

## **A Republican Dilemma**

**by**

**Larry L. Eastland**

1

For the sake of argument, let's assume that the 11 to 20 million illegal immigrants swarming across America today will: (1) learn to speak English at least as well as Arnold Schwarzenegger, (2) stay off welfare and out of jail, (3) pay their taxes on time and in full, and (4) send children to school who will perform as well as Asian kids. In effect, let's assume that they become better citizens than most other Americans.

Given that unlikely hypothesis, what can we conclude from the recent (and continuing) debate over the several immigration bills considered and rejected by Congress? To be sure, the Bush Administration supported a pathway to citizenship for illegal workers and signaled its disapproval of serious measures to close our Southern border. And, some Republican leaders in the Senate – e.g., Trent Lott, Lindsey Graham, and John McCain – joined the Democrats in supporting what opponents were calling “amnesty.” The American people in general, and Hispanics in particular, viewed the debate as highly partisan – with Democrats supporting a pathway to citizenship for illegals and Republicans opposing it.

So, who are the winners and losers? Short-term -- for the next few months, at least – the GOP may appear to be the winner. The majority of Americans seem to be disturbed by what's happening along the Mexican border, and during the debate wanted to see the government take stronger action. Long-term, the Republican position is likely to prove an electoral disaster. The bills will come up again and again. Eventually, one

---

1

will pass in some form. And when it does, Democrats will have hit the demographic jackpot -- to be sure, at the expense of the nation's future. As for conservative Republicans, at the moment, they don't understand the political peril of what they have done – and left undone. Indeed, the debate over the fate of illegal immigrants living in the U.S. may be the single most important factor in deciding the nation's future.

Let me explain.

When legislation to grant citizenship to 11 million<sup>i</sup> to 20 million<sup>ii</sup> illegal immigrants eventually passes, five out of six<sup>iii</sup> will be of voting age. Thus, the new law will minimally add some 8.5 million new voters, mostly Hispanic, to the rolls of various states, not counting the estimated 700,000 - 800,000<sup>iv</sup> new illegal immigrants who cross the borders each year. Since there will be a cutoff date to any legislation, this can be expected to accelerate immigration among people who are anxious to get in under the wire and reap the benefits of U.S. citizenship – including the right to vote. How those new Americans exercise that right will determine the nation's future.

This question is an integral component of a larger population trend at work in America and, incidentally, in the rest of the Western world. Stated in general terms, we are in the middle of a war between two ways of bringing new people into the family, the work force, and into the nation: *replenishment vs. replacement*.

As a technical term, *replenishment* is the means of supplying more of what has been used up. For example, rain replenishes lake water that has evaporated. Likewise, family members who die are replenished by new family members. In traditional communities, populations are typically replaced by local natives, and they in turn replenish the work force.

*Replacement* occurs when one thing is succeeded by something quite different. For example, the horse-drawn carriage was replaced by the automobile, and gas lights were replaced by electric lights. In the current population debate, *replacement* means substituting immigrants for native Americans.

America is alone among the industrialized nations of the Western world in actively seeking to “multiply and replenish the earth.”<sup>v</sup> It has the only native-born population that is maintaining or increasing in population. Also, immigrants (in particular illegal immigrants) to America are having more children than native-born Americans. As reported in an analysis of a 2002 U.S. Census data study by The Center for Immigration Studies:

We estimated that the fertility of illegal aliens in 2002 was 3.06 children on average, or about half again as high as the fertility rate for natives. This compared to an estimated 2.61 for legal immigrants. In a study released in July of this year, we used birth certificate records and estimated that in total there were 380,000 births to illegal aliens in 2002, accounting for nearly one out of every 10 births in the United States.<sup>vi</sup>

Many regard the rapid growth of the immigrant population as ominous. However, a closer look at this phenomenon reveals an encouraging fact: evidence indicates that the dominant immigrant groups in America -- as opposed to the immigrants in Europe -- generally share the core religious and social values of Western culture.

First, let's look at those who have been issued legal permanent status in the United States between 1996 – 2005.<sup>vii</sup> (See the 2005 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, Table 3.) Here, over the past ten years, 60 percent are known to have similar values based on region of origin (Europe, Oceania, North and South America.)

Furthermore, in studying the illegal immigrant population, the Pew Hispanic Center estimates that:

Mexicans make up by far the largest group of undocumented migrants at 5.9 million or 57 percent of the total in the March 2004 estimates. This share has remained virtually unchanged for the past decade, even as the size of the undocumented population has grown very rapidly. In addition, another 2.5 million undocumented migrants or about 24 percent of the total are from other Latin American countries. About 9 percent are from Asia, 6 percent from Europe and Canada, and 4 percent from the rest of the world.<sup>viii</sup>

Using these figures, 87 percent of the illegal immigrants are most likely to be Christian and hence generally “Western” in their cultural values, the same values held by the native population of European ancestry. These values include: a fierce commitment to family, a strong work ethic, and church membership, whether Roman Catholic or (to cite a recent trend) evangelical.

So, for America, the issue is not growth vs. no growth, but what kind of growth and with what consequences. The essence of the question is which will influence the

future culture more: replenishment or replacement – more children in American families, or more immigrant families moving into communities.

The political and social stakes are very high, and the resolution of this dilemma will determine which political party can jump from a dependable 49 percent of the two-party vote to a stable 53 percent or more. Neither party has been able to crack the ceiling in recent years. Although the Democrats appear to be slightly ahead of Republicans (.5111 to .4889 respectively), these figures are deceiving, in that the trend has been against them up until the 2006 election, declining from 53 percent in 1992 to 49.67 percent in 2004. Totals for the Republican election disaster of 2006 showed Democratic House candidates won 52.0 percent of the total vote to 45.6 percent of the total vote for Republican candidates<sup>ix</sup>. So, even when the tide rises for one party, it seldom gets above 53 percent of the total.

With these figures in mind, let's take a look at the dilemma we face: replenishment vs. replacement. First, *replenishment*.

Replenishment is about maintaining a spiritual society, one dedicated to families, traditional social and religious values, and a continuity of generations.

Replenishment requires long-term commitment, sacrifice, time, resources and personal attention. Teacher-parent conferences instead of wine and cheese parties. Saturdays at little league games instead of a golf foursome. Weeknight attention to homework rather than after-work dinners for two at five-star restaurants.

Next, *replacement*. Replacement is based purely on pragmatic economic considerations. It works best when it is impersonal, when you speak in terms of jobs to be filled -- gardeners, fruit pickers, waiters. It is about numbers rather than people with

names, families, and values. When you need someone to perform tasks, you import new backs to haul bags of mulch, new hands to pick oranges or carry trays. Your relationship with them is strictly business – dollars paid for hours worked.

The price of replacement is cheaper, too. The costs can be passed on to others through taxes and social welfare – in effect, spread out among all American taxpayers -- while replenishment requires that large traditional families take care of each other and pay their own way.

Further, replacement has little spiritual content. Its gods are government and secular organizations: welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, public housing, public schools, advocacy groups, and ethnic alliances. The natural tendency of immigrants is to first cloister among people of similar language and heritage; and illegal immigration exacerbates that tendency, since any contact with the mainstream culture carries with it the risk of discovery and deportation. Thus illegal status tends to produce even greater cultural isolation, which in turn results in gangs, crime, and hostility to mainstream America. There also is a socialization process that accompanies legal immigration that is absent in illegal immigration: learning the basics of American civics, voluntarily accepting to live by the rules, and committing to totally forsake citizenship in their country of origin.

So which do Americans prefer: replenishment or replacement? Replenishment – and by a healthy majority. This is not just my opinion: It's what the American people are telling us about themselves. Luntz, Maslansky Strategic Research -- in a February, 2007 study -- posed the following question to a representative sample of Americans: *“Economists say that the only way to sustain economic growth in the long-term is to have*

a growing population. There are two ways we can grow the population in America. Which way do you favor? (ROTATE): We can encourage families to have more children or we can encourage more immigration into the country.”

By 40 percent to 26 percent,<sup>x</sup> Americans favor growth through replenishment over replacement. That’s 60 percent more. However, just as the “devil is in the details,” so is the richness in the data. (See Table I.)

- Fifty percent more Americans in the so-called “Red States” than in the “Blue States”<sup>xi</sup> favor replenishment over replacement (44:30). And, whereas Blue State voters favor two children per family over three children per family by 46 percent to

<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL</u>
Encourage more children	40
Encourage Immigration	26
Don't know/no response	34
<b>Respondents Who Agree</b>	
<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL</u>
Red State	44
Purple State	25
Blue State	30
Bush Voters	53
Kerry Voters	36
Conservatives	59
Moderates	18
Liberals	20
Bush & conservative	57
Kerry & liberal	26
Attend church once a week or more	46
Attend church occasionally	44
Rarely or never attend church	29

25 percent, Red State voters favor three children per family over two children per family by 39 percent to 36 percent.<sup>xii</sup>

- A majority of those who voted for President Bush favor replenishment, while only one-third of John Kerry voters do (53:36).
- Conservatives are three times as likely to favor replenishment as liberals (59:20).
- And, when combining Bush voters with conservatives, and Kerry voters with liberals, Bush conservatives were nearly four times as likely to favor replenishment as Kerry liberals (43:12).

But, the question is about more than politics. It is deeply embedded in other cultural and social characteristics as well. For example, active church goers (once a week

or more),<sup>xiii</sup> were 50 percent more likely to support replenishment (46:29) than those who rarely or never attend church – whatever their denomination.

Without a doubt the political winners of the replenishment race are Republicans<sup>xiv</sup> and conservatives.<sup>xv</sup> They not only preach it, they live it. For every liberal household there are 2.3 children; for every conservative household there are 2.61 children. In Blue States its 2.4 children per household; for Red States its 2.78 children per household.<sup>xvi</sup>

The second measure was to look at how respondents felt about maintaining the “American culture.” They were asked: *Let me read two statements and tell me which you agree with more. (ROTATE): We need to maintain our American culture and values the way they are by encouraging American families to have more children; or, the American culture and values are made better by encouraging new immigrants to come to America.*”

Similar to responses to the first question, divisions along political, ideological and geographical lines are significant among respondents in their views on maintaining American culture and values.

- Thirty-eight percent more Americans in the so-called “Red States” than in the “Blue States” favor encouraging families to have more children over importing new immigrants (40:29).
- A majority of those who voted for President Bush favor it, while only three in ten of John Kerry voters do (51:31).
- Conservatives are three times as likely to favor encouraging larger families as liberals (58:19).
- Similarly, Bush conservatives are more than twice as likely (55:24) to see larger families as maintaining American culture and values as Kerry liberals are.

Additionally, the division between secular America and religious America is just as evident as the differences that divide political America. Religious activity is one of the primary ways in which family socialization takes place in American society. In the case of replenishment, the correlation between religious activity and family composition could not be clearer. (See Table II.)

- Only one in four who rarely or never attend church (26 percent) see American culture and values maintained by growing families from within, while nearly one half of those who attend church either occasionally or often (45 percent and 48 percent) feel that way.

As responses to an exhaustive body of research show, the separation between the “Religious Party” and the “Secular Party” that began with the Roe vs. Wade decision, now manifests itself throughout society.

Families that have more children also believe having more children is a better policy than importing families. In this respect, they are consistent: ideal family size and their own family size are virtually the same. This is no surprise, but it does reinforce the idea that this way of life will continue to produce more children, more like-minded churchgoers, and more conservative voters.

<u>TABLE II: REPLENISHMENT MAINTAINS AMERICAN CULTURE</u>	
<u>ALL RESPONDENTS</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL</u>
More children	40
Immigration	29
Don't know/refused	31
<u>Respondents Who Agree</u>	
<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>% OF TOTAL</u>
Red State	46
Purple State	40
Blue State	34
Bush Voters	51
Kerry Voters	31
Conservatives	58
Moderates	18
Liberals	19
Bush & conservative	55
Kerry & liberals	24
Attend church once a week or more	45
Attend church occasionally	48
Rarely or never attend church	26
Luntz, Maslansky Strategic Research, February 2007	

So what does all this mean? Here are a few implications of the conflict between those who favor replenishment and those who favor replacement.

Liberals and Democrats are losing the replenishment race – in large part because of their own views toward abortion and large families.<sup>xvii</sup> This in spite of the significant voter losses it has caused their party and their ideological base. If they want to replenish their dwindling base, they will have to start having larger families, something they currently refuse to do.

While Republicans and conservatives are winning the replenishment battle, they are in danger of losing the replacement war, what with our porous borders attracting literally millions of illegals, probably destined to become voters at some point in the near future. Clearly, the statistics cited above indicate that the anti-immigration record of the GOP may soon prove its undoing – at least for a long time. As soon as the replacements gain citizenship, they will flock to the party that won them this status, with all the privileges and entitlements that citizenship brings.

To put it another way, when this issue came before Congress, the Democrats and liberals “got it,” and Republicans didn’t. Liberals and Democrats had the luxury -- and good sense -- simply to allow the Republicans to self-destruct on this issue. During its majority rule, its policy disarray over illegal immigration made the Republicans look intolerant and incompetent; an image custom-made for the Democrats. The 2006 election overturned the Republican Congress, and the influence of the Republican president has been increasingly marginalized.

The stage is now set for the Democrats to give themselves the gift of 11-20 million replacements -- a gift that will keep on giving. Their strategy after citizenship is granted is to do what they always do anyway: pass a series of entitlements, special protections, and pro-minority benefits – and they will become for generations the party that welcomed the new citizens and their hoards of children and showered them with presents.

If the Republicans failed to grasp the true meaning of the issue, Americans as a whole understood. In the Luntz Survey, an overwhelming majority agreed on one thing: replacement currently is a big winner for the Democrat political coalition. The question asked was: “*And which political party do you think will benefit more if citizenship is granted eventually to illegal immigrants?*” By a margin of nearly four to one, virtually every demographic group overwhelmingly recognized that the big vote-generating winner will be the Democrats. So, Republicans beware and Democrats rejoice. Despite our nation’s overwhelming commitment to replenishment over replacement, replacement stands poised to become the official policy of the United States; and the consequences of this sea change are obvious to predict: a new era of Democratic domination similar to what happened following Roosevelt’s election and the institution of the New Deal; the inevitable growth of welfare, entitlements, and Big Government; the intensification of ethnic politics; and the continued secularization of American society.

Can this disaster be averted? Perhaps. As already noted, the 11-20 million illegal immigrants who have swarmed over the U.S. are not like the immigrants currently transforming Europe into a Muslim enclave, with a culture alien to the Christian West. The Mexicans, Guatemalans, Salvadorans, and South Americans who have invaded our

borders share our cultural and religious values. Their attitudes have likewise been shaped by the Christian West. Indeed, their intense commitment to Christianity mirrors the attitude of the Red States rather than the Blue States. And they believe in what has been called “the Protestant work ethic,” though they are predominantly Roman Catholic.

These are people with values the Republican Party can embrace – provided they can get back into the good graces of the millions upon millions who view the GOP as intolerant of immigrants. The issue has yet to be resolved. Some time in the not-too-distant future, another Armageddon will be fought on Capitol Hill. Perhaps this time the Republican Party can find a way to win the affection of these replacements, in the sure knowledge that they will immediately become the greatest replenishers of our families, communities, and work force.

---

<sup>i</sup> Jeffrey S. Passel, Senior Research Associate, Pew Hispanic Center, “Estimates of the Size and Characteristics of the Undocumented Population,” p. 2. A Pew Research Center Project, March 21, 2005. “As of March 2005, the undocumented population has reached nearly 11 million including more than 6 million Mexicans, assuming the same rate of growth as in recent years.” Pew Hispanic Center estimates based on March 2002, 2003, and 2004 Current Population Surveys (Passel 2005); includes an allowance for persons omitted from the CPS. Estimates for California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, and New Jersey use “direct” methods; other states based on “synthetic” methods.

That number was corroborated in a report on August 18, 2006 by the Office of Immigration Statistics in the Department of Homeland Security. In an article analyzing that report, SUZANNE GAMBOA, Associated Press Writer, stated that “About 11 million illegal immigrants were living in the U.S. at the start of this year [2006], the federal government said in a report Friday. That’s up from an estimated 8.5 million living in the country in January 2000, according to calculations by the Office of Immigration Statistics in the Department of Homeland Security.”

<http://hosted.ap.org/dynamic/stories/I/IMMIGRATION?SITE=7219&SECTION=HOME&TEMPLATE=DEFAULT&CTIME=2006-08-18-22-16-38>

<sup>ii</sup> Charles Hurt, “Congress open to passing bill on immigration,” *The Washington Times*, December 4, 2006. Congress will approve an immigration bill that will grant citizenship rights to most of the 12 million to 20 million illegal aliens in the U.S. after Democrats take control next month, predict both sides on Capitol Hill. While Republicans have been largely splintered on the issue of immigration reform, Democrats have been fairly unified behind the principle that the illegals currently in the country should get citizenship rights without having to first leave the country.

<sup>iii</sup> Jeffrey S. Passel, p. 1. “Although most undocumented migrants are young adults, there is also a sizeable childhood population. About one-sixth of the population—some 1.7 million people—is under 18 years of age.”

<sup>iv</sup> Jeffrey S. Passel, p. 2.

<sup>v</sup> *The Holy Bible*, *The First Book of Moses Called Genesis* 1:28. *And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth*

<sup>vi</sup> Steven A. Camarota, “Birth Rates Among Immigrants in America”, The Center for Immigration Studies, October 2005.

<sup>vii</sup> Data taken from 2005 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, Table 3. Office of Immigration Statistics, U.S. Department Of Homeland Security, November 2006.

<sup>viii</sup> Jeffrey S. Passel, p. 2.

<sup>ix</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_House\\_elections,\\_2006](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_House_elections,_2006).

<sup>x</sup> 34 percent were undecided or refused.

<sup>xi</sup> Purple States are those states that gave neither candidate 53 percent or more of the vote. The Purples States are: (1) Bush: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Mexico and Ohio. (2) Kerry: Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Oregon, Pennsylvania and

---

Wisconsin.

<sup>xii</sup> Question: “*And what do you think is the ideal number of children for an American family?*”

<sup>xiii</sup> “*How often do you attend organized religious services? (1) More than once a week; (2) Once a week; (3) About once a month; (4) A few times a year; (5) Rarely; (6) Never.*”

<sup>xiv</sup> For a good review of why political parties are here defined by their voting behavior in the last presidential election, see: (1) the late Harvard University professor V.O. Key, Jr.’s seminal work [Parties, Politics and Pressure Groups](#), Thomas Y. Crowell Company, (2) [Party Politics in America](#) by Frank J. Sorauf, or (3) any of dozens of subsequent books on the subject. While political parties can be defined in many ways (i.e., self-identification, the party in control of Congress, contributors to parties, and many more) the most useful for purposes of this article is to define parties as how people actually voted in the last Presidential election, because Presidential elections bring out the highest percentage of voters (as opposed to off-year elections) and forces people to make the choice between the two parties’ most visible standard bearers.

<sup>xv</sup> See Michael Barone’s article “The Return of Patriarchy”, February 28, 2006 in *U.S. News and World Report* that focuses on Phillip Longman’s article in *Foreign Policy*. “He is presenting an argument he also offered in his 2004 book [The Empty Cradle: How Falling Birthrates Threaten World Prosperity and What to Do About It](#). Patriarchy, Longman argues in a long look at history, ‘is a cultural regime that serves to keep birthrates high among the affluent, while also maximizing parents’ investments in their children. No advanced civilization has yet learned to endure without it.’ Another way to put it: Conservatives have more babies than liberals, and so the next generation will tend to have more conservatives—more people prone to patriarchy—and fewer liberals. His numbers are stark: *The 17.4 percent of baby boomer women who had only one child account for a mere 7.8 percent of children born in the next generation. By contrast, nearly a quarter of the children of baby boomers descend from the mere 11 percent of baby boomer women who had four or more children. These circumstances are leading to the emergence of a new society whose members will disproportionately be descended from parents who rejected the social tendencies that once made childlessness and small families the norm. These values include an adherence to traditional, patriarchal religion, and a strong identification with one’s own folk or nation.*”

<sup>xvi</sup> Question: “*How many children have you had?*”

<sup>xvii</sup> See my article that describes the political consequences of abortion in America since *Roe v. Wade*, “The Empty Cradle Will Rock,” *OpinionJournal*, WSJ.com, *The Wall Street Journal*, June 28, 2004. Also published in *The American Spectator*. This 2007 survey asked the same question as the 2004 survey (cited above) with similar results. The question was: *As far as you know, has anyone close to you had an abortion?* Among all respondents, 24 percent responded “yes.” That includes 21 percent of conservatives and moderates and 31 percent of liberals (50 percent more among liberals); also, 22 percent of Bush voters and 28 percent of Kerry voters. Finally, 30 percent of Blue State respondents, 29 percent in Purple States, and 17 Red States (71 percent more in Blue States than Red States); finally, 20 percent of active church goers, 25 percent of occasional attendees and 32 percent of non-church goers (60 percent more among non-church goers).