. That's why free market trumpeters love them so much.

But if the aliens get amnesty, those days will be over. Unions, which have declined in membership from more than one-third of the national labor force at the end of World War II, now represent barely 10 percent of the private sector labor force. Once amnesty for illegals kicks in, that will change. The amnestied aliens will flood into the unions, and the unions will be back in business with plenty to complain and lobby about and with a horde of new voters to back them up.

In short, what the libertarians and free marketeers have done with all their bubble talk about immigration is help resurrect socialism — and not only socialism as it used to be in the 1930s, but socialism with a racial edge. So far from conservative Republicans being able to win the working class Hispanic votes of the future, those votes are likely to go to champions of Big Government and the Brown Resolution.

As for the benefits to American workers or even to those immigrants who chose to obey U.S. laws and immigrate legally, the unions have effectively abandoned them. "What a betrayal of American workers," says Texas Republican Lamar Smith, an

advocate of immigration reform, "Apparently, union bosses are so distraught about declining enrollments they will stoop to exploiting illegal workers."

"Labor leaders," the *New York Times* reports, "are stepping up efforts to unionize hundreds of thousands of immigrants who work in farms, hotels, construction, meat packing and many other industries," and every alien the unions sign up will have a job that used to belong to an American worker.

Moreover, the amnesty and unionization of illegals will pull even more illegals across the border. Illegals come now because the American job market and the wages it offers are so much more attractive than what they can find in Mexico and other Latin paradises — even without the protections that legality and union membership would confer.

But with the prospect of legalization through amnesty and membership in unions, illegal entries will skyrocket. Border enforcement is almost impossible today, but with amnesty and unionization as magnets, there will be no way to control the border, short of military force.

What the AFL-CIO decided to do this week, in other words, is one more betrayal of the American workers it's supposed to be looking out for, and one more act of treachery against

America and its people. But the unions are not alone in their treason.

Almost every other institution that has lost members in the last generation or so also champions unrestricted immigration. Churches do because fewer and fewer Americans attend their services. Teachers and school systems do because many Americans don't have children anymore, and without kids to teach, there's no reason to have people to teach them.

And, of course, political parties want more immigrants because it means more voters to mobilize and pander to. So do welfare bureaucracies, which find among immigrants new social problems to tinker with.

About the only group that doesn't have a vested interest in importing a new population through immigration is the American people themselves, who watch helplessly as their jobs are taken by aliens, their communities invaded and destroyed, their government captured, and their culture and civilization undermined and abandoned. If there are any Americans left who want to halt their dispossession through immigration, they can forget about looking to established leaders in business, labor, religion or government to help them. The only people who can help Americans today are Americans themselves. **TSC**

# The Globalist Copout

## Why aren't immigration numbers part of the population problem?

by Stuart Hurlbert

The Globalist Copout states that since overpopulation is a global problem, the ways of dealing with it must be primarily global or international in nature. It is ok for individual nations to attempt to control their own birth rates. But they should not control or reduce their immigration rates, even if immigration is the major cause of their population growth. It would be "unfair" if one country were able to stabilize its population well ahead of other countries, especially if it were an industrialized western country. So goes the "reasoning."

The U.S., for example, should deal with its population problem by ameliorating the social, political, and economic problems in the rest of the world that cause so many to attempt to come here. Then, in some later century or millennium, they will prefer to stay home.

The Globalist Copout is a device used in the U.S. primarily by four groups of people:

1) as a mantra by the saintly innocents, who *claim* the moral high ground with vague references to "human rights", "social justice", etc. and who are apparently truly without understanding of the consequences of the open border or high immigration policies they advocate;

2) as a smokescreen by those who want high immigration rates so they will have a good supply of cheap labor:

3) as a smokescreen by those who want high immigration rates, but usually only for their own

"group", however defined, in order to increase its political power; and

4) as an excuse for inaction by those afflicted by *el fenómeno microcojónico*, a condition especially widespread among university academics, environmental organizations, scientific societies, other professional organizations, and to a lesser extent among the general public.

This condition is characterized by acute cognitive dissonance which results from full awareness of the problems posed by high immigration, guilt feelings over their luck in being U.S. citizens, and great fear of being called names in public. The epithets favored by the attack dogs are "racist", "nativist", and "xenophobe". The attack dogs come mostly from the three other groups. But even *microcojónicos*, after enough coffee and/or Viagra, have been known to "go postal" on persons who raise immigration issues.

By far the largest and most influential group, it is the *microcojónicos* who are the primary obstacle to stabilization of the U.S. population and the long-term health of the Salton Sea, the Colorado River and its delta, and other environments of California and Baja California, among thousands of other ecosystems in decline.

### Prime Practitioners of The Global Copout

There are so many, choosing is hard! But below we give brief synopses of the copout stances of one political party, one scientific society, and one environmental organization.

#### THE GREEN PARTY OF CALIFORNIA

This paragon of saintly innocence claims to advocate protection of the environment more strongly than do other political parties. Their internet website presents a detailed platform on population and immigration issues. It refers to that majority of the U.S. population favoring reductions in immigration as

---

*Stuart Hurlbert, Ph.D., is professor of biology and director of the Center for Inland Waters, San Diego State University.*

*Email: [shurlbert@sunstroke.sdsu.edu](mailto:shurlbert@sunstroke.sdsu.edu)*

*Website: [www.sci.sdsu.edu/salton/](http://www.sci.sdsu.edu/salton/)*