CHAPTER 4

Crossing Borders: Immigration

QUESTION TO PONDER

One of the many editorials written in response to President George W. Bush’s 2004 proposal for managing illegal immigrants asserts that Americans “pay the lowest prices for agricultural products in any industrialized nation in the world” because our produce is “subsidized by the poorest wage earners in America,” many of whom are illegal immigrants from Mexico.* If you investigated the supermarket prices of fresh fruit grown and picked in the United States, you would find low prices like these: apples for $1.99 a pound; oranges for 99¢ a pound; grapefruit for $1.49 a pound; pears for $1.29 a pound. Realizing that this fruit was most likely picked by immigrant laborers, you are asking, “How do average Americans benefit from legal and illegal immigrants and what global forces are driving the growing immigrant population?”

CONTEXT FOR A NETWORK OF ISSUES

In some communities on Long Island, New York, tension has been building over the last few years as homeowners, politicians, and advocacy groups wrangle over what to do about the growing influx of Latino immigrants. In these long-established suburban communities with few rental properties, immigrants are crowding into houses, causing concern over health, sanitation, and residential codes. Each morning, immigrants cluster on corners waiting to be hired by contractors for a day’s wages negotiated between the parties. Upset residents of these communities are embroiled in civic debates over these questions: Should communities designate town halls as hiring locations for day laborers? Should landlords be allowed to rent one-family homes to large groups of immigrants? If not, where should these people live? What can be

done about businesses employing illegal immigrants and undercutting competitors that have higher labor costs because they pay their legal immigrant workers good wages and provide medical insurance and benefits? And should the presence of large groups of immigrants be allowed to change the “character” of these communities? Like the towns on Long Island, many cities and communities around the country are wrestling with these questions.

Sites of social conflict such as these communities on Long Island are a symptom of larger U.S. issues with immigration. Known as a nation of immigrants, the United States now has a population of whom 11 percent are foreign-born, according to the 2000 census. The decades 1901–1910 and 1981–1990 were peak periods of immigration, with the greatest number of immigrants arriving between 1991 and 2000: roughly nine million. The Statistical Yearbooks of the Immigration and Naturalization Service reports that Mexico, India, the Philippines, China, and El Salvador—developing countries with great economic needs and large, growing populations—contributed 40 percent of the legal immigrants in 2003. The trend toward increasing numbers of immigrants raises questions about the future of U.S. immigration.

Efforts by the U.S. government to control immigration through legislation and physical restraint have proved problematic. The McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 repealed the 1924 Immigration Act and ended the ban on Asian immigration, but it established a quota system by which immigrants were limited by national origin, race, and ancestry. Then in 1965, the Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments ended the discriminatory national origins quota system. This was replaced with a first-come, first-served system, giving preference to uniting families and establishing numerical restrictions according to the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. Another significant piece of legislation was the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, which attempted to fix the problem of the large number of illegal immigrants by granting permanent resident status to those who had lived and worked in the United States since 1982.

More recent governmental efforts to control the volume of immigration have been ineffective. In 1990, the Immigration Act increased the number of new immigrants allowed into the country to 700,000 a year. However, both the total number and the rate of legal and illegal immigration continue to increase. The number of illegal immigrants residing in the United States is now somewhere between eight and ten million, and that number grows by hundreds of thousands each year. Furthermore, governmental strategies to restrain immigration physically along the 1,951-mile U.S.-Mexican border—a concern that has become a heightened national security issue—have also proved unsuccessful. The millions of dollars spent on fences, helicopters, and border patrols have failed to deter illegal immigrants. Instead, because of tighter surveillance in border cities such as El Paso and Laredo, Texas, and San Diego, California, people now take more dangerous routes through the Sonora Desert, where many die of thirst, hunger, and heat.

Once in the United States, immigrants face discrimination and exploitation. Immigrants, particularly undocumented Mexicans, work under the
most dangerous conditions in construction jobs and agriculture. Mexicans represent one in twenty-four workers in the United States but one in fourteen deaths on the job. According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, these largely preventable deaths occur because of lack of safety equipment and job training.* More recently, journalists and policy-makers have been drawing attention to the huge subclass of undocumented workers who work for low wages at some of the most necessary but least appreciated jobs in manufacturing, agriculture, and the service sector. Indeed, businesses, hospitals, restaurants, and other parts of American society including American households that hire gardeners, nannies, and house-cleaners have come to depend on this inexpensive labor. For example, estimates suggest that between 50 and 85 percent of agricultural workers are in the United States illegally.†

U.S. immigration issues are part of the larger, global picture of political, economic, and social forces driving immigration and of the global economic and social problems of regulating and humanely treating immigrants. The movement of masses of people across national borders continues to increase in our globally connected world. According to Susan F. Martin, director of the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University, “150 million people or 2.5% of the world’s population live outside their country of birth,” a figure that has “doubled since 1965.”‡ Some of these people are refugees fleeing political or ethnic persecution and extreme danger in their countries and seeking asylum; many countries such as Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo have had political upheavals and ethnic clashes. However, most immigrants move for economic reasons. Some college-educated persons and professionals choose to leave their poorer countries for developed countries, where they can use their training and education under better conditions for substantially higher pay, a phenomenon called the “brain drain.” The main pattern of migration is from developing countries to richer, more economically stable, and prosperous developed countries. The United States, Canada, and the countries of the European Union are receiving, or destination, countries for many immigrants from sender countries, usually poorer countries.

**STAKES AND STAKEHOLDERS**

Citizens of developed countries as well as citizens of developing countries hold stakes in the potential gains and costs of global immigration. Policy-makers, analysts, and citizens around the world are speculating about the reasons that so many people are leaving their countries of origin and are arguing about the most effective ways to manage immigration. Here are some key issue questions and some of the positions arguers are taking.

---

How Is Globalization Fueling Immigration? Some analysts emphasize “pull” factors such as the enticing lifestyle of the world’s wealthiest nations that is broadcast globally by television and other media, and that insidiously suggests the superiority of these values, customs and “good life.” Other analysts, such as former U.S. Ambassador to Mexico Jeffrey Davidow, posit the dominance of “push” factors—the conditions compelling people to move from developing countries to developed countries. Davidow asserts that emigration from Mexico “will continue at high rates until the Mexican economy can provide sufficient work opportunities and decent standards of living for a far greater percentage of its population.”* Some activists and citizens of developing countries fault global institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) for pressuring developing countries to pay their debts and criticize large multinational corporations for displacing the poor. For example, when giant agribusinesses buy up small subsistence farms in Mexico, they force these farmers to seek food, work, and dignity in the United States. Analysts and politicians from Latin America note that their developing nations depend on remittances—money earned by their citizens abroad and sent back to their own countries in the form of money orders, personal checks, or electronic transfers—as a key percentage of their gross domestic product.

How Much Should Receiving Countries Focus on Their National Interest and How Can Immigrants Be Integrated for the Economic and Social Benefit of All? Citizens and politicians of the rich European Union (EU) nations are debating whether to impose restrictions on immigration from the ten new EU members from Eastern Europe, who, like Slovakia and the Czech Republic, have high unemployment rates. Many British citizens, journalists, U.S. citizens, policymakers, and activists are debating how and to what degree they should restrict immigrants’ access to social benefits, such as the dole (welfare) and housing in Britain and driver’s licenses, welfare, food stamps, Medicaid, and financial support for higher education in the United States. In the United States, some environmental groups like the Sierra Club are concerned about the need to limit immigration in order to reduce U.S. population growth and the drain on natural resources, whereas some European analysts and politicians are arguing that immigrants are beneficial, even necessary, to supply labor to offset Western Europe’s aging population and low birthrate.

To What Extent Are the Most Urgent Problems of Immigration Economic Problems and to What Extent Are They Cultural Problems? Some analysts, politicians, and groups of citizens see immigration problems as religious and cultural differences affecting national identity and cultural

integrity. For example, confronted with increasing numbers of Muslim immigrants from Turkey, Southeast Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East, some Europeans are speaking out in favor of preserving traditional European values. Some voices in this controversy, such as political scientist Samuel Huntington in the United States and France’s president, Jacques Chirac, believe that large immigrant groups need to assimilate into the dominant culture of their receiving countries. In opposition, some immigrants, such as members of the Muslim community in Europe, have labeled these attitudes as racist and are protesting. The recent furor in France over whether Muslim girls should be allowed to wear headscarves (hijabs) in school is an example of these complex clashes over culture and religion. The killing of Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh by a Moroccan man because van Gogh had made a controversial film about abused Muslim women, and the recent fires and riots in France reveal the potential for violence in these cultural conflicts.

**Are Guest Worker Policies Like Those Proposed by President Bush a Fair and Effective Way to Manage Legal and Illegal Immigration?**

The immigration reform plan that Bush announced in January 2004 focuses on regulating illegal immigration, improving homeland security, meeting the economic needs of businesses, and improving the treatment of legal and illegal immigrants. This plan—called a “guest worker plan”—would enable immigrants to apply for renewable three-year worker visas. Both illegal immigrants currently in the United States and people currently in other countries would be able to apply for these temporary visas. People already in the United States would have to show proof of employment and pay a fee to obtain a guest worker visa. Businesses and employers would have to give evidence that they couldn’t fill their jobs with American workers and thus have a need for these immigrant workers. This plan proposes to bolster U.S. security by helping identify and monitor the eight to ten million illegal immigrants and to keep additional illegal immigrants out. It also proposes offering worker protection, retirement benefits, and tax savings accounts to immigrant workers, as well as temporary visas allowing workers to come and go across the U.S. border.

In favor of a guest worker plan, some U.S. owners of agriculture, manufacturing, tourist, restaurant, construction, and landscaping businesses welcome this means to fill unskilled jobs that illegal immigrants currently hold. The proconsumer position cites the benefits of inexpensive labor and the low cost of services. Thinking of national security, some policymakers and politicians like the idea of being able to identify the immigrant population who would be allowed to go openly back and forth to their home countries and see potential to decrease smuggling and drug trafficking.

Although, skeptics and opponents are in favor of the legal protection and secure work environments currently denied to immigrant workers with illegal status, they argue that the proposed guest worker system with three-year renewable visas offers too few gains for these workers, empowering
and benefiting employers much more than the workers. Some citizens and U.S. labor advocates maintain that a guest worker plan would create laws for employers and employees that could not be enforced and argue that the supposed “need” for unskilled immigrant workers has been created by practices that deliberately drive wages lower. In addition, some citizens and anti-immigration groups have labeled Bush’s plan “backdoor amnesty” that rewards lawbreakers by granting them legal status. More extreme anti-immigration groups such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) want to preserve Anglo-American values and racial priorities and call for tighter control of U.S. borders and strict penalties for employers who hire illegal immigrants. In opposition, Latin American politicians and immigrant advocacy groups argue that years of work in the United States should be a quid pro quo for applying for citizenship. If current illegal immigrants registered, they would achieve only temporary legal status and then could be expelled from the country.

**What Are Some Alternatives to a Guest Worker Program?** Some politicians, analysts, and policymakers believe that the way to solve U.S. immigration problems with Mexico and Latin American countries, to stop the further erosion of the U.S. workers’ economic base, and to bring political stability and prosperity to these countries is to tackle the income disparity between the United States and these developing countries. Free trade proponents argue that more emphasis on free trade will bring economic improvement and greater economic equality to these countries. However, other activists contend that free trade dominated by corporations has been a major source of economic disruption—even devastation—in these Latin American countries, and are working instead for more independence and social justice in these countries.

**What Existing and New Global Institutions Could Help to Guide and Regulate Immigration on a Global Level?** Some analysts and policymakers do not think immigration be controlled or restricted. While other leaders are campaigning for regional and international organizations and multilateral approaches with new policies and new laws to help deal with the patterns of global immigration. They propose that global organizations beyond the United Nations should become the overriding institutions and influential powers to govern the movement of both refugees and economic migrants.

**STUDENT VOICE: EXPERIENCING IMMIGRATION ISSUES**

In the narrative that follows, student writer Esperanza Borboa shares her experience of the exploitation of illegal immigrants in the United States.
Esperanza Borboa

I’m from Los Angeles, California, and in 1976, I worked in the garment industry in the heart of downtown where small and large cutting rooms employed anywhere from 5 to 100 people. Gender roles were clearly marked in this industry. Men were cutters, spreaders and pattern makers. Women were seamstresses. Salaries were oftentimes below minimum wage with no benefits, and women sat at the bottom of that pay scale. I worked in the office as an assistant bookkeeper for minimum wage and no benefits. Most of the workers at our shop were Mexicans with a few Cubans. Everyone, including the boss, knew there were some who were undocumented, but we never talked about it. I was slowly becoming aware of how these people were exploited with no protection or recourse. Working and getting to know these men and women, I was learning what they were willing to risk and suffer just for the opportunity to work and provide for themselves and their children, something they couldn’t do in their home countries. One day an experience made me feel the pain of their situation.

On that day I walked out to the cutting room to double check some tickets with numbers I couldn’t read. A young man came running by me, and all at once people were running in all directions. I asked Carmen, one of the lead workers, what was going on and she said the Migra (Immigration) was outside. There was a black passenger van in the alley half filled with workers from our shop and the one across the alley. One of the women being led to the van was crying and shouting to her co-worker “Vaya a mi casa y escoge a mis hijos y te llamo por teléfono!” (“Go to my house and get my children and I’ll phone you!”)

Although I knew they couldn’t take me, a U.S. citizen, in that van, I was scared and stunned. I had known that raids were common, but this was my first experience of one. I asked Carmen what would happen to these people. She said, “They’ll be deported to Mexico, and some of them will be back here by next week if they can come up with the money to pay a Coyote to cross them over the border. Their kids will stay here with friends till their mother or another family member can get here.” As we watched the van pull away, my furious boss was ranting that he needed our help finding replacement workers and that we should let our friends know he was hiring. The Immigration official said they had received an anonymous call about illegal aliens working in this area. We all knew that someone always benefited from these raids, perhaps a competitor or the boss himself. Sometimes the raids would conveniently come the day before payday, enabling the boss not to have to pay “illegal” workers, even if they managed to come back.
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That day my heart ached for all those picked up, and I felt powerless, voiceless and guilty for working there, but as a young single mother I needed to work. I quit that job shortly after the raid and found another job with a company in the same industry only to see it happen again, but this time, most of us were pretty sure the boss had something to do with it because it was too close to a pay period. I quit that job too.

Many years later, I moved to Washington state, and while working with farmworkers, I found out that the same practices were taking place in fields all across the country. The Migra would show up when the fields were almost completely cleared. The growers would deny they had anything to do with it just as the company owners did in Los Angeles, but we all knew better.

INTERNATIONAL VOICES

Along with a number of Latin American countries, Mexico is experiencing dramatic social and economic changes bound up with immigration. Immigration can mean economic survival, improving individuals’ lives and enabling immigrants to send home money, which is then used to build up those communities. However, immigration can also cause emotional distress and major social disruption for individuals, families, communities, and regions. The following article, “Town’s Fate Lies in Immigration Reform” by Mark Stevenson from the March 27, 2004, Seattle Times, reveals some of the repercussions of immigration: economic and social instability and importation of negative cultural influences from the United States.

Residents of a Small Town in Mexico Responding to Immigration

Santa Ana Del Valle, Mexico—

. . . Teacher Eleazar Pedro Santiago says that elsewhere in the mountains of Oaxaca state, he has seen several “ghost towns” with just a few old people and farm animals. . . .

“Everybody has the same idea—to earn money up there and start a business back here,” says Aquino, the weaver. “What they don’t think about is: What are they going to sell and who are they going to sell to?”

Most residents agree things can’t go on as they are. The dual existence the town has led since the 1960s—one foot here, one foot in the north—has not been good for Santa Ana.

“Many of the people came back corrupted by the U.S. lifestyle,” Aquino says. “They import all these fantasies from up north: the good life, total freedom, not having to answer to anyone.”

The habits of U.S. inner cities have already begun to invade. Boys greet each other with a street gang-style handshake, drugs are a problem, and graffiti has begun to appear on the town’s adobe walls.

Many say the town’s salvation doesn’t involve the United States at all.

“What we need here are more job opportunities, so people won’t have to go,” says Abelardo Gonzalez, the school director. “Now, there’s just farmwork, and that’s only when there’s rain.”
GLOBAL HOT SPOT: MEXICO

As the United States has increased its surveillance of the border and its pressure on cities such as San Diego and El Paso, the risks of immigrating have increased substantially. This excerpt from the article “Mexican Biologist’s Desperate Dream leads to Doom in Desert” by Richard Boudreaux from the October 20, 2004, edition of the Seattle Times reveals both Mexico’s social acceptance of illegal immigration as a route to economic survival and the desperation and persistence of Mexican immigrants. It also points out some of the physical dangers of crossing the border illegally: the possibility of dying of heat, cold, thirst, exhaustion, and abandonment.

Sasabe, Mexico—. . . The border’s busiest migration corridor has become the 57-mile dirt road from Altar to Sasabe in the Mexican state of Sonora. Altar’s 7,000 residents run guest houses, sell backpacks and work as drivers for migrants, who gather by the hundreds in the town square each day to meet with smugglers and ride north to foot trails that cross the border.

Within 25 minutes on a recent afternoon, eight vans crammed with migrants out of Altar passed a checkpoint just south of Sasabe run by Grupo Beta, the humanitarian arm of Mexico’s National Migration Institute. Many of the occupants were from tropical lowlands in southern Mexico, getting their first blast of desert heat.

They looked bored by Julio Mallen’s words of caution.

“It’s important to go with enough water for at least two or three days,” the Beta agent emphasized, peering into each van. “Wear long sleeves to protect yourself from the sun. If anyone feels tired and cannot continue, tell your companions so they can help you find a road and get help.”

Grupo Beta defines its mission as minimizing harm to U.S.-bound migrants without explicitly discouraging their exodus. “Have a safe trip and God bless you,” Mallen said at the end of his lecture.

The readings in this chapter will help you think about globalization and immigration from different national and global perspectives as you try to formulate your own views on how receiving and sender nations should respond to these global migration issues.

READINGS

Borders Beyond Control
Jagdish Bhagwati

Jagdish Bhagwati is a bold, articulate defender of economic globalization who has authored numerous books, including In Defense of Globalization, published by Oxford University Press in 2004. Bhagwati holds the title University Professor at Columbia University as well as Andre Meyer Senior Fellow in International Economics at the Council on Foreign Relations and...
has functioned as an advisor to the United Nations. His writing is published regularly in the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the New Republic. This piece appeared in the January–February 2003 issue of Foreign Affairs. Published by the Council on Foreign Relations since 1922, this journal describes itself as “America’s most influential publication on international affairs and foreign policy” and “the international forum of choice for the most important new ideas, analysis, and debate on the most significant issues in the world” (from its Web site).

Jagdish Bhagwati’s target audience for this piece is readers who are well informed about and engaged in global issues. How does he try to make his views on immigration accessible to other readers seeking insights into global immigration problems?

A DOOR THAT WILL NOT CLOSE

1 International migration lies close to the center of global problems that now seize the attention of politicians and intellectuals across the world. Take just a few recent examples.—Prime Ministers Tony Blair of the United Kingdom and José María Aznar of Spain proposed at last year’s European Council meeting in Seville that the European Union withdraw aid from countries that did not take effective steps to stem the flow of illegal emigrants to the EU. Blair’s outspoken minister for development, Clare Short, described the proposal as “morally repugnant” and it died amid a storm of other protests.—Australia received severe condemnation worldwide last summer when a special envoy of the UN high commissioner for human rights exposed the deplorable conditions in detention camps that held Afghan, Iranian, Iraqi, and Palestinian asylum seekers who had landed in Australia.

2 —Following the September 11 attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C., U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft announced several new policies that rolled back protections enjoyed by immigrants. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Human Rights Watch fought back. So did Islamic and Arab ethnic organizations. These groups employed lawsuits, public dissent, and congressional lobbying to secure a reversal of the worst excesses.

3 —The Economist ran in just six weeks two major stories describing the growing outflow of skilled citizens from less developed countries to developed countries seeking to attract such immigrants. The “brain drain” of the 1960s is striking again with enhanced vigor.

4 These examples and numerous others do not just underline the importance of migration issues today. More important, they show governments attempting to stem migration only to be forced into
retreat and accommodation by factors such as civil-society activism
and the politics of ethnicity. Paradoxically, the ability to control mi-
gration has shrunk as the desire to do so has increased. The reality
is that borders are beyond control and little can be done to really
cut down on immigration. The societies of developed countries will
simply not allow it. The less developed countries also seem over-
whelmed by forces propelling emigration. Thus, there must be a
seismic shift in the way migration is addressed: governments must
reorient their policies from attempting to curtail migration to cop-
ing and working with it to seek benefits for all.

To demonstrate effectively why and how this must be done,
however, requires isolating key migration questions from the many
other issues that attend the flows of humanity across national bor-
ders. Although some migrants move strictly between rich countries
or between poor ones, the most compelling problems result from
emigration from less developed to more developed countries. They
arise in three areas. First, skilled workers are legally emigrating,
temporarily or permanently, to rich countries. This phenomenon
predominantly concerns the less developed countries that are
losing skilled labor. Second, largely unskilled migrants are entering
developed countries illegally and looking for work. Finally, there
is the “involuntary” movement of people, whether skilled or un-
skilled, across borders to seek asylum. These latter two trends
mostly concern the developed countries that want to bar illegal en-
try by the unskilled.

All three problems raise issues that derive from the fact that the
flows cannot be effectively constrained and must instead be creatively
accommodated. In designing such accommodation, it must be kept in
mind that the illegal entry of asylum seekers and economic
migrants often cannot be entirely separated. Frustrated economic
migrants are known to turn occasionally to asylum as a way of get-
ing in. The effective tightening of one form of immigrant entry will
put pressure on another.

SOFTWARE ENGINEERS, NOT HUDDLED MASSES

Looking at the first problem, it appears that developed countries’
appetite for skilled migrants has grown—just look at Silicon
Valley’s large supply of successful Indian and Taiwanese computer
scientists and venture capitalists. The enhanced appetite for such
professionals reflects the shift to a globalized economy in which
countries compete for markets by creating and attracting techni-
cally skilled talent. Governments also perceive these workers to be
more likely to assimilate quickly into their new societies. This
heightened demand is matched by a supply that is augmented
for old reasons that have intensified over time. Less developed
countries cannot offer modern professionals the economic rewards or the social conditions that they seek. Europe and the United States also offer opportunities for immigrant children’s education and career prospects that are nonexistent at home. These asymmetries of opportunity reveal themselves not just through cinema and television, but through the immediacy of experience. Increasingly, emigration occurs after study abroad. The number of foreign students at U.S. universities, for example, has grown dramatically; so has the number who stay on. In 1990, 62 percent of engineering doctorates in the United States were given to foreign-born students, mainly Asians. The figures are almost as high in mathematics, computer science, and the physical sciences. In economics, which at the graduate level is a fairly math-intensive subject, 54 percent of the Ph.D.’s awarded went to foreign students, according to a 1990 report of the American Economic Association.

Many of these students come from India, China, and South Korea. For example, India produces about 25,000 engineers annually. Of these, about 2,000 come from the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), which are modeled on MIT and the California Institute of Technology. Graduates of IITs accounted for 78 percent of U.S. engineering Ph.D.’s granted to Indians in 1990. And almost half of all Taiwanese awarded similar Ph.D.’s had previously attended two prestigious institutions: the National Taiwan University and the National Cheng Kung University. Even more telling, 65 percent of the Korean students who received science and engineering Ph.D.’s in the United States were graduates of Seoul National University. The numbers were almost as high for Beijing University and Tsinghua University, elite schools of the People’s Republic of China.

These students, once graduated from American universities, often stay on in the United States. Not only is U.S. graduate education ranked highest in the world, but it also offers an easy way of immigrating. In fact, it has been estimated that more than 70 percent of newly minted, foreign-born Ph.D.’s remain in the United States, many becoming citizens eventually. Less developed countries can do little to restrict the numbers of those who stay on as immigrants. They will, particularly in a situation of high demand for their skills, find ways to escape any dragnet that their home country may devise. And the same difficulty applies, only a little less starkly, to countries trying to hold on to those citizens who have only domestic training but are offered better jobs abroad.

A realistic response requires abandoning the “brain drain” approach of trying to keep the highly skilled at home. More likely to succeed is a “diaspora” model, which integrates present and past citizens into a web of rights and obligations in the extended
community defined with the home country as the center. The diaspora approach is superior from a human rights viewpoint because it builds on the right to emigrate, rather than trying to restrict it. And dual loyalty is increasingly judged to be acceptable rather than reprehensible. This option is also increasingly feasible. Nearly 30 countries now offer dual citizenship. Others are inching their way to similar options. Many less developed countries, such as Mexico and India, are in the process of granting citizens living abroad hitherto denied benefits such as the right to hold property and to vote via absentee ballot.

However, the diaspora approach is incomplete unless the benefits are balanced by some obligations, such as the taxation of citizens living abroad. The United States already employs this practice. This author first recommended this approach for developing countries during the 1960s, and the proposal has been revived today. Estimates made by the scholars Mihir Desai, Devesh Kapur, and John McHale demonstrate that even a slight tax on Indian nationals abroad would substantially raise Indian government revenues. The revenue potential is vast because the aggregate income of Indian-born residents in the United States is 10 percent of India’s national income, even though such residents account for just 0.1 percent of the American population.

UNSTOPPABLE

The more developed countries need to go through a similar dramatic shift in the way they respond to the influx of illegal economic immigrants and asylum seekers. Inducements or punishments for immigrants’ countries of origin are not working to stem the flows, nor are stiffer border-control measures, sanctions on employers, or harsher penalties for the illegals themselves.

Three sets of factors are behind this. First, civil-society organizations, such as Human Rights Watch, the ACLU, and the International Rescue Committee, have proliferated and gained in prominence and influence. They provide a serious constraint on all forms of restrictive action. For example, it is impossible to incarcerate migrants caught crossing borders illegally without raising an outcry over humane treatment. So authorities generally send these people back across the border, with the result that they cross again and again until they finally get in. More than 50 percent of illegals, however, now enter not by crossing the Rio Grande but by legal means, such as tourist visas, and then stay on illegally. Thus, enforcement has become more difficult without invading privacy through such measures as identity cards, which continue to draw strong protests from civil liberties groups. A notable example of both ineffectual policy and successful civil resistance is the 1986
Sanctuary movement that surfaced in response to evidence that U.S. authorities were returning desperate refugees from war-torn El Salvador and Guatemala to virtually certain death in their home countries. (They were turned back because they did not meet the internationally agreed upon definition for a refugee.) Sanctuary members, with the aid of hundreds of church groups, took the law into their own hands and organized an underground railroad to spirit endangered refugees to safe havens. Federal indictments and convictions followed, with five Sanctuary members given three- to five-year sentences. Yet, in response to a public outcry and an appeal from Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-Ariz.), the trial judge merely placed the defendants on probation.

Sanctions on employers, such as fines, do not fully work either. The General Accounting Office, during the debate over the 1986 immigration legislation that introduced employer sanctions, studied how they had worked in Switzerland and Germany. The measures there failed. Judges could not bring themselves to punish severely those employers whose violation consisted solely of giving jobs to illegal workers. The U.S. experience with employer sanctions has not been much different.

Finally, the sociology and politics of ethnicity also undercut enforcement efforts. Ethnic groups can provide protective cover to their members and allow illegals to disappear into their midst. The ultimate constraint, however, is political and results from expanding numbers. Fellow ethnics who are U.S. citizens, legal immigrants, or amnesty beneficiaries bring to bear growing political clout that precludes tough action against illegal immigrants. Nothing matters more than the vote in democratic societies. Thus the Bush administration, anxious to gain Hispanic votes, has embraced an amnesty confined solely to Mexican illegal immigrants, thereby discarding the principle of nondiscrimination enshrined in the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act.

**MINDING THE OPEN DOOR**

If it is not possible to effectively restrict illegal immigration, then governments in the developed countries must turn to policies that will integrate migrants into their new homes in ways that will minimize the social costs and maximize the economic benefits. These policies should include children’s education and grants of limited civic rights such as participation in school-board elections and parent-teacher associations. Governments should also assist immigrants in setting throughout a country, to avoid depressing wages in any one region. Greater development support should be extended to the illegal migrants’ countries of origin to alleviate the poor economic conditions that propel emigration. And for the less
developed countries, there is really no option but to shift toward a diaspora model.

Some nations will grasp this reality and creatively work with migrants and migration. Others will lag behind, still seeking restrictive measures to control and cut the level of migration. The future certainly belongs to the former. But to accelerate the progress of the laggards, new institutional architecture is needed at the international level. Because immigration restrictions are the flip side of sovereignty, there is no international organization today to oversee and monitor each nation’s policies toward migrants, whether inward or outward bound.

The world badly needs enlightened immigration policies and best practices to be spread and codified. A World Migration Organization would begin to do that by juxtaposing each nation’s entry, exit, and residence policies toward migrants, whether legal or illegal, economic or political, skilled or unskilled. Such a project is well worth putting at the center of policymakers’ concerns.

For Class Discussion
1. How would you summarize the three main global immigration patterns that Jagdish Bhagwati describes?
2. How does Jagdish Bhagwati support his claim that migration of masses of people cannot be stopped in a globalized economy?
3. What does Bhagwati mean by the terms “brain drain,” “civil-society activism,” “the politics of ethnicity,” “economic migrants,” and “asylum seekers”?
4. Bhagwati proposes two solutions to the immigration problems facing the world today: the “diaspora” model and a World Migration Organization. How does he support and justify these proposed solutions?
5. What strengths and weaknesses in Bhagwati’s argument might general readers identify?

Lecture on International Flows of Humanity
Kofi Annan

Born in Ghana, Kofi Annan became secretary-general of the United Nations in 1997 after years of holding various leadership positions in world organizations, including the World Health Organization, and serving as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management and Security Coordinator for the UN
System. He is currently serving his second term as secretary-general. Educated internationally and in the United States, Annan holds a Master of Science in management from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 2001, he and the United Nations won the Nobel Peace Prize. Annan’s priorities continue to be reforming the United Nations, advocating human rights and equality, and combating the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Annan delivered this speech at Columbia University on November 21, 2003, as the Emma Lazarus Lecture. (Emma Lazarus [1849–1883] was a well-known Jewish American poet and political activist. Her famous sonnet “The New Colossus” was engraved on a plaque on the Statue of Liberty’s pedestal in 1903. This poem helped to enhance the Statue’s role as a symbol of the United States as a welcoming place of freedom and opportunity for immigrants. Copies of this poem are readily available on the Web.)

How does Kofi Annan make use of the specific rhetorical context of this speech and how does he try to connect with his audience in his introductory remarks?

1 There could be no place more fitting for a lecture on international flows of humanity than this great university, located as it is in a city which has been the archetypal success story of international migration.

2 And you could not have chosen a better person to name it after than Emma Lazarus, whose unforgettable lines are inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty, the Mother of Exiles. Just in case you have forgotten them, they are printed in your programme!

3 While Emma Lazarus’s immortal words promised welcome to the tired, the poor, the wretched, and the huddled masses yearning to be free, another American poet, Walt Whitman, spoke of the vibrancy and vitality that migrants brought to the new world. He called New York the “city of the world” because, he said, “all races are here, all lands of the earth make contributions here”.

4 How right he was—and still is. Today, more than one in three inhabitants of New York City was born outside the United States. The city boasts communities of 188 different national origins—only three fewer than there are Member States in the United Nations—and 47 per cent of them speak a second language at home.

5 New York, in other words, is a brilliant success story of migration, as are many other cities all around the world today. In fact, in the year 2000, some 175 million people, about 3 per cent of the world’s population, lived outside their country of birth—more than at any other time in history.

6 Of these, around 16 million were recognized refugees—people who did not choose to leave home but were forced to. Another 1 million were asylum seekers—people who claimed to be refugees,
but whose claims were in the process of being verified. The remainder, some 158 million, were deemed international migrants—that is, people who have chosen to move.

So much mobility and diversity should be cause for celebration. But migration also gives rise to many problems, leading people to ask: Can we absorb large numbers of new people? Will they take our jobs or absorb our social services? Are they a threat to our security, our way of life or our national identity?

These are understandable concerns, and they must be answered. The answers are not easy. But I have come here today to say that they do not lie in halting migration—a policy that is bound to fail. I say the answer must lie in managing migration—rationally, creatively, compassionately and cooperatively. This is the only approach that can ensure that the interests of both migrant and host communities will be looked after and their rights upheld.

It is the only approach that can effectively address the complex issues surrounding migration—issues of human rights and economic opportunity, of labour shortages and unemployment, of brain drain and brain gain, of xenophobia and integration, of refugee crises and asylum seekers, of law enforcement and human trafficking, of human security and national security. And it is the only approach that can, if we get it right, bring advantages to all parties—sender countries, countries of transit, host countries, and migrants themselves.

Many migrants, while not literally forced to move, choose to do so under duress. They see no opportunity at home to improve themselves, or perhaps even to earn a living at all. Their departure may be a source of sadness for themselves and their families, and also a loss for their home countries—often poor ones, which could have benefited from their talents. They are usually not free riders looking for an easy life, but courageous men and women who make great sacrifices in search of a better future for themselves or their families.

Nor are their lives always to be envied once they have left home. They often face as many risks and unknowns as they do hopes and opportunities. Many fall prey to smugglers and traffickers on their journey, and many more face a surly welcome of exploitation, discrimination and prejudice once they arrive. Many have little choice but to do dirty, dangerous and difficult jobs.

Undoubtedly more needs to be done to create opportunities in poor countries for individual self-improvement. This is yet another reason why we must strive harder to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, including by forging a global partnership for development which, among other things, gives poor countries a fair chance to compete in the global market.

But migration itself can also be part of that global partnership—part of the solution to economic problems, not only in sender
countries, but also in receiving ones. Sender countries benefit enormously from migrant remittances. They bring not only vital sustenance to the migrants’ families. They also bring much-needed stimulus to the national economy. Last year alone, migrant workers in developed countries sent at least $88 billion back to their countries of origin—more than those same developing countries received in official development aid. These amounts are growing fast.

Emigration also relieves the pressures of overpopulation and unemployment, and in time endows sender countries with an educated diaspora who often bring or send home new skills, products, ideas and knowledge.

In short, migration is one of the tools we have to help put more of the world’s people on the right side of—and ultimately, to eliminate—the vast divides that exist today between poor and rich, and between fettered and free.

Host country economies, too, can reap benefits. After all, the main reason any country attracts immigrants is its need for their labour. They perform many services that the host population is eager to consume, but is either unwilling or unable to provide for itself—from highly skilled work in research or information technology to less skilled jobs tending fields, nursing the sick and elderly, working on construction sites, running corner shops that stay open all night, or looking after children and doing housework while parents are out pursuing careers.

Increasingly, as birth rates in many developed countries fall, and populations age, immigrant labour, taxes and spending are becoming a demographic and economic necessity. Without them, pension schemes and health-care systems will be in danger of collapse. While immigration may not by itself be the answer to all these challenges, there is no answer to them that does not include immigration.

So migration has a demand as well as a supply side. Migrants are rational human beings who make economic choices. Up to now, rich countries have been far too comfortable with a policy framework that allows them to benefit from immigrant labour, while denying immigrants the dignity and rights of a legal status.

That is not good enough. Let us remember from the start that migrants are not merely units of labour. They are human beings. They have human emotions, human families, and above all, human rights—human rights which must be at the very heart of debates and policies on migration. Among those rights is the right to family unity—and in fact families reuniting form by far the largest stream of immigration into North America and Europe.

The more we try to deal with migration simply by clamping down on it with tighter border controls, the more we find that human rights are sacrificed—on the journey, at the border, and inside host countries.
Few, if any, States have actually succeeded in cutting migrant numbers by imposing such controls. The laws of supply and demand are too strong for that. Instead, immigrants are driven to enter the country clandestinely, to overstay their visas, or to resort to the one legal route still open to them, namely the asylum system. This experience shows that stronger borders are not necessarily smarter ones. And it shows that they can create new problems of law enforcement and lead almost inevitably to human rights violations.

The gravest violations come at the hands of smugglers and traffickers. Smuggling occurs with the complicity of migrants, usually because they can see no legal route to migrate. Trafficking is a modern form of slavery in which migrants are coerced and exploited. All too often, people who initially collaborate with smugglers later find themselves in the hands of traffickers.

Asylum processes, meanwhile, become clogged with doubtful cases, with the result that bona fide refugees are often detained for long periods. They are often denied the rights accorded to accused or convicted criminals—and, when free, they are objects of suspicion and hostility. This, in turn, undermines support for migration in host countries—despite the fact that many of them need migrants.

Those who manage to get in, or stay, illegally become acutely vulnerable to exploitation. If they attempt to assert their rights, they can be met with a threat of exposure and deportation. Migrant women and unaccompanied children are especially vulnerable to physical, psychological, and sexual abuse, sometimes involving the risk of infection with HIV/AIDS.

I am not suggesting that all these problems could be solved at a stroke simply by lifting all restrictions on migration. It is vital for States to harmonize their policies and maintain networks of cooperation and information sharing on smuggling and trafficking routes and trends, and on effective practices in prevention and assistance.

Nor do I suggest that a society can be expected to forego any process for deciding which immigrants it will accept, and how many at a time. But I do say that those decisions need to be positive as well as negative. And I say here, in the United States, that while I understand this nation’s need to ensure that those who come here are not a threat to homeland security, it would be a tragedy if this diverse country were to deprive itself of the enrichment of many students and workers and family members from particular parts of the world, or if the human rights of those who would migrate here were compromised.

I also believe that States need carefully thought-out policies for integrating immigrants who are allowed in. Since both migrants and host societies stand to benefit from successful integration, both must play their part in making it happen. It is reasonable for
societies to expect those who would become citizens to share certain basic values, to respect the law of the land, and to develop fluency in the local language, with assistance if they need it.

For their part, host societies must have effective anti-discrimination legislation and procedures, reflecting international standards and obligations, and should also take measures to promote appreciation of cultural diversity among all their citizens and residents.

But laws and policies are not enough. Leadership is vital too. All national leaders should be conscious that any form of discrimination against immigrants is a regression from the standards for a just society enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the binding treaties that derive from it.

Many people, in government and academia, in the private sector and in civil society as a whole, are showing the leadership that is needed to combat xenophobia and stigma. I salute them for it. But I am also disturbed by the vilification, in some quarters, of migrants—particularly of asylum seekers—often in an effort to achieve political gain.

Many of those vilified have fled their homelands in fear of their lives. States have a legal obligation not to return them to danger. They must establish fair procedures to determine the legitimacy of asylum claims. If, in extreme circumstances, asylum seekers must be detained, certain minimal standards must be provided, and enforced, to ensure respect for their human dignity and human rights.

The international regime for protecting migrant workers, set out in a host of human rights conventions that are either regional in scope or confined to particular categories of workers, should be made applicable to all categories of migrants, both regular and irregular, and to members of their families. Many States have recognized this need.

Recently, a step forward was taken with the entry into force of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families—the bill of rights for migrant workers and their families in their new home countries. This step was important. But it was not enough. So far, only sender States have ratified the Convention, which means that it will have little practical effect. I call on all States, and in particular receiving States, to ratify the Convention, so that the human rights of migrant workers are protected by law.

The Migrant Workers Convention is but one instance of the efforts that are being made to address the issue of migration at the global level. But despite these efforts, consensus is lacking on many of the principles and policies which should be applied to the governance of international migration.
Internationally, we are not well organized to forge that consensus.

The United Nations does play an important role in dealing with many aspects of migration, and a leading role in helping refugees through the office of the High Commissioner. The International Labour Organization gives a voice to organized labour, and sets standards for fair labour practices, in conjunction with governments and the private sector. Outside the United Nations system, the International Organization for Migration (IOM) facilitates the movement of people, at the request of member States. United Nations agencies and the IOM have come together in the Geneva Migration Group to work more closely on this issue.

But we still lack a comprehensive institutional focus at the international level that could protect the rights of migrants and promote the shared interest of emigration, immigration and transit. No single agency works systematically across the whole spectrum of migration issues, and there is no complete legal framework in place to deal with this quintessentially global phenomenon.

I do not pretend that we can achieve such a framework overnight. And we should not await it before increasing bilateral and regional efforts. I am heartened by the efforts of some States—particularly those of the European Union—to find ways of coordinating their actions and harmonizing their policies.

Yet more and more people are coming to the conclusion that we also have to address this issue globally. Doing it regionally or bilaterally is not enough. I particularly welcome the decision taken by a core group of Member States from both North and South to form a Global Commission on International Migration to deepen our understanding of this issue and to make recommendations for improving international cooperation.

The Commission will have two distinguished co-Chairs in Jan Karlsson of Sweden and Mamphela Ramphele of South Africa. It has my full backing, and I hope it will receive support from States in all parts of the world and from institutions like yours. Most of all, I hope it will help us approach this issue creatively and cooperatively.

As the Commission’s work proceeds, there are many questions I believe it should be asking, and that the rest of us should be asking too. For instance:

• Can greater cooperation be built between sender and receiver countries?
• Have the benefits of short-term and long-term temporary immigration been fully explored?
• Could more be done to work with the laws of supply and demand rather than against them?
• Might financial methods of discouraging illegal migration be more effective and more humane than some current practices?
• What are the best ways to speed up the integration of immigrants into host societies?
• Could more be done to harness the potential of migration as a force for development?
• Can developing countries do more to maintain contact with their emigrants?

No doubt there are numerous other equally important issues to be addressed as well.

Above all, I believe we must approach this issue with a strong ethical compass. The basic fairness and decency of any society can best be measured by its treatment of the weak and vulnerable. The principle of nondiscrimination has become an integral part of the universal moral code, one on which the defence of all other universal values depends. We should keep a firm hold upon it.

The willingness of rich countries to welcome migrants, and the way that they treat them, will be a measure of their commitment to human equality and human dignity. Their preparedness to adjust to the changes that migration brings will be an indicator of their readiness to accept the obligations as well as the opportunities of globalization, and of their conception of global citizenship. And their attitude to the issue will also be a test of their awareness of the lessons, and obligations, of history. After all, many migrants today are seeking to enter countries which not so long ago conquered and exploited their own. And many countries that are now attracting immigrants were until recently major exporters of emigrants.

Along with other countries, the United States falls into a third category—a nation built by immigration, a land where constant renewal and regeneration are essential elements of the national character. That character must never be lost.

And the hope and reality of a new future for those who would migrate must glow brighter today than ever before.

As Emma Lazarus wrote: “Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door.”

For Class Discussion

1. Annan identifies the global stakeholders in immigration issues as “sender countries, countries of transit, host countries, and migrants themselves.” According to Annan, what does each group lose and gain through migration?

2. How does Annan seek to elicit sympathy for migrants?

3. What does Annan claim are the main problems with immigration that are facing receiving countries?
4. What role in regulating immigration does Annan advocate for global institutions?
5. What features of this piece contribute to making it a persuasive argument in favor of global migration?
6. How has it affected your understanding of this subject?

Offer May Vary
Clay Bennett

Clay Bennett is a nationally known editorial cartoonist for the Christian Science Monitor. He is a graduate of the University of North Alabama and holds degrees in art and history. He has worked for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and the St. Petersburg Times. In 2002, he won a Pulitzer Prize for editorial cartooning.

How is Bennett using the contrast between the Statue of Liberty’s traditional symbolism and his revised version in this cartoon to raise questions about the current U.S. immigration policies?

FIGURE 4.1 Offer May Vary
For Class Discussion

1. To understand this cartoon, what historical and cultural background information is it helpful to know about the Statue of Liberty? Why has this statue come to be a famous symbol of the United States?

2. How is Clay Bennett employing this symbol?

3. What is the main claim of this cartoon?

4. The phrase “offer may vary” echoes advertising provisos. What rhetorical effect does it have on readers?

America’s Mixed Messages to Foreigners at the Gate
Ruben Navarrette, Jr.

A syndicated columnist with the Washington Post Writers Group, Ruben Navarrette, Jr., publishes his editorials worldwide. He is a columnist and member of the editorial board for the Dallas Morning News, where this op-ed piece first appeared on February 6, 2004. A native of Fresno, California, and now a resident of Dallas, Navarrette holds a bachelor of arts and a master of arts in public administration from Harvard. He frequently speaks on public television news commentaries on Latino affairs, immigration, and politics.

What important problem of U.S. immigration policy does this opinion piece expose?

1. Those Americans who crusade against illegal immigration often say they want to send the people of other countries a message: Come legally, or don’t come at all.

2. The word isn’t getting through. One reason could be that illegal immigrants—especially those from Mexico and the rest of Latin America—get tons of messages from the United States, and most are mixed.

3. I recently heard Rep. Tom Tancredo, R-Colo., a vocal opponent of illegal immigration, express concern that too many immigrants no longer seem interested in becoming U.S. citizens and involving themselves in the political process.

4. Just a few weeks earlier, I watched talk show host Bill O’Reilly of Fox News, another vocal foe of illegal immigration, express a different concern—that too many immigrants might become U.S. citizens and involve themselves in the political process.

5. So what is it that folks are really worried about—that immigrants won’t become an active part of our society, or that they will and in the process change that society?
Mixed messages are nothing new, and they start even before the immigrants get to the United States.

The fences and border guards say: Stay out. If you don’t come legally, you’re not welcome.

But once they get here, most immigrants—even the illegal kind—never lack for jobs in the United States. The willingness of American employers to hire the undocumented and the desire of some politicians to give employers new batches of guest workers all say: Come right in. We’re glad to have you. Tell your friends.

Then there is the thorny issue of language. English-only laws and the popularity of fire-breathing politicians who push linguistic homogeneity send the message: In the United States, we speak English and we demand the same of you. Don’t expect us to cater to you in your native tongue.

But bilingual education, bilingual ballots and our willingness to translate everything from government documents to menus at fast-food restaurants tell people: Don’t bother learning English. Keep your native language.

Demands that immigrants blend into their surroundings, and the way that many Americans cling to the fantasy that earlier waves of newcomers shed their culture when they arrived on these shores, sends the message: You must assimilate! You have to change your ways and adapt to the ways of your new country.

Yet the efficiency with which many U.S. businesses—eager to get their share of more than $600 billion in annual spending by Latino consumers—helped build the multibillion-dollar industry of Spanish-language billboards, newspapers, radio and television says: You can come to this country and feel like you never left your own. What’s important is that you buy our products.

And of course, voters in various states are always threatening to deprive illegal immigrants of education, health care and other services, as if to say: You don’t deserve anything. After all, you shouldn’t even be here.

Yet illegal immigrants still pay their fair share of taxes—sales, property, municipal, payroll and even (for those who want to become legal residents) federal income tax. That the tax collector isn’t so choosy about who pays the tax sends the message: If you want to live here—and consume goods here—legal or not, you’ll have to pay up.

It’s politically fashionable for Americans and those politicians who pander to them to beat their chests and demand that we get tough on illegal immigration.

As I have written many times, I’m all for it—as long as we begin by cracking down on the root cause: the employers without whom there would be no illegal immigration.
But being tough isn’t enough. Americans also have to be crystal clear. First, they have to be clear in their own minds that they’re prepared to live without the conveniences, bargain prices and higher standard of living afforded them by a ready abundance of cheap labor.

And then they have to be clear in what they communicate to immigrants themselves. After all, Americans want the people of the world to respect their authority and not question their resolve when it comes to protecting U.S. borders. That’s hard to do without first being consistent, credible and clear.

Got the message?

For Class Discussion
1. How does Navarrette support his main claim?
2. What attitude toward his subject and his audience does Navarrette convey in this piece?
3. What is the rhetorical effect of the use of italics?
4. What contribution does this op-ed piece make to the national debate over illegal immigration?

From Guide for the Mexican Migrant
Mexico’s Ministry of Foreign Relations

In January 2005, Mexico’s Ministry of Foreign Relations issued a pamphlet entitled Guide for the Mexican Migrant. In this pamphlet, the Mexican government addresses the reality of steady illegal migration and tries to protect its citizens who are seeking a new life in the United States. Soon after its publication, translations of the Guide began appearing in U.S. newspapers. American Renaissance, a monthly magazine that bills itself as “a literate, undeceived journal of race, immigration and the decline of civility,” printed a version of the Guide in English, from which this excerpt is taken (http://www.amren.com/). To see the entire text of the Guide, go to this site or others on the Web.

As its title indicates, this pamphlet falls in the genre of guidebooks. How are the function and purpose of this guidebook like and unlike those of guidebooks you have used?

INTRODUCTION
1 Esteemed Countryman:
2 The purpose of this guide is to provide you with practical advice that may prove useful to you in case you have made the
difficult decision to search for employment opportunities outside of your country.

The sure way to enter another country is by getting your passport from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the visa, which you may apply for at the embassy or consulate of the country you wish to travel to.

However, in practice we see many Mexicans who try to cross the Northern Border without the necessary documents, through high risk zones that involve grave dangers, particularly in desert areas or rivers with strong, and not always obvious, currents.

Reading this guide will make you aware of some basic questions about the legal consequences of your stay in the United States of America without the appropriate migratory documents, as well as about the rights you have in that country, once you are there, independent of your migratory status.

Keep in mind always that there exist legal mechanisms to enter the United States of America legally.

In any case, if you encounter problems or run into difficulties, remember that Mexico has 45 consulates in that country whose locations you can find listed in this publication.

Familiarize yourself with the closest consulate and make use of it.

DANGERS IN CROSSING HIGH RISK ZONES

To cross the river can be very risky, above all if you cross alone and at night.

Heavy clothing increases in weight when wet and this makes swimming and floating difficult.

If you cross by desert, try to walk at times when the heat will not be too intense.

Highways and population centers are far apart, which means you will spend several days looking for roads, and you will not be
able to carry bodstuffs or water for long periods of time. Also, you can get lost.

Salt water helps keep liquids in your body. Although you may feel more thirst if you drink salt water, the risk of dehydration is much less.

The symptoms of dehydration are

- Little or no sweat.
- Dryness in the eyes and in the mouth.
- Headache.
- Tiredness and excessive exhaustion.
- Difficulty in walking and thinking.
- Hallucinations and visions.

If you get lost, guide yourself by lightposts, train tracks, or dirt roads.

BEWARE OF HUMAN TRAFFICKERS (COYOTES, POLLEROS)

They can deceive you with assurances of crossing in a few hours through the mountains and deserts. This is simply not so!

They can risk your life taking you across rivers, drainage canals, desert areas, train tracks, or highways. This has caused the death of hundreds of persons.

If you decide to hire people traffickers to cross the border, consider the following precautions:

Do not let them out of your sight. Remember that they are the only ones who know the lay of the land, and therefore the only ones who can get you out of that place.

Do not trust those who offer to take you to “the other side” and ask you to drive a car or to take or carry a package for them. Normally, those packages contain drugs or other prohibited substances. For this reason, many people have ended up in jail.

For Class Discussion

1. How is this guide designed to appeal to its target audience?

2. What does the use of comic book illustrations contribute to the rhetorical effect of this pamphlet? (If you find this Guide on the Web, you will see the numerous illustrations in color.)

3. How do you think the genre and appearance of the Guide have contributed to the strong emotional responses it has evoked, especially from some advocacy groups and politicians in the United States?

4. The Guide includes this disclaimer by the Mexican government: “This Consular Protection Guide does not promote crossing by Mexicans without legal documentation required by the government of the United States. Its purpose is to make known the risks,
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and to inform the migrants about their rights, whether they are legal residents or not.” What features of the content, tone, and style of this pamphlet support this declaration? What features, if any, suggest an ambivalent attitude toward illegal migration?

5. Do a brief investigation of the Guide on the Web. What have people in Mexico and in the United States said about this pamphlet?

Guest Worker Visas
Linda Chavez

Known for her forthright views on Latino affairs, Linda Chavez is a prominent conservative journalist who has written for the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, the New Republic, and USA Today. From 1977 to 1983, she served as editor of American Educator, the quarterly journal of the American Federation of Teachers. She has worked with the United Nations and the federal government and is currently president of the Center for Equal Opportunity in Washington, D.C. In addition, she has authored several books, including Out of the Barrio: Toward a New Politics of Hispanic Assimilation (1991), and appeared on television journals such as CNN & Co. This editorial was published in Investor’s Business Daily on November 13, 2002, and appeared on the TownHall.com: Conservative Columnists Web site.

According to Linda Chavez, what is the rationale for a guest worker program in the United States? Whom is she trying to persuade?

1 Washington’s unwillingness to deal with illegal immigration has emboldened several Latin American governments to come up with their own solutions. An estimated 9 million illegal aliens from Latin America live in the United States, so Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala have recently begun issuing identification cards to illegal aliens through their consular offices in the U.S. These IDs allow illegal aliens living here to open bank accounts, obtain drivers’ licenses and library cards, and fly on U.S. domestic airlines.

2 While many Americans may find the practice objectionable, a number of local and state governments have been quick to embrace these new “matricula consular” IDs as a way to bring illegal aliens in their communities out of the shadows, where they are easy prey to criminals and scam artists. So far, several jurisdictions in California, Texas, Arizona, Illinois, Georgia and elsewhere have decided to accept these identification cards where official government IDs are required.

3 Now, El Salvador has gone a step further in driving U.S. immigration policy by actually lobbying its nationals to stay in the
United States—even though they came here illegally in the first place. Salvadoran President Francisco Flores recently sent recorded messages to Salvadorans living in the U.S., reminding them to reapply for the limited amnesty they were granted two years ago in the wake of two devastating earthquakes in their home country. The emergency measure permitted Salvadorans who entered the U.S. illegally prior to February 2001 to apply for temporary work permits, which expired in September 2002. The message from the Salvadoran president was delivered via Americatel, a long-distance carrier, to some 750,000 persons in the United States who had placed calls to El Salvador previously.

Mexico, El Salvador and other Latin American countries are taking these unorthodox steps because illegal immigration has become a safety valve for their own struggling economies. Those unable to find jobs in their own countries simply sneak across the border to the United States, where work is relatively plentiful and wages are substantially higher than at home. What’s more, these illegal aliens send literally billions of dollars home to support family members left behind. Throughout Latin America, these remittances from illegal aliens living in the United States have boosted local economies, even providing needed infrastructure in some communities—roads, schools and even sewers for remote villages. Experts estimate that remittances from family members living in the U.S. are now the chief source of foreign aid to Latin America.

But can the United States afford to have other countries encouraging their nationals to disobey U.S. immigration law? The fact is, these countries are simply taking advantage of the vacuum that exists in American immigration policy. Despite a lot of bombastic political rhetoric over illegal immigration, most politicians—from both parties—are unwilling to take the bull by the horns and come up with a sensible solution.

Like it or not, it’s not possible simply to round up all the illegal aliens in the country and ship them home. Nor would it be desirable to do so. Our economy is simply too dependent on their labor to withstand a round up of illegals like the one the U.S. engaged in during the Great Depression. Most illegal aliens are gainfully employed doing dirty, often dangerous jobs that Americans won’t take, at least not at wages that allow employers to keep the jobs here rather than ship the jobs overseas.

The only answer is a properly constructed guest worker program that regulates the flow of workers into the country, depending on economic conditions in the United States. When we face boom times and labor shortages, we should be able to bring in more workers. When the job market tightens and the economy contracts, we should be able to send them home again. Those already
living and working here, albeit illegally, ought to be able to “earn” legal status by paying a hefty fine for having broken our immigration laws, learning English and demonstrating work history and skills that make them a good bet as future workers.

A guest worker program may not be the perfect solution to our growing illegal immigration problem, but it’s a lot better than what we have now: U.S. officials’ wink and a nod to illegal immigration and foreign governments’ open encouragement to their nationals to flout our laws.

For Class Discussion

1. Which of Chavez’s reasons for a guest worker program in the United States strike you as particularly persuasive?
2. Chavez spends the first two-thirds of her article sketching for her readers the problem she is addressing. In the last third, she presents her solution. How effective is this rhetorical strategy?
3. How does Chavez use evidence in her argument?
4. What does this piece contribute to your understanding of immigration within a global context?

Immigration Is Turning Britain into a Sweatshop

John Laughland

John Laughland has a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Oxford and currently lectures at various French universities. Laughland is a fellow of Sanders Research Associates, an independent firm formed in Ireland in 1997, which is devoted to analyzing “the global political economy for individuals and companies” and to asking critical, probing questions (Found at http://www.sandersresearch.com). He is affiliated with the British Helsinki Human Rights Group and is an independent columnist who publishes his writing in British, European, and American newspapers. This piece appeared in the London paper Mail on Sunday on March 14, 2004.

What parallels between Britain and the United States does John Laughland draw in the economic problems behind the migration of people from poorer countries to richer countries?

1 The first time I visited the sinisterly named Lunik 9, a gipsy slum outside the Slovak town of Kosice, was in 1998.
2 Children, young people and adults cascaded from every door and window to throng around us.
They lived in terrible squalor as they had just been unceremoniously moved out of the centre of town on the orders of mayor Rudolf Schuster, now Slovakia’s president.

I went there because there was a scare about gipsies flooding into Britain.

A programme on Slovak TV had told people they could come to Britain and claim benefit, and many did. Britain took emergency measures, imposing visas on all Slovaks, and the issue eventually died down.

But the scare discredited the government of the day, headed by Schuster’s rival, because it was falsely claimed they were fleeing persecution: an example of how the gipsy issue is easily manipulated for short-term political purposes.

Has anything changed? Some weeks ago the BBC, among others, started a new ‘Slovak gipsies scare’ by sending journalists to a gipsy camp. Other reporters followed, but Slovak journalists have complained that their British colleagues falsified their reports to claim the gipsies all intended to come to Britain on May 1, when Slovakia joins the European Union. But any gipsies who had wanted to come from Slovakia would have had little difficulty coming here in recent years as asylum seekers.

As a result, the British Government is to crack down on benefit scroungers.

But while this is welcome, it is irrelevant. Benefit tourism is being used as a smokescreen for the far more important issue of mass immigration of Eastern Europeans to Britain after May 1 for work. EU enlargement means that about 70 million people will have the right to come to work in Britain, and it is inevitable that huge numbers will.

The British Government has said it actively wants people to come and work here legally. As with asylum seekers, it likes to give the impression that the new arrivals will bring valuable skills.

Some will, but many will be unskilled or semiskilled, and this will exert an inevitable downward pressure on wages, especially for people already struggling on low pay.

Middleclass Government Ministers and other professionals will welcome an influx of cheap labour because they, and their friends in big business, will profit from it. It is our working classes, and those on low pay, who will lose out.

Supporters of immigration argue that it boosts economic growth and that everyone profits from having a healthy economy. But history does not bear this out.

Take America, where there was huge immigration during the late 19th and early 20th Centuries.

Between 1890 and 1913, the US economy grew at an annual rate of 1.9 per cent and there were more than six million
immigrants. From 1913 to 1929 more than 15 million immigrants arrived and growth fell to 1.1 per cent a year.

Compare that with the experience of Japan, which enjoyed huge economic growth from 1955 to 1993, yet there was virtually no immigration.

It is possible that economic output will go up if the population increases through immigration. This is because GDP figures are simply the aggregate of all economic activity: by definition, they go up if more people come here.

But this is not a measure of prosperity. What counts is income per head and this will fall especially for the poorest sections of our society if the immigrants drive down wages.

The New Americans, a book published by the U.S. National Research Council, calculated that the mass immigration of the Eighties reduced the wages of all native-born American workers competing with immigrants by about two per cent.

The effect of the May 1 expansion is likely to be much the same in Britain.

Sometimes, the last generation of immigrants suffers most. The American experience has shown that blacks remain an underclass as Hispanic immigration booms. Middleclass people may welcome Polish plumbers who are cheaper than British ones, but the main economic effect will be to ensure a fresh supply of unskilled labour in the agricultural and food sectors. In other words, immigration tends to shore up a ‘sweatshop’ economy, rather than making British manufacturing more sophisticated.

Therein lies a fundamental problem. Britain has had immigration for decades and yet we systematically see our manufacturing base seep away. This is because immigration allows employers to increase profits by driving down wages, instead of increasing productivity by investing in high-tech manufacturing. As long as there is a supply of cheap labour, there is little incentive to improve productivity.

Even skilled and educated Eastern European immigrants tend to take lower-paid or unskilled jobs for a host of reasons, including a lack of connections in this country and language difficulties. It is already common to find, say, Russian airline pilots working as builders in the West, or Serbian graduates working as nannies.

We already have a legal immigration rate of 200,000 a year, and an unknown amount of illegal immigration. As the Morecambe Bay disaster shows, illegal immigration is hardly policed at all. This flow will turn into a flood on May 1 because the Government, to please big business, has decided to keep down wages.

On its websites, it sells Britain to foreign ‘investors’, that is people who take their profits out of this country, on the basis that ‘Labour market regulations in the UK, including working hours,
are the most flexible in Europe, and staffing costs are highly competitive.

26 It even boasts that British labour law does not require a written contract.

27 In plain English, we are a low-wage economy with little labour protection.

28 The Government is trying to pretend that few will come, but Britain is the only one of the 15 existing EU states not to impose restrictions on labour from the accession countries from May 1.

29 The influx is inevitable because of the catastrophic economic situation in those countries. The president of the European Parliament, Pat Cox, has said growth in Poland is now five per cent and that Poles have more opportunities at home than here.

30 This is simply untrue. The official unemployment rate in Poland is nearly 20 per cent: more than four times our own.

31 But these figures underestimate the true level of joblessness. It is very difficult to sign on the dole in Poland, and you get only Pounds 5 a month. In fact, about half the adults in Poland, 15 million, do not have a job.

32 People get by through scrounging off their families, doing the occasional odd job, buying something here and selling something there. In western Poland, the most prosperous part of the country, unskilled work is paid at 20p per hour.

33 I know from observing elections in Eastern Europe that the main reason the people voted to join the EU is that it will allow them to work abroad.

34 The question in places such as Lithuania is not whether they are going to leave, but when.

35 Migrants will not be able to claim benefits, but they will be able to do the low-paid jobs. So business will be able to reap the profits, while poor British families will continue to be forced to live off the taxpayer. This is the equivalent of the Mexican solution in America.

36 And what do the British people think about this? We do not know, because no one has bothered to ask.

For Class Discussion

1. What is the main claim of this argument?
2. How does John Laughland support his argument? Which pieces of his evidence are the most persuasive?
3. How does he respond to opposing views?
4. What audience do you think Laughland is particularly trying to reach with this argument, which appeared in a general circulation news publication in Britain?
5. A critical reader might say that the title and the opening of this article play on sensationalism and fear. How does Laughland’s argument justify or fail to justify his use of these attention-getting moves?

Illegal Immigrant Economy
Brian Fairrington

Brian Fairrington is a syndicated cartoonist with Cagle Cartoons. His cartoons have been published in hundreds of newspapers and publications including the New York Times and USA Today, and he is a regular editorial cartoonist for the Arizona Republic. This cartoon appeared on the online publication Slate Magazine’s Cagle Cartoon Index for October 17, 2003.

What are the multiple perspectives on illegal immigrant labor portrayed in this cartoon?

For Class Discussion
1. What story does this cartoon tell? What is the setting? Who are the characters?
2. What does the vocal customer not understand about undocumented workers?
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3. A key word in this cartoon is “benefit(s).” What is ironic about the use of this word in this cartoon?

4. Which articles in this chapter agree with this cartoon? Which disagree?

5. If you were to discuss the issue of benefits for illegal aliens with the customer in this cartoon, what questions might you need to research first?

When Guest Workers Opt Not to Go Home; German Example Shows Some Migrant Policies Lead to Isolation, Poverty

Don Melvin

Don Melvin works on the international staff of Knight-Ridder Tribune. This article was first published in Texas’s Austin American Statesman on February 1, 2004.

How does Don Melvin try to make the problems of guest worker plans interesting, important, and relevant to general American readers?

1 Berlin—Fevzi Cakir came to Germany intending to stay a year or two. It was his plan, and that of the German government as well, that he would return shortly to his native Turkey. Thirty-nine years later he’s still here. His wife is here. Two of his four children were born here. He likes his life in Berlin.

2 He came as a guest worker, and now he’s a citizen. He should be a fan of guest worker programs, right?

3 Wrong. Such programs, in his view, cause serious problems.

4 “I don’t understand why America is planning something like that,” said Cakir, who is 62.

5 As the United States contemplates a proposal by President Bush to temporarily legalize some foreign workers with the expectation that they will eventually return to the lands of their birth, the German experience may provide a cautionary tale.

6 More than 40 years after the first Turkish guest workers arrived to help the country rebuild—World War II had left West Germany flush with Marshall Plan reconstruction money but short of manpower—a significant number are still here.

7 Many of the immigrants live in ghettos. Many, even children, do not speak German. Housing and education are substandard. Crime
is high. Unemployment, 18 percent among Berliners, is 35 percent among the city’s Turks.

About three of every four Turks in Germany are not citizens, even after decades in the country. Many play no role in the political life of the country. They feel the sting of bigotry and keep to themselves.

Some, clinging to their roots in a land that remains foreign to them, practice Islam in a manner more conservative and rigid than many people in Turkey. Young people, devoid of prospects, have developed a hip hop-like culture of gold chains and aggressive behavior.

“I don’t think the whole program is very good,” “Cakir said. “It creates heavy problems, as we see here.”

Germany’s guest worker program began in 1955. At first, under treaties Germany negotiated with countries with high unemployment, the workers came from Italy. Spanish and Greek workers followed; then, in 1961, workers from Turkey began to come, followed by those from Morocco and elsewhere.

By 1970, 3 million foreign-born people lived in the country, nearly 5 percent of the population. The program ended in 1973, when the worldwide oil crisis slowed the German economy.

But as family members came to Germany to join the workers, the number swelled to 7.3 million by the beginning of 2002.

The largest group is the Turks. Nearly 3 million live in Germany, about 200,000 of them in Berlin. Some of the city’s neighborhoods are overwhelmingly Turkish, with Turkish doctors, lawyers, shops, eateries, salons. Many apartments are fitted with satellite dishes to pick up Turkish TV.

Citizenship, while not impossible to obtain, is difficult. Although Germany’s citizenship law was liberalized in 2000, for many years it gave preference to applicants believed to have Teutonic ancestry, required a minimum residency of 15 years and required that other citizenship be renounced, something many older Turks were reluctant to do.

Many of the problems are in part attributable to the guest worker concept, according to government officials, academics and members of the Turkish community. Everybody—the German government and the guest workers themselves—assumed the situation was temporary and acted accordingly. There was denial on both sides that what was taking place was immigration, said Ruth Mandel, who teaches anthropology at University College in London and is on leave writing a book about Turks in Germany.

For decades, the German government asserted stoutly that “Germany is not an immigration country” and the word immigrant was never used in referring to the workers. No money was spent to teach the immigrants the German language or to help them integrate into German society.
Nor did the migrants themselves make much effort. Cumali Kangal came to Germany 30 years ago to work in a metal factory, assuming he was staying only temporarily. It wasn’t until seven or eight years later that it finally struck him that he ought to learn the language.

Turkish parents have often shuttled their children between countries, enrolling them in German schools for a year or two, then sending them to school in Turkey for a while.

“Many generations of children have grown up basically as bilingual illiterates.” Mandel said.

“Language is one of the biggest problems we have,” said Michael Ried, a high school chemistry teacher. “If a student does not speak German properly we are of course unable to teach him anything.”

German employers, too, found a temporary program less to their liking than they had expected. They were loath to send workers away once they were trained.

“Economically, it’s nonsense for the factories to change every year the personnel,” said Safter Cinar, an official with the Turkischer Bund, or Turkish Federation, in Berlin.

For that reason, a temporary worker program makes sense only when the work itself is temporary, said Barbara John, who retired recently after 22 years as Berlin’s commissioner for migration and integration. If the workers must leave when the crops are finished, that makes sense, she said. To hire temporary workers for industry, she said, does not.

In addition, she said, it is difficult to enforce temporary programs when there is great economic disparity between the new country and the country of origin. While the program proposed by President Bush is aimed primarily at workers already in the United States illegally, it would also apply to prospective workers abroad.

People familiar with the German experience say there are lessons for all concerned. Kangal, in addition to urging workers to learn the language earlier than he did, said the host country should enter the arrangement with open eyes.

If a country, needing cheap labor, hires another country’s least qualified workers, it will get poorly educated and unsophisticated people ill equipped to learn the language and assimilate.

Though he is a Turk and experiences prejudice “every day,” he also said it was not primarily Turkey’s elite who had come to Germany. “In some way,” he said, “the prejudice is not wrong.”

And Mandel said the host country should have what she called “an ethics of hospitality.”

The German example of making citizenship very difficult to acquire should be avoided, she said. The new citizenship law enacted in Germany in 2000 lowered the minimum residency
requirement from 15 to eight years and grants dual citizenship to children born in Germany whose foreign-born parents have resided in the country for at least eight years.

“The worst things is for society to set up a new and separate economic class with a different set of rights,” she said. That, she said, is a “recipe for divisiveness.”

**For Class Discussion**

1. In this article, Don Melvin presents a precedent argument based on his claim that the United States should not establish a guest worker program like Germany’s after World War II. What reasons does Melvin provide in support of this claim?

2. In this piece, written for a general newspaper audience in a casual, easy-reading journalistic style, Melvin develops his argument with examples and quotations. Which pieces of support are particularly persuasive and rhetorically effective for this audience?

3. If the United States wanted to proceed with a guest worker plan, what could it learn from Germany’s experience with guest workers? In other words, what should the United States do differently?

---

**Anti-Immigration Bumper Stickers**

These bumper stickers (shown only as text here) appear on a commercial Web site directed toward people who want to express their anger and anxiety about illegal immigration (http://www.illegalimmigrationbumperstickers.com/).

What audience beliefs and fears do these bumper stickers speak to?

- **Protect American Wages! End Illegal Immigration Now!**
- **Don’t Gamble with Our Homeland Security Seal Our Borders!**
- **First Our Factories Leave, Then 7,000,000 Illegal Aliens Come Take the Jobs That Are Left!**
- **Protect American Wages!**
- **End Illegal Immigration Now!**
For Class Discussion

1. Bumper stickers are a flashy, in-your-face, abbreviated form of argument. How would you express the claims presented in these bumper stickers in more complete thoughts?

2. To whom do you think the message of these bumper stickers is directed? What group of people are they trying to influence? What actions or changes would the proponents of these bumper stickers like to see?

3. Use the Web address http://www.illegalimmigrationbumperstickers.com to see these bumper stickers in color with their accompanying symbolic images. How do some of these bumper stickers try to use the emotional charge of patriotism to reinforce their messages?

4. What assumptions about the American economy, American workers, and illegal immigrants would the supporters of these bumper stickers hold?

5. Numerous advocacy groups and organizations agree with these bumper stickers, among them, Immivasion (www.immivasion.us); ImmigrationsHumanCost.org; Federation for American Immigration Reform (www.fairus.org); Americans for Immigration Control (www.immigrationcontrol.com); Americans for Better Immigration (www.betterimmigration.org); and Minuteman Project (www.minutemanproject.com). After investigating some of these organizations’ Web sites, list the reasons and evidence they offer to support these bumper stickers’ claims. In other words, how do these organizations justify their views and what actions are they promoting to solve the problems they perceive?

The Special Case of Mexican Immigration

Samuel P. Huntington

Samuel P. Huntington is a major scholarly analyst in the fields of international relations, comparative politics, and American politics. He is the chairman of the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies, cofounder of Foreign Policy magazine, a vocal neoconservative, and a prolific writer. His famous book The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order (1996) posits the thesis that the main conflicts of our global age will not be economic, political, or environmental; instead they will center on the values of groups of people (civilizations) and will involve their history, culture, and religion. Huntington has sparked even more controversy with his recent argument about the threat and challenge of Mexican immigration to
U.S. national identity. He advances this position in his article entitled “The Hispanic Challenge,” published in both Foreign Affairs and Foreign Policy magazines, and in his most recent book, Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity (2004). “The Special Case of Mexican Immigration” is an adaptation of these longer writings. It appeared in 2000 in the American Enterprise, the online publication of the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank. This publication says it seeks to appeal to a wide range of readers and to promote informed, independent thinking by offering well-reasoned and highly readable arguments.

Many of the articles in this chapter focus on economic issues related to immigration. In contrast, where does Huntington think the main U.S. problems with immigration lie?

1 America is often described as a country defined by commitment to a creed formulated in the writings of our Founders. But American identity is only partly a matter of creed. For much of our history we also defined ourselves in racial, religious, ethnic, and cultural terms.

2 Before the Revolution we thought of ourselves in religious terms: 98 percent of Americans were Protestants, and Catholic Spain and France were our enemies. We also thought of ourselves in racial and ethnic terms: 80 percent of Americans at the time of the Revolution were from the British Isles. The other 20 percent were largely German and Dutch.

3 America is also often described as a nation of immigrants. We should distinguish immigrants, however, from settlers. Immigrants are people who leave one society and move to a recipient society. Early Americans did not immigrate to an existing society; they established new societies, in some cases for commercial reasons, more often for religious reasons. It was the new societies they created, basically defined by Anglo-Protestant culture, that attracted subsequent generations of immigrants to this country.

4 Demographer Campbell Gibson has done a very interesting analysis of the evolution of the United States’ population. He argues that if no immigrants had come to this country after 1790, the population of the United States in 1990 would have been just about half of what it actually was. Thus, the American people are literally only half an immigrant people.

5 There have been great efforts in our history to limit immigration. In only one decade in the nineteenth century did the annual intake of immigrants amount to more than 1 percent of the population each year. In three other decades it was slightly over eight-tenths of 1 percent, while in six decades it was less than four-tenths of 1 percent. Obviously immigration has been tremendously important to
this country, but the foreign-born population has exceeded 10 percent of our total population only in the seven census years from 1860 to 1930. (When the 2000 census results come out we will be back above the 10 percent level again.)

As I began to investigate the question of immigration, I came to the conclusion that our real problem is not so much immigration as assimilation. Seventy-five or 100 years ago there were great pressures to ensure that immigrants assimilated to the Anglo-Protestant culture, work ethic, and principles of the American creed. Now we are uncertain what immigrants should assimilate to. And that is a serious problem.

As I went further in my research, I concluded there was a still more significant problem, a problem that encompasses immigration, assimilation, and other things, too—what I will refer to as the Mexican problem. Much of what we now consider to be problems concerning immigration and assimilation really concern Mexican immigration and assimilation. Mexican immigration poses challenges to our policies and to our identity in a way nothing else has in the past.

There are five distinctive characteristics of the Mexican question which make it special. First, Mexican immigration is different because of contiguity. We have thought of immigration as being symbolized by Ellis Island, and perhaps now by Kennedy Airport. But Mexicans do not come across 2,000 miles of ocean. They come, often easily, across 2,000 miles of land border.

Our relationship with Mexico in this regard is in many respects unique in the world. No other First World country has a land frontier with a Third World country—much less one of 2,000 miles. The significance of this border is enhanced by the economic differences between the two countries. The income gap between Mexico and us is the largest between any two contiguous countries in the world.

The second distinctive aspect of today’s Mexican immigration concerns numbers. Mexican immigration during the past several decades has been very substantial. In 1998 Mexican immigrants constituted 27 percent of the total foreign-born population in this country; the next largest two contingents, Filipinos and Chinese, each amounted to only 4 percent. Mexicans constituted two-thirds of Spanish-speaking immigrants, who in turn were over half of all new arrivals between 1970 and 1996. Our post-1965 wave of immigration differs from previous waves in having a majority from a single non-English language group.

A third distinguishing characteristic of this Mexican immigration is illegality. Illegal immigration is overwhelmingly a post-1965 and Mexican phenomenon. In 1995, according to one report, Mexicans made up 62 percent of the immigrants who entered the United States illegally. In 1997, the Immigration and Naturalization
Service estimated Mexican illegals were nine times as numerous as the next largest contingent, from El Salvador.

The next important characteristic of Mexican immigration has been its concentration in a particular region. Mexican immigrants are heavily concentrated in the Southwest and particularly in southern California. This has very real consequences. Our Founders emphasized that immigrants would have to be dispersed among what they described as the English population in this country. To the extent that we have a large regional concentration of immigrants, it is a departure from our usual pattern.

Now obviously we have previously had high concentrations of immigrants in particular areas, such as the Irish in Boston, but by and large the immigrants have dispersed to different cities, and those cities have simultaneously hosted many different immigrant groups. This is the case still in New York, where there are many immigrants today, but no group that dominates. In Southern California, though, two-thirds or more of all the children in school are Spanish speaking. As Abe Lowenthal and Katrina Burgess write in *The California-Mexico Connection*, “No school system in a major U.S. city has ever experienced such a large influx of students from a single foreign country. The schools of Los Angeles are becoming Mexican.”

Finally, there is the matter of the persistence of Mexico’s large immigration. Previous waves of immigration fairly soon came to an end. The huge 1840s and ‘50s influxes from Ireland and Germany were drastically reduced by the Civil War and the easing of the Irish potato famine. The big wave at the turn of the century came to an end with World War I and the restrictive legislation in 1924.

These breaks greatly helped to facilitate the assimilation of the newcomers. In contrast, there does not seem to be any prospect of the current wave, begun over three decades ago, coming to an end soon. Mexican immigration may eventually subside as the Mexican birth rate slows, and possibly as a result of long-term economic development in Mexico. But those effects will only occur over a very long term. For the time being we are faced with substantial continued immigration from Mexico.

Sustained high levels of immigration build on themselves. After the first immigrants come from a country, it is easier for others from that country to come. Immigration is not a self-limiting process, it is a self-enhancing one.

And the longer immigration continues, the more difficult politically it is to stop. Leaders of immigrant organizations and interest groups develop a vested interest in expanding their own constituency. Immigration develops political support, and becomes more difficult to limit or reshape.
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18 For all these reasons Mexican immigration is unique. What are the implications of this for assimilation?
19 The answer appears uncertain. In education and economic activity, Mexicans rate much lower than other immigrant groups. The rate of intermarriage between Hispanics and other Americans appears to be decreasing rather than increasing. (In 1977, 31 percent of all Hispanic marriages were interethnic; in 1994, 25.5 percent were.) With respect to language, I suspect Mexicans will in large part follow the pattern of earlier immigrants, with the third generation being fluent in English, but quite possibly, unlike previous third generations, also fluent in their ancestral language.
20 All of the characteristics I have mentioned lead to the possibility of a cultural community evolving in the Southwest in which people could pursue their lives within an overwhelmingly Mexican community, without ever having to speak English. This has already happened with the Cubans in Miami, and it could be reproduced on a larger and more significant scale in the Southwest. We know in the coming decades people of Hispanic origin will be a majority of the people in California and eventually in other southwestern states. America is moving in the direction of becoming a bilingual and bicultural society.
21 Without Mexican immigration, the overall level of immigration to this country would be perhaps two-thirds of what it has been—near the levels recommended by Barbara Jordan’s immigration commission a few years ago. Illegal entries would be relatively minor. The average skill and education level of immigrants would be the highest in American history, and the much-debated balance of economic benefits versus costs of immigration would tilt heavily toward the positive side. The bilingual education issue would fade from our agenda. A major potential challenge to the cultural, and conceivably political, integrity of the United States would disappear.
22 Mexico and Mexican immigration, however, will not disappear, and learning to live with both may become more and more difficult. President-elect Vicente Fox wants to remove all restrictions on the movement of Mexicans into the United States.
23 In almost every recent year the Border Patrol has stopped about 1 million people attempting to enter the U.S. illegally from Mexico. It is generally estimated that about 300,000 make it across illegally. If over 1 million Mexican soldiers crossed the border, Americans would treat it as a major threat to their national security and react accordingly. The invasion of over 1 million Mexican civilians is a comparable threat to American societal security, and Americans should react against it with comparable vigor.
Mexican immigration looms as a unique and disturbing challenge to our cultural integrity, our national identity, and potentially to our future as a country.

For Class Discussion
1. What points would you include in a summary of Huntington’s ideas in this article?
2. The American Enterprise Institute is a conservative think tank. What features of this article’s structure, depth of material, main points, and kinds of evidence indicate that its publication, the American Enterprise, seeks to reach a broad audience?
3. Many people responding to Huntington’s book Who Are We? and his article “The Hispanic Challenge,” which develop the views presented in this piece, have criticized Huntington for fostering racism and nativism (privileging native-born residents over immigrants). What ideas in this article could fuel those attitudes toward immigrants? What assumptions would an audience have to hold about Mexican immigration in order to agree with Huntington?
4. What key points about immigration, especially Mexican immigration, is Huntington not factoring into his argument? In your view, how would including those points affect the logic and credibility of his argument?

MALDEF AND LULAC Rebuke Samuel Huntington’s Theories on Latino Immigrants and Call on America to Reaffirm Its Commitment to Equal Opportunity and Democracy

Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) and League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)

This policy statement, dated April 23, 2004, is a formal response to Samuel P. Huntington’s publications on Mexican immigration. The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund protects the legal rights of Latinos. It is a national, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization headquartered in
Washington, D.C. Also centered there, the League of United Latin American Citizens, is a grassroots organization committed to the civil rights of Latinos. Both of these organizations are large, well established, and highly reputable. On its “About Us” link on its Web site, MALDEF states its mission “to foster sound public policies, laws and programs to safeguard the civil rights of the 40 million Latinos living in the United States and to empower the Latino community to fully participate in our society” (www.maldef.org).

How does the mission of MALDEF itself refute Huntington’s underlying thesis? What impression of the Latino community does refutation of Huntington’s views convey?

1 On May 27th, Samuel P. Huntington will publish his new book, alleging that Latino immigration threatens “Anglo-Protestant values” which are the “creed” of American culture. Since the release of his article announcing his new theory in Foreign Policy magazine in March, Huntington’s methodology and conclusions have been proven wrong by experts across the board. As national Latino civil rights groups, we further believe that Huntington’s writing is dangerously biased against Latinos and goes against fundamental American values.

2 Huntington’s biases are un-American. The United States is a nation of immigrants from around the world. In the U.S., individual accomplishment is valued. The very foundation of American democracy is the Bill of Rights, respecting and even guaranteeing

---

1 S. Huntington, “José, Can You See?” Samuel Huntington on how Hispanic immigrants threaten America’s identity, values, and way of life (Foreign Policy, March/April 2004)(cover story).

individual rights. By passing various civil rights laws in the 1960’s, Congress re-established that our Constitution also means that not one race, religion or ethnicity should dominate another. The American dream is built upon the hard work of immigrants and the fundamental value of equal opportunity. We must not go back to a system where one’s race, class or religion determines one’s fate, regardless of one’s intellect or willingness to work hard.

Huntington has made astonishing and unsupported generalizations about Latinos. His generalizations about Latinos being “persistent” in immigration to the U.S., being exceedingly fertile, having less interest in education and not wanting to learn English are not based on fact and appear to emanate from a prejudice against Latinos. He has no proof that every Latino/a, or even the majority of Latinos/as and their families, fall into these stereotypes, nor any proof that Latinos are very different from other ethnic groups. This kind of analysis harkens back to the justifications for legal segregation and discriminatory policies that were commonplace prior to the civil rights laws of the 1960’s.

Mexican-Americans and Latino immigrants are not inferior to white Anglo-Protestants. A recent New York Times poll found that Latino immigrants are hard-working, have strong family values, do not take public benefits, and generally epitomize the American dream. Latino immigrants are contributing billions of dollars to the economy and even creating jobs for U.S. citizens. Studies consistently find that immigrants contribute far more in taxes to the government than they use in government services.

3 V. Ruiz, “We Always Tell Our Children They Are Americans” Méndez v. Westminster and the California Road to Brown v. Board of Education, Review No. 200, Fiftieth Anniversary of the Supreme Court Ruling (College Board, Fall 2003), at p. 20–23 (Detailing history of Latino school segregation, along with other forms of segregation, “justified” by racial myths alleging Mexican Americans not like “Americans”; social scientists were needed to disprove these myths in a 1944 Méndez v. Westminster school desegregation case).


6 See, e.g., M. Fix & J. Passel, “Immigration and Immigrants. Setting the Record Straight.” Urban Institute (1994) at p. 6 (“Overall, annual taxes paid by immigrants to all levels of government more than offset the costs of services received, generating a net annual surplus of $25 billion to $30 billion.”).
Latina/o parents value education and encourage their children to do well in school at the same rates as Anglo parents, with more than 90 percent of Latina/o children reporting that their parents want them to go to college. Moreover, studies demonstrate that Mexican Americans support American core values at least as much as Anglos.

Huntington alleges that Latinos do not want to become American, despite the fact that Latino immigrants consciously choose to leave their home countries and migrate to the U.S. in order to become American and live the American dream, especially for their children. Everything that is traditionally thought of as “American,” Latinos live out fully. They are family-oriented, religious, hard-working and loyal to the U.S. In fact, Latinos have won more medals of honor for their service in the U.S. military than any other ethnic group.

Huntington fails to take into account that the significant accomplishments of Latinos have occurred in spite of the long and shameful history of discrimination specifically directed against Latinos in the U.S. When Huntington alleges that Latinos have not achieved as much as whites in education, he neglects to acknowledge the history of segregation against Latinos, and Mexican Americans in particular, especially in the Southwest. Even today, when legal segregation is outlawed, Huntington does not take into account that Latinos are attending the most segregated schools in the country, which are providing a lesser quality of education as compared to majority white schools. Predominantly minority schools have less-qualified teachers, more overcrowding, worse educational facilities, and less access to advanced curricula. Despite all these barriers, children of Latino immigrants are succeeding at a very high rate.

---

8 R. de la Garza, A. Falcon & F. C. Garcia, “Will the Real Americans Please Stand Up: Anglo and Mexican-American Support of Core American Political Values,” Vol. 40, No. 2 American Journal of Political Science (May 1996), pp. 335–51 (Results were that: “At all levels of acculturation, Mexican-Americans are no less likely and often more likely to endorse values of individualism and patriotism than are Anglos.”). Also, 9 out of 10 Latinos new to the U.S. believe it is important to change so they can fit into American society. R. Pastor, Toward a North American Community; Lessons from the Old World for the New World (Wash, D.C., Institute for International Economics, 2001), pp. 164–166 (citing Washington Post, Kaiser Foundation and Harvard Univ. comprehensive poll).
It is ironic that Huntington blames Latinos for segregation. Latinos and other people of color know from tough experience that such segregation is not voluntary, as it [is] still difficult for Latinos to gain equality in white communities, and there is still discrimination in jobs and housing. However, like African-Americans, Latinos have been segregated and mythologized as “different,” and subject to unfair criticism, because of their ethnicity.

Huntington criticizes Latinos’ use of Spanish and falsely alleges that Latinos do not want to learn English. The majority of Latinos speak English. Among Spanish-speaking Latinos, poll after poll shows that Latinos want to learn English. Their ability to learn English is sometimes limited if they entered the U.S. at an older age and when they do not have access to English classes because they are working more than one job and there are limited English classes offered. As far as the ability to speak Spanish, Huntington portrays it as a negative, whereas in the global economy, many see such language capabilities are a positive.

Huntington mischaracterizes the history between the U.S. and Mexico and the causes for migration patterns between the two countries. Huntington characterizes Mexican immigration as “persistent” and a “massive influx” post-1960’s civil rights laws. This characterization fails to recognize the unique, historical relationship between the two countries. In 1848, the U.S. acquired a significant portion of Mexico, which became what is now known as the Southwest in the U.S. Those people living in that region were Mexican citizens prior to the acquisition. When the U.S. experienced severe labor shortages while its soldiers were fighting in the world wars, the U.S. entered into several agreements with Mexico to bring temporary migrant laborers from Mexico who worked under abusive conditions in the agricultural fields for decades. Most of these workers did not have the opportunity to become citizens, making it difficult to exercise full political participation. During the Great Depression, the U.S. government and a number of state and

---

10 Majority of Americans Prefer to Live in Mixed Neighborhoods, Diversity.com (April 9, 2004) (“According to the ‘Civil Rights and Race Relations’ survey conducted by Gallup, 68 percent of African Americans, 61 percent of Latinos and 57 percent of whites prefer to live in mixed neighborhoods.”).

local governments forced repatriation of one-third of the Mexican American population to impoverished conditions in Mexico. Shockingly, most of those who were deported were U.S. citizens who happened to be of Mexican ethnicity.12 Despite this checkered past, Mexican immigrants continued to come to the U.S. to fill U.S. economic needs and to pursue economic opportunities not available in Mexico.13

Characterizing past non-Mexican immigration as “legal” and current Mexican immigration as “illegal” is false and misleading. Prior to 1939, it was not illegal to enter the U.S. without the U.S. government’s permission. Millions of immigrants, mostly from Western Europe, entered the U.S. without proper visas.14 Currently, many Mexicans enter the U.S legally. The U.S. legal immigration system, however, is in need of serious overhaul. The current system is not meeting the economic or family reunification principles it was designed to meet. The backlogs in legal visa processing for the spouses and children of Mexican legal immigrants living in the U.S. are causing families to be separated for 13 years. In order to reunite with their families, some Mexican citizens do enter without proper documentation.

Present high levels of migration between the U.S. and Mexico are based on geographic proximity and economic interdependence of the two countries. Many Mexicans come here because Mexico is our close neighbor and trading partner. Mexico is closer than Europe so the voyage to America is more natural. The U.S. and Mexican fate and economies are inextricably intertwined. That is, the U.S. is just as dependent on Mexico and Mexican migration as the opposite is true.

For Class Discussion

1. This is a bare-bones argument a policy statement structured as a rebuttal to Samuel P. Huntington’s articles and book on Mexican immigration. What reasoning and evidence are persuasive? What points call for more development in order to be persuasive to a general audience?

2. What is the rhetorical effect of the extensive documentation in this argument?

3. In your mind, does this article incorporate key points about immigration that Huntington omits? How does MALDEF seek to reframe the controversy over cultural integration?

4. Where or how could this argument acknowledge alternative views?

---

**No Room at the Inn**

Yasmin Alibhai-Brown

Educated at Oxford University, Yasmin Alibhai-Brown is a British Muslim journalist from Uganda. In the 1980s, she worked for the *New Statesman* and currently writes a weekly column for the *Independent*. She has been a fellow of the Institute for Public Policy Research, a British think tank connected to the Labour Party. She has also published a number of books, among them *Who Do We Think We Are? Imagining the New Britain* (2001), *Mixed Feelings: The Lives of Mixed Race Britons* (2002), and *Some of My Best Friends Are . . .* (2004). Alibhai-Brown is considered an articulate voice in the current public controversies in Britain over cultural integration, race, and national identity. This piece was published in the October 2002 issue of the *New Internationalist*. The Web site for this group describes it as “a workers’ cooperative . . . to report on the issues of world poverty and inequality; to focus attention on the unjust relationship between the powerful and powerless worldwide; to debate and campaign for the radical changes necessary to meet the basic needs of all; and to bring to life the people, the ideas and the action in the fight for global justice” (“About Us,” www.newint.org).

In her redefinition of the controversies surrounding immigration in Europe, how does Yasmin Alibhai-Brown connect global justice, immigration, cultural integration, and racism in her argument?

1. People attending a Holocaust Memorial Day in London in 2001 will never forget the appearance on stage of Kemal Pervanic, the once-emaciated Bosnian Muslim seen on the news looking through barbed wire in the Serb-built Omarska concentration camp.

   He spoke evocatively in English about what he had been made to suffer, but this was not the same man who had been broken by starvation and humiliation. His smart suit, beautifully groomed long hair and supreme confidence symbolized the vital reclamation of a lost life. He fled to the UK in 1993 and is now a science graduate. Britain gave him a future, by letting him come here as a refugee. It is what European countries used to do.

2. Populist anti-immigration politicians now in the ascendancy across Europe are destroying this precious heritage and have embarked on a concerted project which will create a white Fortress Europe rejecting and ejecting desperate people who are not white
or Christian. These leaders may pretend that they are responding to ‘illegal’ immigrants but it is pernicious racism and xenophobia which is animating their zeal and policies.

4 The assertion is easily proved. Where is the hysteria in Europe about white South Africans and white Zimbabweans who flood into the continent? They end up in top jobs and yet they are not resented or despised. Spain, so troubled that immigrants are rushing in, ignores the destruction of the Spanish national character by English immigrants on the south coast who do not integrate and who have criminals and anti-social exiles nestling in their enclaves. Politicians and others may claim that they are concerned about immigration and ‘culture’ but this latest flare-up is all about white panic brought about by the knowledge that most of the world’s refugees at present are Muslims and are black or brown.

5 In Britain in 1997 only 0.18 per cent of applications from Australian visitors were denied. The figure for Ghanaians was 30 percent. Almost all US citizens requesting settlement rights in the Britain were granted these rights but 30 per cent of Indians failed to acquire residency.

6 Those who temporarily make it are left in no doubt that they are unwanted. At a school in London this is a poem I heard recited by refugee children.

   Sorry
   Sorry that we are here
   That we take your time
   Sorry
   Sorry that we breathe in your air
   That we walk on your ground
   That we stand in your view
   Sorry
   That my name is not David
   Or Catherine
   Or Mary
   But Rushed
   And Hotly...
   And sorry that we brought nothing
   The only thing we have is a story
   Not even a happy story.

7 European Jews should know this well. In 1888 the Manchester City News wrote about Jews escaping pogroms in Eastern Europe: ‘Their unclean habits, their wretched clothing and miserable food enables them to perpetuate existence upon a pittance . . . they have flooded the market with cheap labour.’ In 1905 the Aliens Act was passed by politicians eager to placate these prejudices. Some 1,378 Jews were deported soon after. In 1938 the Express riled against an ‘influx of Jews . . . who are overrunning the country’.
'CARRIERS OF CHAOS'

MC—the name appears Kurdish—sends me this email: ‘I have no chance of warding off the emotional tauntings and assaults of some peer groups of white guys . . . How should I act in this situation and continue preserving my self-esteem and not start behaving like them? I have been beaten and called “fucking Paki”.’

Every week I get a number of such desperate e-mails from asylum seekers who obviously use their meagre allowances in internet cafés in order to express their grief and rage at the way they are forced to live. One such young man, 22-year-old Firstat Yildez from Turkey, was murdered in an unprovoked racist attack in Sighthill, Glasgow, the city which received 4,000 asylum seekers last March. Hundreds of asylum seekers are currently in prison without being charged or convicted of any crime and many of them are picked on for ‘special treatment’ by inmates and officers.

Death of non-white immigrants evokes little sympathy. Two years ago the bodies of 58 young Chinese men and women were found in the back of an airless container on one of the hottest days of the year in Britain. Imagine the horror. The piss and vomit and clawed flesh, wild screams and fists banging on the walls. The nameless 58—after all they were only Chinese, plenty more of them in the world—vanished into the ether, ignored by politicians, even in death un-pitied as ‘economic migrants’.

White immigrants are always seen as ‘intrepid’ people with ‘vigorous’ blood which adds to the stock of the receiving nation; similarly ambitious immigrants with darker skin or other ‘alien’ characteristics are always presumed to be carriers of chaos and untold problems.

Politicians and opinion-makers would deny that they are being racist or xenophobic. It is to do with culture, they argue, and to keep indigenous populations from feeling ‘swamped’ and thus prey to rabid extremists.

Once more the underpinning xenophobia becomes evident. The murder of Pim Fortuyn, the gay, so-called ‘liberal’ yet vehemently anti-immigrant politician, brought this agenda out in the open. He became a hero overnight for being the first to ‘dare’ to bring up cultural protectionism as a reason for his policies.

In the wake of this killing, nearby Denmark brought in the most punitive asylum laws of any developed country, mainly because the population does not want more Muslims entering the country. France and Germany only take people who can prove persecution by the State. This means that Algerians fleeing unidentified murder squads or Palestinians trying to escape the wretched battles between their militants and the hard-line Israeli Government would have no case at all in those countries. These policies are tailor-made to exclude people whose lives are destroyed by a
number of forces and almost all these people are from poorer or Muslim countries.

**MONGREL CONTINENT**

15 The assumption is that the European nations have superior monocultural identities which are threatened by dark hordes who will destroy the democratic heart of the continent. But Europe has always been a mongrel continent, made and remade by outsiders who come in and change the countries and themselves. Most non-white Europeans would not return to their countries because they now value democracy, freedom and rights which they have acquired through migration.

16 And in time many give their adopted country much more than they ever take from it, as a British government report *Migration, an Economic and Social Analysis* confirms. Levels of entrepreneurship, self-employment and education are high. At present 33 per cent of asylum seekers to the Britain have a degree or professional qualifications compared with 15 per cent of the British population; 65 per cent speak at least two languages in addition to their first language; 66 per cent had jobs in their own countries.

17 Those unquantifiable benefits count for far more than the plain economics of course, in sports, the arts, pop music, food. The best selling author of *White Teeth* Zadie Smith and top heart-transplant surgeon Sir Magdi Yacoub are products of the searing and creative interactions and exchanges which migration forces both on those who move and the inhabitants of the places they move to.

18 Immigration brings new blood and extraordinary advantages. There are challenges to be met. Integration and disintegration are real problems as is civic unrest and social disorder. When people with diverse values share spaces, there is inevitable internal competition. As immigration debates get ever more emotive, settled migrants and citizens of colour react with animosity towards new arrivals whatever the push factors. Politicians from the main parties and sections of the media have convinced British people of all races that their good lives are in jeopardy, threatened by newcomers who are mostly liars, thugs, thieves, with contrived sob stories about human-rights abuses which they use as illegal passports to enter and settle down in a country which patently does not want or believe them.

19 Societies, too, have the right to reject values which are directly inimical to human rights and social democracy. Some hard ongoing bargaining on just what is appropriate and acceptable in terms of cultural and religious rights should be part of the process of settlement. In many European countries there is understandable rejection of oppressive practices against young people and women
within some migrant groups. Forced marriages, denials of personal autonomy or rights to education cannot be 'tolerated' in the name of multiculturalism. Governments have the right to question and marginalize immigrants who operate as an enemy within or those who ask to be allowed to operate as states within states. Most European Muslims—who do feel themselves to be just that and not Muslims who are just camped in Europe—find it intolerable to be associated with militant haters of Jews, Christians and others and they would welcome a more prominent role in defining immigration and integration policies.

In Canada, which has one of the more intelligent, compassionate and less racist immigration policies, it is stated up-front that all arrivals should be bound by a set of non-negotiable principles and values in exchange for equal and fair treatment. Sure, racism exists but a clear policy and well-resourced public education campaigns reduce its impact. It is a model Europe would do well to emulate.

For Class Discussion
1. According to Alibhai-Brown, why should European countries value their immigrants? What is her main claim?
2. How does Alibhai-Brown seek to tap into her readers’ values and emotions? What connections do you see between the mission of the New Internationalist, its target audience, and the approach Alibhai-Brown has taken in writing about her subject?
3. What is the meaning of the title of the article and how does it function rhetorically?
4. What details of European history does she relate to the current cultural problems in Britain and Europe?
5. In what part of her argument does she acknowledge and respond to opposing views?
6. Alibhai-Brown devotes most of her argument to identifying a problem. What solutions does she suggest?
7. How has this piece influenced your views of immigration?

Pakistanis Protesting France’s Ban on the Hijab Photo

Faisal Mahmood

In 2004, France passed a law upholding secularism and prohibiting the wearing of Christian crosses, Jewish skullcaps, and Muslim headscarves (hijabs) in schools. Critics of the law say it is mainly directed at Muslim girls
and their wearing of the hijab. The law has sparked intense debate, particularly in the older European Union countries of Germany, France, and England. In addition to touching on human rights and feminist issues, it is perceived by its critics to be an act of exclusion and control of the Muslim religion and Muslims themselves. The countries of the European Union have substantial, growing communities of Muslims from Turkey, North America, Southwest Asia, and the Middle East and are wrestling with issues of integration, assimilation, and tolerance of these immigrant groups. This photo was taken on January 28, 2004 outside the French Embassy in Islamabad, the capital of Pakistan. It shows supporters of Jamat-e-Islami Pakistan, the country’s major political party, protesting France’s ban on students wearing the hijab (headscarf).

What features of this photo stand out for you? What impressions does this photo convey?

For Class Discussion
1. After researching the meaning of the hijab to Muslim culture and religion and investigating the protests that took place in January of 2004 against France’s ban on girls wearing the hijab in school (especially the International Day of Solidarity with the Hijab), what do you think are the many different reasons protesters want to protect
the right to wear the hijab in school? What threats to traditional European culture does the wearing of these headscarves pose?

2. How is this controversy both a big issue itself in Europe and a symbolic one?

3. What ideas about globalization can you draw from the fact that Muslims and Muslim supporters around the world joined protests against France’s ban?

4. Not all Muslims oppose the hijab ban. From your research, what reasons do some Muslims give for not insisting that women wear the hijab?

5. What comparable problems over the cultural integration and assimilation of immigrants has the United States had?

Our Foreign Legions
Francis Fukuyama

Francis Fukuyama is a professor at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins. He is the author of numerous books on politics, democracy, the international political economy, and culture’s effect on the economy; among his most recent books are The End of History and the Last Man (1992) and State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century (2004). Fukuyama has served on various political boards, including the President’s Council on Bioethics. This article was first published in the Wall Street Journal on January 26, 2004, and then posted on the Web site for the World Security Network the same day. According to its “About Us” link, the World Security Network strives to prevent war by offering valuable analytical insights to journalists, political leaders, and academics. It seeks to remedy “the lack of public awareness about imminently threatening crises and conflicts, a lack of analytical judgment and crisis management, but above all, a lack of targeted action before the situation explodes” (www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/corp/index3.cfm).

In its approach to cultural conflicts, how does this article suit the purpose and audience of the World Security Network?

We have seen demonstrations all over Europe and the Middle East to protest the French government’s proposed prohibition of Muslim girls from wearing headscarves in public schools. This ban is part of a larger struggle taking place throughout Europe over the continent’s cultural identity. France and other European countries are host to Muslim minorities that constitute upward of 10% of their populations, minorities that are becoming increasingly active politically. European Muslims are primarily responsible for the rise
in anti-Semitic incidents over the past three years, and their perceptions heavily color European media reporting of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This demographic shift has already affected foreign policy: the French government’s stance against the Iraq war and U.S. foreign policy more generally seeks in part to appease Muslim opinion.

But while the French government is publicly supportive of Arab causes, it and other European governments are privately worried about future trends. Sept. 11 revealed that assimilation is working very poorly in much of Europe: terrorist ringleaders like Mohamed Atta were radicalized not in Saudi Arabia or Afghanistan, but in Western Europe. In a revealing incident that took place shortly after the attack on the World Trade Center, a crowd of mostly second- and third-generation French North Africans booed the Marseillaise during a soccer match between the French and Algerian national teams and chanted Osama bin Laden’s name. Third-generation British Muslims have traveled to the West Bank to martyr themselves in suicide operations.

Europeans differ among themselves in the way that they approach assimilation. The Germans for many years never tried; until their citizenship law was changed in 2000, a third-generation Turk who grew up in Germany and spoke no Turkish often had a harder time getting citizenship than an ethnic German from Russia who spoke no German. The German state, moreover, recognizes the communal rights of religious groups, collecting taxes on behalf of the Protestant and Catholic churches. The issue there, as in the Netherlands, is whether to add an Islamic pillar to the existing Christian ones, one that would have control over education and other issues. Such a policy would tend, of course, to enshrine rather than diffuse cultural differences over time.

The French by contrast have always accepted the principle of assimilation. French citizenship, like ours, is not based on ethnicity but is universal. The republican tradition recognizes only the rights of individuals, not groups, and its commitment to laïcité or secularism remains strong. French school teachers in particular are heirs to an anticlerical tradition stemming from the French Revolution, and have looked askance at expressions of religiosity in public schools.

The new French policy on headscarves should thus be seen as a type of forced assimilation. Previously it had been up to individual schools and teachers whether to ban headscarves or not; the new policy takes this burden off their shoulders by making it a national policy. Whether the ban will work is a delicate tactical issue: it may create a counterproductive backlash, driving observant Muslims out of the public school system and into their own Islamic schools.
But the ultimate goal of the policy is not to crush religious freedom but to promote assimilation, one that American opponents of multiculturalism should appreciate.

Europeans have only recently begun to confront the problem of assimilation, and continue to suffer from a stifling political correctness in talking honestly about the issue of immigration. In 2001 the German Christian Democrats gingerly floated the concept of leitkultur, or “leading culture,” the idea that immigrants would be accepted as Germans but only if they in turn accepted certain German cultural values. The idea was immediately batted down as racist, and never raised again.

There is a strong correlation in Europe between immigrants and crime, just as there is between race and crime in the U.S., but mainstream politicians have been loath to acknowledge this. This explains the meteoric rise of the openly gay Dutch politician Pim Fortuyn, who was the first to argue that Muslim immigration should be limited because Muslims did not accept traditional Dutch tolerance. Only with the national soul-searching that followed his assassination in 2002 did discussions in Holland become more open about the immigration-crime nexus. And only when Jean-Marie Le Pen, leader of the extreme right-wing National Front, came in second behind Jacques Chirac in the 2002 French Presidential election, did the government begin to get serious about dealing with crime and immigration through appointing the tough interior minister Nicolas Sarkozy. The headscarf policy is simply part of this new line.

The ultimate success of assimilation depends not just on policy, but on the cultural characteristics of the immigrant group being assimilated as well. Europeans are right to say that they face a bigger problem with their Muslim immigrant populations than Americans do with their Hispanic immigrants.

The speed with which an immigrant group assimilates in the second and third generations after arrival has very much to do with that group’s rate of outmarriage, which in turn is a byproduct of the degree to which immigrant families can control their daughters’ sexuality. In the U.S., rates of outmarriage correlate strongly with both assimilation and upward socioeconomic mobility on the part of different racial and ethnic groups. In many Middle Eastern countries, there is a strong emphasis on cousin marriage, in which daughters are urged to marry not just within their ethnic group, but within their own extended family.

Individualism within the family—i.e., the right to marry whomever you want—is the mother of all individualisms, and it is the denial of this right that allows traditional social structure and culture to be transmitted across the generations. Traditionalist
Muslims are thus more astute than they are given credit for when they insist on marking their daughters with headscarves that signal their sexual unavailability to outsiders. The girls themselves who want to wear the headscarf as a symbol of their identity do not understand the long-term threat to their individual freedom it represents.

Americans, looking at Europe, should be glad that they have made their country an assimilation powerhouse. But as the authors of a new volume on assimilation edited by Tamar Jacoby indicate, this is not something that we can take for granted. During the big immigration wave of the late-19th/early-20th centuries, the largely Protestant native-born elites deliberately sought to use the public school system to assimilate the newcomers from southern and eastern Europe to their cultural values. The 1960s and '70s gave rise to multiculturalism, affirmative action, and bilingualism, which sought to reverse course on assimilation. The '90s saw a backlash against this kind of divisive identity politics with the passage of Proposition 227 in California that wiped out public school bilingual programs at a stroke. This was our version of the headscarf ban, one that worked well because it was supported by a great many Hispanic parents themselves who felt their children were being held back in a Spanish language ghetto.

It is in this context that we should evaluate President Bush’s recent proposal to grant illegal aliens work permits. Many Americans dislike the policy because it rewards breaking the law. This is all true; we should indeed use our newly invigorated controls over foreign nationals to channel future immigrants into strictly legal channels. But since we are not about to expel the nearly seven million people potentially eligible for this program, we need to consider what policies would lead to their most rapid integration into mainstream American society. For the vast majority of illegal aliens, the law they broke on entering the country is likely to be the only important one they will ever violate, and the sooner they can normalize their status, the faster their children are likely to participate fully in American life.

It is no exaggeration to say that the assimilation of culturally distinct immigrants will be the greatest social challenge faced by developed democracies over the coming decades. Given the sub-replacement fertility rates of native-born populations, high levels of immigration have become necessary to fund not just current standards of living but future social security benefits. Divergent immigration patterns will unfortunately deepen the wedge that has emerged between America and Europe in foreign policy. We cannot do much to affect European policy, but we can take steps to see that their problems do not become our own.
For Class Discussion

1. How would you summarize Fukuyama’s view of the global challenges posed by immigration? What changes does he claim that Europe must make?

2. How has Fukuyama shaped his analytical argument for a general audience yet also for policymakers, business leaders, and journalists? What information about European conflicts and political context does Fukuyama offer?

3. How does Fukuyama interpret the headscarf controversy in France?

4. What connections does Fukuyama see between European responses to the cultural problems of immigration and American responses to these problems?

5. This piece is a short policy statement. How does Fukuyama persuade you that he is authoritative and correct in his views about Europe?

6. How do the terrorist bombings in London in July 2005 and the fires and riots near Paris in fall 2005 relate to Fukuyama’s points in this argument?

CHAPTER QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTION AND DISCUSSION

1. How has immigration affected your community, city, or region? List the effects and influences.

2. Where do Jagdish Bhagwati’s and Kofi Annan’s acceptance and praise of global migration intersect? Where do their arguments differ in rhetorical features and in content?

3. Authorities are in disagreement about whether the volume and patterns of economic immigration the United States is experiencing today are a continuation—albeit a stepped-up one—of earlier immigration trends or a new phenomenon shaped by worldwide political, economic, and technological forces. From your reading of the articles in this chapter, which view do you support?

4. What do the readings in this chapter suggest that the United States can learn from other countries’ experiences with guest worker programs and from their problems with cultural conflicts and integrating immigrants? What alternatives to a guest worker program do you think are the most promising and why?

5. How do the views of the following people on the effects of immigration on American workers and immigrant workers agree and disagree: Linda Chavez, John Laughland, Don Melvin, the supporters of the
bumper stickers, and the political cartoonists Clay Bennett and Brian Fairrington? Does a large immigrant labor force lower the wages for native workers? You might want to deepen your discussion of labor by investigating these sources:

Bureau of Labor Statistics (http://www.bls.gov/) (Check the effect of immigrant labor on the earnings of unskilled American workers.)
Rescue American Jobs, (http://www.rescueamericanjobs.org/)
American Federation of Labor (www.afl-cio.org) (What is the current union response to immigration?)

6. A number of the articles in this chapter argue that immigration brings cultural problems as serious and pressing as economic ones. What intersections and differences do you see in the views of Samuel P. Huntington, the two organizations MALDEF and LULAC, Yasmin Alibhai-Brown, and Francis Fukuyama?

7. Which authors suggest connections between immigration’s economic and cultural repercussions? In other words, which authors’ views provide the most complex and informed approach to immigration issues?

8. One of the main questions regarding immigrants is how to create effective legal channels for immigration. Using the Web, research the kinds of visas that the United States currently grants as well as the “matricula consular” IDs that Linda Chavez mentions in her article “Guest Worker Visas,” and answer the following questions about the options for legal status for immigrants. You might find the following Web sites useful:

United States Immigration Support (http://www.usimmigrationsupport.org/)
United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (http://uscis.gov/graphics/index.htm.)

- What are the differences between F1 student visas, HIB work visas, H2B work visas, and TN NAFTA visas?
- How do “matricula consular” IDs differ from these U.S. visas?
- How would Bush’s temporary worker visa differ from the current U.S. visas available for workers?
- What are green cards and how do they differ from visas?

WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

Brief Writing Assignments

1. Write a short narrative recounting (a) some part of your family’s immigration story; (b) some part of the immigration story of a friend; or (c) an
experience of acceptance or alienation you had while living in another country.

2. Choose one of the following controversial claims and write for twenty minutes supporting or rebutting the claim. Use examples from the readings, your own background knowledge, and your experiences to develop your view.

A. Illegal immigration to the United States cannot be stopped.
B. Immigrants—even undocumented ones—are beneficial to Americans and the United States.
C. U.S. policy toward immigration, especially illegal immigration, is contradictory and hypocritical.
D. Immigration problems can be solved only by international institutions and policies.
E. In the United States (and/or Europe), the effects of immigration on national identity and culture are more urgent and important than immigration’s effect on the economy.

3. For you, which reading in this chapter presents the most powerful and illuminating argument on immigration problems? Write a short justification of your choice.

4. Write a short response to this question: How have the readings in this chapter helped you understand the complexity of immigration issues in a globalized world?

Writing Projects

1. Choose one of the articles in this chapter that you think is very effective for a general audience, and write an essay that analyzes this piece and argues for its persuasiveness. In what ways does it make a valuable contribution to the public debates on global immigration? Include a short summary of the piece and an analysis of several of its rhetorical features (for example, the clarity of its claim; the strength of its evidence; its emotional impact; the author’s credibility). How has this article changed your views of immigration?

2. Write an editorial for your university or college newspaper in which you construct your own argument for or against guest worker programs based on your synthesis of the ideas in the readings in this chapter. Use your documentation of these ideas in your argument to strengthen your own credibility as a person knowledgeable about this issue.

3. Sometimes the citizens of a country that is experiencing a heavy influx of immigrants feel overwhelmed, irritated, or threatened by foreigners. Imagine that you have a friend who is wrestling with these feelings toward immigrants. Write an argument with this person as your audience. Try to enlarge your friend’s understanding of immigration and
arouse sympathy for immigrants as struggling human beings seeking jobs and dignity, and as small pieces in a vast, global political and economic system.

4. From your understanding of U.S. immigration issues, write a letter to your U.S. senator or representative in which you present an argument in favor of or against a guest worker program for the United States. In other words, what national policies on immigration would you like him or her to support and why?

The following research suggestions can lead to informative or argumentative writing projects.

5. Research the patterns of immigration in your own region of the country, or more locally, your city or community, and write a description of these patterns. If your region is experiencing an influx of immigrants, you could develop your research into an argument in which you first describe those patterns and then claim that immigration is or is not an issue in your community. Based on your research, you might (a) argue for measures that are successfully integrating immigrants into your community; (b) argue against current unsuccessful measures for integrating immigrants; or (c) propose alternative measures that you think would be helpful. Your audience for this piece could be the residents of your community or its decision makers and political representatives.

6. After doing field research about organizations that seek to integrate immigrants into your community or region, create a brochure that informs the general public of how people can support the work of one or several of these organizations.

7. Both European Union nations and the United States have groups of citizens alarmed about national security and seeking to preserve their countries’ traditional cultures. Think of the English Only movement in the United States and organizations such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform (www.fairus.org); Americans for Immigration Control (www.immigrationcontrol.com); Center for Immigration Studies (www.cis.org); and Americans for Better Immigration (www.betterimmigration.org). Research the European Union’s controversies over immigration (for instance, the resistance to Turkey’s bid to join the EU; concerns over terrorism and crime related to immigration; or the hijab ban controversy) and a corresponding immigration issue in the United States. Write an analysis for your class in which you explain similarities or differences in European and American problems with immigration.

8. This chapter has dealt primarily with U.S. immigrants from Mexico and Latin America. Investigate the current concerns of another U.S. immigrant group such as the Irish or people from Arab or Muslim countries.
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and propose a way that U.S. immigrant policy could help integrate them into American life.

Irish Radio Network in New York
Philadelphia's Irish Immigration and Pastoral Center
Emerald Isle Immigration Center in Queens
Council on American-Islamic Relations
American Muslim Alliance

9. Compose a brief argument for your class, arguing for several key features of an immigration policy that you think would do the most to bolster homeland security. The following government organizations might provide useful information for your argument.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials
Department of Homeland Security
Homeland Security’s division of U.S. Customs and Border Protection

10. Many articles and reports about remittances—money earned by immigrants and sent back to their families in their home countries—speak enthusiastically about the way that this money pays for food, health care, housing, and clothing; for establishing businesses such as gas stations and supermarkets, and for building roads. After examining several sources that investigate the role of remittances in developing countries, write an argument for your classmates, asserting that remittances are or are not a positive force for international relations.

11. For many people, the issue of immigration is strongly entangled in issues of race, ethnicity, culture, and values. Three writers who take different stands on the value of immigrants to American society and on immigrants’ desire to integrate into American society are these: neo-conservative political scientist Samuel P. Huntington of Harvard, author of the book *Who Are We? The Challenges to National Identity* (2004); sociologist Amitai Etzioni, the University Professor at George Washington University and author of the book *Monochrome Society* (2003); and Tamar Jacoby, prolific, well-known conservative journalist, senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, and author of the book *Reinventing the Melting Pot: The New Immigrants and What It Means to Be American* (2004). Research the ideas of these three writers and write a short argument in support of the writer whose ideas you think are the most realistic and constructive.

12. A number of Latino organizations and advocacy groups are working for the wellbeing of legal and illegal immigrants. After researching some of these groups’ programs and proposals, write an argument for your classmates in which you support a program, proposal, or piece of
legislation as the best solution to a particular problem related to Latino immigrants.

AgJobs Bill
National Council of La Raza
Workplace Project
Hispanic Alliance for Progress
Latino Coalition
Pew Hispanic Center
Labor Council of Latin American Advancement
Urban Institute
Justice for Janitors campaign
California Coalition for Immigration Reform
United Farm Workers Union