

“Even this ‘land of immigrants’ must change sometime”

*The Australian*

January 6, 1995

by John H. Tanton

Your editorial, “Republican Migrant Move Unfair,” (*The Australian*, 27/12/94) misses the mark. A few points:

Firstly, the immigration-restriction movement in the United States is much more anti-immigration than anti-immigrant. Many of us simply don’t want to see our population ballooned from the present 260 million to 400 million-plus by 2050, as our Census Bureau projects ... even with the nicest of folks. We believe that’s beyond our carrying capacity if we still want to have some parks, wilderness areas, and adequate food and water. By the way, what is Australia’s carrying capacity?

Secondly, immigrants were always supposed to be self-supporting. We’ve fallen away from this idea rather badly; a correction is long overdue.

That immigrants are “one of its (America’s) greatest sources of strength” is an old canard. Over 90 percent of our population is native born. We fought World War II almost entirely with the native born – we had few immigrants from 1925-1950.

One of the main “benefits” of recent high levels of highly diverse immigration is social-cultural conflict on a huge scale. For one example, read “Blacks Vs Browns” by Jack Miles in the October 1992 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*. You are welcome to a “swirling mix of cultures”: we are already sufficiently diverse – school is taught in California in about 80 languages.

Another canard: “No modern nation has been so heavily built on immigration.” How about Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Canada, South Africa, Costa Rica, etc. – and Australia? But all of these countries now either take virtually no immigrants, or have cut back on admissions. Even Israel is concerned about challenges to its immigration program by those coming from India and Nigeria claiming to be one of the “lost tribes.” In addition, the new black government of South Africa is sending tens of thousands of fellow blacks back home to Mozambique and Zimbabwe.

Immigration is America’s “manifest destiny.” Good grief! We gave up that concept when our western frontier was declared closed in 1890 – 100 years ago.

What about the 184-member nations of the United Nations? Is emigration their manifest destiny? If so, they’re in for a rude awakening. With world population increasing at 10,000 an hour, Australia’s intake of approximately 80,000 a year equates with only one eight-hour reproductive shift. Canada, at 250,000 yearly, accounts for one day’s worth; the U.S. at 1 million, four days’ supply. Who else is willing to take the product of the other 360 days?

What is to happen to the rest of the annual increase in human numbers? The answer: they will have to bloom where they are planted. Permanent migration as a solution to human problems is in its last days – the numbers are just too large, and there are too few places left to go. A paradigm shift is needed: we've reached the end of the migration epoch.

If people don't like conditions at home, then trying to fix things, not just running away, will be the only option for the overwhelming majority of the world's people. Helping those who stay should be our goal, rather than focusing our attention and resources on the minuscule percentage that leave.

The billy is boiling. Maybe it's time for Australians to wake up and smell the coffee. Read the novel *The Camp of the Saints* by Jean Raspail if you can handle a despairing view of a future that has already arrived on our shores – and yours. Or read Paul Kennedy's article in the December 1994 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*, entitled "Must It Be The West Against the Rest?"