

December 2005/ January 2006 Immigration Report

TRUE Enforcement Takes Backseat to Weaker Legislation

See Page 3

Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) Introduces Largest Immigration Increase in U.S. History

See Page 4

A Personal Note on the Passing of Eugene McCarthy

See Page 5

Former 9/11 Commissioners Warn Homeland Security Recommendations Ignored

See Page 6

Citizenship and Immigration Services Adds Exclamation Point to Warnings of Former 9/11

Commissioners

See Page 7

Reformer Tools: *2006 Legislative Calendar*

See Page 8

Phoenix District Attorney Holds Conference on Illegal Immigration, Border Security and Crime

See Page 9

Around the Country

See Page 10

Book Review: *Invasion*

See Page 12

From the Hill: *"The 1986 Amnesty All Over Again" by Rep. J.D. Hayworth*

See Page 13

Victory for Immigration Reform Advocates in Costa Mesa, California

See Page 14

Houston City Council Under Pressure to End Sanctuary Policies

See Page 15

Making News: *Global Delusions (conclusion)*

See Page 16

Reformer Corner: Chris Chojnowski

See Page 18

White House Strategy Uncovered

See Page 19

TRUE Enforcement Takes Backseat to Weaker Legislation

Dangerous Indentured Worker Plan Around the Corner

As Congress headed home for the holiday recess to face an electorate increasingly alarmed about the lack of immigration controls, the White House pushed for passage of a House bill that incorporates immigration enforcement. The move was designed to allow members of Congress to assure enraged constituents the problems of mass illegal immigration and out-of-control borders are being addressed in Washington.

The House legislation, the Border Protection, Antiterrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act, was introduced on December 7. The *Denver Post* reported that the so-called tough enforcement measure in the House will be packaged with a massive amnesty and guest worker measure that will be pushed through the Senate in early 2006, according to a White House plan. The strategy is designed to be an end-run around strong opposition in the House for President Bush's amnesty/guest worker plan by making immigration enforcement part of a package that includes massive giveaways to illegal aliens and cheap labor interests.

This House bill (H.R. 4437), was introduced by House Judiciary Committee Chairman James Sensenbrenner (R-Wis.). The legislation, though falling far short of the comprehensive enforcement bill, H.R. 4313, introduced in November by Armed Services Committee Chairman Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.) and Rep. Virgil Goode (R-Va.), includes some important border and employer sanctions provisions. However, these enforcement provisions will be seriously eroded if the White House strategy to tie them to an amnesty and guest worker program is successful.

As it became evident that immigration was going to be a major legislative issue in what remains of the 109th Congress, FAIR issued the [Seven Principles of True Comprehensive Immigration Reform](#). Anticipating that the Bush Administration and allies in Congress would attempt to "solve" illegal immigration by making it legal and by creating massive programs to allow millions of would-be illegal immigrants to enter the country legally, FAIR sought to head-off the type of strategy being employed by the White House.

Among the key principles of real immigration reform are:

- Cut the numbers.
- No amnesty or guest worker programs.
- Protect wages and living standards for American workers.

President Bush's stated plan, and the administration's legislative strategy for enacting the plan, violates at least three of the seven principles that constitute real immigration reform.

Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) Introduces Largest Immigration Increase in U.S. History

Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) needed the assistance of the White House in early 2005 to overcome opposition within his own party to his chairmanship. In late November, Specter repaid the Bush Administration by unveiling draft legislation that would bring about a massive increase in government- mandated immigration to the U.S.

President Bush, in his immigration address on November 28, pledged to work for an increase in the number of green cards issued each year and stated his intent to work with Sen. Specter to bring it about. Specter's draft legislation would send government mandated immigration levels into the 2 million-a-year range.

Under Specter's draft legislation, the cap on family-preference immigration would be increased by 254,000 visas annually and hundreds of thousands of additional relatives would be exempted from annual limits. In addition, Specter proposes raising the cap on employment-based immigration by 150,000 a year, and allocating any unused visas to other preference categories.

If enacted, Specter's legislation would mandate the largest increase in immigration in this nation's history. Moreover, according to FAIR's analysis, such legislation would fuel the demand for still higher levels of immigration as more extended family members line up to follow an ever-growing number of immigrants streaming into our country.

A Personal Note on the Passing of Eugene McCarthy

by Dan Stein

I note with great sadness the passing of former Minnesota Senator Eugene McCarthy, a longtime member of the FAIR Board of Advisors, on December 10 at the age of 89.

Over the years I had the privilege of getting to know Senator McCarthy quite well. Always friendly, witty and outgoing, he would often drop into my office unannounced just to chat about the wide range of subjects on his mind — more often than not the need for organic reform of the nation's democratic system. Clever, literate (he was a poet), humble and full of humor, Gene was never content with the status quo.

He was a reformer's reformer — the true citizen politician. He took this high-minded quest into the realm of immigration policy. As an original cosponsor of the Immigration Act of 1965, he was willing to admit the Senate had been misled by the Johnson administration. Later he conceded that this legislation was a mistake. This man of honor worked tirelessly to fix it. He stood as a beacon of leadership willing to speak out for positive change in the nation's immigration system. He loved and respected FAIR; we all loved and respected him.

Senator McCarthy can never be replaced and I know I speak for the entire organization when I say he will be dearly missed.

Former 9/11 Commissioners Warn Homeland Security Recommendations Ignored

Former Gov. Thomas Kean and former Congressman Lee Hamilton, the ranking Republican and Democratic members of the 9/11 Commission, excoriated the Bush Administration and Congress in early December for what they termed a “lack of urgency” in addressing ongoing threats to our nation’s security. The 9/11 Commission’s assessment of our nation’s preparedness for another terrorist attack echoes warnings issued by the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), which has detailed the ongoing threat posed by our failure to control our borders and to enforce our immigration laws.

“More than four years after 9/11...people are not paying attention,” Gov. Kean stated on national television. His colleague, Cong. Hamilton added ominously, “We believe another attack will occur. It’s not a question of if. We are not as prepared as we should be.” With a few exceptions, the leaders of the 9/11 investigatory commission gave the Bush Administration and Congress failing grades on implementing the commission’s 41 recommendations for strengthening the nation’s defenses against another terrorist attack on our soil.

Among the commission’s recommendations, which were issued in July 2004, were calls for tightening many of the loopholes in our immigration laws and enforcement policies that were exploited by the terrorists who carried out the attacks of 9/11 and others that can be exploited by future terrorists. These recommendations included tighter border security, more rigorous interior enforcement, and improving the security of vital government-issued identity documents. Adding to the urgency of the former commissioners’ warnings was the arrest in late November of an Iraqi national with ties to al-Qaeda along the U.S.-Mexico border.

On the fourth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, FAIR published [*Code Orange: Diminishing the Terrorist Threat to America*](#), which lays out a series of concrete recommendations for correcting the immigration-related vulnerabilities cited by the 9/11 Commission and others. Code Orange makes 21 specific recommendations to improve security along our nation’s borders and to improve our chances of detecting and removing terrorists who may already be inside the country. These recommendations have been incorporated into H.R. 4313, the True Enforcement and Border Security Act of 2005. Code Orange is available online at FAIR’s website, www.fairus.org.

“God help us if we have another attack,” said Gov. Kean, “and we have not done all that we can reasonably do to prevent it. What will our excuse be?” he asked rhetorically.

Citizenship and Immigration Services Adds Exclamation Point to Warnings of Former 9/11 Commissioners

One of the key findings of the 9/11 Commission was the failure of government agencies to share pertinent information with one another making it possible for the terrorists to attack our country. Less than a week after leading members of that commission recently warned that vital information is still not being shared, the Washington Times reported turf wars within the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services agency (USCIS) that are preventing personnel from gaining access to important information about visa applicants. USCIS is the agency charged with doing background checks and making decisions about who gets green cards, student and other visas.

According to internal emails, access to vital information between departments within USCIS is being hampered by internal turf battles. People who are making crucial decisions in cases with national security implications are also being denied access to relevant databases within the Department of Homeland Security.

The disarray within USCIS has alarmed some on Capitol Hill. Rep. John Culberson (R-Tex.) called it, "a scandal of immense proportions that has got to be brought out into the open." Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-Colo.) echoed those sentiments. "We have an agency in meltdown," he said.

Meltdown, a condition that began in the defunct Immigration and Naturalization Service and continues within the new USCIS, is precisely the reason FAIR has called for a moratorium, or time out, on all non-essential immigration. These latest revelations, coupled with the dire warnings of the people who investigated the 9/11 attacks, indicate conclusively that our chaotic immigration polices undermine America's national security.

2006 Legislative Calendar

	Convenes	Adjourns
Alabama	January 10, 2006	April 24, 2006
Alaska	January 9, 2006	May 9, 2006
Arizona	January 9, 2006	April 22, 2006
Arkansas	No Regular 2006 Session	
California	January 4, 2006	August 31, 2006
Colorado	January 11, 2006	May 10, 2006
Connecticut	February 8, 2006	May 3, 2006
Delaware	January 10, 2006	June 30, 2006
District of Columbia	January 3, 2006	January 2, 2007
Florida	March 7, 2006	May 5, 2006
Georgia	January 9, 2006	April 7, 2006
Hawaii	January 18, 2006	May 3, 2006
Idaho	January 9, 2006	March 17, 2006
Illinois	January 11, 2006	January 9, 2007
Indiana	January 10, 2006	March 10, 2006
Iowa	January 9, 2006	April 19, 2006
Kansas	January 9, 2006	May 26, 2006
Kentucky	January 3, 2006	April 11, 2006
Louisiana	March 27, 2006	June 19, 2006
Maine	January 4, 2006	April 19, 2006
Maryland	January 11, 2006	April 10, 2006
Massachusetts	January 4, 2006	January 2, 2007
Michigan	January 11, 2006	December 31, 2006
Minnesota	March 1, 2006	May 19, 2006
Mississippi	January 3, 2006	April 2, 2006
Missouri	January 4, 2006	May 26, 2006
Montana	No Regular 2006 Session	
Nebraska	January 4, 2006	April 18, 2006
Nevada	No Regular 2006 Session	
New Hampshire	January 4, 2006	June 30, 2006
New Jersey	January 10, 2006	January 8, 2007
New Mexico	January 17, 2006	February 16, 2006
New York	January 4, 2006	January 3, 2007
North Carolina	May 8, 2006	July 26, 2006
North Dakota	No Regular 2006 Session	
Ohio	January 3, 2006	December 31, 2006
Oklahoma	February 6, 2006	May 26, 2006
Oregon	No Regular 2006 Session	
Pennsylvania	January 3, 2006	November 30, 2006
Rhode Island	January 3, 2006	June 26, 2006
South Carolina	January 10, 2006	June 1, 2006
South Dakota	January 10, 2006	March 13, 2006
Tennessee	January 10, 2006	May 26, 2006
Texas	No Regular 2006 Session	
Utah	January 16, 2006	March 1, 2006
Vermont	January 3, 2006	May 18, 2006
Virginia	January 11, 2006	March 11, 2006
Washington	January 9, 2006	March 17, 2006
West Virginia	January 11, 2006	March 13, 2006
Wisconsin	January 10, 2006	May 18, 2006
Wyoming	February 13, 2006	March 10, 2006
U.S. Congress	January 18, 2006	December 6, 2006

Phoenix District Attorney Holds Conference on Illegal Immigration, Border Security and Crime

The momentum generated by passage of Proposition 200 by Arizona voters in November 2004 continues as we enter the election year of 2006. While entrenched interests in Washington continue to fight rising public sentiment for true immigration reform, leaders at the local level are beginning to respond to the demands of ordinary Americans that this nation enforce its immigration laws.

In early November, Maricopa County, Arizona District Attorney Andrew Thomas held a three-day conference in Phoenix bringing together leading lawmakers, law enforcement people, and immigration experts to discuss the impact mass illegal immigration has on local communities and to find ways of empowering them to deal with the crisis. Some 300 people attended this conference.

FAIR's Western Regional Field Director, Rick Oltman, who has worked closely with grassroots immigration reform groups in Arizona and elsewhere, was among those who addressed the conference. Creating coalitions with police and sheriff's departments all across the country to confront the issues posed by mass immigration has been a key FAIR goal for many years. The Phoenix conference — the first of its kind to be organized by a district attorney — indicates that top law enforcement officers are likely to become an important voice in the immigration reform debate.

Around the Country

Colorado

In the home state of long-time champions of immigration reform former Governor Richard Lamm and Congressman Tom Tancredo, immigration is shaping up as a major campaign issue in the 2006 election. Since passage of Proposition 200 in Arizona in 2004, local activists in Colorado have been exploring the idea of placing a similar measure on the Colorado ballot. Republican State Representative Dave Schultheis, after attending a meeting in Arizona with members of other state legislatures, called a hearing in November about the problems associated with illegal immigration in Colorado. The forum provided an opportunity for Coloradans to express their overwhelming support for immigration law enforcement.

Colorado Democratic legislators plan to hold a meeting of their own on the matter in mid-December. Billed as a bipartisan forum, House Speaker Andrew Romanoff promises the December meeting will be a “thoughtful discussion” of the issue, including a focus on “how to enforce the laws we’ve got.”

Georgia

The *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, Georgia’s leading newspaper, reports SB 170, a bill that would bar illegal aliens from receiving non-emergency state benefits and services, is gaining support across the state. The legislation was introduced by State Senator Chip Rogers, who estimates that the cost of illegal immigration to the state runs about \$1 billion annually. FAIR, working with an extensive network of state activists, is helping to build grassroots support in Georgia for state-based measures to curb illegal immigration. Illegal alien supporters who are members of the state legislature have sought to counter the growing reform momentum by introducing a bill guaranteeing illegal aliens in-state tuition benefits in Georgia’s public universities and colleges.

New York

In the exclusive enclave of East Hampton, Long Island, where the rich and famous spend their summers, the presence of illegal alien day laborers on the streets is not welcome. The East Hampton police have begun cracking down on loitering violations and citing people who hire illegal day laborers off the street corners. Police officers are assigned to take photographs and record the license plates of people who pick up day workers, and pass the information along to the Internal Revenue Service and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement bureau.

Connecticut

Unlike many cities around the country that complain bitterly about the costs of illegal immigration, even as they refuse to help enforce immigration laws, the mayor of Danbury, Mark Boughton, has been actively fighting illegal immigration in his city. In December, Boughton joined with Suffolk County (New York) Executive Steve Levy, who has actively opposed illegal immigration on eastern Long Island, to announce a plan to seek reimbursement from the federal government for their costs. Their formula for assessing the costs and seeking reimbursement is seen as a model for other communities that take an active role in immigration enforcement.

South Carolina

In recent years mass immigration has become an important issue across the South. Local activist groups have sprung up all across the region, and South Carolina is emerging as a new base of immigration reform activism. A November 17 meeting in Myrtle Beach, organized by FAIR, brought together reformers from across the state and from neighboring North Carolina to discuss the problems faced by people in the region and to coordinate efforts and strategies to advance the cause of immigration reform. The meeting was moderated by FAIR's Interim Eastern Regional Field Representative.

Book Review

Invasion

Author, Michelle Malkin

Michelle Malkin, a nationally syndicated columnist, news commentator and public speaker, has been one of the leading critics of America's immigration policies for many years. Malkin plays no favorites in her scathing assessment of how our political leaders have mis-handled this vital national security issue, ripping both Republicans and Democrats for their perfidious sell-out of American interests when it comes to immigration policy.

Invasion, first published in late 2002, is as relevant and important today as it was when it first hit book shelves. As President Bush has made a massive illegal alien amnesty and further opening of America's borders a top priority of what remains of his tenure in the White House, Malkin's assessment of the motives of our leaders rings true. "Our immigration enforcement priorities didn't fall into chaos by accident," she writes. "America's homeland security system is a mess largely because a conglomerate of special interests helped make it so." Those same special interests are evident as we enter into a crucial legislative debate in 2006.

The recent frank assessment by the former members of the 9/11 Commission, that America is not appreciably more prepared for a terrorist attack than we were on September 10, 2001, and that four years after the attacks our national leaders are sliding back into complacency, confirms Malkin's bill of indictments against our political leaders. *Invasion* includes a call for many of the same policy reforms which were included in the 9/11 Commission's recommendations in 2004.

Published by Regnery Press, *Invasion* is available at leading bookstores, or at www.michellemalkin.com and leading online booksellers.

From the Hill

“The 1986 Amnesty All Over Again.”

by Rep. J.D. Hayworth

Americans traditionally, and with good reason, nurture a healthy skepticism about government. As Daniel Webster once said, “ Now is the time that men work quietly in the fields and women weep softly in the kitchen; the legislature is in session and no man’s property is safe.” I understand why Americans who care about fixing our broken immigration policy harbor similar sentiments as the House of Representatives leaps into the debate at the midnight hour of the first session of the 109th Congress.

The timing, combined with the thin, patchwork context of the House bill reinforces my concern that many in Washington view illegal immigration as a political problem to be managed rather than an invasion to be stopped. Those of us determined to turn back the invasion and reclaim our sovereignty and culture understand it is time for a bold leap, not timid incremental steps. All signs indicate the House bill will resemble the latter and I, and many others, believe that would be a tragic mistake and a missed opportunity with catastrophic consequences.

We should be alarmed that, inadvertently or not, the House bill may serve only as an empty vessel into which a guest worker plan and further weakened interior enforcement provisions will be stuffed during a conference to reconcile differences between the House and Senate versions. In basic terms, items not already in the House version cannot be added in conference to what most observers predict will be an even weaker Senate bill. That is why we fought so hard to strengthen the House version.

The worst-case scenario—our worst nightmare—is a conference report that contains a guest worker scheme and limited enforcement provisions that are just enough to give it a patina of toughness. This would tempt members who genuinely want to “do something” to vote for it. With the special interests, urged on by the White House, coming together to promote its passage, it could turn out to be the 1986 amnesty all over again with lip service paid and no real intent to follow through on interior enforcement.

The only thing that will prevent our nation from suffering that sad and dangerous fate is an aroused citizenry, beginning with the committed members of organizations such as FAIR. A grassroots uprising is our best hope to get immigration reform right. It begins with citizens contacting their elected representatives and senators face to face by phone, letter, e-mail or fax as a second alternative. Organize petition drives. Follow up by calling the radio talk shows, writing letters to newspapers and magazines.

It’s up to you to deliver the message: **ENFORCEMENT FIRST!** No amnesty. No excuses. This time, Congress, get it right!

It’s now...or never.

You may write Congressman J.D. Hayworth, 2434 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20512; or send a fax to his district office, 480-926-3998; or call 480-926-4151.

Victory for Immigration Reform Advocates in Costa Mesa, California

Costa Mesa, California, in the heart of Orange County, was the first local government to construct a hiring center for illegal alien day laborers more than ten years ago a center that the city has recently decided to close. On December 6, it became the first city to request federal training for local law enforcement personnel to identify and detain illegal aliens. Costa Mesa joins a growing list of communities around the country that are opting for enforcement of laws against illegal immigration rather than accommodation of illegal immigrants.

By a 3 to 2 vote, with the backing of Mayor Allan Mansour, Costa Mesa approved a measure requesting training for police. Like other city council meetings dealing with illegal aliens and day labor sites, the Costa Mesa City Council meeting drew a standing-room-only crowd of some 200 people. As a result of the council's vote, Costa Mesa will move forward on "securing an agreement with the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement regarding use of the Costa Mesa Police Department personnel to enforce immigration laws on individuals arrested and brought into the City's custodial facility."

Orange County itself submitted a proposal for training of sheriff's deputies in October 2005, and the city of Costa Mesa is requesting that its own local police officers be included under the county's application. City officials have said that checks of immigration status would apply only to individuals arrested for felonies or gang related activities. Local enforcement efforts could begin as early as January. "The public is demanding this. This is the very least the public expects from us," said Mayor Mansour.

While Costa Mesa is the first municipality to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) seeking federal training to identify illegal aliens, other state and county governments have also inked MOUs with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Alabama, Arizona and Florida have obtained training for state police, while Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties have joined Orange County in signing MOUs with ICE.

What has taken place in Costa Mesa is emblematic of the growing impact of grassroots groups that are fighting for real immigration enforcement within their own communities. Public pressure on elected officials all across the country is driving more and more states, counties and cities to become part of the solution to mass illegal immigration, instead of part of the problem.

FAIR has worked with activists groups all across the country to build organized community support for local immigration enforcement, and slowly but surely, the tide is turning in our favor. FAIR has a wealth of information and organizing material to help members and activists replicate the kind of successful grassroots efforts that are now paying dividends in places like Costa Mesa and other communities across the nation, and we encourage people to get in touch with us to help launch similar efforts in your community.

Houston City Council Under Pressure to End Sanctuary Policies

The decision taken by the Costa Mesa, California, City Council to have local police enforce immigration law violations is part of a national trend. In Houston, the nation's fourth largest city, lawmakers were considering termination of a local policy that bars police from inquiring about immigration status or acting to detain suspected illegal aliens.

Houston City Councilman Mark Ellis has proposed a city ordinance requiring city police to act when they have reason to believe that federal immigration laws are being violated. Houston residents turned out at a council hearing about Ellis' proposal and by a 3 to 1 margin, supporters of immigration enforcement outnumbered supporters of the current de facto sanctuary policy. Unlike Costa Mesa, where immigration enforcement enjoyed the support of the mayor, Houston Mayor Bill White has stated his opposition to having local police enforce immigration laws.

Making News

Global Delusions: Open Borders Will Destroy Society (part 2)

The following is the second part of an article written by FAIR Media Director, Ira Mehlman, for the online publication, The World & I, responding to the globalists' enthusiasm for open borders. The first part of the article, reprinted in the October issue of the FAIR Immigration Report, examined the flaws in the European Union model. The second part of the article looks at the impact of NAFTA and the potential consequences of a unified Western Hemisphere labor market.

Failed Promises of NAFTA

If elimination of borders in Europe has been less than an unqualified success, the elimination of borders in the Western Hemisphere is a disaster waiting to happen. Though not on the scale of the integration of the EU, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) foreshadows the destruction of the middle class and the social upheaval that will inevitably result from a hemisphere, or perhaps even a world, without borders.

NAFTA has worked remarkably well for the elite in the U.S. and Mexico, but has been a resounding dud for the vast majority of workers in both countries. (The relationship between the U.S. and Canada has been less problematic, owing to the fact that the two nations enjoy roughly equivalent standards of living and have similar labor and environmental laws.) While productivity in Mexico surged by 50 percent between 1994 and 2001, manufacturing wages in that country fell by 11 percent (and, in real terms, earnings were lower than they were in 1981). According to the World Bank, 51 percent of Mexicans lived in poverty in 1994 when NAFTA went into effect. Four years later 58 percent of Mexicans lived below the poverty line, while 82 percent of those in rural areas could be classified as poor.

Under NAFTA, wages for workers in the maquiladoras have fallen, and jobs that left the U.S. to take advantage of lower wage Mexican labor are now leaving Mexico in pursuit of still lower wage labor in China and other countries. Meanwhile American agricultural exports to Mexico (often harvested by illegal Mexican migrants in the U.S.) have wrought havoc on small subsistence farmers in Mexico. Many of these displaced farmers have migrated to the cities, or have found their way across the border to the U.S.

On our side of the border the results have not been any better. NAFTA was sold to American workers as a treaty that would allow millions of U.S. workers who were willing to retrain themselves to move into higher value added jobs, while the migration of labor intensive jobs to Mexico would provide economic sustenance and reduce the flow of Mexican workers headed north. Neither promise has been fulfilled.

The headline in the July 3, 2005, edition of The New York Times, "Profits, Not Jobs, In Silicon Valley," is all too familiar to middle class workers in the U.S. High tech, which was supposed to be the bright future of middle class workers in the U.S., is on the rebound after some rough years. That ought to be good news, "Unless, that is, you happen to want to work...in Silicon Valley," observes the Times. Profits for the seven largest high tech firms in Silicon Valley have increased by an eye-popping 500 percent in the last three years, notes the article. Over the same period, employment in Santa Clara County (where these companies are headquartered) declined from 787,200 to 767,600.

If NAFTA's promise of better 21st century jobs to replace the lost 20th century industrial jobs in the U.S. has produced disappointing results, the promise that it would stem the tide of illegal immigration to the U.S. has been utterly unfulfilled. Illegal immigration to the United States from Mexico has exploded since NAFTA went into effect. The Pew Hispanic Center estimates that since the implementation of NAFTA, more than 7 million illegal aliens have settled in the U.S. Mexico accounts for 57 percent of those in the U.S. illegally, while all of Latin America combined accounts for 81 percent of the illegal immigrant

population of the U.S. Moreover, the numbers of illegal aliens from Mexico are increasing, not decreasing, after more than a decade of free trade.

In time, of course, if we continue on the path we're headed, migration from Mexico will abate, but for all the wrong reasons. Rather than being dissuaded from migrating because of growing prosperity in Mexico, as promised under NAFTA, people will eventually stop moving when the same poverty that grips the majority of workers in Mexico is replicated in the U.S. As such, those open border enthusiasts like Robert Reid, who promote open borders as the "final solution" to illegal immigration from Mexico, will have their predictions realized in all the sinister connotations of that term.

We Are a Nation, Not an Economy

A just and moral society must be predicated on the realization that the economy and all other social institutions exist to serve the interests of the people, and not the other way around. Nations, as Thomas Jefferson wrote 229 years ago, derive "their powers from the consent of the governed." In creating this nation, the founders of the United States affixed their signatures to a historic document that stated that "we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

That closing sentence of the Declaration of Independence remains the best definition of what it means to be a nation. We, the people, agree to work for the common good and, if necessary, to die for one another. In return, we have every reason to believe and expect that we will benefit from that arrangement. The social contract that has propelled this nation to greatness has never included a clause that suggests we are all interchangeable and replaceable with the rest of humanity. When every person on earth (or even in our hemisphere) has an equal claim on residence and employment in America, our existence as a nation will cease.

As a nation, we should actively promote economic and political reform in Mexico and other nations in our hemisphere and beyond. At the same time, we must promote prosperity for those who form the backbone of this nation. However we choose to define ourselves as a nation, it must be something more than an amalgamation of workers, consumers, or even taxpayers, who happen to occupy a defined geographic area.

If the social bonds that hold the nation together are shattered, we will become slaves to destiny instead of masters of it. When people no longer believe that their nation and their society is loyal to them, social order will inevitably break down (and with it, ironically, the world's economy itself).

Far from promoting liberty and prosperity, a world without borders will inevitably lead to a conflict, misery and chaos. In other words: tyranny.

[Go to Part I of the article.](#)

Reformer Corner

Chris Chojnowski

This month's reformer is Chris Chojnowski of Michigan. We invite FAIR members and other reformers to include short accounts of how they got involved and share their successes with others working for this cause.

I got my first glimpse of our nation's illegal alien problem in 2003 when the Mexican Consulate came to my hometown of Kalamazoo, Michigan, to lobby our city's officials into accepting the matricula consular card as a valid identity document. As I and others in the community fought this effort on the part of the Mexican government, we received assistance from Susan Tully and Michael Hethmon of FAIR.

I was amazed at the tactics the Mexican consulate used to achieve their goals. They would stop at nothing. A powerful example of this is what happened to me at the conclusion of a Kalamazoo City Commission meeting. I was approached by the Mexican Consul Antonio Meza Estrada (who is currently under investigation in Mexico for embezzling \$33 million) who said to me, "This is not over here. You will be hearing from us." He then turned around and walked away. This only served to enflame my desire to protect our country from abuses such as these.

Over the past couple of years I have assisted FAIR in an investigation of the registration of illegal aliens to vote, matricula card procurement, and of the sale of Mexican identity documents. Currently I am working to influence state lawmakers in Michigan to pass laws restricting illegal immigration.

The biggest challenge I see in getting more people to turn toward our cause is getting them to learn — in more detail — the devastating effect illegal immigration is having on our country. Yes, the humanitarian view has validity, but if this continues unchecked, we will no longer have a country. As a sovereign country the U.S. has a right to decide who should enter this country. This definitely should not include those who break and scoff at our country's laws.

An interesting item to note is that my wife is from Colombia. Of all the foreign-born individuals residing in the U.S. legitimately with whom I have spoken, including my wife, I have not found one person who supports illegal immigration.

I speak fluent Spanish and am classified as a Spanish-speaking professional by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Defense. I also studied in Bogota, Colombia, and have a BA degree in Spanish from Western Michigan University. I am half Hispanic on my mother's side.

I worked for a short time as a police officer in North Miami Beach, Florida. While there I saw huge numbers of illegal immigrants. Unfortunately, the police agencies (pre 9/11) in South Florida did not look favorably upon enforcing illegal immigration laws.

White House Strategy Uncovered

President Bush's speech at Davis-Moahan Air Force Base in Arizona on November 28 was billed by the White House as an opportunity for the president to present to the nation his plan for immigration enforcement. Bowing to growing public sentiment, the president's speech was peppered with tough-sounding talk about enforcement of the borders and our immigration laws.

Unfortunately, aside from a change in rhetoric, President Bush's address leaves many questions unanswered and indicates that his version of comprehensive immigration reform and enforcement amounts to amnesty, open borders and little in the way of enforcement.

The following is FAIR's analysis of why the president's tough talk on immigration enforcement is just talk:

Bush: The first part of the plan is to promptly return every illegal entrant we catch at the border with no exceptions.

FAIR: The best estimates are that we catch only about one out of three illegal border crossers. Without a serious interior enforcement strategy, millions of illegal aliens who elude apprehension at the border will remain in this country.

Bush: [A]bout four of every five non-Mexican illegal immigrants we catch are released into society... This practice of catch and release has been the government's policy for decades. It is an unwise policy, and we're going to end it.

FAIR: If catch-and-release is an unwise policy and poses a threat to homeland security, why has it taken five years for this administration to propose changing it? And why is the president making termination of the catch-and-release policy contingent on passage of an amnesty and guest worker program?

Bush: The third part of our plan to strengthen border enforcement is to stop people from crossing the border illegally in the first place. And we're increasing manpower. We're increasing technology and infrastructure across this border.

FAIR: The president is trying to convince the American public that he is serious about confronting mass illegal immigration because he is spending money. Border enforcement is essential and it is important to have manpower, technology and infrastructure in place. But until Mr. Bush adopts a plan that convinces illegal aliens that crossing the border illegally will not benefit them, then he is not dealing with this problem in a serious manner.

Bush: Better interior enforcement begins with better worksite enforcement...[M]y administration has expanded a program called Basic Pilot. This program gives businesses access to an automated system that rapidly screens the employment eligibility of new hires against federal records.

FAIR: It is interesting that the president acknowledges the importance of worksite enforcement, while his administration has all but ceased worksite enforcement. The Basic Pilot program, which enables employers to instantly verify the legal status of new hires, will remain voluntary under the president's proposal. Unless employee verification is universal and mandatory, there can be no effective worksite enforcement.

Bush: As we enforce our immigration laws, comprehensive immigration reform also requires us to improve those laws by creating a new temporary worker program...Workers would be able to register for legal status for a fixed period of time and then be required to go home.

FAIR: There is no such thing as a successful temporary worker program that brings people from third world countries to work in first world countries. In every instance in which it has been tried, the vast majority of workers have wound up remaining permanently.

Bush: This program would create a legal way to match willing foreign workers with willing American employers to fill jobs that Americans will not do.

Response: There are few, if any, jobs Americans won't do. What the president is talking about is matching willing workers in other countries with willing employers in this country at the wage the employer wishes to pay. Under the Bush proposal, employers would never again have to compete for American workers by offering better wages, benefits or working conditions. The Bush proposal is nothing less than a prescription for the destruction of the middle class in America.

Bush: The program that I propose would not create an automatic path to citizenship. It wouldn't provide for amnesty. I oppose amnesty. Rewarding those who have broken the law would encourage others to break the law and keep pressure on our border.

FAIR: The president is being disingenuous. Any program that gives legal status to persons who broke our laws to be in the United States is an amnesty. At the end of the six years, either permanent residence will be made available to these workers or they will revert to illegal residence.