

Letters to the Editor

Editor:

The fall issue of *The Social Contract* is excellent. I confess I was a little surprised by the opening sentence of your statement of purpose, which placed the origins of the population movement at just over two decades ago. I have on my bookshelves books published on the population issue in 1948 by William Vogt, Fairfield Osborn and Robert C. Cook.

I put Vogt on the platform at a meeting on natural resources which I organized while still an official of the CIO to discuss the population issue. His audience was composed of public officials and liberal representatives of organizations indisposed to think there was a population problem.

Vogt became chairman of Planned Parenthood-World Population in the late 1960s and served in that capacity until the family planners ousted the population people.

Hugh Moore was another member of our group. He financed much of the work of the Population Reference Bureau, which Bob Cook has resuscitated, beginning around 1948. Cook and he coined the expression "the population explosion," which preceded "the population bomb" by some twenty years.

You can even go back further than that to the organization of the Population Reference Bureau in 1929. I also have on my shelf Margaret Sanger's *My Fight for Birth Control* published in 1931, which shows that at that time the birth control people were concerned with population stabilization, and not merely voluntary parenthood.

Again, I think *The Social Contract* is invaluable. Keep up the good work.

Anthony Wayne Smith
Attorney at Law
District of Columbia and New York

[Editors note: Since receiving this letter we have been advised that Mr. Smith died on Feb. 29, 1992.]

* * *

Editor:

After reading Leon Bouvier's *Fifty Million Californians?*, and the condensation of it in the January 1992 *Social Contract*, I wondered in what section of the library this book will be placed in the year 2020: fiction or non-fiction?

This book is much more frightening than any works of Stephen King because *Fifty Million Californians?* has a real possibility of coming true.

Therefore, those of us who are concerned about the overpopulation problem in California must become even more zealous in our goal of recruiting more activists to champion this cause.

All inputs into the population growth rate are of great concern. However, to change family traditions, religious beliefs and fertility rates in the world takes time, education and dedication — more time than I have. Therefore, the input that I am most concerned with is immigration. The immigration portion can be changed immediately with the enforcement of existing laws and a will on the part of our elected officials to do what the majority of the people in the state want done: *No illegal immigration, and a reasonable ceiling on legal immigration.* The average citizen realizes that we cannot be the "911" or the escape valve for the world. Most people also realize that with close to 6 billion people in the world (and growing), it would be unrealistic to think there will not be economic want, natural disaster, or war some-where in the world. Our world will continue to create refugees. Can California be the resettlement zone?

It is not an important factor as to where immigration comes from. All people basically need the same things — jobs, education, health care, affordable housing, clean air, water, etc. All of the above are already in desperately short supply in 1991. Human beings cause problems for the resources, infrastructure, and environment of this state. Immigrants, like permanent residents, have neither a monopoly on, or immunity from, creating more problems. If the average illegal aliens are age 15, it is logical to assume they are *en route* to the job market, housing market, maternity wards and our clogged freeways. Does anyone consider this a benefit to California?

This is not a partisan issue. Both the Democratic and the Republican parties should bow their heads in shame because of their lack of concern for our borders. It is not only our sovereign right, but it is the will of the majority of the American people, as poll after poll has shown, to maintain them. The "immigration" question should be asked of everyone in or running for public office, and we should all vote accordingly.

We have not been able to get realistic thinking into the heads of our elected officials, but maybe now the timing is right. We may be able to get into their minds through their (i.e. *our*) billfolds. Money is a rare commodity in California's state government and the cost of operating this state must get a serious examination. Leon Bouvier, Governor Wilson and the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) have started a much-needed dialogue that will not go

away. Budgets need to be justified and passed with all media and voters watching.

If immigration laws and policies are made and enforced with our nation's best interests at heart, and family planning is made available and affordable, we may be able to place *Fifty Million Californians?* in the fiction section. No one would be more pleased than Leon Bouvier to find that, because his book made us more aware of the danger, we may have proved his projections wrong.

Helen Graham
State Program Director
Federation for American Immigration Reform
Sacramento, CA

* * *

Editor:

Thank you for the winter issue of *The Social Contract*. I read with interest the numerous articles by representatives from many countries concerning the issue of immigration as a cause of burdensome overpopulation in the developed countries. Implicit in the article by Roy Beck, regarding U.S. population growth, is the concept that quality of life is significantly influenced by the fertility rate among Americans.

As our socio-economic state of affairs continues to change, so too, does the family size. For those entering the U.S. from underdeveloped, poverty-stricken, third world countries where over-population is a way of life, the concept of limited population growth carries no significant meaning. Hence, Bouvier's insightful study, which revealed that the majority of the U.S.'s population growth is a result of the reproductive rate of immigrants and their descendants is not particularly surprising.

I am pleased that there is such a well-organized group of socially conscious and academically proficient individuals working to heighten awareness of this sensitive moral issue.

In contradistinction to Garrett Hardin's thesis that "there is no technical solution to the problem," I feel that the immigration issue eventually can be dealt with in a morally correct and technically efficient fashion. In this era of political correctness, our government has obviously been listless in dealing with this problem. Nevertheless, the existence of illegal aliens in the United States must not be considered a *fait accompli*; we must not, in Hardin's words, "increase our herd without limit in a world that is limited."

Kenneth B. Gum, M.D.
Traverse City, Michigan

* * *

Addenda to the Winter 1991-92 Issue

The article by Dr. Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., "The Mexico Free Trade Agreement: An Idea Whose Time Has Not Yet Come," appeared in the proceedings of the 1991 Annual National Legal Conference on Immigration and Refugee Policy, *In Defense of the Alien*, Volume XIV, (Staten Island, N.Y.: The Center for Migration Studies, 1992, pp. 63-70; Lydio Tomasi, Editor.

Also, we incorrectly referred to Dr. Jack Parsons as Senior Lecturer in Sociology at Cardiff University, Wales. He is a Senior Lecturer in Population Studies.