

Faith Traditions, the Social Justice Agenda and Immigration
IRCOT/TFIR, Houston

3/16/2010

Dr. Stephen Steinlight

Good evening. First things first. I'd like to thank my host, Rebecca Forest, founder and President of the Immigration Reform Coalition of Texas, for inviting me to speak. She's a dedicated, tireless leader, a marathon champion, in what everyone here understands is a decisive battle for the future of our country. I also wish to thank Louise Whiteford, President of Texans for Immigration Reform, my co-host and a veteran commander in the struggle. We'll win this fight because of these women. I also wish to express my gratitude to each and every one of you for coming out tonight. It's an honor to be with you.

Since my reputation may have preceded me, some of you are probably cowering in fear I'll speak at epic length. Rest easy: I won't be channeling all of my inward Fidel Castro tonight. This is a different sort of occasion for me. It's rare for me to be among allies, and rare to be among people who know a great deal about the subject. You aren't the great-unwashed needing enlightenment or heathen needing to be evangelized. So, as Jane Austen once said of the subject matter of her remarkable novels, I'll focus on my "four inches of ivory," that is to say, I'll be sharing some of the particulars that form my agenda. I'm also eager for us to talk, to have a good discussion so I can learn what has worked most effectively in your advocacy.

I'm going to concentrate on the importance of denying our opponents the high ground they falsely believe they possess on the ethics of immigration policy, something we need to do more regularly and forcefully; and, allied to that, exposing and decrying their habit of misquoting Scripture and twisting fundamental Judeo-Christian teaching out of context to make their case – and I'll offer a corrective. In doing these things I'll interweave pertinent findings from a recent Zogby/CIS poll that reveal we are trouncing our opponents among people of faith across the spectrum of American religious life. Those findings show the good sense and skepticism of the American people in the face of unceasing bullying of their too often politically correct clergy. We may have fewer friends than we'd like among the post-American universalists in the pulpit, but the folk in the pews are solidly with us.

In the rough division of labor at the Center for Immigration Studies, the small but very productive think tank where I'm privileged to work, responsibility for arguing our case on our left flank, taking on self-described liberal opponents, most frequently falls to me. "*Why is he so lucky?*" I can almost hear you thinking aloud. Though I've described myself for some years now as "post-ideological" – meaning I'm profoundly distrustful of all "isms" and believe overarching, rigidly consistent worldviews too often become substitutes for thinking and don't and can't begin to do justice to the complexities and ambiguities of social and political realities – let alone help us figure out who and what we are – there was a time when my politics were broadly speaking "progressive."

The point is I know where my opponents are coming from. When I debate them, I have an unfair advantage because their game book is in my head. I appear to be psychic: I know exactly what they're going to say before they say it. It's having a crib sheet when taking an exam. Not only can I anticipate every argument they will marshal, but I also know precisely when they'll do it. I even have their favorite rhetorical ploys – every tired platitude, irrelevant cliché, false analogy, illogical parallel, ahistorical example, and misapplied literary and Biblical reference more or less memorized. They can't take me by surprise since I own the bag of tricks they still use. In fact, I often wish they would come up with something new because disposing of them has become so effortless I'm getting complacent, and I complacency isn't a good thing.

Though I'm entirely conversant with their playbook, what never fails to strike me as curious – I suspect you find this odd as well – is that our opponents seem unconcerned about their absolute paucity of concrete, substantive arguments. Of course this is mere sleight of hand, but one would think they'd do a better job concealing it.

They have real arguments, all right, but the motive forces that drive their case are too narrowly chauvinistic, politically cynical, ideologically foreign, anti or post-American, or just too brutal to share with the American people. What they're promoting is extreme identity politics for Hispanics, a dual nationality country – always a formula for unending political, social and cultural crises (see Canada, Belgium, the Balkans, etc.), ceaseless ethnic pandering for partisan gain, the rejection of the legal and moral authority of the American nation state, the political ambitions and economic interests of Mexico, and championing raw economic greed for the corporate service-sector members of their alliance who seek to re-barbarize American capitalism, using cheap immigrant labor, legal and illegal, to create a permanent underclass as a lever to lower wages and working conditions for all American working people.

Obviously enough, these are not the kind of arguments one makes publicly to the American people. Even the tiny minority that agrees with them would prefer to have their narrow self-interest portrayed as more high-minded, and also understands that politics is as much about appearances and perceptions – however false – as anything else. So they resort to a set of pseudo-arguments, with three predominating, each of them suffused with intense if insincere moralism.

Most often, they argue ad miseracordiam, trying to guilt-trip ordinary Americans about the plight of illegal aliens for whom they wish to engender greater sympathy than for our own unemployed and impoverished fellow citizens. At about a quarter of my speaking venues there's at least one immigration lawyer in the audience. In the early days this concerned me: surely, I thought, they'd possess some highly technical and terribly urgent information about which I'm ignorant. I feared being outpointed on an arcane question of law or display of special astuteness about legal inconsistencies in public policy. It never happens. (And not only because I've come to the conclusion most of them must have evidently graduated at the bottom of their law school classes.)

They don't argue the law. They, too, argue ad miseracordiam, and seek – to the extent lawyers who mostly profit by making promises to desperate, indigent clients they know they can't keep – to exude syrupy compassion. They have no end of sob stories about their clients, the families my heartless policy recommendations would theoretically separate. They are incapable of acknowledging that the conscious decisions of their clients to break the law invariably constitute the crux of each case. Bottom line: they're not good at making their compassion convincing or the objects of their compassion sufficiently attractive. What I initially viewed as a curse I now see as a blessing: an immigration lawyer in the audience? Marvelous!

When I point out their clients are victims of their own bad judgment who imagine themselves to be above the law, I get the attention of just about everyone in the audience. Their intense interest is palpable. When I refuse to cave in to the sob stories and point out the sad personal consequences of bad judgment and law breaking cannot form the foundation of American jurisprudence and policy – the audience is nothing less than delighted. I didn't understand this at first: then it came to me in an epiphany. I have just lifted a heavy burden from them by dispatching an argument that previously had made these nice, decent, empathetic Americans profoundly uncomfortable. I've dispatched the monster of bogus empathy, and they are relieved and grateful.

Since our opponents so predictably exploit compassion, when we speak or when we write our op eds or articles it is critical to point out that on this miserably unjust planet of 7 billion human beings, where the difference between the chance for leading a materially comfortable life or one of unimaginable misery is all about winning the cosmic lottery that determines your place of birth, and where 3 billion human beings have nothing at all – Mexicans are the richest in the Third World. Mexicans possess twice the income of the most wretched 3 billion and more than five billion of the seven. There is no starvation in Mexico, no pandemics, no civil war, no unbridled tyranny. There's plenty of corruption and a rising death toll in the war among drug cartels and between the cartels and what passes for law enforcement, but life is better than in all of sub-Saharan Africa and virtually all of East Asia and South-East Asia. In fact, as we all know, Mexico could provide a very good life to its citizens. It is rich in oil, natural gas, agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, etc. Its problem is that it has the most uneven distribution of wealth in the entire Western hemisphere, the widest gap between its richest and poorest citizens. What Mexico needs is not a Marshall Plan; I'm always amused when some well-intentioned person offers the solution of American money to solve its problems. No, the oligarchy that rules Mexico as if it were a family business is swimming in money. What Mexico desperately requires is a major re-distribution of wealth downward and the replacement of its politics of *clientismo* with real democracy. All of its public institutions are corrupt and it has essentially no civil society. Mexico needs a social revolution, though I pray it will not be a violent one. That will not only be a nightmare for Mexico, but it will also put enormous pressure to open our borders even wider.

In a world with so much poverty and injustice, the selective compassion shown for Mexico is comprehensible only if viewed through the prism of narrowly defined communal, political, commercial and, yes, Catholic sectarian interests. I do not question the social conscience of many priests or even princes of the Church. But I cannot help but recall their historic failure

to exhibit commensurate moral outrage when genuinely persecuted non-Catholic groups sought entry to this country. Nor can I leave out of the equation the fact that massive Mexican immigration is an excellent way to fill the church pews that have emptied due to the unbridled anger of our obstreperous American Catholics who have been appalled over the scandal of pederast priests who have been protected and transferred to other parishes by prominent Archbishops so they could continue their sexual assaults on children. This is utter moral bankruptcy: I cannot conceive of worse.

And, yes, there is also an unspoken desire for denominational supremacy. Should “comprehensive immigration reform” prevail, America will become a majority Catholic country. I am not passing judgment on this outcome: I only note it as a motivating factor.

The second of their three standard pseudo-arguments is to accuse those of us who disagree with them of bigotry, xenophobia, and racism, the allegation that is the moral equivalent of dropping a nuclear weapon in politically correct America. Little matter that Hispanics are not a race: the word has magical power to discredit. It is evidently of little matter as well that our unavoidable focus on Mexican immigration has nothing to do with hostility to Mexicans or Hispanics more generally; rather, it is because contemporary mass immigration and illegal immigration are essentially coterminous with Mexican entry into the United States. Asking someone in the immigration policy area why talk about Mexico is like asking Willy Sutton why he robbed banks.

I won't belabor my account of my own experience with this scabrous strategy: suffice it to say I've been on the receiving end of these ugly, preposterous allegations. As many here undoubtedly know, this is a special tactic of groups like the Southern Poverty Law Center, the National Council of La Raza, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, the Leadership Conference on Civil Right, among others. Ridiculous, easily disprovable attack dog research by the Southern Poverty Law Center identified CIS and me as supporters of White Supremacism, racism, xenophobia, and, wait – anti-Semitism. The Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, whose President and CEO has particular hostility to me for making him look like an idiot on several occasions in print and before the House Judiciary Committee, directed his VP for Communications to send out hundreds of “secret” emails (marked “**Not for publication**”) to editors of Jewish newspapers telling them not to publish any story I might write on immigration, attaching a link to the bogus SPLC “research,” and other emails to Jewish organizations not to host me. I found out about this politically correct McCarthyism when the editors of several Jewish newspapers, none of them acquaintances, contacted me because they were outraged by this transparent attempt to stifle free speech. The smear did result in a score of cancelled invitations, additional libels by another national Jewish organization, and only after the charges and my counter-attack played out for weeks as a major story in the Jewish press – where coverage shifted in my favor – did things die down.

I confess I found these attacks painful in the extreme – no matter how patently absurd. There are undoubtedly hundreds of people who do not know me who are easily gulled by anything in print or who don't bother to consider the source who will forever associate me with attitudes I despise. For a time I was so disheartened I couldn't focus properly on my work. A great friend at that time was Roy Beck, one of the finest and most principled people I'm privileged to know, who told me that he gone through the same Purgatory, having been

described by leaders of the Methodist Church as an example of a “Methodist gone wrong.” His friendship was a great help, especially in recognizing these charges are made to throw us off balance, keep us on the defensive, and that the best response is to re-commit to the battle with all one’s heart.

The consolation in this, and it is a large one, is knowing they recognize they can’t win the argument on the merits. In my case, the particular viciousness of the attack was proof positive that they understood and feared the progress I have made in changing opinion on immigration policy, especially in the American-Jewish community.

The third pseudo-argument, one I feel we’re often negligent in answering, is unquestionably their most outrageous: they assert Göt Mitt Uns, God is with us, engaging in advocacy exegesis, abusing Scripture to try hoodwinking a deeply religious nation. They wish to portray us a cruel, Godless people with hearts of stone. The Zogby/CIS poll shows they’re not succeeding in churches, Cathedrals and synagogues across America: wonderful news. But I want their rout to be even more complete.

Further, I know many of our opponents in pulpit are secularists at heart; their clerical robes are little more than disguises worn to give them the appearance of spiritual or moral authority to pursue political agendas. These are the people who appear routinely at press conferences with our political opponents and make sure to be photographed at the head of every demonstration for illegal immigration. I know this is true within my own faith, especially in its Reform and Reconstructionist denominations, where the “pursuit of social justice” is accorded highest priority. That would not trouble me at all – social justice is one of the highest goals one might seek; the Hebrew Scriptures call upon us to join God in helping to “mend the world;” and a social gospel can be a magnificent thing – but not when it is so politically blinkered, ideologically frozen, confused with narrow partisanship, and rests on post-American assumptions. It is also troubling when it refuses to accept that opponents may have sound and ethical reasons for taking a different view.

So I’m also concerned about the impact on Americans who are primarily secular, or those who are only nominally believers, who belong to a denomination outwardly, attend Church or synagogue sporadically, but whose faith is weak. When I speak in synagogues I often wear an old Adlai Stevenson pin, next to my American flag. When congregants ask why, I have fun responding I do so because I’m making the presumption that their personal image of God is a celestial incarnation of Adlai Stevenson, and though he was an admirable man in many ways, he is a questionable deity.

Combining politics with arrogant religiosity, whether ersatz or real, is a dangerous brew. To correct this misapprehension that God supports “comprehensive immigration reform,” a bilingual America, etc., I’ll offer perspectives from Jewish texts that address questions that arise in the context of immigration, recognizing none of our Scriptures addresses immigration directly, certainly not in modern historical terms. I also know my readings are subjective interpretations. Reticence is essential. God and God’s intentions are ineffable. Scripture speaks with many voices: none reducible to a single meaning, and none can be understood outside of context. The great majority of Jews have traditionally despised literalism. Jewish respect for the interpretive process is embodied in a great hermeneutical enterprise of 16th century Judaism that remains authoritative: *Mikraot Gidolot*, the so-called

rabbinic Bible, in which the text is surrounded by the commentaries of 6 great medieval Biblical exegetes, including Rashi and Maimonides.

Our opponents – who cherry pick and infantilize sacred text – regard one Biblical passage as their trump card: Leviticus 19:33-34. I'll recite it:

When an alien lives with you in your land, do not mistreat him. The alien living with you must be treated as one of your native-born. Love him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt. I am the Lord your God.

This passage expresses Judaism's ethical universalism. Some liberal and secular Jews regard universalism as Judaism's totality – though it's half of a dialectic balanced by another: strong particularism, including national and civilizational allegiances.

This striking expression of moral empathy is not a press release from God's Washington DC Legislative Affairs Office endorsing "Comprehensive Immigration Form." It says nothing about immigration – for which there is no word in Biblical Hebrew – or amnesty, birthright citizenship, identity theft, E-Verify, bilingualism, etc.

The authors of the Hebrew Bible did not anticipate the debate on immigration in 21st century America and do not address it in Leviticus. This self-evident truth should prevent clergy or lay leaders from treating it like political talking points. But they do, and act as though the Bible were written by policy wonks, mimicking lunatics that believe in the Bible Code. This approach drenches political advocacy with religiosity, dangerously sanctifying partisanship.

Does Leviticus 19:33 address – let alone endorse – "comprehensive immigration reform?" **Not by the most lenient interpretive standard.** It commands empathy, "love" for the "other," for gentiles, asserting humanity's oneness and God's omnipotence. It commands us to treat the "other" kindly, **the stranger residing temporarily and lawfully among us. It commands nothing more.**

Exploiting Leviticus to support amnesty requires conscious mistranslation. *This is not an esoteric quibble.* The word for stranger in the Hebrew Bible is *Ger v'toh-shav* – "sojourner" in English. First appearing in Genesis 4:23 to describe Abraham when he dwells briefly among the Hittites, its final appearance is in Chronicles 29:15, when King David contrasts the transitory nature of human existence with the eternality of God.

The eminent scholar Richard Elliot Friedman, Professor of Biblical Hebrew at Oxford and Cambridge, translates it as "alien" and "visitor." All English dictionaries define "to sojourn" as "to stay temporarily." Arguing some 11.5 million illegal aliens should remain permanently finds no support in Leviticus.

There is no term for "immigrant" or "immigration" in the Hebrew Bible. The Book of Ruth is a rare narrative about adopting a new national identity. Ruth, a Moabite, chooses to remain with her Israelite mother-in-law after her husband's death and become an Israelite. The primal assertion of national belonging Ruth expresses to Naomi contrasts sharply with the apparent indifference to national identity *or loyalty to a competing one* that characterizes many contemporary resident aliens. Ruth says, "Wherever you go, I will go; And wherever you lodge,

I will lodge; Your people will be my people and your God will be my God. **Where** you die, I will die, and there will I be buried.” This is surely the most ancient expression of the ideal of patriotic assimilation.

Approximately 17% of our huge cohort of foreign-born Hispanics has naturalized, and that number dropped 62% last year because of a minor hike in the fee. In Ruth we encounter an outsider’s total identification with an adopted nation and longing for complete absorption. Among many contemporary **transnational migrant workers** (a more precise term than “immigrant”) we see the opposite. Whether stemming from the anomie of the deracinated, economic calculation, unwillingness to choose between identities, or more likely, an abiding loyalty to Mexico – all Mexicans remain Mexican by Mexican law – there’s no indication of a parallel desire to embrace American identity. That’s especially true since it requires paying a price for wholesale violations of American law, playing by the rules, and going to the back of the queue.

Recent surveys by Zogby International find 69% of Mexicans believe their compatriots in the US owe Mexico primary loyalty; another shows 62% harbor irredentist attitudes, regarding the American Southwest as Mexican. It’s also impossible to disaggregate these groups – Mexicans here, Mexicans there – given porous borders, their peregrinations, and Mexico’s unbroken hold – ideological and legal – on its children here.

The Hebrew Bible addresses inclusion of strangers/aliens in civil and legal terms. (See Exodus, 12:49; Leviticus, 24: 22; and Numbers, 15:14). It proclaims: "One law for the citizen/native and the alien/stranger that dwells among you."

But this is no Bill of Rights for sojourners. It’s a demand for strict obedience to Israelite laws and norms. Aliens gain rights only through lawful residency. “Aliens” need not convert, but must embrace monotheism, the bedrock of Judaic civilization. The punishment for idolatry is death. Strangers had to pay taxes, demonstrate civic loyalty by making the annual pilgrimage to the Temple in Jerusalem, and preserve social order.

The Bible draws a bright line between its religiously defined concept of being a full member – in Biblical Hebrew the word is *ezerach* – from a sojourner. The Bible recognizes forms of legal residency for non-Jews, but only conversion to Judaism conferred all rights (such as remission of debts every seven years) and made one a full member of the people – a parallel to a prepositional conception of American citizenship.

The Bible addresses another key issue in the immigration debate. The God of the Hebrew Bible regards borders as meaningful and important. Deuteronomy 32:8 informs us: “When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he divided mankind, he fixed the borders of the peoples according to the number of the sons of God.” Ezekiel 47:13-23 details the Promised Land’s boundaries. Numbers 34:1-15 describes the borders the Lord established for each tribe of Israel. Deuteronomy 19:14 commands against moving a neighboring tribe’s boundary stone marking its inheritance in the Promised Land.

God also employed foreigners as instruments of His justice, with invasion as a recurring curse. Second Chronicles:36 describes the decline of Judah as the result of its disobedience to God’s law. It leads to the Chaldean conquest of Israel and the Babylonian captivity. The curse in Deuteronomy 28:43-44 reads: “The sojourner who is among you shall rise higher

and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and lower. He shall lend to you, and you shall not lend to him. He shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.” This curse recurs throughout the Hebrew Bible.

Leviticus 19:33 exhorts us to “Love the stranger.” “Comprehensive Immigration Reform” isn’t about love; it’s about exploiting cheap labor, building a second Mexican nation in the US, and creating a permanent Democratic political majority.

I’ve spoken of the need to elevate our claim to the moral high ground in the immigration debate. Demonstrating the brutal social costs of mass lowskill immigration on our most vulnerable fellow citizens is a highly effective means of challenging assumptions and winning converts among people of conscience in any community. We must not permit ourselves to be portrayed or perceived –sometimes as a result of our own failure to make the case – as cold-hearted, chauvinistic nationalists with little concern for the poor and marginal among us: indeed, we should make the protection of their interests one of the most important tenets of our movement. Working within the American-Jewish community, which has a long, proud history of involvement in movements for social justice, whether Civil Rights for African Americans, women’s rights, or better working conditions for working-class men and women, I’ve worked diligently to show our response to mass lowskill immigration makes the most moral sense: it is the best, grownup, real world ethical choice. If I failed to make my case on its ethics, I could not win the argument over immigration in synagogue after Synagogue, but I have, and I am.

Contemporary immigration pits hard-pressed constituencies against each other: poor illegal aliens against America’s unemployed, working poor and working class. It creates brutally unfair competition for our fellow citizens who are poor or just get by, especially in these times of economic distress. Our “jobless recovery” has given us a Federal U-6 unemployment/under-employment rate of 17.5% of the workforce. While 6 citizens chase every job advertised, illegal aliens hold some 7 million jobs. In this zero-sum game, our countrymen have first call on our loyalty: our “charity truly begins at home.” It must not end there, but it should begin there.

There’s a mountain of irrefutable, powerful data dramatizing those brutal consequences for our most vulnerable, and we must ever tire of employing it. The National Research Council of the American Academy of Sciences’ study *New Americans: Economic, Demographic and Fiscal Effects of Immigrants* finds the cheap labor of lowskill illegal aliens and impoverished immigrants caused **44% of the decrease in wages among the poorest Americans from 1980-1994**. These findings are dated: recent ones would show more damaging effects. Some 15-18 million workers, the poorest 12% of the American labor force, have suffered pay cuts, heavy job losses, and are falling deeper into poverty.

For the past 25 years, real wages for American workers without a high school education have declined 22%; 11% for those with only a high school education. The unceasing flow of impoverished immigrants into the workforce plays a significant role.

In the zero-sum game that’s immigration, it’s easy to identify winners and losers. Big winners are

owners of industries in the service-sector: restaurant, retail, agriculture, construction, meatpacking and processing; and the garden industry. They're breaking the law and taking jobs away from Americans at the worst possible time. They make fat profits on the cheap labor of poor immigrants who work for minimum or below minimum wage and receive zero benefits. They treat immigrants like dogs while using the leverage of their cheap labor to assault the living standards of America's working poor and working-class. Unchecked, the outcome will be the creation of a vast permanent underclass of immigrant labor to drive down wages and worsen working conditions for all Americans.

Those who suffer most are Americans at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder: the unemployed, working poor, seasonally employed, the elderly who still have to work, young people trying to start careers, African Americans and recent legal immigrants. Immigrants gain because even the appalling wages and hideous working conditions are better than those in their countries of origin.

As I stated earlier, one of the unspoken real motivations of the lobby pushing for an endless supply of cheap labor is seeking to take American capitalism back to the days of Upton Sinclair's *Jungle* and **re-barbarize American capitalism**. How do we know? Whenever there's been a large-scale raids by ICE on an industry employing large numbers of illegal workers we find vile, atrocious working conditions, the kind of conditions my mother, who died on February 21 at age 96 fought as a young union organizer. Pity President Obama and Secretary of DHS Napoletano have decided to curtail these raids.

Two examples. In a mill in New Bedford, MA, that hired hundreds of illegal Guatemalan workers, federal agents found one toilet for 500 workers, and if workers used the toilet for more than three minutes they were docked \$25.00. If one worker spoke to another worker both were docked \$25.00. The factory gates were locked during the day – inviting another Triangle Fire.

At the AgriProcessors “kosher” slaughtering works in Postville, Iowa, which produced 3/4ths of the kosher meat in the USA, ICE agents found horrendous abuses of child labor: the owner/manager is facing 9,311 counts for “egregious violations of child labor.” Pay started at \$6.12 an hour for a 12-16 hour day six days a week, with no medical benefits or paid holidays. Workers were routinely cheated out of overtime pay, and there are multiple counts for sexual abuse of female workers. This is the moral equivalent of outsourcing on American soil. There used to be so-called Maquiladoras – sweated labor shops just across the border – now they're in rural Iowa, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Massachusetts.

Despite crushing unemployment, the Fed are importing 125,000 foreign workers every month, and CEO's and their Congressional flunkies are writing legislation to increase the inflow of foreign workers, and not just unskilled labor. Whether it's Bill Gates seeking a greatly-expanded H-1B visa program for mid-level tech workers from South Asia to drop wages in the tech sector; or the hospital lobby pushing for more nurses from the Philippines – this is putting hundred of thousands of Americans out of work, depressing wages across the board, and foisting new subsidies on taxpayers.

Poor immigrants represent the greatest threat to people like themselves with whom they compete for low paying unskilled jobs and cheap housing: other poor people, usually recent immigrants and those Americans at the bottom of the ladder. This is undoubtedly the reason for the survey finding that some 77% of Hispanics in America are opposed to increased immigration by the unskilled. Surprised, no?

Current immigration is devastating the African-American community. The National Bureau of Economic Research's paper "Immigration and African-American Employment" shows immigration substantially lowers wages and labor-force participation by black men. George Borjas of Harvard's Kennedy School, the dean of immigration economists, reports percentage increases in immigration track almost perfectly with percentage increases in the incarceration rates of African-American men.

Mass (especially Mexican) immigration and the unforgiving law of supply and demand spells disaster for blacks. This wave is buffeting a foundering community, one with unemployment rates among men from ages 19-40 often averaging from 40-50% in many urban centers. (At the height of the Great we considered it a national catastrophe when unemployment averaged 25%.) The Congressional Black Caucus has sold out its constituents. In 2000, it cut a deal with the Hispanic Caucus that no sitting black Congressperson would be challenged by an Hispanic – in return for supporting open-borders immigration.

The Hebrew Prophets repeatedly demand justice for common laborers of one's own community; indeed, Halacha calls on Jewish employers to hire Jews first. The call for justice for humble workers is part of the "Holiness Code" read in every synagogue on Yom Kippur. Distorting Scripture to support legislation designed to import cheap labor to depress the wages and worsen the working conditions of our vulnerable fellow citizens is nothing less than sacrilege.

Thanks for your patience.