

# The Myth of Immigration

© Michael Hagos 2002, Malmö. All rights reserved.

The refugee crisis around the world is, as a matter of opinion, a backlash effect of U.S. and EU foreign policy, since the U.S. and the EU shape policies that serve, in significant measure, their own agendas at the expense of the Third World.

In the long run, if the West implements smart, viable socio-economic programs that lead to sustainable growth in Third World countries, they can almost certainly count on a sharp decrease in refugee traffic, for they will then have created enough incentive for wannabe refugees not to flee from their economically impoverished countries in search of greener pastures. And for those political refugees who are compelled by *force majeure* events to leave their countries for safety reasons, the West must implement speedy and effective processing for them, so that they can become an asset to their new-found countries before red tape breaks their morale, after which they are not much use to themselves, much less their new communities. In this respect, Denmark set in mid-May (followed by Britain, Italy and now even Spain) a disastrous precedent by prolonging refugee application procedures to a full seven years, during which time public assistance for refugees will be cut back significantly. The neo-Nazi movement in Europe (now also well-advanced in Holland, Belgium and Austria, according to local polls), which seems to be permanently rooting itself in the political arena, will not serve European interests in the long run.

Here is why: as a matter of fact, North America, Europe, Japan and Australia have very low birth and fertility rates, below “replacement level.” Such rates are unprecedented and incredible. So much so that in the long run the West has much more to lose than to gain by going wobbly on immigration. Immigration is the key to Western growth and prosperity. Without it, not only would it lose its competitive edge in many areas, but the economic ramifications will be devastating, affecting pension funds, tax revenues, military budgets, and a long list of other fiscal strains. (sic) (These thoughts are extracted from the source mentioned below.)

For example, “Europe has already begun ‘de-populating’; Japan will follow soon, according to UN projections, which show Europe losing 124 million people by 2050, while its median age climbs to about 50. Over time, if it weren’t for immigration, [the West] would stop growing and perhaps begin slowly depopulating. Such a no-growth, ageing West could find it hard to lead in what may be a long struggle among civilisations.” (See Washington Post from March 30, 2002, by Ben Wattenberg, *Don’t Wobble on Immigration*, [washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com); p. A17)

In sum, it should not be overlooked that the negative domino effect in immigration policies throughout those European countries that aren’t being led by the extreme right, is a counter-measure against losing voters support to neo-Nazi and fascist parties.

---

© Michael Hagos 2002, Malmö  
All rights reserved.

*Editors Note: The Lundian is grateful to Mr. Hagos for sharing his views and opinions on this matter. Submissions should be 500 words or less, spell checked, spaced 1.5 and submitted by email to [thelundian@hotmail.com](mailto:thelundian@hotmail.com). All material is submitted on a pro bono basis. We do not pay for articles.*