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UCSD Emeriti Association
How Should We Fix Immigration?

By Wayne A. Cornelius
Dickson Professor and Theodore Gildred Professor of U.S.-Mexican Relations, Emeritus
Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Emeritus

In the spring semester this year I was hauled back into the classroom to teach a course on the comparative politics of immigration at Portland’s Reed College. The students’ main assignment was to design a piece of legislation on comprehensive immigration reform (CIR) for the United States. It had to contain at least six pages and as many as six policy proposals, grounded in the research data. The legislation also had to be politically realistic – i.e., able to attract enough votes for passage in both houses of Congress. It had to improve the status quo without a lot of unintended consequences. All in all, a formidable challenge for undergraduates, and I daresay, for the U.S. political class, which has failed five times in the last 18 years to enact CIR, and which remains paralyzed on the issue at this writing.

What would I put into my own CIR proposal? Here goes: I begin by stipulating that by January 2021, or some date beyond that, both houses of Congress will be under Democratic control, preferably by a veto-proof majority. Nothing will happen on CIR until that condition obtains, since the Republican Party has made a religion of restricting immigration and asylum-seeking, in ways that would be unacceptable even to centrist Democrats in Congress.

Sensible immigration policy design must begin with a correct definition of the “problem” to be fixed. I suggest viewing immigration in 21st Century America not as a problem but as an essential solution to one of our most fundamental problems: the yawning demographic deficits that we have in meeting the economy’s labor requirements and financing public services.

The United States faces the challenge of replacing 76 million retiring baby boomers, at a time when total labor force growth has fallen sharply, from an annual average of five percent in the 1970s to less than one percent since 2000. Combined with population aging and reduced tax payments of older workers, the United States has little slack to spend on budgets for programs like Medicare and Social Security. The dependency ratio—the number of active workers versus the number of retired—projected to climb steeply in the next 30 years. Former Federal Reserve chairman Ben Bernanke had it right. In October 2006, he told Congress: “We need a more liberal immigration policy to ease the burden of a shrinking workforce.” In fact, Bernanke pointed out, we would need an annual inflow of nearly 3.5 million immigrants—not the 1 million per year being admitted under current policy—to replace the baby boomers. Ben Bernanke

The point of departure must be immigration reform legislation that includes a generous path toward legalization for the approximately 11 million undocumented immigrants now living here. Keeping them in illegal status indefinitely benefits no one, and it stunts their human capital development. It is fantasy to expect them to self-enforce emsae, if only we make life truly miserable for them, by restricting access to formal sector employment and basic human health care aid of the future is unlikely to be a robot.

These challenges are common to all advanced industrialized countries today. Indeed, most of those nations are at a considerably more advanced point in their demographic transition, facing absolute population declines in the tens of millions plus rapid aging population. Because the U.S. received large numbers of immigrants in the 1990s and 2000s, we are in a much less dire position. The total fertility rate of 1.77 children per woman is well below the 2.1 population “replacement” level. But the rate would be even lower if it were not being propped up by immigrants whose childmaking exceeds that of native-born Americans—for now. The immigrants’ descendants are likely to mirror the low fertility rate of the general U.S. population. It’s time to think seriously about how immigration policy might be used to address our fundamental demographic and fiscal imbalances.

“We need a more liberal immigration policy to ease the burden of a shrinking workforce.” In fact, Bernanke pointed out, we would need an annual inflow of nearly 3.5 million immigrants—not the 1 million per year being admitted under current policy—to replace the baby boomers. Ben Bernanke

The point of departure must be immigration reform legislation that includes a generous path toward legalization for the approximately 11 million undocumented immigrants now living here. Keeping them in illegal status indefinitely benefits no one, and it stunts their human capital development. It is fantasy to expect them to self-enforce emsae, if only we make life truly miserable for them, by restricting access to formal sector employment and basic health

unpredictability of student choice? I don’t know the answers to those questions. But the situation raises concerns about the future of the humanities and particular campus departments. In too many departments, students are graduating without having been exposed to the work of great minds. And what’s worse, they are not even aware of the existence of these departments because they are simply not taught.

In the case of science and engineering, research has advanced to the point that a faculty member without research funding is no longer in the game. These days competition for federal research grants is simply outrageous. Department chairs face having to put together million-dollar packages for incoming assistant professors. And very few professors are required to spend more and more time raising money to support their graduate students and their projects. We say that we need more people in STEM disciplines, but the academic job market can still be fiercely competitive for bright young Phds. And we punish our professors when they try to maintain sufficient autonomy. Kerr’s essential task as pres-ident was to ensure that the University of the 1960s became an institution of human capital development, not an empire. He succeeded brilliantly--but not completely. Over time, the Regents and the president continued to delegate authority to the campus level. As president, I tried to do my part. I considered empowering chancellors and their campuses to be absolutely essential to the future of the University. But I have another view about UC governance that will probably be less popular. When I was a chancellor I was always a fresh opportunity to make the case for the University of California. We will have that opportunity in January, and I have high hopes.

Some of the things I’ve said to-night may leave you with the impression that I am pessimistic about UC’s future. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am a believer in the research university’s resilience and its genius for adaptation. And I am convinced of its lasting im-portance in a world facing the kind of world future generations will want to live in. So let me end these remarks where I began—with Clark Kerr and The Uses of the University: “Higher education in the United States is built on three-and-a-half centuries of triumph, not tragedy.” I am truly convinced that the future may be harder to come by. Yet I believe that a significant share of those triumphs will be achieved right here at the University of California. It is and will remain one of the most exciting institutions in the world. Drawn from remarks at the award ceremony in Berkeley, December 5, 2018 in which Atkinson and C. Jud-son King, formerly UC Senior Vice President, were both awarded the Clark Kerr Medal by the UC Berke-ley Academic Senate. For an ac-count of Atkinson’s presidency see Patricia A. Pelfrey, Entrepreneurial President (UC Press, 2012), reviewed in Chronicles (September, 2012).
Canada is now admitting about 6 times as many refugees as we are, on administration has radically restrict-ed the grounds for claiming asylum, while jacking up the denial rate. None of these policies required Con-gressional approval, so they can be

Most asylum-seekers reaching our southern border today are from three Central American countries – Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salva-dor – which have high levels of gang
and drug violence as well as exten-

administration has been cutting such

Finally, it is long past time for the United States to have a proactive, national-level policy to promote the integration of immigrants into our
society. Canada and other industrial-
ized nations have such policies, and they are largely successful. Canada’s policy emphasizes public-private partnerships; most government fund-
ing for immigrant integration is

organizations. A key focus should be providing easy access to programs that acceler-ate English acquisition in the context
build job and language skills simulta-neously already operate in California and Washington state. In addition, ESL instruction is offered by thou-

relatives of U.S. citizens are un-
capped.) There is also a seven per-
cent annual cap on visas issued to nationals of a given country, within each of four visa preference catego-
ries. These numerical limits com-
bine with strong visa demand in some countries to produce enor-mous backlogs. Green-card appli-cants from countries like India, Chi-
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and bio-medical companies, insti-
tutes, and facilities. In talking about universal ac-
cess today, we would make explicit what is implied in Kerr’s use of that term: namely, the promise of equal opportunity for students of every race, ethnicity, and gender, without regard to family income. The past few decades have been marked by both backward and forward move-
ment on that front. The 1995 debate over banning affirmative action in UC admissions sparked a fight on the Board of Regents that spilled over into many areas of university
life, from state budgets to shared governance. Jud King and I spent
many months (in close partnership with the Academic Senate and the Council of Chancellors) forging new admissions policies for UC’s post- affirmative-action act. We
should just mention the most important principle underlying the admissions policies: the idea that students should be de-
serve to be judged not only on grades and test scores but also on

the educational and life challenges they have faced, and by how well they have dealt with those challeng-
es. The shorthand term for this ap-proach is “opportunity to learn,” and it means an admissions process that gives appropriate weight to grades and test scores but also to context and character. I believe this has served the University and our stu-
dents well. Overall, our progress in diversity may not be as rapid as we would wish. But it has been far bet-
ter than the prospects looked in the fall of 1995, after the controversial Regents’ vote ending affirmative action. And we have done incredi-

ly well in enrolling low-income students. That is something we can all be proud of.

Third, the quality of graduate-
education is better today than ever, despite large classes and in-
creasing dependence on part-time lecturers. Since I stepped down as president, I have spent a lot of time with de-
graduates and undergraduates and have been quite impressed. What we expect of

our students these days is absolutely remarkable, and they have responded accordingly. In my opinion, UC un-
dergraduates are among the best in the world. I do admit, however, that it may be too easy for at least some of them to choose courses lacking rigorous intellectual content in the interest of avoiding subjects they consider too tough. (Good grades weigh heavily on the minds of young people, given the current tilt toward vocational education.) I wonder whether we might lure more students into taking demanding subjects if the courses themselves were made a lit-
tle less demanding.

Fourth, an observation about the progress of online learning. When I became president in 1995, I was con-fident that online instruction was at the cusp of a great leap forward. I was mistaken. Not about the poten-
tial of online learning, but about the state of the art. We now have the basic technology and computing power for elegant interactive courses, but so far, at least, they have not put together quite in the right fast fashion. What is critical is making them relevant and adaptable to the individual student. That was chal-

enging enough back in the 1960s, when a Stanford colleague and I cre-
ated computer-based courses in read-

ing and mathematics for elementary school students. It is much more challenging to do at the college level. The courses I have seen are just not interactive or intellectually challeng-
ing enough. I have never had any doubt that online instruction would flourish one day, but I am surprised that this day seems so slow in com-
ing.

Fifth, I have some worries about the growing professional burdens on our faculty. Two examples, from different disciplines. The first is the decline in students majoring in the humanities. There is a growing liter-

ari, pro and con ...
sands of NGOs around the country. Why not channel federal funding through such programs? Participation in adult ESL is the single fastest path to higher wages, more stable employment, and more successful navigation of our health care and education systems. When did you last hear a presidential candidate talk about that?

Future attempts to enact comprehensive immigration reform should not get bogged down in further, sterile debates over “border security.” A huge accumulation of evidence from field interviews—including fifteen years of studies by UCSD’s Mexican Migration Field Research Program—suggests that investing additional billions in physical border fortifications located in remote areas is the least cost-effective approach to reducing unauthorized immigration. But to win enough votes for Congressional approval, any CIR legislation must have a border security component. My recommendation would be to invest in staffing up scrutiny of people and vehicles at our legal ports of entry, through which upwards of one-third of unauthorized entries occur (not to mention more than 90 percent of illicit drugs).

Cracking down on visa-overstayers, who now significantly outnumber migrants who enter clandestinely, would also make more sense than border barrier-building. But the U.S. lacks a computerized system for tracking entries and exits, despite repeated Congressional mandates. Moreover, identifying and removing large numbers of over-stayers would be extremely disruptive. Those who have lived here for more than ten years (the median, according to national-level survey data) should be offered a path to permanent legal status.

How far down the demographic implosion rabbit hole must we go before the political conditions exist for rational, evidence-based immigration policy-making? Probably not before labor shortages become so widespread and structural—that is, not tied to the business cycle—that they cannot be ignored by most members of the general public. At that point, Bernanke-level increases in legal immigration admissions may be necessary to avoid crippling the nation’s economic performance. The zero-sum political calculus that currently paralyzes federal immigration policymaking will weaken, and at least some politicians will even come to see electoral benefit in embracing less restrictive policies. Stranger things have happened!

By Richard C. Atkinson
Chancellor Emeritus and UC President Emeritus

This award recognizes a lasting gift the Berkeley faculty has made to the University of California and American higher education—namely, the leadership and legacy of Clark Kerr. For many of us, both are crystallized in his 1963 Godkin Lectures at Harvard. The lectures were published as The Uses of the University and were further enriched by a series of reflections and considerations Kerr added to each of its five editions. Few writers of any subject have distilled so much thought and insight into a mere 95 pages. He had a remarkable ability to describe the broad evolution of the American university without losing touch with the essential subplots. In re-reading the last edition, I was struck by his division of the history of the research university into four stages.

The initial two stages cover 130 years—from 1810 to 1940. The first (1810–1870) is defined by the growing influence of German ideas about higher education (brought back by Americans who had studied there) and by the 1862 Land-Grant College Act. Early in the second stage (1870–1940), the triumph of the German research university model is established with the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876. Research at public and private universities grows at a very gradual pace during this stage—teaching remains the primary faculty responsibility.

The third stage—the fifty years from 1940 to 1990—encompasses the research university’s enormous expansion in students, faculty, academic quality, and engagement with society. Near the end of World War II, Franklin Roosevelt asks his science adviser, Vannevar Bush, for a plan on how to organize science in the post-war era. Bush’s 1945 report, Science: The Endless Frontier, lays the foundation for what has become the nation’s science policy. A key feature of the policy is that these universities are assigned principal responsibility for the conduct of basic research. What follows is the establishment of the National Science Foundation and the reorganization of the National Institutes of Health and other federal agencies to provide extramural grants and contracts for university research—almost all of them awarded for peer-reviewed projects. The federal government’s massive investment in both research and education continues, with some fluctuations, throughout the third stage. It is the high point of a golden age for research universities that Kerr felt was destined never to return.

The final stage—1990 to the present day—is characterized by Kerr, with some understatement, as “an era of constrained resources.” This is our era, whose contours we know all too well, and the one I want to talk about. I don’t intend to present a comprehensive vision of what these years have meant for the University of California or what the future holds. Instead I want to offer a few observations on some of the encouraging, worrisome, or surprising developments of this period as it looks to me today, fifteen years after I stepped down as president. My list includes seven topics (for cognitive psychologists like me who study memory, seven is a magic number).

First, as I’m sure you’ve noticed, we have been through some very bad times together. The nation’s recovery from the depths of the 2008 recession continues to be strong, but unfortunately, federal and state funding for universities has not kept pace. What looked like a fiscal crisis of limited duration in 2008 now looks like a new steady state. Unless current trends change, ten years from now there will be many universities which will no longer be able to call themselves research universities. It goes without saying that the University of California will not be one of them.

We have faculty leadership to thank for that. No faculty in the country has compiled a more brilliant record of success. This is still Kerr’s California—a subject to which I will return. Second, there are nonetheless some continuities with the world Kerr knew in 1963. In his account, three large forces were driving research policies at the time. These are still important goals that must we go before the political conditions exist for rational, evidence-based immigration policy-making? Probably not before labor shortages become so widespread and structural—that is, not tied to the business cycle—that they cannot be ignored by most members of the general public. At that point, Bernanke-level increases in legal immigration admissions may be necessary to avoid crippling the nation’s economic performance. The zero-sum political calculus that currently paralyzes federal immigration policymaking will weaken, and at least some politicians will even come to see electoral benefit in embracing less restrictive policies. Stranger things have happened!
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Climate change is a gloomy and depressing topic in some ways, and it is already causing human suffering and damage to the natural world, but as an intellectual adventure and an inspiring scientific success story, it is one of the most motivating issues we face. For example, in 2018, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released its Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and their Implications for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. The report concludes that limiting global warming to 1.5°C could entail significant challenges and may require rapid and far-reaching changes in almost all aspects of society. The report emphasizes the urgent need for immediate action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

The report highlights several key points:

- Limiting global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels would require significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and a transition to a low-carbon and resilient society.
- To achieve this target, global greenhouse gas emissions need to be reduced by 45% by 2030 and reach net-zero by 2050.
- Adaptation measures are crucial, particularly in vulnerable regions and sectors.
- There are economic and social benefits to limiting global warming to 1.5°C, including reduced public health impacts, reduced costs of climate change adaptation, and increased resilience to climate change.

The report also emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and collective action to address climate change. It highlights the need for developed countries to provide financial and technical support to developing countries to help them adapt to the impacts of climate change and transition to a low-carbon and sustainable future.

In conclusion, the IPCC Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels provides a clear and urgent call to action. It underscores the need for immediate and coordinated efforts to mitigate climate change and adapt to its impacts, ensuring a sustainable and resilient future for all.
Walter Munk - Education, Awards and Recognition

- BS and MS in physics from Caltech,
- PhD in Geophysics from UCLA, and oceanography from Scripps Institution of Oceanography.
- Appointed to Scripps Institution of Oceanography faculty in 1947
- Served in the United States Army Ski Battalion for a year as an oceanographer with the University of California Division of War Research, and as a meteorologist for the Army Air Corps.
- Named a Guggenheim Fellow three times in 1948, 1953, and 1962
- Received Arthur L. Day Medal from the American Geological Society in 1965
- Named California Scientist of the Year by the California Museum of Science and Industry in 1969.
- Awarded Agassiz Medal from the National Academy of Sciences in 1976
- Received Maurice Ewing Medal from the American Geophysical Union in 1976
- Named a Foreign Fellow by The Royal Society of London in 1976
- Awarded the Captain Robert Dexter Conrad Award, from the Office of Naval Research, Department of the Navy in 1978
- Awarded the National Medal of Science in 1983
- Appointed Secretary of the Navy Chair in Oceanography in 1985
- *Mobula Munkia*, or Munk’s devil ray, named in honor of Munk in 1987
- Awarded William Bowie Medal from the American Geophysical Union in 1989
- Inaugural recipient of the Walter Munk Award in 1993, given “in recognition of distinguished research in oceanography related to the sound and the sea,” awarded by the Oceanography Society, Office of Naval Research and U.S. Department of Defense Naval Oceanographic Office
- Given Kyoto Prize in Basic Sciences from the Inamori Foundation in Japan in 1999, the first time the prize was awarded to an oceanographer
- Received Albert A. Michelson Award from the Navy League of the U.S. in 2001, which recognizes scientists whose research has significantly improved the nation’s maritime forces or the U.S. industrial technology base.
- Inaugural recipient of the Prince Albert I Medal in the physical sciences of the oceans in 2001, created by Prince Rainier of Monaco
- Awarded Crafoord Prize from the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences in 2010
- Received Explorers’ Club Medal in 2014
- Named Revelle College Faculty Fellow in 2016
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Dalai Lama hugs Walter Munk as Mary Munk looks on.

A memorial event at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography is being planned for July. More information will go to members as soon as we receive it.
France’s conversion from zero to about 75% nuclear electricity was accomplished in relatively few years following a 1974 decision to take that route...
sands of NGOs around the country. Why not channel federal funding through such programs? Participation in adult ESL is the single fastest path to higher wages, more stable employment, and more successful navigation of our health care and education systems. When did you last hear a presidential candidate talk about that?

Future attempts to enact comprehensive immigration reform should not get bogged down in further, sterile debates over “border security.” A huge accumulation of evidence from field interviews—including fifteen years of studies by UCSD’s Mexican Migration Field Research Program—suggests that investing additional billions in physical border fortifications located in remote areas is the least cost-effective approach to reducing unauthorized immigration. But to win enough votes for Congressional approval, any CIR legislation must have a border security component. My recommendation would be to invest in staffing up scrutiny of people and vehicles at our legal ports of entry, through which upwards of one-third of unauthorized entries occur (not to mention more than 90 percent of illicit drugs).

Cracking down on visa-overstayers, who now significantly outnumber migrants who enter clandestinely, would also make more sense than border barrier-building. But the U.S. lacks a computerized system for tracking entries and exits, despite repeated Congressional mandates. Moreover, identifying and removing large numbers of over-stayers would be extremely disruptive. Those who have lived here for more than ten years (the median, according to national-level survey data) should be offered a path to permanent legal status.

How far down the demographic implosion rabbit hole must we go before the political conditions exist for rational, evidence-based immigration policy-making? Probably not before labor shortages become so widespread and structural—I.e., not tied to the business cycle—that they cannot be ignored by most members of the general public. At that point, Bernanke-level increases in legal immigration admissions may be necessary to avoid crippling the nation’s economic performance. The zero-sum political calculus that currently paralyzes federal immigration policymaking will weaken, and at least some politicians will even come to see electoral benefit in embracing less restrictive policies. Stranger things have happened!
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The initial two stages cover 130 years—from 1810 to 1940. The first (1810-1870) is defined by the growing influence of German ideas about higher education (brought back by Americans who had studied there) and by the 1862 Land-Grant College Act. Early in the second stage (1870-1940), the triumph of the German research university model is estab-

The final stage—1990 to the present day—is characterized by Kerr, with some understatement, as “an era of constrained resources.” This is our era, whose contours we know all too well, and the one I want to talk about.

I don’t intend to present a comprehensive vision of what these years have meant for the University of California or what the future holds. Instead I want to offer a few observations on the post-war era. Bush’s 1945 report, Science: The Endless Frontier, lays the foundation for what has become the nation’s science policy. A key feature of the policy is that these universities are assigned principal responsibility for the conduct of basic re-
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Chancellor Emeritus and UC President Emeritus

The UCSD Emeriti Association’s Book Club meets from 11:30 AM to 1 PM, on the fourth Monday of each month at the Ida & Cecil Green Faculty Club. Please RSVP on the EA RSVP website: https://hrweb.ucsd.edu/ea/ Each month a different Book Club member facilitates the discussion of the book.

In April, the Emeriti Association Book Club will discuss the book “Dead Wake, The Last Crossing of the Lusitania”, by Erik Larson. The May book selection is “Genesis of the Salk Institute, the Epic of It’s Founders”, by Suzanne Bourgeois. Join us for these interesting discussions. You may choose to purchase lunch at the Faculty Club, or not.
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Our southern border today are from three Central American countries – Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador – which have high levels of gang and drug violence as well as extensive low-end poverty. Migrant flows from these countries can be reduced by well-targeted development and rule-of-law assistance. The Trump administration has been cutting such subsidized nations have such policies, and they are largely successful. Canada's policy emphasizes public-private partnerships; most government funding for immigrant integration is channeled through community-based organizations. A key focus should be providing easy access to programs that accelerate English acquisition in the context of job and language skills simultaneously already operate in California and Washington state. In addition, ESL instruction is offered by th......
By Wayne A. Cornelius
Dickson Professor and Theodore Gilded Professor of U.S.-Mexican Relations, Emeritus
Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Emeritus

In the spring semester this year I was hauled back into the classroom to teach a course on the comparative politics of immigration at Portland’s Reed College. The students’ main assignment was to design a piece of legislation on comprehensive immigration reform (CIR) for the United States. It had to contain at least three and as many as six policy proposals, grounded in the research data. The legislation also had to be politically realistic – i.e., able to attract enough votes for passage in both houses of Congress. It had to improve the status quo without a lot of unintended consequences. All in all, a formidable challenge for undergraduates, and I daresay, for the U.S. political class, which has failed five times in the last 18 years to enact CIR, and which remains paralyzed on this issue at this writing.

What would I put into my own CIR proposal? Here goes: I begin by stipulating that by January 2021, or some date beyond that, both houses of Congress will be under Democratic control, preferably by a veto-proof majority. Nothing will happen on CIR until that condition obtains, since the Republican Party has made a religion of restricting immigration and asylum-seeking, in ways that would be unacceptable even to centrist Democrats in Congress.

Sensible immigration policy design must begin with a correct definition of the “problem” to be fixed. I suggest viewing immigration in 21st Century America not as a problem but as an essential solution to one of our most fundamental problems: the yawning demographic deficits that we have in meeting the economy’s labor requirements and financing public services.

The United States faces the challenge of replacing 76 million retiring baby boomers, at a time when total labor force growth has fallen sharply, from an annual average of five percent in the 1970s to less than one percent since 2000. Combined with population aging and reduced tax payments of retired Boomers, the US is facing high pressure on the cost of social programs like Medicare and Social Security. The dependency ratio—the number of active workers relative to the number of beneficiaries—is projected to climb steeply in the next 30 years. Former Federal Reserve chairman Ben Bernanke had it right. In October 2006, he told Congress: “We need a more liberal immigration policy to ease the burden of a shrinking work force.” In fact, Bernanke pointed out, we would need an annual inflow of nearly 3.5 million immigrants – not the 1 million per year being admitted under current policy – to replace the baby boomers.

Ben Bernanke

The point of departure must be immigration reform legislation that includes a generous path toward legalization for the approximately 11 million undocumented immigrants now living here. Keeping them in illegal status indefinite-ly benefits no one, and it stunts their human capital development. It is fantasy to expect them to self-emigrate en masse, if only we make life truly disagreeable for them, by restricting access to formal sector employment and basic human health care aide of the future is unlikely to be a robot.

These challenges are common to all advanced industrialized countries today. Indeed, most of those nations are at a considerably more advanced point in their demographic transition, facing absolute population declines in the tens of millions plus rapid population aging. Because the U.S. received large numbers of immigrants in the 1990s and 2000s, we are in a much less dire position. The total fertility rate of 1.77 children per woman is well below the 2.1 population “replacement” level. But the rate would be even lower if it were not being propped up by immigrants whose child-making exceeds that of native-born Americans – for now. Immigrants’ descendants are likely to mirror the low fertility rate of the general U.S. population. It’s time to think seriously about how immigration policy might be used to address our fundamental demographic and fiscal imbalances.
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**Proposed Slate for 2019 - 2020**

**Officers**
- Robert Knox: President
- Irving (Jake) Jacoby: Vice President
- Winifred Cox: Secretary/Treasurer
- Phyllis Mirsky: Past President

**Executive Committee**

Members at Large: Greg Mitchell [Scripps Institution of Oceanography]; Henry Powell [Health Sciences]; Alan McCutchan, [Health Sciences]; Irina Scheibler [Molecular Biology]; Kim Signoret-Paar [Development]; and Maria Vernet [Scripps Institution of Oceanography].

Ex Officio: Jack Fisher, Historian, TBD, Liaison to the UCSD Retirement Association; Sandy Lakoff, Editor, Chronicles; Suzan Cioffi, Managing Editor, Chronicles, and Director, UCSD Retirement Resource Center; and Kim Signoret-Paar, Liaison to Oceanids.

The election of the proposed slate will take place in April by email. If you do not have access to email, you are welcome to mail in your approval of the proposed slate, or your proposal of an alternate officer or Member at large to: Suzan Cioffi, Director, UCSD Retirement Resource Center, 9500 Gilman Drive, #0020, La Jolla, CA 92093-0020. The deadline for mail ballots is April 29, 2019.

---

**Chronicles**

Newsletter of the UCSD Emeriti Association

**Officers**
- Sanford Lakoff: Editor
- Suzan Cioffi: Managing Editor

---

**Members at Large:** Mark Appelbaum, Atiyeh, Sandy Lakoff, Jack Fisher, and Kim Signoret-Paar.

**Executive Committee**

- Phyllis Mirsky: President
- Robert Knox: Vice President
- Win Cox: Secretary/Treasurer
- Morton Printz: Past President, Awards

---

**In Memory of Walter Munk, World-Renowned Oceanographer**

Working from a motor launch at a Pleistocene Atoll called Alexa Bank During the Capricorn Expedition (1952-1953).

---

**UCSD Emeriti Association Annual Business Luncheon**

Atkinson Pavilion, UCSD Faculty Club

11:30 AM - 2:00 PM

Fee: $25 member/$40 non-members

David G. Victor, Professor of International Relations and Endowed Chair in Innovation and Public Policy

Co-Director of the Laboratory of International Law and Regulation and the Center for Global Transformation.

*Topic: “The New Geopolitics of Climate Change”*

---

**Chancellor’s Scholars**

Freshman Cohort

*Academic Poster Session— Free of charge / open to all*

Meeting Rooms 1-2-3, UCSD

Faculty Club, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM

---

BOTH of the following events are on WEDNESDAY, MAY 15

1. **Chancellor’s Scholars**
2. **Freshman Cohort**
3. **Academic Poster Session**

---
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---
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