

NEW YORK TIMES' OPEN-BORDERS HISSY-FIT

By Don Feder

(Posted July 17, 2006)

These are heady days at The New York Times And Tokyo Rose Report. The paper, whose motto is “all the news that’s fit to print,” has been making news itself, by exposing a secret government program to monitor financial transactions related to terrorism.

Irate Congressmen have been talking about investigations. There have been calls to prosecute those responsible for this blow to national security.

But there’s more to the Times’ efforts to subvert America than just tipping off Osama – much more.

Take its recent editorial (“The Immigration Road Show”) in which Traitors R Us threw a bizarre hissy fit over House Speaker Dennis Hastert’s decision to hold hearings on the Senate’s amnesty bill.

“This was supposed to be a time that the House and Senate got serious about immigration—by working out the differences between their drastically opposing bills and sending a solution to President Bush, who has made *repairing* the immigration system one of his cornerstone promises to Americans,” the Times intoned, in its typically restrained Jane-you-ignorant-slut voice.

“Repairing the immigration system” is Times-speak for amnestying an estimated 12 million illegal aliens (which would, in turn, act like a super-magnet -- attracting millions more from impoverished third-world countries) and creating a so-called guest-worker program that will legally import 60-million low-skilled, incapable-of-assimilation, aliens over the next 20 years. That’s

“repairing” in the same sense that the World Trade Center attack was urban renewal.

Instead of sensibly opening wide the floodgates, the Times whines, House Republicans want “to take a closer look” at what the paper calls a “bipartisan bill.” (FYI, 58% of Senate Republicans voted against it.) The fact that Harry Reid and company got the usual gaggle of RINO, establishment, Wall Street, want-to-do-a-photo-op-with-Ted-Kennedy Republicans to go along with the open-borders travesty makes it “bi-partisan”?

Holding hearings means taking “the Senate bill on a perp walk through red states, relishing the catcalls denouncing it as ‘amnesty’ and using the hearings to milk whatever anti-immigrant sentiment they can drum up for the benefit of their candidates. Their motives could not be clearer,” the Times declaims.

And neither could the Times’ mo.

Its mantra is: Rubber-stamp the Senate bill now! Don’t ask questions. Don’t deliberate. And, for God’s sake, don’t look closely at this 640-page monstrosity.

Even its Senate supporters didn’t understand its ramifications. Sen. Diane Feinstein now admits that when the bill was before the Judiciary Committee “we did not realize the extent to which large numbers of people are brought in on some of these visas. We were working to a march. We had to get this bill done.” I’ll say.

No matter, The New York Times will not abide any delay.

It doesn’t want Congressmen to hear the views of National Border Patrol Council Local 2544, representing agents in Tucson, Arizona, whose public information officer told NewsMax.com:

“We strongly oppose any attempt to reward illegal alien lawbreakers. We have risked our lives to keep them out of this country. The slick politicians can call it ‘guest-worker’ or ‘earned legalization’ all they want, but it’s amnesty.”

America’s newspaper of wretched would rather there was no loose talk about the illegal alien/crime connection – that 75% of people on the most wanted list in Los Angeles are illegals, that 95% of murder warrants in the city are for undocumented workers, and that almost 25% of all inmates in California detention centers are drawn from the hard-working folks without “papers” who take jobs most Americans don’t want (like murder, rape and armed robbery).

The Times claims “500 economists have signed an open letter to Mr. Bush arguing that immigration is a net plus for the nation’s economy.” Doubtless, the same 500 economists believe that tax hikes are a net plus for the economy, increases in the minimum wage are a net plus for the economy and signing the Kyoto Treaty on so-called global warming would be a big boost for the nation’s economy.

Robert Rector, a Heritage Foundation analyst who – unlike the Times standard-issue 500 economists – is invariably right about the impact of legislation on the economy, tells us the following:

- By the late 1990s, immigrant households were 50% more likely to receive means-tested government benefits (i.e., welfare) than native-born households. Moreover, the longer an immigrant stays here, the more likely he is to end up on the dole.
- By amnestying 10 million illegal aliens and putting them on the path to citizenship, the Senate bill (S.

2611) would cost the taxpayers an extra \$16 billion annually.

- Once an amnestied immigrant becomes a citizen, he can bring in his parents. Rector estimates the annual cost of Jose bringing in Padre Juan and Madre Maria to be \$30 billion per year, or more.
- Says Rector, if enacted, S. 2611 (the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act) would be “the largest expansion of the welfare state in 35 years.”

Then there’s the guest home-invaders program. Heritage estimates the Senate bill would bring in at least 60 million over the next 20 years – low-skilled workers, aliens in every sense of the word, who won’t learn English, will never develop an American identity and will bring more crime and drug abuse in their wake. Look at what those wonderful Arab guest-workers have done for France.

The Times doesn’t want Middle America to be made aware of any of this. It wants the whole thing decided inside the Beltway – by the political elite, with the advice and consent of the media elite.

At a certain point, the aforesaid editorial descends into what can only be described as sputtering, incoherent rage. “Given the topics that have preoccupied Congress lately, one wonders why Republicans don’t simply propose a catchall bill aimed at illegal gay liberal Mexican flag burners and be done with it.” Huh?

Do you ever wonder what sort of life forms write New York Times editorials: 1) Do they have three heads? 2) Are they strange visitors from another planet? 3) Do they want to star in the musical version of “Das Kapital”? 4) Do they think America consists of Manhattan, Cambridge and Marin County, plus the hinterlands? 5)

Do they have pink taffeta tutus hanging in their closets and insist their friends call them Miss Mabel?

Question: What do you get when you cross Cindy Sheehan with John Murtha? Answer: A New York Times editorial writer.

What connects the Times disclosure of a sensitive intelligence operation (while Americans are dying in the war on terrorism) and its insistence on cramming an amnesty down our throats is a blinding hatred for America.

The New York Times wants America to lose the war on terrorism. Immigration is the elite's own weapon of mass destruction. Along with multiculturalism, bilingualism, hate-crimes legislation and quotas, they are using it to deconstruct America.

They dream of an America where the majority will feel no loyalty to the land, the flag or the heritage it represents, an America without a national language (where a fragmented population will babble at each other in a multitude of tongues), an America too divided to assert itself internationally, an America without borders, where a de facto merger of the United States and Mexico has been achieved, an America where government and multinational corporations will rule every aspect of our lives.

Finally, the Times' editorial moves from anger to absurdity. "The American people Deserve action on a good immigration bill (*read: amnesty plus guest wreckers*), and if this do-nothing Congress won't give it to them, they should elect a Congress that will."

Imagine Middle America taking to the streets, carrying banners that read "Hey, hey, ho, ho – America's borders have got to go!", "Give us Another 60 Million Peons, or Give Us Death," "It's Not An Amnesty; It's Just Rewarding Lawbreakers," and

“National Identity? We Don’t Need No Stinkin’ National Identity!”

That will be just down the street from the Jews for Hamas, the Veterans for Fonda, the Sex-Abuse Survivors for Bill Clinton and the Baptists for Gay Marriage demonstrations.

(This commentary was originally published at Front Page Magazine.com)