



Death of the Party

“IT IS A FAR, far better thing that I do than I have ever done; it is a far, far better rest that I go to, than I have ever known.” From *A Tale of Two Cities*, Sydney Carton’s words, as he rode the tumbrel to the guillotine, came to mind on reading the latest statistics on what open borders has done to a Republican Party that altruistically embraced it.

The Center for Immigration Studies reports that, since 1980, some 25.2 million immigrants have entered legally and been granted permanent status with green cards to work and become citizens.

“Immigration, Political Realignment and the Demise of Republican Political Prospects” is the title of the CIS report, which understates the crisis. Bottom line: the more immigrants in an electoral district, the more grim the GOP prospects. Consider a few of the largest counties in the nation.

Between 1980 and 2008, Los Angeles, No. 1, grew by 2.5 million to 10 million people. The immigrant share went from 22 percent to 41 percent. Over those decades, the GOP share of the presidential vote fell from 52 percent in Ronald Reagan’s rout of Jimmy Carter to 29 percent for John McCain.

Orange County, the bastion of Barry Goldwater conservatism, saw its population rise from 1.9 million in 1980 to 3.2 million in 2008, with the immigrant share rising from 13 percent to 34 percent. Reagan swept Orange County with 68 percent. McCain got 50 percent.

Consider Cook County, the nation’s second largest. While Cook grew by 350,000 from 1980 to 2008, the character of Chicago changed, with the immigrant share of the population rising from 12 percent to 25 percent. In those 28 years, the GOP share of the presidential vote fell from 40 percent to 23 percent.

In Kings County (Brooklyn), the immigrant share of the population rose from 24 percent to 44 percent, and the Republican share of the presidential vote plummeted from 38 percent to 20 percent.

Nixon and Reagan carried California seven times on presidential tickets. Both carried New York and Illinois in their greatest victories. Yet the GOP has not won one of those three pivotal states in the last five elections.

If California, New York, and Illinois are moving out of reach for GOP presidential candidates, and the party is being annihilated in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago, our three largest cities, what of red states Arizona, Texas, and Florida? They are going the same way.

Harris County, Texas, the nation’s third-largest, grew by 1.4 million since 1980. Its immigrant population tripled as a share of total population to 25 percent. Where Reagan carried Harris with 58 percent, McCain lost it with 49 percent.

Dallas County added a million people to hit 2.5 million by 2008, as its immigrant population surged from 5 percent to 27 percent. Where Reagan won 59 percent of Dallas County, McCain got only 42 percent.

Phoenix is sited in the fourth most populous county, Maricopa. Its population in 30 years has gone from 1.5 million to 3.8 million. Where 5.5 percent of Maricopa was immigrant in 1980, the percentage is now above 15 percent. And where Reagan carried Maricopa with 65 percent, McCain, an Arizonan, carried Maricopa with only 54 percent.

In Dade (Miami), the immigrant share of the population has gone in 30 years from 36 percent to 58 percent, and the GOP share of the vote has fallen from 60 percent to 42 percent. In Broward (Ft. Lauderdale), legal immigrants tripled as

a share of the population, while the GOP presidential vote fell from 56 percent to 32 percent.

The correlation seems absolute. The more immigrants who come in and become citizens, the more Democratic the country becomes. Why? Almost all immigrants, legal and illegal, are poorer and less skilled than Americans and depend far more upon government.

According to CIS, of recent immigrants who became citizens by 2008, by 55-30 percent they identified as Democrats. Among immigrants who have not yet become citizens, 70 percent identify as Democrats, 15 percent as Republicans. The sooner Democrats get them naturalized, registered, and voting, the sooner the bell tolls for the Grand Old Party.

Is the GOP problem its hard line on illegal immigration? This is a myth. According to a Zogby survey done for CIS, 56 percent of Hispanics and 68 percent of African-Americans say legal immigration is too high. Only 7 percent of Hispanics and 4 percent of African-Americans say it’s too low. On no issue is the gulf between elites and the people so wide.

What would be a GOP policy that advanced both the national and party interest? First, an offensive against the administration for laxity in enforcing our immigration laws against businesses that hire illegals. Each time a business is forced to let illegal workers go, the jobs go to some of our 25 million unemployed and underemployed. Second, a Put-Americans-First moratorium on legal immigration until U.S. unemployment falls below 6 percent. And what is Republican Lindsey Graham up to? Collaborating with Sen. Chuck Schumer on a path to citizenship for illegal aliens. ■

Tolerance Mafia

Who watches the hate watchers?

By **W. James Antle III**

KEN SILVERSTEIN is an unlikely ally for those trying to get control of the nation's borders. A liberal journalist, he finds the Minutemen “crackpots” and Arizona's immigration-hawk Sheriff Joe Arpaio a “kook” whose activities are “reprehensible.” Silverstein's wife is Dominican, and he freely admits he does not know whether she originally came to America legally. Yet there he was at the National Press Club on a panel sponsored by the restrictionist Center for Immigration Studies (CIS).

“I have different immigration views than the center,” Silverstein said in his presentation. “But I don't believe I have a monopoly on wisdom.” What he does believe is that free speech is too important to be shouted down by ersatz civil-rights organizations like the Southern Poverty Law Center. “The SPLC squelches free speech and free debate,” Silverstein argued. And, he would add, they raise an awful lot of money from unsuspecting liberals in the process.

Silverstein was there to mark the release of a powerful CIS report entitled “Immigration and the SPLC: How the Southern Poverty Law Center Invented a Smear, Served La Raza, Manipulated the Press, and Duped its Donors.” On that last point, Silverstein is something of an expert: he wrote “The Church of Morris Dees” story for *Harper's* a decade ago documenting how Dees, the SPLC's founder, had enriched himself by posing as a defender of racial equality against a rising tide of hate.

What calling could be nobler than working against the cross-burning knuckle-draggers of the Ku Klux Klan?

But the country that elected Barack Obama president is not the America of “Mississippi Burning.” Organizations like the Klan have been thoroughly marginalized, their racist ideologies soundly rejected by Americans of all colors and creeds. To raise money as if they constitute anything more than an unpleasant reminder of our Jim Crow past is to perpetuate a fraud.

That's why Dees and his merry band of politically correct enforcers have had to branch out, endlessly expanding the list of “hate groups” to include perfectly mainstream organizations with which they disagree. Advocates of reduced immigration levels and stronger border security are high on the SPLC's list of targets because of the obvious racial component of the immigration issue.

Locating cranks who have made ill-tempered remarks about immigrants is not terribly difficult work for highly trained members of the thought police. But Morris Dees's marauders have not been content to stop there. In late 2007, the SPLC labeled the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) a hate group. This troubling designation by extension tarred organizations like CIS and Roy Beck's NumbersUSA—and quickly achieved its intended chilling effect on the immigration debate.

The SPLC's smear became the centerpiece of the National Council of La Raza's “Stop the Hate” campaign. “Hate” was loosely defined as any position that differed from La Raza's advocacy of loose borders and amnesty for illegal immigrants. La Raza used the SPLC's “findings” to try to silence its critics, and

the mainstream media, always eager to portray conservatives as racists, cheerfully repeated the slur in its woefully biased coverage of the amnesty debate. Stop the Hate claimed its biggest scalp when Lou Dobbs stepped away from his microphone at CNN—by most accounts, a voluntary move, but one hastened by the network's growing discomfort with the controversy surrounding Dobbs's outspoken views on immigration.

FAIR, CIS, and NumbersUSA are far from hate groups. They are wonky, white-paper-generating organizations committed to nothing more controversial than cutting back immigration from its post-1965 high of 1 million new immigrants a year to the more traditional level of 300,000. They shy away from the more racially charged aspects of the debate, which reflects their roots in the wing of the immigration-restrictionist movement animated primarily by environmental and economic concerns rather than blood and soil.

But such facts cannot be allowed to get in the way of a good fundraising mailing—or a malicious attempt to drum certain viewpoints out of polite society. In its fevered writings about immigration reformers, the SPLC has concocted conspiracies so elaborate they would raise eyebrows within the John Birch Society. While the Birchers have David Rockefeller, the SPLC has Michigan environmental activist John Tanton: the “puppeteer” supposedly pulling the strings whenever leading immigration reformers Mark Kirkorian and Roy Beck speak, the all-purpose explanation for why seemingly color-