

GOP Establishment Calls for Amnesty for Illegal Aliens after Romney Loss

In the wake of President Barack Hussein Obama's re-election the call for Republicans to discard their opposition to amnesty for illegal aliens has been deafening. Establishment Republicans have been arguing that the defeat of GOP Presidential candidate Mitt Romney was proof that Republicans must embrace "comprehensive immigration reform," (amnesty and unlimited immigration) even prior to the final election results being tabulated. Presumably, having figured that whatever the outcome of the election, they would point to it as an excuse to advocate for open-borders. Former GOP Governor of Florida Jeb Bush and Clint Bolick send this message in their book being released in March on this very topic. The amnesty for illegals is just a convenient excuse to avoid reconsideration of other parts of the GOP message that must be modified, but the temptation for establishment Republicans to call for "comprehensive immigration reform" is great.

Eisenhower solved the US Illegal alien problem

In a July 6, 2006, article in the Christian Science Monitor, titled "How Eisenhower solved illegal border crossings from Mexico," it was reported that America's southern frontier was as porous as a spaghetti sieve. When the newly elected Dwight Eisenhower moved into the White House, America was suffering from an illegal alien problem. As many as three million Mexicans seeking jobs in California, Arizona, Texas and points beyond had walked and waded northward over a period of several years.

This illegal traffic was cut off by President Eisenhower. And with only 1,075 United States Border Patrol agents – less than one twentieth of today's force – President Eisenhower did it quickly and decisively. Still highly praised among veterans of the Border Patrol is the operation.

One piece of historic evidence indicates how he felt, although there is little to no record of this operation in Ike's official papers. To U.S. Senator of Arkansas William Fulbright (D), Ike wrote a letter in 1951. To examine unethical conduct by government officials who accepted gifts and favors in exchange for special treatment of private individuals, the senator had proposed that a special commission be created.

To Senator Fulbright's proposal General Eisenhower, who was gearing up for his run for the Presidency, said "Amen." Highlighting one paragraph a report in The New York Times was then quoted by President Eisenhower that said: "The rise in illegal-border crossings by Mexican 'wetbacks' to a current rate of more than 1,000,000 cases a year has been accompanied by a curious relaxation in ethical standards extending all the way from the farmer – exploiters of this contraband labor – to the highest levels of the Federal Government.

In an interview with the writer of the article, Eisenhower's first attorney general, Herbert Brownell Jr., said years later that their President had a sense of urgency about illegal immigration when he took office.

Mr. Brownell said, America "was faced with a breakdown in law enforcement on a very large scale. When I say large scale, I mean hundreds of thousands were coming in from Mexico [every year] without restraint."

At the time, farmers and ranchers in the Southwest had become dependent on an additional low-cost, docile illegal labor force of up to 3 million, mostly Mexican laborers although an on-and-off guest-worker program for Mexicans was operating.

This illegal workforce had a severe impact on the wages of ordinary working Americans indicated the Handbook of Texas Online, published by the University of Texas at Austin and the Texas State Historical Association.

In 1950, a study by the President's Commission on Migration Labor in Texas found that cotton growers in the Rio Grande Valley, where most illegal aliens in Texas worked, paid wages that were "approximately half" the farm wages paid elsewhere in the state. (Reporting from the Handbook Online)

Apparently, Eisenhower was worried by profits from illegal labor and the kind of corruption it led to. In the early 1950s some senior U.S. officials overseeing immigration enforcement "had friends among the ranchers," and agents "did not dare" arrest their illegal workers, said a retired 21-year veteran of the Border Patrol Joseph White.

A similar story was told by Walt Edwards who joined the Border Patrol in 1951. He said, "When we caught illegal aliens on farms and ranches, the farmer or rancher would often call and complain [to officials in El Paso]. And depending on how politically connected they were, there would be a political intervention. That is how we got into this mess we are in now."

Politically powerful people are still fuelling the flow of illegals said Bill Chambers, who worked for a combined 33 years for the Border Patrol and (then called) U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS).

However, if only for about ten years, this "Good Old Boy" system under Eisenhower changed during the 1950s. President Eisenhower appointed in 1954 as the new INS commissioner a former West Point classmate and veteran of the 101st Airborne retired General Joseph "Jumping Joe" Swing.

Burnell said, dead set against strong border enforcement and favoring open borders were influential politicians including U.S. Senator of Texas Lyndon B. Johnson (D) and U.S. Senator of Nevada Pat McCarran (D). However, the

meddling of powerful political and corporate interests was thwarted because of General Swing's close connection to President Eisenhower that shielded him and the Border Patrol.

Amnesty for illegals will not give Republicans a Hispanic majority.

The Republican establishment falsely believes that it is amnesty for illegals that stands between them and a Republican Hispanic majority. However, it is the core Democrat principles of a more generous safety net, strong government intervention in the economy and progressive taxation that creates a strong bond between Hispanics and the Democrat party.

And compared to the re-election of President Obama, the victory of Governor of California Jerry Brown's (D) Proposition 30, which raised upper-income taxes and the sales tax, Hispanics will prove to be even more decisive.

Unfortunately, the wave of the future is California. For example, Republican economic policies were a stronger detractor for Hispanic voters in California and Republican positions on illegal immigration according to a March 2011 poll by Moore Information. On class-warfare grounds, 29 percent of Hispanic voters were suspicious of the Republican party in that "it favors only the rich;" "Republicans are selfish and out for themselves;" "Republicans don't represent the average person." In comparison, 7 percent objected to the Republican stance on immigration.

In an article in [National Review Online](#) titled, "Why Hispanics Don't Vote for Republicans," by Heather MacDonald, she wrote that she spoke with John Echeveste, founder of the oldest Latino marketing firm in southern California, about Hispanic politics. He said, "What Republicans mean by 'family values' and what Hispanics mean are two completely different things. We are a very compassionate people, we care about other people and understand that government has a role to play in helping people."

So many Hispanics use government programs, that it is a strong reason for their support for big government. For example, in California, compared to native-born non-Hispanic households, U.S.-born Hispanic households use welfare programs at twice the rate. This is because a little over one-tenth of non Hispanics are poor in California as compared with nearly 25 percent Hispanic. In this state, compared to less than one in six non-Hispanic children, nearly seven in ten of poor children are Hispanics. In classrooms across the state one can see that disparity in which Hispanic educational performance is trying to be boosted by classes full of social workers and teachers.

Another delusion is the idea of the "social issues." For example, a Pew Research Center poll from October found a majority of Hispanics now support

homosexual “marriage.” And compared to whites, Hispanic out-of-wedlock birth rate is 53 percent.

A Republican party that purports to stand for small government and free markets faces an uncertain future because of the demographic changes set into motion by official and de facto immigration policy favoring low-skilled over high-skilled immigrants.

Many in the GOP are now saying that the GOP’s refusal to court Hispanics is a major reason for Mit Romney losing the 2012 Presidential election. As the networks were projecting Romney’s loss, Republican strategist Ana Navarro said “If we don’t do better with Hispanics we’re going to be out of the White House forever.”

For “failing to appeal more creatively to minority voters” the Wall Street Journal chided on Wednesday, November 7, 2012, Romney and concluded that “The GOP needs to leave its anti-immigration absolutes behind.”

Politico’s Jonathan Martin noted that the GOP stance on illegal aliens cost Republicans big time. He said, “In 2004, George W. Bush won 44 percent of Hispanics. Four years later, John McCain the author of an immigration reform bill (amnesty for illegal aliens) took 31 percent of Hispanics. And this year, Romney captured only 27 percent of Hispanics.”

Amnesty and Congress

On Thursday, November 8, 2012, Speaker of the House John A. Boehner (R–Ohio) said in an interview with Diane Sawyer on, “ABC World News,” that he was “confident” Congress and the White House could come up with a comprehensive immigration solution.

He said, “This issue has been around for too long, and while I believe it’s important for us to secure our borders and to enforce our laws, I think a comprehensive approach is long overdue, and I am confident that the President, myself, others can find the common ground to take care of this issue once and for all.”

In a statement, U.S. Senator of New York Charles E. Schumer (D) said, “This is a breakthrough to have the speaker endorse the urgency of comprehensive immigration reform. Democrats in the Senate look forward to working with him to come up with a bipartisan solution.” When U.S. Senator of Florida Marco Rubio (R) first proposed his compromise version of the Dream Act just seven months ago, the idea was called “difficult at best” to take up in the House by Speaker Boehner saying, “The problem with this issue is that we are operating in a very hostile political environment.”

However, after the election, open to taking their cues from Senator Marco Rubio who many see as their best hope for helping to expand their voter base and guide the way on immigration are many Republicans.

Fortunately, several Conservative lawmakers took issue with Speaker John Boehner's words.

A statement was issued urging Boehner to "talk with House Republicans before making pledges on their national news," by U.S. Representative of Louisiana John Fleming (R) on the morning of November 9, 2012.

He said, "I'm concerned that Speaker Boehner is getting ahead of House Republicans when he commits to getting a 'comprehensive approach' to immigration taken care of 'once and for all.' There's been zero discussion of this issue within the conference."

For considering citizenship for illegal immigrants one of the most Conservative members of the GOP conference U.S. Representative of Iowa Steve King (R) slammed Republicans.

He tweeted on Friday, November 9, 2012, "Obama voters chose dependency over liberty. Now establishment R's want citizenship for illegals. You can't beat Santa Claus with amnesty."

However, noting that he did not make any "pledges" of policy prescriptions in the ABC interview, Boehner denied to [The Hill](#) that members of his conference had discussed their concerns with him.

Speaker of the House John Boehner said he was "not talking about a 3,000 page bill," but "talking about a step by step common sense approach to secure our borders allows us to enforce the laws and fix a broken immigration system."

U.S. Senator of Arizona John McCain (R) tweeted on November 9, 2012, "I agree with the calls for comprehensive immigration reform."

"Conservative" Pundits

The GOP must moderate its immigration message to attract Hispanic voters, who voted for Obama by nearly three-to-one margin suggested Charles Krauthammer and many other Beltway pundits.

Also, on Thursday, November 8, 2012, Sean Hannity told his radio listeners that he has "evolved" on immigration and now supports a "pathway to citizenship." He continued by saying the United States needs to "get rid of the immigration issue altogether."

He added, "It's simple to me to fix it. I think you control the border first. You create a pathway for those people that are here – you don't say you've got to go home. And that is a position that I've evolved on. Because, you know what, it's got to be resolved. The majority of people here, if some people have criminal records you can send them home, but if people are here, law-abiding, participating for years, their kids are born here, you know, first secure the border, pathway to citizenship, done. You can't let the problem continue – it's got to stop." Furthermore, Sean Hannity said, "There is a fundamental shift going on. We've got to look at some of these demographics. You've got to look at what young voters are saying. The Hispanic vote went 70 percent Democrat."

Amnesty for illegal has caused the current immigration problems

The Simpson-Massoli Act is an Act of Congress which reformed United States immigration law. The bill was signed into law on November 6, 1986, by President Ronald Reagan with great fanfare amid promises that it would grant a legal status to illegal immigrants, crackdown on employers who hired illegal workers and secure the border once and for all. As is the case with much legislation passed by Congress and signed into law by the President, its proposed resolution of the problem instead exacerbates the problem. Such is the case with the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), Public Law 99-603, 100 Statute 3359 which resulted in an illegal alien surge as fraudulent applications tainted the process and many employers continued their illicit hiring practices. Currently, those that hope to put illegal aliens on a pathway to citizenship say they have learned from the past. Unfortunately they foolishly ignore the fact that history will repeat itself.

Even though immigration officials identified possible fraud in nearly a third of the applications in the late 1980s, they still approved more than 90 percent of the 1.3 million amnesty applications for a specialized program for agricultural workers. So there is no doubt that today a similar pattern will occur and the market for counterfeit documents will escalate.

Any bill proposed by the current Congress would create an immigration bill similar to the one in 1986 that will be vulnerable to fraud. And the government's commitment to maintain adequate financing for border security and employee verification would be suspect and insufficient. Also, an enormous burden would be placed on the Department of Homeland Security which would carry out the program. For example, eligible for amnesty 26 years ago were about 3 million illegal aliens. And expected to be eligible for legalization this time could be 11.5 million illegal aliens estimates the Department of Homeland Security whose figures are based on figures collected as part of the 2010 Census.

Romney lost because Conservatives did not vote for him

Superficially, it sounds plausible that Mitt Romney's strong pro-enforcement (but also pro-mass immigration) stance caused Obama to receive 71 percent of the Hispanic vote up from 67 percent in 2008. However, in 2008, US Senator of Arizona John McCain (R) who supported amnesty for illegal aliens did only a little better than Romney. And for Obama, comparing 2012 to 2008, the difference may not be statistically significant because the margin of error is large enough.

This shift is obviously not a result of immigration policy; and although it is a strong showing for Obama, obviously it is a small shift in a relatively small part of the electorate.

A heterogeneous group concerned with the same types of issues as are other Americans with immigration preferably far down the list are those of Mexican, Puerto Ricans, Cuban (and so on) heritage. The Democrats' message of big government and racial quotas is going to resonate with these groups of individuals as it always has because they are poorer than average, pay less in taxes, use more in government services, benefit from affirmative action, and are less likely to have health insurance.

Furthermore, even before immigration was much of a political issue, Jimmy Carter received 76 percent of the Hispanic vote in the 1980 Reagan landslide. Also, compared to white Democrats Hispanic Republicans are to the left of them. Therefore, embracing the Bush/McCain/Kennedy approach to immigration will lose a much larger number of white voters and will not win over many Hispanic voters.

Mark Krikorian, wrote in [National Review Online](#) on November 8, 2012, that Ted Frank of the Manhattan Institute had written the following:

“Hispanics are voting on economic issues, not on immigration, and that isn't going to shift [them] to Republican ideals anytime soon. Any political gains the Republicans can make by yielding on immigration are going to be more than offset by the adverse effect on the economy for the lower middle class and the increased number of Democratic voters.

In 2004, Bush received 44 percent of the Hispanic vote notes the open-borders GOP establishment. However, since the national exit poll results were simply incorrect he actually received between 38 to 40 percent. For the pro-amnesty GOP this has become the benchmark figure and it was better than Romney or McCain received. However, Romney still would have lost the election even if he had received a similar share of the Hispanic vote. In Florida and Nevada it might have made a difference. However, there are deep problems with the GOP message that have nothing to do with immigration and would not have made a difference in Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa or Virginia.”

Mark Krikorian has made a very good observation regarding the 2012 Presidential election. He writes that each one percentage point of the two-part vote (Obama plus Romney) is 1.172 million votes and about 2.7 million was Obama's margin of victory. He notes, as the remaining results trickle in, these numbers will change; however, the proportion should not significantly change. Compared to Romney's 27 percent, Obama received 71 percent of the Hispanic vote. Obama still would have won the popular vote even if Romney had received ten percentage points more of the Hispanic vote (Bush's 2004 number was close to 37 percent) Therefore, he would have received 1.172 million more Hispanic votes and Obama would have lost a similar number for a total shift of 2.34 million since 10 percentage points of the Hispanic vote is equal to 1 percent of the total electorate.

What is infuriating is what Mark Krikorian writes next. Thirty-five percent of the electorate is self-identified as Conservative exit polls report . And Obama received 17 percent of the Conservative vote compared to 82 percent that voted for Romney. If Romney was to have won the popular vote, he would have had to pick up 2.05 million more votes and a similar number would have been lost by Obama. The reason for this is that five percentage points of Conservative votes equals 1.75 percent of the electorate.

It is not amnesty for illegals that will make a future GOP Presidential candidate win the White House. Unfortunately, Mitt Romney was a liberal to moderate Republican but had he been a true Conservative he would have received at least an additional five points of the Conservative vote not a delusional 10 points of Hispanic vote. And possibly would be President-elect Romney.

Final Thoughts

Today, the American worker is facing one of the worst job markets in generations. And the illegal alien workforce has a severe impact on the wages of ordinary workers. So there is no doubt as President Obama continues his failed economic policies and the implementation of health care reform (ObamaCare), regardless of gender, age, race, or educational level, the economic outlook for Americans will be even worse next year.

Daily the rule of law is eroded by the Obama administration. Although their employment is a violation of U.S. law, some 16 million illegal aliens are part of America's workforce. And as a result of Obama's Dream Act, U.S. Border Patrol officers must turn captured illegals loose. In fact, a suit has been filed by a union of immigration officers claiming they are being intimidated by being told not to stop or question illegals, contending the Dream Act is illegal.

The Obama administration, leaders in Congress, establishment Republicans and yes even "Conservative" pundits are recommending passage of legislation that

would give amnesty to almost 12 million illegal aliens when forecasts indicate a worsening unemployment trend. What is even more disturbing is the more realistic figure of illegal aliens in U.S. that may be much closer to 60-70 million when the U.S. Border Patrol's own data is used and the relative ease with which drug smugglers and illegals that make multiple crossings into this nation is considered.

Instead of freeing those jobs up for American workers, amnesty would allow illegal aliens to keep the jobs they should never have had. Also, through amnesty illegals would be allowed to openly compete for scarcely available jobs with Americans who are unemployed.

To ensure that available jobs are filled by legal workers is the responsibility of Congress as well as the President. Congress' basic responsibility is to protect the American people, and any attempt to pass amnesty legislation during harsh economic times is a dereliction. To resolve the current problems with the porous southern U.S. border and to cut off the flow of illegal traffic Washington lawmakers should follow President Eisenhower's blueprint.

A Tremendous cost of illegals to the American society

Annually, billions are lost to the American economy by the actions of illegals. For example, illegal aliens annually send back to their families in their counties of origin \$45 billion. The annual cost to taxpayers for illegal aliens is astronomical. They include, in part \$11-\$22 billion spent for welfare by state governments; for food assistance such as food stamps, Women, Infants and Children program (WIC) and school lunches, \$2.2 billion; for Medicaid \$ 2.5 billion; and on education for students who are here "illegally and they cannot speak a word of English" \$12 billion. Although their parents are illegal aliens, children who are automatically American citizens by being born in the U.S. ("anchor babies") receive \$17 billion annually. Since their children are born in the U.S., many illegal aliens receive welfare and by getting a "child tax credit," they receive a check from the government.

Compared to non-aliens, illegal's crime rate is two and a half times higher. And annually, nearly 1 million sex crimes are committed by illegals. Furthermore, 30 percent of the federal prison inmates are illegals at a daily cost of \$3 million to incarcerate them.

The lies of the coming days and months

In the coming days and months, Americans will be told that granting citizenship to illegal aliens will be a tremendous boost to the nation's tax base and will help to bring down the escalating federal budget deficit.

However, tragically these are bold face lies since the majority of illegal aliens neither currently nor in the future will they ever make enough money to even qualify for income taxes. They will join the 47 percent of people that pay no income tax at all and will cause the federal deficit to soar. Largely do to additional tax credits through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, the Tax Policy Center projected 47 percent of people would pay no income tax in 2009. And House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R– Virginia) said in an appearance on CNBC’s “Squawk Box” on Wednesday, April 27, 2011, “We also have a situation in this country where you’re nearing 50 percent of people who don’t even pay income taxes.”

Obama creating a Third World nation

There is no doubt President Obama wants to create a new American society. He falsely believes that those that are successful have achieved it unfairly. He also believes that America became an economic and military superpower at the expense of other nations of the world. To remediate this unfairness he is destroying America economically as well as morally. The only reason Obama and the Democrats favor amnesty for illegals is to secure their votes which assures that Democrats in the future will control Congress and the White House. In the process, as he bankrupts the nation further, a fiscal collapse soon will occur from the burdens of the massive Obama welfare state that can no longer be supported. He will then be able to rest because he will have accomplished his goal of making America into a Third World nation. Then Americans can learn how the rest of the world lives in his delusional belief in the “greed and corruption” of America.

By supporting amnesty for illegal aliens, all the GOP establishment is doing is increasing the Democrat share of the electorate through ongoing mass immigration. These individuals foolishly believe if they pander to this group they will win the next election but this will only cause the Democrats to win more elections and keep the GOP candidate from winning the White House. If Republicans are going to be successful in coming elections, Conservatives must take back the party from establishment Republicans and run candidates that truly believe in Conservative principles, not only during primaries but in general elections as well.

What has made America great is the Founders’ ideology of liberty, freedom, God, individualism and a belief in limited government. However, daily Obama is eroding these beliefs which, if not stopped, will cause this nation’s destruction.

End Notes

1. Mark Krikorian, "[Now What? Immigration Edition](#)," *National Review Online*, November 8, 2012.
2. Heather MacDonald, "[Why Hispanics Don't Vote for Republicans](#)," *National Review Online*, November 7, 2012.
3. John Dillin, "[How Eisenhower solved illegal border crossings from Mexico](#)," *The Christian Science Monitor*, "July 6, 2012, (accessed November 9, 2012).
4. Barack Obama, "[The Border Patrol has 20,000 agents – more than twice as many as there were in 2004](#)," *Politifact.com*, May 10, 2011.
5. Mike Riggs, "[Can the GOP Embrace Hispanics and Small Government at the Same Time?](#)," *Reason.com*, November 7, 2012.
6. Ben Johnson, "['ObamaCare is the law of the land:' Boehner says House will not repeal](#)," *LifeSiteNews.com*, November 8, 2012.
7. Eric Cantor, "[There is "a situation in this country where you're nearing 50 percent of people who don't even pay income taxes](#)," *CNBC's "Squawk Box*," April 27, 2011, (accessed November 13, 2012).
8. "[Number of illegal immigrants in U.S. is stable: DHS](#)," *Reuters*, March 24, 2012, (accessed November 13, 2012).
9. Phillip Williams, "[Ex-border Patrol agent urges controls over nation's illegal aliens](#)," *The Gilmer Mirror*, November 11, 2012.
10. Dave Gibson, "[Just how many illegal aliens are in the United State?](#)," *Examiner*, August 27, 2009, (accessed November 13, 2012).