The University of Florida (UFL) is posting an online guide for employers who hire foreign guest workers even as American college students face the toughest job market in decades. Specifically, they show that guest workers are exempt from social security taxes.

The federal government, for its part, shows that imported employees in amusement parks, where yours truly spent a quarter of his college employment, fall into this category as well. Call it the 7 percent solution for such employers, already facing declining profits and exorbitant overhead during troubled times and anxious to cut costs wherever possible.

What it portends for the native-born labor force at the entry-level, whom institutions such as UFL claim to care about deeply, is another story. By law, employers have to go to the extra expense of paying the social security taxes of entry-level employees born in the USA. (By the way, this is about the largest tax paid by and for the poor.)

“More than 900,000 H-2B guest worker visas for seasonal non-agricultural work were issued between 1994 and 2009,” Steven A. Camerota and Karen Jensenius write in a backgrounder from the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS). “Created in 1990, the annual number of H-2B visas rose from 10,400 in 1994 to a peak of 129,547 in 2007.”

“In addition, nearly four million J visas (excluding family members) were issued to exchange visitors between 1994 and 2009 in 12 different programs,” they report. “About two-thirds of all exchange visitors in the United States are working, rather than studying or doing research.”

“While many J visa workers are likely not in competition with teenagers, between 2001-2007 1.19 million ex- _continues on page 2_
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change workers were issued for Au Pair, Camp Counselor, Intern, Summer Work/Travel, and J-1 Trainees. Many of these individuals work in occupations that often employ large numbers of teenagers.”

“There is also the Q-1 visa, sometimes referred to as the “Disney visa.” Created in 1990 at the request of the owners of large theme parks, from 1994 to 2009 24,789 Q-1 visas were issued.” Moreover, they note, “the immigrants are overwhelmingly adults over age 20.”

The employment picture such jobs are a part of is a bleak one, Camerota and Jensenius show. “The summer of 2009 was the worst summer ever experienced by U.S.-born teenagers (16-19) since citizenship data was first collected in 1994,” they write. “Just 45 percent were in the labor force, which means they worked or were looking for work.”

“Only one-third actually held a job.” Yet and still, for those who would seek out the usual suspect, these trends played out similarly across not only racial but also economic lines.

“The severity of the decline is similar for U.S.-born black, Hispanic, and white teens,” Camerota and Jensenius discovered. “Between 1994 and 2007 the summer labor force participation of black teens declined from 50 to 35 percent; for Hispanic teens from 52 to 37 percent; and for whites it declined 69 to 55 percent.”

“The fall-off is also similar for U.S.-born teenagers from both high- and low-income households.” That the decline which cannot be hidden is tied to immigration is something that Camerota and Jensenius demonstrate, perhaps more persuasively than any social scientists who have attempted to find such a link ever have.

“Comparisons across states in 2007 show that in the 10 states where immigrants are the largest share of workers, just 45 percent of U.S.-born teens were in the summer labor force, compared to 58 percent in the 10 states where immigrants are the smallest share of workers,” Camerota and Jensenius reveal. “Looking at change over time shows that in the 10 states where immigrants increased the most as a share of workers, labor force participation of U.S.-born teenagers declined 17 percentage points.”

“In the 10 states where immigrants increased the least, teen labor force participation declined 9 percent.”

“Teens work a lot more in Pennsylvania than in California,” Camerota said at a press conference on May 12, 2010 when CIS released the study.

Even babysitting jobs are getting hard-to-come-by. At the CIS event, Howard University historian Daryl Scott noted that people are increasingly relying on imported au pairs and governesses for such tasks.

For his part, B. Lindsay Lowell of Georgetown, also at the conference, argues that other government programs and policies, such as minimum wage laws, also serve to push up teen unemployment. Lowell, who was also present at the CIS meeting, claimed that studies show that raising base pay by government fiat pushes joblessness among the young up at least slightly.

Lowell is the director of Policy Studies for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown.
GOOD OLD BOYS RULE

David Cameron’s new coalition government may not be everyone’s cup of tea, but after 13 years of the Labour Party calling the shots, certain Brits are breating a sigh of relief that class, status and old school ties are back in style.

For one thing, Eton graduates like journalist James Fergusson no longer feel like they have to hide their pedigrees and “tone down their upper-crust pronunciation,” according to the Wall Street Journal. As a former classmate of David Cameron’s at Eton, Fergusson said that during the Labour tenure, there “was an assumption that the days of Etonians in high office were over,” until . . . “bang, along comes David Cameron.”

This is truly a different group of leaders. For starters, the new Tory and Lib Dem officials are far more likely to come from wealth and privilege than their Labour counterparts. This of course means top-of-the-line prep schools followed in most cases by Oxford and Cambridge.

Apparently Oxford has “a special stranglehold on the top job: Of UK prime ministers since 1940 who attended university, only one – Gordon Brown – didn’t go to Oxford.”

Although the “old boys” are back in power again, it may be only a matter of time until status and “posh” fade into the mist, due to Britain’s increase in ethnic population, said sociology prof Anthony Heath.

Meanwhile, newly elected conservative MP Jacob Rees-Mogg recalls that during his Eton days, the school would routinely “head up two lists: the highest number of old boys as MPs and the highest number in jail.” He attributes both statistics to the fact that Eton always encouraged students to develop their individuality.

DO CARTOONS MAKE YOU FAT?

Is the U.S. government’s anti-obesity campaign already spinning out of control? One of the latest targets is apparently none other than “SpongeBob SquarePants,” whose association with unhealthy, calorie-laden food might just get him hauled up before a food court – or a Congressional committee – for leading kids astray.

Fortunately, an “interagency panel” is already on the case, according to the American Thinker, which reported that the President’s “comprehensive review of the issue, coupled with Michelle’s expertise, all but guarantee a speedy resolution to the problem of corpulent kiddies.”

Since the task force has already suggested that cartoon characters only be associated with healthy food products, SpongeBob could become an endangered species if he and his cartoon cohorts like Krabby Patty refuse to play by the rules.

However, late word has it that SquarePants and Nickelodeon are already making “frantic adjustments that include SpongeBob’s image appearing on packages of carrots, spinach and citrus.” But they’ll have to stay one step ahead of the feds when they learn that Mr. SquarePants’s image is still “plastered all over supermarket shelves, stocked with sugary, diabetes-causing SpongeBob SquarePants cereal, frozen Popsicle pop-ups and containers of Breyers Cookie Dough ice cream.”

The upside of this relentless campaign to monitor our food choices is this: It might actually inspire parents to come up with a couple of new child-rearing approaches, i.e. “instead of offering lollipops and cookies, they can say instead, ‘If you clean your room, you won’t have to eat beets and sautéed okra tonight.’”
SQUEAKY CHALK

THE ART OF PROTEST

The AP recently reported that “A Swedish artist who angered Muslims by depicting the Prophet Muhammad as a dog was assaulted Tuesday as furious protesters interrupted his university lecture about the limits of artistic freedom.

“Lars Vilks told the Associated Press a man leaped from the front row and head-butted him as he was delivering his speech, breaking Vilks’s glasses, but leaving him uninjured. Two people were arrested but it wasn’t immediately clear whether the attacker was among them.

“A video clip of the incident by a Swedish newspaper showed police using pepper spray and batons to hold off an angry crowd shouting ‘God is great’ in Arabic after Vilks was escorted out of the lecture hall.

“Vilks has faced numerous threats over his controversial drawing of Muhammad with a dog’s body, but Tuesday’s incident was the first time he has been physically abused.”

ANTHI-HELICOPTER PARENTING

In a world where some parents actually follow their offspring to college to do their laundry, it is refreshing to note that someone like author Laura Bennett speaks for the other side – the side that says, “Hey wait a minute, what about me?”

Bennett’s book, Didn’t I Feed You Yesterday? takes the obsessive, overly protective parenting cult head-on, and offers in return, the philosophy of a happy laissez faire parent. No stressed out mom is she – a married mother of six children – yes SIX – with a career to boot (she was a recent contestant on TV’s Project Runway), this is a woman who has never needed Parenting 101 classes.

The author, who definitely has a politically incorrect take on parenting, notes that the advantage of having six children is that “if I lose one somewhere, there are extras.” Fortunately for readers, Bennett chooses not to provide an instructional manual for her brand of parenting, but simply a witty commentary on her life, along with the humorous realization that her views are at odds with most of her peers. What she seems to be saying to over-educated mothers is “Calm Down. Enjoy your life. Don’t get so stressed.”

Bennett says that while some parents thrive on experiencing every precious moment of their child’s education, “which includes warding off the slightest bit of separation anxiety,” she’s not one of them. For example, her six year old doesn’t always need her around, “as evidenced the first time he walked into his classroom, comfortable and confident, looked around and intoned: ‘Where the hell is my cubby?’”

Bennett says she does not want readers to think that she views raising children as a piece of cake. Far from it, notes the author, adding that “child rearing is war, and children are worthy opponents.”

She believes that one of the most challenging experiences for parents is driving with children in the car. For example, “vehicular discipline” can escalate quickly when one of the kids says, “He’s touching me.” This seemingly innocuous comment can move a small conflict into serious terrain when the kids “move out of their seat belts to start duking it out” and the van suddenly becomes “a mobile version of Fight Club.”
ANATOMY OF AN ACTIVIST

By Malcolm A. Kline

The nomination of Solicitor General Elena Kagan to the U. S. Supreme Court gives us a chance to reflect, not so much on her qualifications for the bench but how her career trajectory illustrates the manner in which academia provides an outlet for activism, perhaps at the expense of scholarship.

We can see this trend illustrated in the endpoints of the arc of Kagan’s private sector career, from her senior thesis at Princeton to her tenure as dean of Harvard Law. In the former, she lamented that, “In our own times, a coherent socialist movement is nowhere to be found in the United States.” In the latter milieu, she refused to allow military recruiters on campus.

“Americans are more likely to speak of a golden past than of a golden future, of capitalism’s glories than of socialism’s greatness,” she wrote in her three-decades-old dissertation. “Conformity overrides dissent; the desire to conserve has overwhelmed the urge to alter.”

“Such a state of affairs cries out for an explanation.” This she had endeavored to do in the previous 126 pages of the paper, which was entitled, “To the Final Conflict: Socialism in New York City, 1900-1933.”

In the acknowledgements she writes, “Finally, I would like to thank my brother Marc, whose involvement in radical causes led me to explore the history of American radicalization in the hope of clarifying my political views.” This she clearly did in her conclusion.

“The story is a sad but chastening one for those who, more than half a century after socialism’s decline, still wish to change America,” she concludes. “Radicals have often succumbed to the devastating bane of sectarianism; it is easier, after all, to fight one’s fellows than it is to battle an entrenched and powerful foe.”

“Yet if the history of Local [Sic] New York shows anything, it is that American radicals cannot afford to become their own worst enemies. In unity lies their only hope.”

To be fair, the paper does what it sets out to do in an extensively, documented, reasonably well-written fashion. Nevertheless, there is one curious omission in the draft, delivered on April 15, 1981.

She writes about how the defection of socialists to the Communist party drained the socialists of members and cites one of the prominent defectors—John Reed. What she does not even note in passing is Reed’s disillusionment with the Soviet Union itself, where he is buried.

Reed’s epiphany is so well-known among his admirers and detractors alike that even auteur Warren Beatty, not a right-wing zealot by any means, felt compelled to devote about one-third of his mostly adulatory three-hour biopic on Reed to it.

Now let’s go back to the future. Elaine Donnelly of the Center for Military Readiness notes, “It is unfortunate that President Barack Obama has chosen to replace the only military veteran on the Supreme Court with extensive wartime experience with a nominee whose only significant record indicates deliberate hostility and opposition to laws protecting the culture and best interests of the American military.”

“Senators considering this nomination should question Elena Kagan’s flawed logic and anti-military attitude that she expressed by signing an amicus brief challenging the Solomon Amendment in Rumsfeld v. Fair,” Donnelly continued. “It is significant that the
Continued from page 5

U.S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of that legislation, which protects equal access for military recruiters on college campuses, with a unanimous (8-0) vote. Even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg did not agree with Kagan’s anti-military views.”

“In addition, Elena Kagan’s record as Solicitor General should be considered a serious problem. In her current capacity, Kagan failed to appeal the unjustified and problematic procedural ruling of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in a case challenging the 1993 law stating that homosexuals are not eligible for military service.”

In between the presidential elections of 1980 and the 2008 contest, Kagan has also penned 5 law review articles, an unusually low total for a law school professor, let alone a dean. In an article which appeared in the Harvard Law Review in 2001, Kagan wrote, “In the first month of his tenure, Reagan issued an executive order creating a mechanism by which the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), an entity within the Executive Office of the President (EOP), would review all major regulations of executive branch agencies.”

“As Reagan’s and then Bush’s terms proceeded, and the antiregulatory effects of this system of review became increasingly evident, administrative law scholars took part in a sharp debate about its propriety. With the advent of the Clinton Administration, however, this debate receded. Although President Clinton issued his own executive order providing for OMB review of regulations, the terms of this order struck most observers as moderating the aggressive approach to oversight of administration taken in the Reagan and Bush Presidencies.

“Perhaps as important, the Clinton OMB chose to implement the order in a way generally sympathetic to regulatory efforts. Because objections to OMB review in the Reagan and Bush era arose in large part from its deregulatory tendencies, this reversal of substantive direction contributed to the waning of interest in, and even recognition of, the involvement of the President and his EOP staff in administration.”

Well, two out of three ain’t bad. Certainly, the history of the Reagan years shows that the fortieth president was committed rhetorically and substantively to halting the growth of the regulatory state, if not dismantling it.

Conversely, President Clinton’s efforts were, as a matter of equally documentable record, and Kagan footnotes same, in the opposite direction. Yet lumping the Gipper in with his successor is, to put it mildly, misleading.

As Bush won election and assembled his transition team in order to take over from Ronald Reagan:
- The federal share of the Gross Domestic Product was going down as was;
- The federal budget deficit as were;
- The number of new pages of regulations in the Federal Register.

Within Bush’s quartet of years as chief executive, all but the last of these timelines would be reversed, and pointing in the direction they have been heading in ever since. Moreover, despite Bush’s passive image, all of the above was accomplished, chiefly, through his active initiatives including:
- The Americans with Disabilities Act;
- The Civil Rights Act of 1990;
- The Clean Air Act of 1990; and
- The 1990 Budget Deal.
Dear Reader,

In these pages we ceaselessly point out where so-called scholarship in higher education is wanting. Yet and still, in stark contrast to our own economic picture, it is lucrative and plentiful.

Moreover, unlike the fortunes of other fields of employment, those of institutions of higher learning have, if anything, improved in the recent economic downturn. According to HigherEdJobs.com:

- “Despite the vast fall-off in overall U.S. employment due to the recession, the total number of jobs in higher education remains stable and continues to follow normal historical patterns.
- “While the number of jobs in higher education has remained relatively stable, the number of advertised job openings, which decreased dramatically during the recession, experienced significant growth during the first quarter of 2010.
- “The ratio of faculty to non-faculty postings was down during the first quarter of 2010 compared to the year before, but was still higher than pre-recession levels.
- “The number of jobs at community colleges continues to increase while the percentage of job openings from community colleges declines slightly.
- “The ratio of part-time postings in higher education continues to rise, although the rate of growth may be moderating in 2010.”

Meanwhile, the University of California at San Diego lists their predicted hot jobs for college grads. The UCSD top 10 list includes:

1. Healthcare information technology.
2. Mobile media.
3. Data mining.
4. Embedded engineering.
5. Geriatric healthcare.
6. Occupational health and safety.
7. Spanish/English translation and interpretation.
8. Sustainable business practices and the greening of all jobs.
10. Teaching English as a foreign language.

Apparently, they didn’t notice that all of these positions are dependent on the productive end of the economy. Where is that latter portion going to come from?

All the best,

Mal Kline
Executive Director