



Policy Brief

American Immigration Control Foundation P.O. Box 525, Monterey, Virginia 24465

Exposed: The Real Reason for Amnesty

For years as the country's immigration crisis worsened, the American people were told by politicians, journalists, business leaders, and immigration activists that the only feasible solution was mass amnesty for the millions of aliens who had entered the U.S. illegally or overstayed their visas during decades of government neglect of border security.

Today, Democrat Party strategists, politicians, labor leaders, and a host of left-wing "social justice" organizations are engaged in a nationwide political effort to enact that amnesty, along with a few Republican supporters. With the financial backing of many big business leaders eager to import cheap labor, the political coalition for amnesty is powerful and well-funded. Posing as humanitarians concerned only about the welfare of humble and downtrodden "unocumented immigrants," the coalition has launched vicious attacks on anyone who supports enforcement of immigration laws and opposes amnesty. Routinely denounced as "anti-immigrant" bigots, racists, and worse, advocates of immigration law enforcement are derided and smeared -- even by many journalists -- as having no legitimate point of view worth debating or considering.

Why the hatred and vitriol? Why try to delegitimize the opponents' point of view? After all, political debate and differences of opinion are regular features of American life, the very hallmark of America's democracy. Why must those who simply advocate enforcement of law be discredited so viciously?

The reason is that the advocates of amnesty for millions and millions of illegal aliens have a lot more at stake in this issue than mere humanitarian concern for the welfare of illegal aliens. What's at stake is raw political power.

In reality, they are engaged in a carefully plotted strategy to transform America's population through mass immigration in order to guarantee their own and their allies' dominance in U.S. government, society, and culture. Their long-term goal is to reshape the American electorate through mass immigration. The strategy is to reduce the political clout of the native white middle class, which generally votes conservatively in national elections, while enlarging and enhancing the voting strength of constituencies that tend to vote for left-wing candidates.

If the plan succeeds, America's ethnic composition and cultural and political character will be changed forever.

The Curley Effect

Altering a population's make-up in order to suit a ruling elite is nothing new in history. Harvard researchers Edward L. Glaeser and Andrei Shleifer have recounted how demographic manipulation has been a tool of ruling groups in the U.S. and elsewhere throughout the 20th century. In their paper, "The Curley Effect," published by the Harvard Institute of Economic Research, they show how the Irish-American Mayor James Michael Curley of Boston in four terms between 1913 and 1950 used a combination of aggressive economic redistribution and incendiary rhetoric to transform Boston's electorate to suit his political ambitions. He sought to transform Boston from an integrated city of poor Catholic Irish-Americans and wealthier Protestants of English descent into a virtually all-Irish city. Curley's goal, said Glaeser and Shleifer, was "to turn Boston into a city that would elect him." He did that by fiery rhetoric and official government policies aimed at reducing the wealth of his English-descended opponents and favoring his poorer Irish constituents. The effect was to drive away his ethnic opponents and thereby increase the relative size of his political base.

The Curley Effect is what Glaeser and Shleifer call the deliberate shaping of the demographics of an office-holder's electorate through destructive policies aimed at opposition voters, even if the long-term effect has economically negative consequences for the entire political jurisdiction. The Curley Effect occurs when the incumbent "wants to maximize the probability of his re-election," but doesn't regard "the overall economic performance of the city or nation as the crucial determinant of that probability."

That's what Glaeser and Shleifer say happened in Detroit under Mayor Coleman Young and in Zimbabwe under President Robert Mugabe. "In his 24 years as mayor, Detroit's Coleman Young drove white residents and businesses out of the city," they noted. Young remained popular with black voters who consistently reelected him, even at the cost of ruining the city's mainly white economic base. And it happened in Zimbabwe where "President Robert Mugabe abused the white farmers after his country's independence, openly encouraging their emigration even at a huge cost to the economy." Those policies, they say,

“are motivated by a desire to alter the political landscape, including by shaping the electorate. Socially costly policies are attractive to the political leaders because they eliminate or weaken the political opposition.”

Plot Exposed in Britain

In Britain, mass immigration has already been exposed by a former Labor Party insider as a political strategy used against conservative opponents. Andrew Neather, a former senior aide to Labor Prime Minister Tony Blair and Home Secretary Jack Straw, admitted in an October 2009 article in the London Evening Standard that mass immigration “didn’t just happen: the deliberate policy of Ministers from late 2000 ... was to open up the UK to mass immigration.” Neather, who still supports mass immigration from the Third World, said that in meetings with government officials, the plan had what he called “a driving political purpose” which was to defeat the conservative Tory opposition. He wrote, “mass immigration was the way that the Government was going to make the UK truly multicultural. I remember coming away from some discussions with the clear sense that the policy was intended — even if this wasn’t its main purpose — to rub the Right’s nose in diversity and render their arguments [against multiculturalism] out of date.” He said the government intended to keep the plan secret, for fear of alienating the public. He wrote, “ministers wouldn’t talk about it. ... [W]hile ministers might have been passionately in favour of a more diverse society, it wasn’t necessarily a debate they wanted to have in working men’s clubs...” Since poorer non-white immigrants tend to vote liberal-left when they become citizens while older, mostly white voters tend to support the conservatives, Labor Party leaders knew mass immigration would give them electoral advantages.

Here in the U.S., the plan to transform America by granting citizenship to increasing numbers of poor, low-skilled, non-white illegal immigrants for precisely the same reasons is quietly recommended by Democrat Party strategists and left-wing leaders. Publicly they claim to support amnesty for illegals and mass immigration of poor Third World populations for purely “humanitarian” or “moral” reasons, but among themselves, they openly admit their real motives.

The Democrats’ Strategy

Robert Creamer, an influential Democrat strategist and left-wing “social justice” activist, has called for just such an immigration-based electoral strategy. Creamer is the husband of left-wing Democrat Rep. Jan Schakowsky, D-IL, and is a long time party loyalist, consultant, and lobbyist. He is the head of Strategic Consulting Group, a political consulting firm whose clients include the left-wing ACORN, the Service Employees International Union

(SEIU), the AFL-CIO, the United Steelworkers Union of America, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and other left-wing outfits. Creamer has also worked for the far left Open Society Institute funded by the radical multi-billionaire international financier George Soros. Even though Creamer in 2006 was convicted and sentenced to prison for bank fraud and tax evasion, he is still held in high regard by Democrat powerhouses, and after getting out of jail was invited to attend President Barack Obama’s first official state dinner at the White House.

He and other Democrat strategists know that Hispanics, the single largest ethnic group of legal and illegal immigrants, historically vote heavily Democrat. In 2008, Hispanics voted 67 percent for Barack Obama, and only 31 percent for John McCain, a ratio of more than 2 to 1. Nationwide, all Hispanic subgroups voted Democrat by heavy margins. The Pew Research Center reported that the vote of young Hispanics was a lopsided 76 percent for Obama. (Although Republicans do well among middle-class Cuban-American Hispanic voters, their share of the Hispanic vote is rapidly declining as the poorer Mexican Hispanic population increases.)

Democrat strategists also know full well that while Democrats do extremely well among Hispanic and black voters, the party doesn’t perform very well nationally among white voters, compared to Republicans. Since 1972, no Democrat presidential candidate has been able to win a majority of the white vote. The GOP since 1972 has won majorities of white voters in all but two presidential elections. (The GOP didn’t win a majority of white votes in 1992 and 1996 because of the third party presidential candidacy of Ross Perot who siphoned off 20 percent and 9 percent of the white vote in those elections.) Democrats never won more than 43 percent, except for Jimmy Carter’s 47 percent in 1976.

In his book, “Stand Up Straight! How Progressives Can Win,” Creamer urges a strategy that will dilute white voting strength. He says the Democrats who control Congress should grant amnesty to illegal aliens because it will enhance the political clout of left-wingers by increasing their voter base. He writes, “the immigration battle is ... important because it will have an enormous impact on the battle for power between the progressive and conservative forces in American society. As of 2007, there are 12 million undocumented immigrants in the United States. If they are placed on an earned pathway to citizenship through immigration reform, they will be eligible for citizenship and voting rights by 2012 and 2016.” He notes that their numbers will be added to nearly 30 million other immigrants who are already legal residents who “could apply today for citizenship, or are citizens not yet registered to vote, or immigrant voters who never go to the polls, or immigrants who will turn 18 years old this year and could register to vote.”

He argues that if Democrats work for issues such as amnesty that are important to immigrants, that “will define immigrants’ loyalties for a generation. If we are successful, a gigantic block [sic] of progressive voters will enter the electorate over the next 15 years — a block [sic] that could be decisive in the battle for the future...”

Creamer’s book received high praise and endorsements from many influential Democrat office holders and operatives, including David Axelrod, Obama’s former chief campaign strategist, and senior White House advisor; and John Podesta, former chief of staff to President Bill Clinton, now president of the left-wing think tank, Center for American Progress. Both are key figures in national Democrat electoral strategy and planning. Axelrod called the book a “blueprint” for progressives. Sen. Sherrod Brown, D-OH, said that if every left-winger reads it, “we could change our country. This book will help bring on the New Progressive Era.”

Labor Leader Endorses the Plan

Another leader in the left’s grand strategy to transform the U.S. is Eliseo Medina, the radical executive vice president of the powerful 2.2 million-member Service Employees International Union (SEIU). Medina was born in Zacatecas, Mexico, and was a farmworker and labor organizer for the United Farm Workers union. He is also honorary chairman of the Democratic Socialists of America. In a speech to a strategy meeting of the left-wing group, America’s Future Now!, he explained how amnesty for illegal aliens will help the left-wing cause.

“We reform the immigration laws, it puts 12 million people on the path to citizenship and eventually voters,” he said. He noted that in November 2008, Hispanics “voted overwhelmingly for progressive candidates. Barack Obama got two out of every three voters that showed up. Can you imagine if we have, even the same ratio, two out of three? Can you imagine 8 million new voters who care about our issues and will be voting? We will be creating a governing coalition for the long term, not just for an election cycle.”

Left-wing strategists know that if they can dilute the strength of the white vote by inundating the country with non-white, left-leaning poor voters, Republicans could be locked out of the White House — perhaps permanently.

Clinton/Gore Used Immigration Strategy

The strategy to grant citizenship to massive numbers of immigrants was used by Democrats during the Clinton administration to boost their chances in the 1996 elections. The “Citizenship USA” program run by then Vice President Al Gore accelerated the naturalization process for more than 1 million immigrants between August and September.

The program organized mass citizenship ceremonies in big city sports stadiums around the country, naturalizing as many as 5,000 immigrants at a time. As a result of the rush to make the Democrat-leaning immigrants eligible to vote in time for the November election, the Immigration and Naturalization Service failed to conduct fingerprint and background checks on more than 180,000 immigrant applicants. Of all applicants, more than 75,000 were later found by an independent audit to have criminal arrest histories, according to David P. Schippers, the chief counsel for the House Judiciary Committee, who led a congressional investigation of the Citizenship USA program.

Supplementing the Democrats’ strategy to legalize millions of politically sympathetic new voters, powerful Hispanic advocacy groups and allied left-wing “social justice” organizations exert tremendous political pressure on Congress and the White House to prevent any reduction in the massive flow of immigration to the U.S. — both legal and illegal. Well-financed groups such as the National Council of La Raza and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) work closely with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and left-wing pressure groups to block enforcement of immigration laws as well as construction of effective barrier fencing along the border with Mexico, guaranteeing that the flow of hundreds of thousands of illegals into the U.S. annually continues without interruption. That provides the potential new voters who hold the key to future power.

Following the strategy employed by Boston’s James Michael Curley, Detroit’s Coleman Young and Zimbabwe’s Robert Mugabe, pro-immigration leaders use incendiary rhetoric to frighten and intimidate their opponents into silence and to generate hatred towards them. Citizens who call for enforcement of immigration laws or border fencing are viciously denounced as “racists,” “Nazis,” “bigots,” and “hatemongers.”

Hispanic Leaders Envision Triumph Over White Voters

As millions of illegals pour across the border, the demographic reality is that Republicans — and their core, mostly white conservative constituency — face electoral doom unless they are able to stop the left-wingers’ plans to inundate the country with millions of new Democrat voters. Art Torres, Hispanic chairman of the California Democrat Party in 1995, well understood the growing strength of his ethnic group back when the state’s voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition 187 to block public welfare benefits to illegal aliens. He consoled Latino voters by telling them, “Remember, 187 is the last gasp of white America in California. Understand that.”

Hispanic politicians actively seek to keep immigration flowing from south of the border to enhance their political

clout. Rep. Joe Baca, D-CA, of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, told the annual conference of the Southwest Voter Registration Project, “The Latinos are coming! And the Latinos are going to vote. So our voices will be heard. So that’s what this agenda is about. It’s about insuring that we increase our numbers, that we increase our numbers at every level. We talk about the congressional, we talk about the senate, we talk about board of supervisors, board of education, city councils, commissions. We have got to increase our numbers...”

Hispanic activist Mario Obledo sees in starkly racial terms an emerging political struggle that might have severe consequences for white voters. “California is going to be a Hispanic state,” he said. “We are going to control all of the institutions. If people don’t like it, they should leave.” When asked by a radio interviewer if he really said that, he replied, “Yes, they should go back to Europe.” Obledo is a central figure in the Hispanic immigration movement and highly regarded by Democrat leaders. He was California’s Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare under Gov. Jerry Brown, a cofounder of MALDEF, former president of the League of United Latin American Citizens, and was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Bill Clinton.

GOP Already in Trouble

In an analysis of the political impact of immigration, political scientist Prof. James G. Gimpel of the University of Maryland noted that the prospects are not good for Republicans.

In his study, “Immigration, Political Realignment, and the Demise of Republican Political Prospects,” Gimpel said, “large scale immigration has caused a steady drop in presidential Republican vote shares throughout the country. Once politically marginal counties are now safely Democratic due to the propensity of immigrants, especially Latinos, to identify and vote Democratic. The partisan impact of immigration is relatively uniform throughout the country, even though local Republican parties have taken different positions on illegal immigration.”

Before he won the GOP presidential nomination, Sen. John McCain was a staunch advocate of amnesty for illegal aliens, and even supported making illegal alien workers eligible for Social Security benefits based on their illegal working history in the U.S. But Hispanics still voted overwhelmingly against him. Mexican immigrants, and their counterparts arriving from other Third World countries tend to fit the profile of the kind of poorer, low-skilled voter who traditionally supports Democrat candidates who favor more government-sponsored programs for welfare, health care, housing, education, and racial preferences such as “affirmative action” to give them preferred access to jobs and college admissions. The Pew Hispanic Center found,

for example, that an extremely high 81 percent of registered Hispanic voters believe that the government should provide health insurance to the poor. Hispanics are also skeptical of the Republicans’ tax cut policies. Only 23 percent of registered Hispanic voters said President Bush’s tax cuts were a good idea, according to Pew. McCain’s experience in 2008 confirms what opinion surveys reveal about Hispanic voters: they tend to prefer the Democrats’ overall political agenda. In contrast to Republicans who are skeptical of expanding government programs, Hispanics tend to favor them.

Democrats and their supporters in the corporate media hope to fool Republicans into backing amnesty for illegals by urging them to compete for immigrant voters, instead of limiting immigrant arrivals. Left-wing pundits at newspapers such as the New York Times frequently “warn” Republicans not to offend the “growing Hispanic electorate” by supporting immigration control measures. Democrat strategist Creamer, for example, says that he thinks “the interests of the country require that the immigrant-friendly forces in the Republican Party stand up straight and join with Democrats,” but he admits, “as a progressive Democrat, I would like nothing better than to see the Republican Party marginalized...”

But to win over Hispanic voters, Republicans would have to mimic the Democrat Party in calling for the left-wing policies that Hispanics support — thus losing its identity and risking loss of its own more conservative and largely white base.

The conclusions in Prof. Gimpel’s study present a stark picture: “past Republican votes in Congress in favor of a more generous immigration policy have unquestionably bolstered local Democratic majorities, and succeeded in stamping out Republican prospects in once politically competitive locales.” Gimpel concluded, “immigration may help Republican business interests hold down wages, but it also undermines the party’s political fortunes.”

If the plot to transform the U.S. is to be stopped, Americans must demand that their elected leaders assert control over immigration policy and enact immigration laws that are in the interests of the nation as a whole, rather than allow immigration law to be used as a political tool by left-wingers who seek to manipulate America’s demographic make-up for their own interests.

Additional copies of this and many other publications on America’s immigration crisis are available from:

American Immigration Control Foundation
P.O. Box 525
Monterey, Virginia 24465

www.aicfoundation.com