A side-issue for Diane Macunovich is demonstrating the consequences of immigration for the number of births, world-wide. Reading any row of Table IV (21(2), 176) from left to right one sees considerable detail. The table shows, says Macunovich, that immigration from any high-fertility, third world country into the United States results in fewer total births for the planet. The departures induce a higher fertility rate among those left in the third world country but this effect is offset, according to Macunovich's calculations, by the much lower fertility induced among natives in the host country. Lower fertility in the host, or immigrant-receiving, country is due to the labor market effect: immigration increases the competition for jobs, depresses the wages of native-born workers and more recent arrivals, and lowers the number of children they want or, indeed, ever have.

Taking Table IV at face value and reading across, say, the top row (Bangladesh in 1965), one sees that a hypothetical 90,000 emigrants leaving Bangladesh to come to the United States removes 302,000 births from Bangladesh. When these immigrants come to the United States, the result is 89,000 fewer births in the United States, assuming that the immigrant fertility rate remains unchanged.

Recalling that numbers in the table are in thousands, I first read this top row to mean (as Macunovich later avers [on p. 21 of manuscript]) that 90 Bangladeshi immigrants result in 89 fewer births (-89) to current residents of the United States. That is, approximately one birth to current U.S. residents (mostly native-born Americans) is foregone for each additional
immigrant who comes to the United States. But, dearly beloved, clear as the matter appears on its face, I think that my first reading—even if it is what Macunovich reiterates—was wrong.

The number $-89$ in Column 5 is a net number. It summarizes two phantom columns that precede it. These columns would show: 1) the addition of 302 immigrant births in the United States—these are the births removed from Bangladesh and brought to the United States by immigrants, and 2) the 391 births foregone by native-born and resident Americans. This number of American births foregone is dictated by arithmetic: if $302 - x = -89$, then $x = -391$.

Why does Macunovich not show us the total number of births foregone by native-born Americans and current residents? Why also does she fail to clearly show that immigrants coming to the United States simply transfer their high fertility from the third world to the industrialized world? Table IV is relatively explicit except for omission of these phantom columns.

Interestingly, the omitted columns contain a fact and a conclusion that would be salient for many Americans. That fact is that births which immigrants do not have in their country of origin become U.S. births. The conclusion, that on account of immigration, native-born Americans forgo a very large number of children they would otherwise have had, is astonishing.

Macunovich ends her discussion with a disclaimer. The replacement of native-born American births "is more an ethical than an economic question—one which requires soul-searching on our part, if we feel that a birth to a current U.S. resident should be preferred over a birth to a new resident" (p. 21 in manuscript). But, given that the presentation obscures the magnitude of the immigrant effect on U.S. fertility, is this disclaimer disingenuous?

It would not be the first time that a scholar of highest repute weighed in on immigration policy through presenting findings in a way that redirects the reader’s attention from a truth that might be disturbing. Most egregious within the recent past is a publication that appeared in *Science* by chief demographer of the Population Council, John Bongaarts.

The Oct. 16, 1998 issue of *Science* describes an increase in the U.S. fertility rate, "from 1.77 to 2.08 births per woman between 1975 and 1990" (Bongaarts, 1998, p. 420). In the mid-1970s, in fact, American women had reduced their fertility rate to below replacement level, so their childbearing at young ages was low by historic standards. Extrapolating that fertility behavior to the remainder of their reproductive careers gave the appearance, but only the appearance, states Bongaarts, of very low completed fertility. He then offers the reader his conclusion that these de-