we won't know until they've given a chance to actually govern. That won't happen until the ongoing media blackmail campaign is dealt with.

Hayden Dahlenberg

Immigration ... appearance and reality

IMMIGRATION and Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies is a book of essays about America and how it has handled, or mishandled, its immigration programs, but the implications go much further than that. It is also about world population growth, into early next century, including that out of the US, and the problems such growth creates. It is also about the wide variety of motives people have in wanting to migrate, and the differing reasons, some Idealistic and others self serving, that those advocating mass migration to their country possess. It is about costs and benefits, those who benefit and those likely to suffer in the host country. It is also about encouraging and assisting the development of underdeveloped countries and the very mixed blessing this could be for advanced countries helping this to happen. It is also about how immigration flows have been used to facilitate the spread of crime and the enormous international drug industry in the face of which countries like America now appear powerless. There is material about Australia, Canada, Germany as well as the US. Two of the editors are Australian. It demonstrates the law of Unintended Consequences whereby the Road to Hell can be paved with good intentions. Thus, for example, 50% of babies now being born in Brussels are Arab. Did Belgians really expect this when they threw open their borders to foreign asylum seekers etc? It tells a familiar but melancholy tale of unlovely enterprises started by idealistic folk, only to see them hijacked by others, neither unselfish nor idealistic. There are lessons for Australia, one of the last three or four countries who still go out seeking migrants.

The first thing is that world population is growing at an exponential rate, such that it may double by 2050. It now increases by 90 million a year. Immigration is no answer to this, even though over 100 million people live in countries other than their homeland. The same kind of reasoning holds for 21 million refugees. Most people will die in the countries in which they are born; it is up to them to make their countries liveable. It is said that, although taking in economic refugees is clearly impractical, those suffering human rights deficiencies or oppressed by undemocratic regimes, should be admitted. This prospect too is tragically limited. Freedom House recently established that only 19% of the world live under conditions that can be described as free i.e. 4 billion don't. This important question will face us soon, when Hong Kong changes hands.

Finally, as of now, 30% of the world's labour force i.e. 820 millions is unemployed. Between 1990 - 2010, the work force of less developed countries will increase by another 800 millions. The total work force of the developed world is less than 500 millions. The West can no longer employ their own people. European unemployment is running at figures from 13% in France to 20% in Spain, Germany has 4.5 million unemployed. America and Britain rig their statistics. A less propitious time for people moving from poor to 'rich' countries could scarcely be imagined. This is the price of a capitalist system which increases 'growth' by technology, while shedding workers.

The US was the hope of the world, for many people, for a long time – for not only its economic and technological progress excited admiration, and emulation, but also its social advances and democratic philosophy. Migration was a jewel in their crown. America was first as the land of opportunity, a haven for the poor and persecuted, those wishing to make a new, better life where they would find a place to raise a family in serenity and affluence, with greater life opportunities for the masses than almost anywhere else. Admireable. So millions of Europeans flooded in until the US had to introduce some restrictions - for they had social and economic problems too. They established a quota of nationalities. The flow continued but better regulated.

In 1965, under the influence of a belated realization by US liberals that their negro citizens had been treated most inequitably, a new philosophy of anti racism arose. And an Anti Discrimination Immigration Act was passed whereby the quota system was dropped and a first come, first served practice instituted. Thereafter most migrants have come from Mexico and the Americas, East Asia, and latterly, places like Nigeria. First as the composition and then the volume of migration changed; dramatically.

Strangely, overlapping this great innovation was another which ran counter to it, representing what we'd now call a Green analyses. US Congress set up a Commission on Population and the American Future. Therein, the concern was with population growth and its effects upon the quality of life, including the environment. Nixon had said in 1969: 'One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be the growth of the population. Whether man's response to that challenge will be a cause for pride or for despair in the year 2000 will depend very much on what we do today.' Alas, 28 years on, we have cause for real despair.

The Rockefeller Commission put forward a strong anti growth message in 1972: 'After two years of concentrated effort we have concluded that, in the long run, no substantial benefits will result from further growth of the Nation's population, rather than the gradual stabilization of our
population would contribute significantly to the Nation's ability to solve its problems. They posited an optimum population of 240 million. They criticized the 'growth mystique,' the 'ideological addiction to growth,' including population, which really belonged to an earlier era. As to ecological damage, the overall effect (of frivolous and extravagant consumption that pollutes) is a product of numbers times styles of life, taken together. One multiplies the other. They saw a connection between growth, and the increase in regimentation and the shrinking of private space.

Population should be stabilised at 240 million, and migration which was 373,000 in 1970, not be increased as it was a potent influence upon population growth. And much more like that.

By the time Nixon got the Report in 1972, Congress had changed and ignored the Report it had commissioned.

In the years that followed, the US population has jumped 50 million, half of those migrants and their offspring. With a far higher fertility rate than old Americans e.g. 3.9 children per Mexican migrant woman as against 1.7 for native women. And greater than women in Mexico itself. Grants of all categories of permanent residency to aliens have increased from 380,000 in 1972 to 1.5 million in 1991. Apprehensions of illegal aliens have jumped from 500,000 in 1972 to 1.1 million in 1991. As many again go undetected. The end result is 3 million new immigrants each year.

The Census Bureau's 'high' projections forecast an American population of 500 million by 2080. Lower Urban Institute studies speak of 355 million by 2040. But both depend on net immigration of 800,000 per annum and 950,000 respectively. These immigrant numbers are far lower than the present reality.

Leaving aside 2040 and so on, what has happened as of now? The education, health and welfare systems are cracking and buckling; crime and law and order are right out of control; 3 Southern States -- California, Texas and Florida -- and Northern New York, are under siege. The situation of the great losers in this story, America's negroes, one of the oldest communities, is a disaster. Virtually all the progress they were making up to the late 60s was obliterated, as factory jobs went and then their semi skilled/ unskilled work was grabbed by Hispanics willing to work for nothing. And Filipino maids -- more respectable -- replaced young black women. The white liberal ladies, who hate racism and support high immigration, have done well.

The negro family system is in partial collapse -- no jobs for young males, so, can't make a home or keep a family. Drugs, violence, single parent families did not result from the permissive society, gay liberation etc. -- it economics. And migration is an economic activity. So resentment rises and interracial strife simmers.

Most illegals come across the Mexican border or by sea from the Caribbean, or from Northern Asia. The US say they haven't enough resources to man these borders and coastlines. Really? If Mexico were Communist they would - or if Caribbean and Central American states were friends of Iran or Ghadafii, they would. Eighty-nine per cent of US cocaine comes via Mexico, bought over the border; the heroin etc. by sea. Too many people now benefit from this post 72 situation to make reform seem possible. Thus, the lawyers processing the legal, defending the illegals, the criminals and the deportees, serving the 150,000 legal refugees per annum, and working with the criminal networks which have come with this traffic are thriving. And judges do well, as do social and welfare people, and employers of cheap labor. And liberals employing those illegals. None of the beneficiaries want anything changed.

One of the most underrated features of this scene is the establishment of foreign gangs and networks who are pushing the Cosa Nostra to the sidelines. Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Colombians, Nigerians, Russians, Israelis, Jamaicans (very tough), Haitians and Koreans are making the police enforcement task virtually impossible. The refusal by many states and cities to provide information on illegals, and illegals' crime, the rarity of actual deportations of criminals, all make for a society under attack. Commentators are discouraged from naming the nationality of ethnic gangs and criminals, for that would be racist.

It seems unlikely that the US can now change its course. Migration is one of those processes which becomes self-sustaining - almost proof against changes in wages, job levels, government regulations. Families and networks for illegals make migration for subsequent settlers - far less hazardous, less expensive. Their own people take them in, point them to jobs, welfare where the lures are; provide cover for the illegals, often at a very stiff charge. States are almost irrelevant in this process for they have lost control. The US, I think, probably can't reign control of all this. They are now a very different country than they were 30 years ago, and more and more Americans are looking back to what most seen a golden past. In Australia, we still have some options left, but there will be a big struggle to keep them open.

As to pumping aid into other countries to help them develop, acquire living standards and economies like ours (so that they start lowering their birth rates and won't want to migrate), in the short to medium term this would do produce great internal disruption. Mechanizing agriculture can force millions, even hundreds of millions off the land, while more and more industry kills own village and small industries and business. Privatising or closing down 'uneconomic' state enterprises throws still more on the jobless pile. Massive internal migration to the cities, or anywhere there is work, follows. Pressure to migrate must increase. In the end, birth rates may drop, jobs appear; but, of course, we'll all be dead.

Certainly the ecological consequences of countries like China, India etc. reaching for western consumption standards, don't bear thinking about.

So we may not have a positive duty to pour aid into our populous neighbours, and those brave souls who suggest we spend this 1.5 trillion on our own urgent problems, may not be all that wide of the mark. But we have a powerful aid lobby and an even more powerful migration lobby, in Australia, already taken fright who will call such sceptics racist and the rest of us selfish rednecks if we agreed with them. One of the things missing in these 'debates' are books like Immigration and the Social Contract: The Implosion of Western Societies, (Edited by Tanton, McCormack and Smith, Avebury Press); and their absence is no coincidence.

Max Tegtmann