



# **¡ADIOS, AMERICA!**

**THE LEFT'S PLAN TO  
TURN OUR COUNTRY INTO A  
THIRD WORLD HELLHOLE**

# **ANN COULTER**

**Author of 10 *New York Times* Bestsellers**

**¡ADIOS, AMERICA!**

# **¡ADIOS, AMERICA!**

**THE LEFT'S PLAN TO  
TURN OUR COUNTRY INTO A  
THIRD WORLD HELLHOLE**

# **ANN COULTER**

*Author of 10 New York Times Bestsellers*

 **REGNERY  
PUBLISHING**  
A Division of Salem Media Group

Copyright © 2015 by Ann Coulter

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in a magazine, newspaper, website, or broadcast.

Regnery® is a registered trademark of Salem Communications Holding Corporation

Cataloging-in-Publication data on file with the Library of Congress

ISBN 978-1-62157-274-9

Published in the United States by  
Regnery Publishing  
A Division of Salem Media Group  
300 New Jersey Ave NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
[www.Regnery.com](http://www.Regnery.com)

Manufactured in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Books are available in quantity for promotional or premium use. For information on discounts and terms, please visit our website: [www.Regnery.com](http://www.Regnery.com).

Distributed to the trade by  
Perseus Distribution  
250 West 57th Street  
New York, NY 10107

*For M. Stanton Evans*

# CONTENTS

- 1 The End of America Won't Be Televised
- 2 Teddy: Why Not the Third World?
- 3 America to the Media: Whatever You Want, Just Don't Call Us Racists
- 4 The Lie: There's No Such Thing as America
- 5 Thirty Million Mexicans
- 6 Immigration as "Mystery Bargain Bin"
- 7 Immigrants and Crime: Why Do You Ask?
- 8 Why Can't We Have Israel's Policy on Immigration?

## **SPOT THE IMMIGRANT!** Case No. 1: Fresno, California

- 9 Public Warned to Be on Lookout for "Man"

## **SPOT THE IMMIGRANT!** Case No. 2: Homecoming Dance

- 10 Here's a Story, *Rolling Stone!*

## **SPOT THE IMMIGRANT!** Case No. 3: Death Sentence Champions

- 11 Why Do Hispanic Valedictorians Make the News, but Child Rapists Don't?
- 12 Keep America ~~Beautiful~~ Multicultural
- 13 Carlos Slim: The New York Times' Sugar Daddy

## **SPOT THE IMMIGRANT!** Case No. 4: Indian Sex Slaves in Berkeley

- 14 Every Single Immigration Category Is a Fraud
- 15 Shut It Down

**16** I Wrote This Chapter After Noticing How Stupid Rich People Are

**17** Most of Our Champions Are Sellouts—Half of the Rest Are Incompetent

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

**NOTES**

**INDEX**

# 1

## THE END OF AMERICA WON'T BE TELEVISED

**T**HIS IS “GOODBYE,” AMERICA. ADIOS. PAALAM NA. 再见。  
No further warning will be issued.

For forty years, the people have tried to tell politicians they want less immigration, but the politicians won't listen. Every single elite group in America is aligned against the public—the media, ethnic activists, big campaign donors, Wall Street, multimillionaire farmers, and liberal “churches.” They all want mass immigration from the Third World to continue. Both political parties connive to grant illegal aliens citizenship and bring in millions more legally, and the media hide the evidence.

Their game plan is: Never allow an honest debate on immigration. On every other important subject, both sides can be heard. The media are against pro-lifers, but it's possible to hear the pro-life side—from churches, pro-life organizations, and the alternative press. The mainstream media neurotically push global warming, but, on the other side, we have the entire conservative media, MIT scientists, and even some lefties, like the late Alexander Cockburn of the *Nation* magazine. There was no difficulty getting both sides of the debate on the Iraq War, Obamacare, the shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, and any number of other hot-button issues.

Only in the case of immigration is the public systematically lied to from every major news outlet. The media lie about everything, but immigration constitutes their finest hour of collective lying. They know their ideas on the topic are not popular.

How immigration is changing our country is a lot more important than most of the “news” we hear about endlessly. The media will pound away at Chris Christie's “Bridgegate,” apocryphal fraternity rapes, the Augusta National Golf Club's membership policies, “white privilege,” four Americans killed in Syria, and the sexual preferences of various Olympic athletes. But getting the truth about immigration is nearly impossible.

The media tell us, for example:

- Polls show the public overwhelmingly supports “comprehensive immigration reform.”

*No poll shows this. Only polls that lie about what “comprehensive immigration reform” is manage to produce majority support. These are polls about a bill that*



doesn't exist.

- Immigrants are doing jobs Americans just won't do.

*Americans are perfectly happy to do all manner of jobs—they just won't do them for \$7.00 an hour. Unions used to care about that, but now they just want political power. Greedy businessmen: What do you think the business climate will be like under a government run by AFSME?*

- Amnesty will be fantastic for the economy.

*Unless we're talking about the Mexican economy, this is patently ridiculous. Adding another 30 million poor, unskilled, non-taxpaying, welfare-receiving people to America is good only for government workers and employers who refuse to mechanize their operations or pay Americans one dollar more.*

- Obama is the “Deporter in Chief”—he's deported more than Bush!

*To the contrary, Obama is deporting far fewer illegal aliens than Bush—and that wasn't a high bar. The Obama administration simply changed the definition of “deport” to include “illegal aliens turned away at the border.” It's as if a school lowered the definition of “passing grade” from 70 to 40, then bragged about its high graduation rate.*

- Hispanics will never vote for Republicans unless they pass amnesty.

*First of all, moron Republicans: If they can't vote, they can't vote against you. Voting machines don't register angry glints in people's eyes. Second, Hispanics who are citizens don't care about amnesty! They're already in. They vote 8–2 for the Democrats because they like big government. That's why Obama's Spanish-language ads during the 2012 campaign didn't say word one about amnesty. Instead, he promised Hispanics free healthcare under Obamacare.*

- “Comprehensive immigration reform” isn't amnesty.

*And abortion isn't “abortion,” it's “choice”!*

The problems stemming from unchecked immigration are all over the news. You'll just never be told they *are* problems of immigration—children living in poverty, childhood obesity, teen pregnancy, out-of-wedlock births,<sup>1</sup> abysmal high school dropout rates,<sup>2</sup> income inequality, “homegrown” terrorists, massive Medicare frauds, internet crime, identity theft, prison overcrowding, the vast number of uninsured used

to justify Obamacare,<sup>3</sup> sex trafficking, the epidemic of child rape, the destruction of our national parks, drunk driving casualties, drug-resistant tuberculosis, measles and other viral outbreaks, bankrupt government pensions, lower reading and math scores, and shorter “Americans.”

Are these problems made better or worse by mass immigration from the Third World? The fact that Hispanics have the highest unmarried birthrate in the country—even higher than American blacks—accounts for a raft of social problems that are discussed ad infinitum by the media, but that will never be identified as the consequence of mass immigration.<sup>4</sup>

A nation’s immigration policies are at least as important as, say, going to war. But the media have decided that who gets to live in America is none of America’s business. The public can’t be trusted with the truth. Go back to the kids’ table. The grown-ups are deciding this. Anyone who challenges the elite consensus on immigration will be swarmed with blitzkrieg attacks. It can be difficult to discuss America’s immigration policies when it’s considered racist merely to say, “We liked America the way it was.”

There’s no sense in arguing about any other political issue. If we lose immigration, we lose everything.

## **THE ISSUE THAT WON’T GO AWAY: SHOULD DEMOCRATS BE GIVEN 30 MILLION NEW VOTERS?**

The media convince people to believe lies by the simple process of repetition: Diversity is a strength! We’re a nation of immigrants! It’s a crisis to have people living in the shadows! If it doesn’t fit, you must acquit! It’s like the hypnotic repetitions drilled into infants’ sleeping brains 150 times a night, three times a week, in *Brave New World*.

By neurotic perseveration, mass-immigration proponents have completely moved the goalposts. After Reagan’s amnesty, no one talked about allowing *new* illegal aliens to stay. The only issue was: When are we going to get started on those promised employer sanctions and securing the southern border? Now we’re told we have to both allow new people in and amnesty the illegal immigrants already here. We’re getting the exact same arguments that were made for the old amnesty, but this time with attitude: *Wait a minute—you’re not seriously telling me that you don’t want to give amnesty to the people already here?* To which Republican politicians whimper: *We hope we’re not inconveniencing you by not moving more quickly to forgive you for the laws you broke, illegal aliens.*

I don’t mean to be obtuse, but why is it a crisis that illegal aliens are “living in the shadows”? I forget. We need to bring in more people who will drive down the wages of our fellow Americans because—why again? It is not a crisis for Americans that other people have come into their country illegally and now find it uncomfortable to be living here breaking the law. It’s *supposed* to be uncomfortable to break the law. Perhaps illegal aliens should have considered that before coming.

Americans are being asked to respond to the world's oldest joke: A guy kills his parents, then throws himself on the court's mercy as an orphan. How *did* all these illegal aliens get into "the shadows" in the first place? They weren't kidnapped and dragged across the border. They came here. At most—and this is dubious—it's a crisis for the illegal immigrants. But "living in the shadows" is evidently better than living in Guadalajara, otherwise, there's an easy solution. Living in the shadows doesn't seem to be much of a crisis even for them.

Historically, Democrats have found it fun and profitable to bully Republicans into taking suicidal positions. This latest push for amnesty is approximately the Republicans' fifth mugging. As with all disastrous legislation, Republicans are being told, "We have got to do this yesterday!" *If we don't produce a global warming bill, the American people will have our heads! If we don't pass campaign finance reform tomorrow, the voters will punish us! You're not seriously thinking of blocking a new gun control bill, are you?* It always turns out, no, there's no backlash. The only politician who was ever punished for his position on global warming was Al Gore. Debate any urgent liberal demand long enough, and the problem usually just goes away.

It's entirely possible that the only Hispanics enraged about amnesty are the ones we see on TV. In polls, a majority of Hispanics answer "Don't know" to the question "Who is the most important Hispanic/Latino leader in the country today?"<sup>5</sup> Self-appointed Latino spokesmen, claiming to speak for millions, apparently speak for about fifteen people. At least Al Sharpton has a posse of two hundred losers he can drag around with him. Most Hispanics seem completely unaware that they're part of some angry movement led by Jorge Ramos. The notion of Hispanic unity—much less Hispanic-black unity—is pure liberal fantasy. Puerto Ricans and Dominicans hate one another, blacks and Mexicans hate one another, Haitians and African Americans hate one another, and everyone hates the Cubans.<sup>6</sup> Republican elites apparently don't talk to their servants: They're convinced Cuban Marco Rubio will be catnip to Hispanic voters. Yes, remember how Manhattan women flocked to Sarah Palin just because she was a woman? GOP political consultants will never steer you wrong.

The only place a failure to pass amnesty will produce genuine, heartfelt remorse is in the better sections of town, when wives of Wall Street bankers realize that Manuela the nanny will not be able to get taxpayer-subsidized healthcare.

There is simply no reason for Republicans to legalize 30 million people who will vote 8–2 against them. They don't have to be embarrassed about opposing immigration because of how the immigrants vote. The reason Democrats *support* immigration is because of how they vote. Al Gore didn't mind challenging military ballots during the Florida 2000 recount. Obama challenged the petition signatures of every single Democrat running for an Illinois senate seat in 1996, disqualifying all of his opponents and "winning" by being the last man standing.<sup>7</sup> Israel won't allow Palestinians to return to homes they used to live in because of how they'd vote. Palestinians demand a right to return to their pre-1967 homes, but Israel says, quite correctly, that changing Israel's ethnicity would change the idea of Israel.<sup>8</sup> Well, changing America's ethnicity changes the idea of America, too. Show me in a straight line why we can't do what Israel does. Is Israel special? For some of us, America is

special, too.

Democrats aren't big on amnestying other lawbreakers. They don't hysterically demand amnesty for accounting cheats or polluters—not even for “the children” of accounting cheats and polluters. Enron executives were hard workers. They loved their families and wanted the best for them, just as I'm sure MS-13 gang members love their families. Think of how the executives' children have suffered—the divorces, the broken families, the prison sentences. Why do we have to punish the children?<sup>9</sup> How many breaks did liberals cut the Amirault family in Massachusetts after they were sent to prison in the child molestation hysteria of the 1980s, even after it was proved they were innocent? Martha Coakley fought like a banshee to keep Gerald Amirault in prison well after the charges were exposed as a fraud. Where was his amnesty? Democrats only care about the children of lawbreakers when it will get them 30 million new voters. Convicted felons are next.

Republicans have no obligation to make a grand forgiving gesture toward lawbreakers, hoping that Hispanics will applaud their sportsmanship. This doesn't require bravery. It requires that Republicans not be idiots. Democrats are just going to have to get 30 million new voters some other way.

## **STEP ONE: SECURE THE BORDER;**

## **STEP TWO: REPEAT STEP ONE**

As Reagan's amnesty proves, it's pointless to talk about what to do with the illegal aliens already here until we've secured the border. When the bathtub is overflowing, the very first thing you do is: TURN OFF THE WATER. You don't debate whether to use a rag or a mop to clean up the water, whether to get a bucket or put a hose out the window, whether to use towels or sponges. The No. 1 priority is: Shut off the water.

Obviously, any amnesty functions as a magnet for more illegal aliens. Nothing shows the bad faith of amnesty advocates with more blinding clarity than their steadfast refusal to seal the border. Ordinary people see this and know they're being lied to.

The “border security” measures of every amnesty bill all employ the same meaningless Washington metric of success. In government, effectiveness is measured not by results, but by how much money is spent. How effective is it? Why, we've tripled the budget! That's what Republican Senator Bob Corker of Tennessee actually said about Rubio's “Gang of Eight” amnesty bill, formally titled “The Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013”—which was way better than its original title: “We Surrender.”

“The fact is,” Corker exclaimed, “we are investing resources in securing our border that have never been invested before.”<sup>10</sup> Why, he's so serious about getting in shape, he's taken out three gym memberships! Increasing the pensions of border agents is not a measure of border effectiveness. We're interested in results, not outlays. Even within the meaningless category of “Money Spent,” it can be spent in ways that are counterproductive. If the bill includes one dime for ACLU attorneys to process immigration claims, then part of the money we're spending to make the border more

secure is going to make it less secure. Rubio's bill gave \$150 million to nonprofits to help illegal aliens apply for amnesty.<sup>11</sup>

Most Hispanics are smarter than Marco Rubio. In 2011, 73 percent of California Hispanics said they'd support a candidate who wanted to "secure the border first, stop illegal immigration, and then find a way to address the status of people already here illegally."<sup>12</sup> In a 2014 Univision poll, 58 percent chose "require border security first" over "pass immigration reform."<sup>13</sup>

## PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN GATED COMMUNITIES TELL US FENCES DON'T WORK

Americans ought to be suspicious about being incessantly told fences "don't work." It's like being told wheels don't work. The media maniacally repeat this nonsense, hoping to lull people into thinking, *Maybe it is impossible to control the borders*. The *New York Times* explains, for example: "Would-be migrants still find ways over, under, through and around them."<sup>14</sup> *Wheels still find ways to bend, break, or spring leaks*. China built a thirteen-thousand-mile wall several centuries before Christ, and it's still working.

The *Times* gave the game away with this sentimental glop about border fences being "the approach favored by ancient empires: the raising of a wall." The article continued: "The barrier wasn't very likely to overturn the law of supply and demand, but it did serve as a useful symbol of the process of alienation, a closing-off of lives and minds, along the line it traces."<sup>15</sup> Yes, that's precisely the idea! Aren't fences peachy? Tellingly, the *Times* added: "Still, the tattered ideal of a world without borders holds great power." For whom is a "world without borders" an ideal? People who don't much care for America, I gather.

Even Republicans who pretend to want a secure border are always telling us fences won't work. The NEW WAY of stopping tubs from overflowing is to use mops and blow-dryers. Sure, we can always turn the water off, but that won't work because it could always spring a leak. Let's just keep mopping. Responding to an increasingly annoyed public, Congress has repeatedly voted to build a border fence. But somehow, the fence never gets built—and Congress does nothing. In January 2011, Obama's Department of Homeland Security announced that it had "ended the Secure Border Initiative Network" on the grounds that "it did not meet cost-effectiveness and viability standards."<sup>16</sup> And if there is one thing the Obama administration absolutely insists upon, it's cost-effectiveness and viability!

The steadfast refusal of the amnesty crowd to agree to a fence tells us that Americans should not budge on the point. In addition to being the only sane, logical thing to do, demanding a fence forces amnesty proponents to admit that they have no intention of ever sealing the border. The surge of ninety thousand poor Central Americans across the border in 2014 proved that. Obama pretended his hands were tied. *It's the law!* It wasn't the law. So either Obama is stupid or he was deliberately lying, and the smart money is on "deliberately lying." But Democrats—and some Republicans—insisted there was some mysterious "loophole" in the law that

prohibited this country from stopping illegal aliens at the border. If politicians really believed that, why didn't they close the loophole?

Instead, amnesty supporters tried a surprise argument: To stop illegals pouring across the border, Congress had to pass amnesty. They were hoping to stun us into silence with the stupidity of their argument. No one was prepared for it. *I'm sorry, Your Honor, we didn't bring our notes on that. We were ready for "It's wrong" or "What about the children?" We weren't expecting: To stop the surge at the border, we need to reward the people surging across it.*

Everyone knows that one amnesty begets more illegal aliens, which begets another amnesty. It's called an "incentive." There's less of an incentive if the gate is locked. First lock the gate, then figure out what to do with the people already here. Any amnesty is an inducement to illegal aliens. If you choose to argue it's not, I refer you to history. This is not the first time Americans have been promised secure borders in return for amnesty. The 1986 Simpson-Mazzoli Act, also known as "The Charlie Brown and Lucy with Football Act," was supposed to end illegal immigration forever: Give us amnesty one time, then: Never again.<sup>17</sup>

As with all laws that combine the bitter with the sweet, such as tax hikes and spending cuts, we got one and not the other. The amnesty came, but the border security never did. Illegal immigration sextupled. There have been a half dozen more amnesties since then, legalizing millions more foreigners who broke our laws.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps we could have trusted Washington's sincerity thirty years ago, but Americans have already been fooled once—then, six more times. They aren't stupid.

The two parts cannot be done simultaneously. A border fence must be started first—and completed first. Only after all the ACLU lawsuits and INS rulings have run their course, and the border is still secure, do we move to Step Two. I happen to think we don't do the amnesty part ever, but it's tendentious even to discuss what to do with illegal aliens already here until we can prevent more from coming. We'll talk about legalization as soon as it's as hard to get into the United States as it used to be to get out of East Germany.

To review:

Step One: Secure the border.

Step Two: Discuss what to do with illegals already here.

## **AMNESTY IS GOODBYE, AMERICA**

Contrary to everything you've heard, the only options are not: Amnesty or deporting 11 million people. There's also the option of letting them stay in the shadows—or *the same thing we've been doing for the last thirty years*. Americans are under no moral obligation to grant amnesty to people who have broken our laws. "The moral thing to do" is usually defined as "following the law." The fact that Democrats want 30 million new voters is not a good enough reason to ignore the law and screw over American workers, as well as legal immigrants already here. How about Republicans try this: *We're not giving you anything—not even half—because there's no reason to do so.*

The demand for amnesty is not going away. Nothing ever gets struck from the

Left's "To Do" list. Democrats had been angling for national healthcare since the FDR administration. Conservatives thought they killed it with the ignominious defeat of Hillarycare in 1994, but the very next time Democrats controlled both Congress and the presidency—we got Obamacare. To paraphrase what President Bush used to say about terrorists: The anti-amnesty side has to be perfect every time; the pro-amnesty side only has to win once. And then the country is finished. There won't be any reason to care about politics, anymore. At least I can finally clean out my attic.

Any other bad law can be repealed. *Roe v. Wade* can be overturned. Obamacare can be repealed. Amnesty is forever.

## 2

### TEDDY: WHY NOT THE THIRD WORLD?

**H**OW DID IMMIGRANTS BECOME A SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP MORE POWERFUL than Americans? I'm not a high-priced political consultant, but shouldn't politicians be more concerned with what citizens think of them than what foreigners do? It's a measure of how out of whack public dialogue is on immigration that it comes as a startling concept to even ask if our laws should help our country rather than help other countries solve *their* problems. Wouldn't any sane immigration policy be based on the principle that we want to bring in only immigrants who will benefit the people already here? Why not take immigrants who are better than us, instead of immigrants who are worse than us?

A good-for-America immigration policy would not accept people with no job skills. It would not accept immigrants' elderly relatives, arriving in wheelchairs. It would not accept people accused of terrorism by their own countries. It would not accept pregnant women whose premature babies will cost taxpayers \$50,000 a pop,<sup>1</sup> before even embarking on a lifetime of government support. It would not accept Somalis who spent their adult lives in a Kenyan refugee camp and then showed up with five children in a Minnesota homeless shelter.<sup>2</sup> An immigration policy that benefits Americans would not result in news items like this one: "After arriving from Kampala, Uganda, Ayan Ahmed and her nine children, ages four to eighteen, spent six months in Phoenix. There, Catholic Charities had lined up a furnished four-bedroom home for the family and a neurologist for Ahmed's eldest son, *who is blind* [emphasis added]."<sup>3</sup>

If our government were in the international charity business, they'd be doing a fantastic job. America takes in half the refugees of the entire world.

In fact, however, taking in refugees is not even in the top hundred jobs we want the government doing. At what point will Americans remind their government that it has a responsibility to us, not to every sad person in the world? We can't solve everyone's problems—and that's not what we're paying taxes for our government to do. Catholic Charities may enjoy taking in immigrant families, so they can feel like the Harriet Tubman of Uganda, but they don't have a right to do it on the taxpayers' dime.<sup>4</sup> It's not "charity" if we have to pay for "their" good works. It's charity if *they* pay. But I notice that we always end up paying, while they go to all the awards dinners at the Ugandan-American Society.

Try calling another country's embassy and asking to immigrate there.



Consulate: *What do you do?*

You: Well, I can't read or write, I have no skills, and I've got nine kids. Oh and by the way, if I can't make it in your country, would you mind cutting my family a check once a month?

Consulate: *Click.*

Other countries must be laughing their heads off at us. Our “family reunification” policies mean that being related to a recent immigrant from Pakistan trumps being a surgeon from Denmark. That’s how we got gems like the “Octomom,” the unemployed single mother on welfare who had fourteen children in the United States via in vitro fertilization; Dzhokhar and Tamerlan Tsarnaev, who bombed the Boston Marathon, killing three and injuring hundreds, a few years after slitting the throats of three American Jews; and all those “homegrown” terrorists flying from Minnesota to fight with ISIS. Family reunification isn’t about admitting the spouses and minor children of immigrants we’re dying to get. We’re bringing in grandparents, second cousins, and brothers-in-law of Afghan pushcart operators—who then bring in their grandparents, second cousins, and brothers-in-law until we have entire tribes of people, illiterate in their own language, never mind ours, collecting welfare in America. We wouldn’t want our immigrants to be illiterate, unskilled, *and* lonesome.

## **LIVING IN THE SHADOWS—COLLECTING GOVERNMENT BENEFITS IN BROAD DAYLIGHT**

We’re told—as if it’s good news—that immigrants use welfare only at 18 percent above the native-born rate.<sup>5</sup> No, the fact that any immigrants are on welfare proves we’re not taking the right immigrants. It’s like saying, *Only 18 percent of our cars burst into flames when you start them.* We don’t want *any* cars bursting into flames. These aren’t native-born citizens who are poor. Aren’t immigrants who immediately go on government assistance, by definition, immigrants we don’t want? We can’t pay for our own poor people, but now we have to be the welfare ward of the world?

Our government does such a terrific job at choosing who gets to immigrate to America that 52 percent of *legal* immigrant households with children are on government assistance. In all, nearly 60 percent of immigrants—legal and illegal—are on government assistance, compared with 39 percent of native households.<sup>6</sup> Why would any country voluntarily bring in people who have to be supported by the taxpayer?

Immigrants from nineteen of the top twenty-five source countries are more likely to be in poverty than native white Americans, generally far more likely.<sup>7</sup> Immigrants from Mexico and Honduras, for example, have a poverty rate three times higher than white Americans.<sup>8</sup> The only immigrants *less* likely to be in poverty than white Americans are those from Canada, Poland, the United Kingdom, Germany, India, and the Philippines.<sup>9</sup> Needless to say, we take fewer immigrants from these countries than from the neediest immigrant countries. Poland and Germany aren’t even in the top ten source countries, and Canada and the United Kingdom *combined* send us fewer

immigrants than Mexico does.

Business lobbyists have an irritating habit of dismissing the massive welfare use of immigrants by saying, *Yes, of course, we have to get rid of welfare*. First of all, their cheap labor wouldn't be so cheap if not for all the goodies provided by the U.S. taxpayer, so this is a ruse. The immigrants get a taxpayer subsidy to work for the rich, and the rich get a break on the maid. This cozy deal is funded by the long-suffering middle class.

Second, it would be easier to repeal the law of gravity than to prevent immigrants from accessing welfare. The Republicans' 1996 welfare reform bill barred immigrants from receiving direct welfare payments for a mere five years. That turned out to be the single biggest cost savings of the entire welfare reform. Most people said, *THAT'S NOT ALREADY THE LAW?* But at the *New York Times*, needy immigrants are the most desirable immigrants. The *Times* hysterically attacked the immigration provisions as one of the "cruellest aspects" of welfare reform. Congress immediately restored welfare for immigrants who arrived before the law passed on the grounds that it would be unfair to take welfare away from immigrants who came here *expecting* to live off the American taxpayer. Subsequent Congresses restored welfare for elderly immigrants, immigrants with children, refugees, and immigrants who are hungry, get pregnant, or brought a wife-beater with them.<sup>10</sup>

America should be choosing immigrants like the New England Patriots choose players. They don't have a lottery system for their draft picks. No one guilts them into taking a blind kid with one leg over an All American—much less the blind kid's cousin, to keep him company. But that's America's immigration policy. We're in a seller's market, but instead of taking the top draft picks, we aggressively recruit cripples, illiterates, and the desperately poor. A strange idea has taken hold that it's unfair to get the best immigrants we can. Why should that top model be allowed to date only rich, good-looking guys? She should be forced to date poor, balding losers. Maybe Kate Upton should have a lottery system to decide whom she goes out with.

Proposing an immigration policy that serves America's interests should not require an apology.

## **THIS IS ON THE KENNEDY HIGHLIGHTS REEL, RIGHT AFTER THE PART WHERE HE KILLS THAT GIRL**

It's our current immigration laws that demand an apology. It was Teddy Kennedy's 1965 immigration act that snuffed out the generous quotas for immigrants from the countries that had traditionally populated America—England, Ireland, and Germany<sup>11</sup>—and added "family reunification" policies, allowing recent immigrants to bring in their relatives, and those relatives to bring in *their* relatives, until entire Somali villages have relocated to Minneapolis and Muslim cabdrivers are refusing to transport passengers with dogs or alcohol.<sup>12</sup> America has to take in all the poor people of the world, so that Ted Kennedy could get his face on commemorative plates. I'm sorry the Kennedy family felt awkward in Brahmin Boston, but that isn't enough of a reason to

wreck our country.

Kennedy's immigration law was enacted during the magical post-1964 period, when Congress had free rein to push through the craziest left-wing legislation since the New Deal. It was the most destructive period in American history. Anything the Left had ever dreamed of became law, in such profusion that it could have been a test to see if members of Congress were actually reading the bills. The premise of the 1965 immigration act sounds like the bizarre belief of a weird hippie cult: The poor of the world have the right to come to America, and we have to take care of them!

Liberals had tried convincing Americans to vote for them, but that kept ending badly. Except for Lyndon Johnson's aberrational 1964 landslide, Democrats have not been able to get a majority of white people to vote for them in any presidential election since 1948.<sup>13</sup> Their only hope was to bring in new voters. *Okay, fine. You won't vote for us, America? We tried this the easy way, but you give us no choice. We're going to overwhelm you with new voters from the Third World.* As Democratic consultant Patrick Reddy wrote for the Roper Center in 1998: "The 1965 Immigration Reform Act promoted by President Kennedy, drafted by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, and pushed through the Senate by Ted Kennedy has resulted in a wave of immigration from the Third World that should shift the nation in a more liberal direction within a generation. It will go down as the Kennedy family's greatest gift to the Democratic Party."<sup>14</sup>

Since then, the Democrats' insatiable need for more voters has continued unabated. A year before the 1996 presidential election, the Clinton administration undertook a major initiative to make 1 million immigrants citizens in time to vote. The White House demanded that applications be processed twelve hours a day, seven days a week. Criminal background checks were jettisoned for hundreds of thousands of applicants, resulting in citizenship being granted to at least seventy thousand immigrants with FBI criminal records and ten thousand with felony records.<sup>15</sup> Murderers, robbers, and rapists were all made citizens so that the Democrats would have a million foreign voters on the rolls by Election Day.<sup>16</sup> The *Washington Post* reported—after Clinton was safely reelected—that the citizenship initiative was intended to create "a potent new bloc of Democratic voters." Even the INS had objected to "running a pro-Democrat voter mill."<sup>17</sup> Democrats didn't care. Clinton's reelection was more important than the country.

The mass migration of the poorest of the poor to America is bad for the whole country, but it's fantastic for Democrats. Ask yourself: Which party benefits from illiterate non-English speakers who have absolutely no idea what they're voting for, but can be instructed to learn certain symbols? The foreign poor are prime Democratic constituents because they're easily demagogued into tribal voting. A white person can vote Republican or Democratic without anyone saying to him, "HOW CAN YOU VOTE AGAINST YOUR RACE?" By contrast, every nonwhite person is required to vote Democrat.<sup>18</sup> Republicans' whispering sweet nothings in Hispanic ears isn't going to change that. Voting Democratic is part of their cultural identity. Race loyalty trumps the melting pot.

Moreover, poor people are never opposed to big government because they're exempt from all the annoying things that government does. They're not worried about

taxes: The government is not going to raise any taxes that they pay. They drive unlicensed cars, have no insurance, flee accidents, and couldn't pay a court judgment anyway. The government doesn't want to get in touch with the poor for any reason other than to give them things. So it's lucky, in a way, that Democrats are the party of government workers. Unending immigration means we need rafts of government workers to educate non-English speakers, teach cultural sensitivity classes, arrest criminals, man prisons, clean up parks, distribute food stamps, arrange subsidized housing, and work in hospital emergency rooms to deliver all those premature babies.

MSNBC is constantly crowing about Democrats sweeping every ethnic group. Could we see the party preferences of voters whose great-great-grandparents were born in America? Republicans would win that demographic in a landslide. The American electorate isn't moving to the left—it's shrinking. Democrats figured out they'd never win with Americans, so they implemented an evil, genius plan to change this country by restocking it with voters more favorably disposed to left-wing policies than Americans ever would be. Unfortunately, this scheme was implemented long before I was able to object.

But that's not how the story of the end of America will be written. Rather, it will be: THEN, FINALLY, PROGRESSIVE POLITICS SWEEPED THE NATION! THERE WAS RESISTANCE, BUT, IN THE END, THE LEFT'S ARGUMENTS WON. No minds have been changed. Democrats just brought in a new group of voters whose minds don't need to be changed. It's as if the Democrats switched teams at halftime, from the worst team in the NBA to the best. *We've got five NBA All-Stars guarding LeBron—Woo hoo! We won!* Don't pat yourselves on the back, Democrats. The country isn't changing—you changed the voters.

Occasionally, Democrats speak openly about what they're doing. In 2002, liberal journalist John Judis and political scientist Ruy Teixeira wrote a book boasting that immigrants, combined with the Democrats' usual disgruntled voters—divorcées and college professors—would give Democrats an insuperable majority within a few decades. Third World immigration, they said, would consummate “George McGovern's revenge”—which up to that point I thought was a particularly nasty lower intestinal condition. A decade later, when Obama won his 2012 reelection, Teixeira gloated that—as he had predicted—ethnic minorities were voting 8–2 for the Democrats, and had grown to nearly one-third of the electorate. “McGovern's revenge only seems sweeter,” Teixeira said.<sup>19</sup>

McGovern's revenge also represents the Democrats' switch from a party of blue-collar workers to a party of urban elites—feminists, vegans, drug legalizers, untaxed hedge fund operators, and transgender-rights activists. Back when Democrats still claimed to represent working Americans, they opposed illegal immigration. Since being taken over by the Far Left, all that matters to them is changing the electorate to one that doesn't mind liberal insanity.

## **PROUD TO BE UN-AMERICAN**

It's striking how so many immigration activists don't seem to particularly like this country. They tell us that America is a teeming mass of racist, sexist, homophobic