

**Immigration Micro-Macro Debates**

**Media List**

**Debatable Issue: The United States should substantially reduce immigration.**

Background/Both Sides (General)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lBJcqxI7kas>

[Video, 25 minutes] Very solid history of immigration from the origins of the United States to the present. Helps students put current debates on immigration in a broader, longer historical context.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immigration_to_the_United_States>

Broad, sweeping summary of a wide swath of issues related to U.S. immigration, including history, current status, economic impact, and social and political ramifications.

<http://www.choices.edu/resources/documents/immigration_options.pdf>

Good summary of our immigration policy options, and a brief reference to arguments for and against each of them, from the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University

<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/10/31/untangling-the-immigration-debate>

*The New Yorker* reviews some of the most salient and out-front arguments in our current societal debate on immigration, with an emphasis on the economic arguments for and against high levels of immigration. Generally comes out on the negative side, but provides evidence for both sides.

<http://www.pbs.org/independentlens/newamericans/foreducators_lesson_plan_02.html>

PBS’s “Independent Lens” has put out a short curriculum on immigration, attendant to their documentary, “The New Americans.” The curriculum has students review claims made on both sides of the debate, examining and evaluating the evidence that supports them.

<http://www.balancedpolitics.org/immigration.htm>

Arguments on both sides of the reduce immigration debate, laid out with explanatory warrants (but without additional supporting evidence or links).

<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/immigration-united-states-new-economic-social-political-landscapes-legislative-reform>

A detailed and scholarly overview of the entire U.S. immigration topic, providing data and historical background on all of the micro-debate issues below.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YXd5oJYQbOY>

[Video, 3.5 minutes] Discussion of the rise of Islamophobia as the latest version of nativism.

Economic Impact Overall

<http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/04/16/the-economics-of-immigration>

The *New York Times* Room for Debate series takes on the overall economics of immigration, with short articles on each side of the debate.

<http://www.cis.org/sites/cis.org/files/articles/2009/MassImmigration_ch2.pdf>

Expanding low-skilled immigration causes significant increases in federal government program expenditures and therefore significantly increases the U.S. budget deficit.

<http://www.city-journal.org/html/how-unskilled-immigrants-hurt-our-economy-12946.html>

The social safety net and welfare state in the U.S. means that immigrants will be an economic burden on the society as a whole. Also, immigrants today are coming in the country largely unskilled, unlike immigrants of the past. The lack of skills means that they cannot improve the economy like prior immigrants did.

<http://cis.org/Welfare-Use-Immigrant-Native-Households>

Data shows that immigrants use significantly greater governmental resources, including welfare, than does the native-born low-income American population.

<http://www.newsweek.com/why-americans-think-immigration-hurts-economy-72909>

The American public as a whole believes that immigration has a negative effect on the economy, and there are reasons for this belief. Immigrants draw disproportionately from state and local services, and are not evenly distributed around the country.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2012/07/12/ten-ways-immigrants-help-build-and-strengthen-our-economy>

The Obama Administration lays out its arguments that immigration has significant benefits for the American economy, emphasizing immigrants’ disproportionate commitment to starting and growing businesses and innovating new technologies and business practices.

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/dougbandow/2013/09/16/immigration-benefits-the-u-s-so-lets-legalize-all-work/>

There are very substantial economic benefits to expanding immigration to the U.S. The economic pie in the U.S. would be enlarged with more immigrants, benefiting everyone. To expand immigration, though, we don't necessarily have to make newcomers U.S. citizens.

<http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/jobs/posts/2013/08/02-immigration-wages-greenstone-looney>

According to the Brookings Institution, immigrants bring the following economic benefits: more innovation, more demand for domestically produced goods and services, more overall economic activity, and a higher standard of living through lowered cost of immigrant-intensive services (e.g, daycare provision).

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/expanded-immigration-would-reduce-the-federal-deficit-some-conservatives-say/2013/04/08/a388e8cc-a07b-11e2-9c03-6952ff305f35_story.html>

The American Action Forum, a conservative think tank, concludes that expanding immigration could reduce the U.S. federal budget deficit by more than $2 trillion over 10 years.

<http://business.time.com/2013/01/30/the-economics-of-immigration-who-wins-who-loses-and-why/>

Time Magazine responds to the arguments that immigration hurts the economy and explains why they are narrow and miss the bigger picture. While it is true that immigration hurts workers in certain specific and limited industries, immigration clearly helps the economy overall.

High Skilled Workers

<http://www.cis.org/articles/2007/back407.html>

The Center for Immigration Studies argues that the U.S. does not now restrict immigration for high-skilled, highly-educated immigrants, and that those who argue that we do are disguising their desire to allow in many more low-skilled workers into the U.S.

<http://cis.org/Testimony/miano-Impact-of-High-Skilled-Immigration-on-US-Workers>

Currently the H-1B program, which is the name of the program that allows for high-skilled worker immigration, is being abused by companies to hire cheaper employees from overseas and replace American workers.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/8090774/Just-one-in-four-highly-skilled-migrants-in-skilled-jobs.html>

The British example shows: 75% of high-skilled immigrants are not working in high-skilled jobs, so all of the negative implications of more immigration apply to them.

<http://conversableeconomist.blogspot.com/2016/07/high-skilled-immigration.html>

High-skilled immigrants can be a boost to the economy, but only if they are the right type of high-skilled immigrants. They have to be especially entrepreneurial and ambitious, and not average or typical.

<http://www.renewoureconomy.org/issues/highly-skilled-immigrants/>

The organization New American Economy argues that high skilled immigrants will be the key to the new innovation economy and that it is vital to increase immigration of high skilled workers to promote American economic growth.

<http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-03-29/study-american-economy-hampered-by-limits-on-skilled-immigrant-workers>

A new report from Dartmouth College produces data showing that high-skilled immigrants actually increase high-paying jobs for American-born workers, because of their impact on economic growth.

<https://www.cato.org/publications/cato-online-forum/boost-highly-skilled-immigration>

The Cato Institute states that high-skilled immigrants are more entrepreneurial and will drive American competitiveness internationally.

<http://www.kauffman.org/what-we-do/research/immigration-and-the-american-economy>

The Kauffman Foundation has produced a series of academic studies finding that increasing high-skilled, highly-educated immigrants is crucial for the future of the American economy.

Humanitarianism/Democratic Values

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LPjzfGChGlE>

[Video] Numbers USA, a conservative anti-immigration group, argues that taking in 1 million immigrants per year is a drop in the ocean (a gumball in a sea of gumballs) in relation to the problem of global poverty.

<http://thefederalist.com/2015/11/24/5-ways-americans-could-really-help-syrias-refugees/>

The moral case for letting Syrian refugees into the U.S. doesn’t make sense. There are things that the U.S. should do other than admitting refugees if we are driven by a moral purpose.

<http://ethics.harvard.edu/event/immigration-policy-sovereignty-humanitarian-law-or-human-rights>

Law professor Ruth Gavison addresses Harvard University and argues that (1) countries are not obligated to restrict their sovereignty on the grounds of a humanitarian appeal, and (2) that human rights also don’t apply to immigration, since they imply the need to have courts determine the cases.

<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/charles-burrell-syrian-refugees-1.3363572>

As in the Canadian example, it makes more sense to help our own citizens who are struggling and in need than it does to let additional people into the country who are struggling and in need.

<http://www.cnn.com/2015/09/08/world/refugee-obligation/>

The countries that have a moral obligation to take in Syrian refugees are in Europe and the Middle East, based on their signed treaty obligations. They should be addressing this humanitarian crisis.

<http://openborders.info/blog/roy-beck-unwittingly-makes-the-case-for-open-borders/>

Response to the Numbers USA video (this is a blog, not a video). (1) Every life that is saved or improved is of value. (2) The implication of the video is that we should do much more (even open our borders), not much less (reduce immigration).

<https://www.opendemocracy.net/matthew-c-altman/us-is-failing-in-its-moral-obligation-to-syrian-refugees>

The organization Open Democracy argues that the suffering of the Syrian population means that the U.S. has a moral obligation to take in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees. It also argues that the U.S. is required to do so under international agreements it has made.

<http://www.theblaze.com/contributions/the-us-has-a-moral-obligation-to-address-the-syrian-refugee-crisis/>

The U.S. has a moral obligation to stop the genocide of the certain religious groups in Syria.

<https://tcf.org/content/report/why-america-could-and-should-admit-more-syrian-refugees/>

According to the Century Foundation, the U.S. has a moral and legal obligation to take in far more Syrian refugees than it is currently taking in.

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/libertarianism-z/201007/should-the-us-restrict-immigration>

The benefit to immigrants in the process of immigration should be taken seriously -- it improves people's lives. Also, the costs of trying to reduce immigration are outweighed by the benefits of expanding immigration.

Social Division/Diversity

<https://ourfuture.org/20071127/immigration-and-american-values>

A much greater focus should be placed on ensuring that new immigrants actually share America’s core principles and beliefs. Currently they are able to bring their native values into the U.S. and stick with them, too often.

<http://thefederalist.com/2016/08/17/why-liberals-dont-want-immigrants-to-embrace-american-values/>

Opposition to testing immigrants for their patriotism reflects a view that there are no basic American principles that unify us all. Opposition is the equivalent of social incohesion.

<http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/immigration-diversity-and-social-cohesion/>

Data from the U.S. suggests that as our country gets more diverse, there is less trust among groups and less social cohesion overall.

<http://www.economist.com/node/9587776>

The Economist magazine reports that increasing levels of Latino immigration in the U.S. is heightening tensions and social struggles between Latinos and African-Americans in the U.S.

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nataly-kelly/immigration-benefits_b_2523562.html>

Immigration brings diversity of cultures, ideas, and languages that is good for the U.S. and makes our country stronger.

<http://www.publiceye.org/ark/immigrants/CulturalDiv.html>

The U.S. has always been a country of immigrants, which is at the root of its strength as a nation. This source addresses numerous arguments made against immigration on the basis of social and cultural division.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3856769/>

Immigrants have made major contributions to American culture – to the arts and sciences in this country – and our culture would not be anything like it is today without immigrants.

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rohit-kumar/4-ways-immigrant-cultural_b_2926214.html>

Examples of the ways that cultural diversity is leading to new thinking and new solutions in America.

Terrorism

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NuCkggoGP3c>

[Video] Sen. Rand Paul (R – KY) argues on Fox News that the U.S. needs to place a temporary moratorium on immigration from the Middle East, for national security reasons.

<http://www.nationalreview.com/article/396262/troubling-math-muslim-migration-ian-tuttle>

Immigration of Muslims from the Middle East is simply a mathematical threat: the more the U.S. allows in, the greater the chance that radical Islam will present a threat of terrorism in the U.S.

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/09/04/the-middle-east-needs-to-take-care-of-its-own-refugees.html>

The Muslim refugee crisis in the Middle East should be solved by wealthy Muslim countries in the Middle East, not by Western democracies. Countries like Saudi Arabia and Qatar have taken zero Syrian refugees. It is not the moral obligation of the Europe and the U.S. to take Middle Eastern refugees, it is much more the obligation of countries in the region to do so.

<http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/melanie-hunter/fbi-director-admits-us-will-have-no-basis-vet-some-syrian-refugees>

The FBI states that screening persons coming into the country from Iraq is feasible, given how long the U.S. has been in Iraq in large numbers, but that screening from countries like Syria cannot be effective for persons in that country who have maintained a low profile.

<http://cis.org/articles/2005/kephart.html>

A detailed examination of the way that a set of immigrants since 9/11 have abused the system and become terrorist threats within the U.S.

<http://www.ibtimes.com/terrorism-attacks-911-have-involved-us-citizens-not-immigrants-despite-gop-debate-2228202>

Two important facts that Republicans get wrong when they connect the threat of terrorism in the U.S. to immigration from the Middle East: the overall threat level from terrorism in the U.S. is relatively low, by historical standards, and most terrorism in the U.S. is carried out by American citizens born in the U.S. (even if some of them are Muslim), not immigrants.

<http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2016/jun/13/donald-trump/wrong-donald-trump-says-theres-no-system-vet-refug/>

The United States has a very robust and careful screening system currently in place for refugees from the Middle East, one that more than two years for each individual applicant to go through.

<http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2016/03/10/Trump-Presidency-Could-Give-ISIS-Foothold-US>

Islamophobic policies promoted by Trump could deepen the alienation of the 3 million Muslims living in the U.S., making a ISIS-inspired terrorism in the U.S. more likely.

<http://www.theatlantic.com/news/archive/2016/06/immigrants-and-crime/486884/>

Europe has experienced a problem with immigrants from the Middle East and crime and the risk of terrorism because immigrants in Europe are much less well assimilated into mainstream society in those countries. In the U.S., Middle Eastern and Muslim immigrants are much more integrated into American society, so they pose little risk of crime and terrorism.

<http://www.vice.com/read/we-asked-an-expert-how-trumps-anti-muslim-immigration-policy-would-work>

Two immigration experts (from New York University School of Law and the University of Virginia School of Law) make several brief points against Trump’s policy: (a) it would be very difficult to implement, (b) it would result in retaliation by Middle Eastern countries, hurting our business and diplomatic ties, and (c) it didn’t improve national security when a similar provision was tried in the 2002 Homeland Security Act.

Wages/Unemployment

<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/why-more-immigration-bad-america-11210>

Immigration lowers wages for American workers. High levels of immigration are supported by employers who want cheaper labor.

<http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/09/trump-clinton-immigration-economy-unemployment-jobs-214216>

Immigration can have positive effects on the economy overall, but it reduces wages for many workers and increases unemployment in targeted sectors of the economy, as well.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0335.2009.00803.x/abstract;jsessionid=CF347F06EC2F0CEEE35ACEDFF1A5444E.f02t03>

Article by George Borjas et al in Economica (2010) uses census and other data to conclude that immigration between 1960 and 2000 reduced African-American male wages by 2.5%, increased African-American male unemployment by 5.9%, and increased African-American male incarceration by 1.3%.

<http://cis.org/Testimony/Camarota-The-Impact-of-Large-Scal-%20Immigration-on-American-Workers>

A detailed empirical analysis shows that while the overall economy may be improved by large-scale immigration to the U.S., wages for native-born Americans have clearly been negatively affected and unemployment for these workers has increased.

<http://cis.org/sites/cis.org/files/borjas-economics.pdf>

According to Harvard University economist George Borjas, the economic benefits of immigration almost all go to the immigrants themselves -- only about 2% accrue to the benefit of the non-immigrant population. What's more, low-skilled workers are hurt in wages and unemployment by more immigration.

<http://stanfordpress.typepad.com/blog/2016/01/does-immigration-hurt-the-economy.html>

The majority of studies conclude that immigration doesn’t depress lower-skilled American workers’ wages, and may even raise them slightly.

<https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/immigration-doesnt-hurt-nativeborn-workers>

Because immigrants fill niche-jobs that native-born Americans either cannot or will not fill, they do not increase unemployment. They also don’t lower wages.

<https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/economic-blame-game-immigration-and-unemployment>

A collection of data that shows that immigrants do not lower wages or cause native-born American unemployment. Immigrants don’t compete for the same jobs as native-born Americans, and they actually create jobs with good wages because of their business practices and skills.

<http://www.seattletimes.com/business/economy/does-immigration-hurt-the-economy-a-new-study-says-no/>

A new study from the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine shows that immigration does not lower wages or employment for native-born Americans. Its only negative effect might be on the wages of other immigrants.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/17/magazine/do-illegal-immigrants-actually-hurt-the-us-economy.html>

The economic impact of immigration – even on wages and employment, overall – is clearly positive. It is only political opposition to immigration that is obscuring that fact.