

Chapter 1 : Birthright Citizenship Is a Legacy of Former Slaves (VIDEO)

The Modest Immigrant | It is now nearly fifty years since Mr. Lowell wrote his famous essay, "On a Certain Condescension in Foreigners"; an essay in which justifiable irritation prompted the telling of plain truths, and an irrepressible sense of humour made these truths amusing.

Lowell wrote his famous essay, "On a Certain Condescension in Foreigners"; an essay in which justifiable irritation prompted the telling of plain truths, and an irrepressible sense of humour made these truths amusing. It was well for Mr. Lowell that he was seldom too angry to laugh, and he knew, as only a man of the world can know, the saving grace of laughter. Therefore, though confessedly unable to understand why foreigners should be persuaded that "by doing this country the favour of coming to it, they have laid every native thereof under an obligation," he was willing in certain light-minded moods to acquit himself honourably of the debt. When a genteel German mendicant presented a letter, "professedly written by a benevolent American clergyman," and certifying that the bearer thereof had long "sofered with rheumatic paints in his limps," Mr. When a French traveller assured him, with delightful bonhomie, that Englishmen became Americanized so rapidly that "they even begin to talk through their noses, just like you do," the only comment of our representative American was that he felt ravished by this testimony to the assimilating powers of democracy. Nevertheless, it is well in these years of grace to reread Mr. We can also speculate pleasantly upon his frame of mind could he have lived to hear Mrs. Amadeus Grabau Mary Antin say, "Lowell would agree with me," the point of agreement being the relative virtues of the Pilgrim Fathers and the average immigrant of to-day. When the dead are quoted in this fashion and nothing happens, then we know that, despite the assurances of Sir Oliver Lodge, the seal of silence is unbroken. Were the proud souls who have left us, able and willing to return, it would not be to reveal the whereabouts of a lost penknife, but to give the lie to the words which are spoken in their name. The condescension which Mr. Lowell observed and analyzed was in his day the shining quality of foreigners who visit our shores. Immigrants were then less aggressive and less profoundly self-conscious than they are now, and it is the immigrant who counts. It is his arrogance, not the misapprehension of the tourist, or the innocent pride of the lecturer, which constitutes a peril to our republic. We can all of us afford to smile with Mr. Lowell at the men and women who, while accepting our hospitality, "make no secret of regarding us as the goose bound to deliver them a golden egg in return for their cackle. Perhaps they have written books which none of us have read, or edited periodicals which none of us have seen. Perhaps they have known celebrities of whom few of us have heard. It does not matter in the least. Pankhurst came to tell us the worth of womanhood does not the ocean roll between Boston Common and Hyde Park? It is a thing she would not dream of doing at home. In fact, nobody would go to hear her, you know. Even the books which are written about us make no painful bid for immortality. And though our visitors patronize us, they seldom fail to throw us a kind word now and then. Sometimes a sweet-tempered and very hurried traveller, like Mr. Arnold Bennett, is good enough to praise everything he thinks he has seen. Before August, , it was not the habit of our guests to scold or threaten us. That privilege had hitherto been reserved for the alien, who, having done us the honour of accepting citizenship, wields his vote as a cudgel, bidding us beware the weapon we have amiably placed in his hands. No other nation cherishes this illusion. An Englishman knows that a Russian Jew cannot in five years, or in twenty-five years, become English; that his standards and ideals are not convertible into English standards and ideals. A Frenchman does not see in a Bulgarian or a Czech the making of another Frenchman. Our immigrants may be as good as we are. Sometimes we are told they are better, that we might "learn a lesson" from the least promising among them. But no one can deny that they are different; in many instances, radically and permanently different. Horace Kallen has put the case into a few clear conclusive words when he says, "Only men who are alike in origin and spirit, and not abstractly, can be truly equal, and maintain that inward unanimity of action and outlook which makes a national life. The utmost we can hope is that their mutual antagonisms will neutralize their voting power, and keep our necks free from an alien yoke. Those of us who have lived more than half a century have seen strange fluctuations in the fortunes of the foreign-born. The Reverend Thomas Thornton, speaking to the Knights of Columbus, prophesied mournfully that the time

was at hand when Catholic voters in the United States would be "reduced to the condition of tribute-paying aliens. Some weeks later, the "Jewish Tribune" boasted that the angry protest voiced by Catholics against the sending of Signor Ernesto Nathan as commissioner to the San Francisco Fair had been "checked in its infancy" by the power of the Jewish press. It is all very lively and interesting, but where does the American come in? What place is reserved for him in the commonwealth which his heroic toil and heroic sacrifices moulded into what Washington proudly called a "respectable nation"? The truth is contemptuously flung at us by Mary Antin, when she says that the descendants of the men who made America are not numerous enough to "swing a presidential election. I heard told with glee" the glee which expresses pure American unconcern" a story of a public school in one of our large eastern cities. A visitor of an investigating turn of mind asked the pupils of various nationalities, Germans, Polacks, Russian Jews, Italians, Armenians and Greeks, to stand up in turn. When the long list was seemingly exhausted, he bethought himself of a nation he had overlooked, and said, "Now let the American children arise! It is hardly surprising that these foreign children, recognizing the strength of numbers, should take exception to our time-honoured methods of education. Little boys of a socialistic turn of mind refuse to salute the flag, because it is a military emblem. Little boys of a rationalistic turn of mind refuse to read the Bible, any portion of the Bible, because its assertions are unscientific. Little Jewish boys and girls refuse to sing the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," because of its unguarded allusions to Bethlehem and Calvary. Indeed, any official recognition of the Deity offends the susceptibilities of some of our future citizens; and their perplexed teachers are bidden to eliminate from their programme "any exercises which the pupils consider objectionable. I was not sure whether I ranked as useful or amusing, and the number of topics I was bidden to tactfully avoid, added to my misgivings; when suddenly all doubts were dispelled by the superintendent saying sweetly, "Oh, Miss Replier, you were asked to speak for forty minutes; but I think your address had better be cut down to twenty-five. The girls are eager for their ice-cream. Even at my advanced age, I prefer ice-cream to lectures. Miss Addams has reproached us most unjustly for our contemptuous disregard of the immigrant; and Mrs. We may be left naked and shivering sooner than she anticipates. Lowell feelingly, "is not always nice in concealing his contempt"; and if this was his attitude in , to what superb heights of disdain has he risen by ! A German ambassador has derided diplomatic conventions, and has addressed his official communication, over the head of the Administration, to German voters in the United States, sparing no pains to make his words offensive. German officials have sought to undermine our neutrality and imperil our safety. In the opening months of the war, a German professor at Harvard, who for years has received courteous and honourable treatment at the hands of Americans, threatened us insolently with the "crushing power" of the German vote; and bade us beware of the punishment which twenty-five millions of citizens, "in whose homes lives the memory of German ancestors," would inflict upon their fellow citizens of less august and martial stock. The "Frankfurter Zeitung" published a cheering letter from an American Congressman, assuring a German correspondent that his countrymen know how to make themselves heard, and expressing hearty hopes that Germany would triumph over her "perfidious" rival. Is it any wonder that, stimulated by these brilliant examples, the average "German-American" should wax scornful, and despise his unhyphenated fellow citizens? Stand shoulder to shoulder in this election, as our countrymen in the trenches and on the high seas are fighting for the preservation of our dear Fatherland. Men asked themselves in bewilderment and wrath what the dear Fatherland, any more than dear Dahomey or the beloved Congo, had to do with the Chicago elections? They have been putting similar questions ever since. Some months later, the German-American Central Society of Passaic, uniting itself with the German-American National Alliance, called for assistance in these glowing words: If it means exhortations, pamphlets, and platform oratory, the champion of Germany stands well within his rights. But the next paragraph drops all figures of speech, and states the real issue with abrupt and startling distinctness: When the franchise was granted to him, or to his father, or to his grandfather whichever did this country the honour of first accepting citizenship , a solemn oath was sworn. Allegiance to a foreign government was forever disowned; fealty to the government of the United States was vowed. He who uses his vote to further the interests of a European state is a perjured man, and that he should dare to threaten us with the power of his perjury is the height of arrogant ill-doing. That such a question as "What is the proportion of votes which the Germans of your section control? When the Lusitania

was sunk, and the horror of the deed shamed all Christendom, save only those strange residents of Berlin who received the news with "enthusiasm," and "joyful pride," the first word tactfully whispered in our ear was that, while we might regret the drowning of Americans, we were impotent to resent it. And this impotence was to be a concession to the foreign vote. God only knows of what material Germany thought we were made, "putty, or gutta-percha, or sun-baked mud? Certainly not of flesh and blood. Certainly not with hearts to bleed, or souls to burn. Every comment vouchsafed by the German press placed us in the catalogue of worms warranted not to turn. The contempt which the German "is not always nice in concealing" shines with a chastened lustre in the words and deeds of other foreign-born citizens. They accept the vote which we enthusiastically press upon them, regarding it as an asset, sometimes of marketable value, sometimes serving a stronger and more enduring purpose, always as an esteemed protection against the military service exacted by their own governments. They do not come to us "with gifts in their hands," to quote Mr. They are for the most part destitute, not only of money, but of knowledge, of useful attainments, of any serviceable mental equipment. Edward Alsworth Ross, who is not without experience, confesses ruefully that the immigrant seldom brings in his intellectual baggage anything of use to us; and that the admission into our electorate of "backward men" men whose mental, moral, and physical standards are lower than our own "must inevitably retard our social progress, and thrust us behind the more uniformly civilized nations of the world. Meditating on these disagreeable facts, we find ourselves confronted by sentimentalists who say that if we would only be kind and brotherly, the sloping foreheads would grow high, the narrow shoulders broad, the Pole would become peaceable, the Greek honest, the Slav clean, the Sicilian would give up murder as a pastime, the Jew would lose his "monstrous love of gain. Roosevelt alone, of all their orators, has had the hardihood to say bluntly that citizenship implies service as well as protection; that the debt contracted by the citizen to the state is as binding as that contracted by the state to the citizen; that a voter who can not speak English is an absurdity no less than a peril; and that all who seek the franchise should be compelled to accept without demur our laws, our language, our national policy, our requisitions civil and military. This is what naturalization implies. That saving phrase, "It is the law," which made possible the civilization of Rome, and which has been the foundation of all great civilizations before and since, has little weight or sanctity for our immigrants. They resent legal interference, especially the punishment of crime, in a very spirited fashion. Samuel Gompers defended the McNamaras and their "social war" murders before a subcommittee of the United States Senate, he said with feeling that the mere fact that these men should have come to look upon dynamite as the only defence left them against the tyranny of capital, was a "terrible charge against society. Grenville, said reproachfully to his victims, "What scoundrels you must be to fire at a gentleman who risks his life upon the road! Yet surely, if there is an immigrant who owes us everything, it is the Jew. Even our spasmodic and utterly futile efforts to restrict immigration always leave him a loophole of escape, because he controls the National Liberal Immigration League. It is our custom to assume that the Russian Jew is invariably a fugitive from religious persecution, and we liken him in this regard to the best and noblest of our early settlers. But the Puritan, the Quaker, and the Huguenot sacrificed temporal well-being for liberty of conscience. They left conditions of comfort, and the benefits of a high civilization, to develop the resources of a virgin land, and build for themselves homes in the wilderness. They practised the stern virtues of courage, fortitude, and a most splendid industry. Had the Pilgrim Fathers been met on Plymouth Rock by immigration officials; had their children been placed immediately in good free schools, and given the care of doctors, dentists, and nurses; had they found themselves in infinitely better circumstances than they had ever enjoyed in England, indulging in undreamed-of luxuries, and taught by kind-hearted philanthropists, "what pioneer virtues would they have developed, what sons would they have bred, what honours would history have accorded them? If our early settlers were masterful, they earned the right to mastery, and the price they paid for it was endurance. To the sacrifices which they made, to their high courage and heroic labours, we owe law, liberty, and well-being.

Chapter 2 : Deportation vs. the Cost of Letting Illegal Immigrants Stay | Center for Immigration Studies

Below are the facts about immigrants today: who they are, where they live, and their impact on the U.S. economy. There were million foreign-born people in the United States in

History of Immigration Laws in the U. With the exception of Native Americans, all persons living in the United States are descended from immigrants or slaves who came to the country during the last years. By the late seventeenth century, foreign-born persons constituted seventy-five percent of the American population. Following the Civil War, however, states began to pass their own immigration statutes. The United States Supreme Court determined that immigration came under federal jurisdiction in , and Congress established the Immigration Service in . Most early immigration laws were instituted in order to control the composition of the U. In , Congress passed the Naturalization Act, which effectively limited immigration to persons of European and Caucasian descent. This law was repealed by the passage of the Magnuson Act. There were some who also proposed restrictions against people from European nations, including Ireland, Italy and Poland. In addition to ethnicity, the U. Between and , Congress passed laws restricting the immigration of, among other groups, prostitutes, criminals, the mentally ill and financially unstable persons. In the late nineteenth century, the government became concerned about the potential for foreign laborers to negatively affect employment or payment rates for native laborers. Laws passed in and were among the first to restrict immigration based on economic concerns. Labor issues remain a major part of the modern immigration debate. From to , Congress established a "quota system," which granted permission to a set number of individuals from each ethnic group to immigrate. Certain ethnic groups, including people from most Asian nations, were excluded entirely. The number of immigrants from each ethnic group was determined according to the census. The government also developed provisions intended to promote the immigration of certain types of laborers whose skills were lacking in the existing population. In , as concerns about border security increased, Congress established the first office of border control to monitor immigration from Canada and Mexico. Immigration rates dropped substantially between and , especially during the Great Depression. In , Congress made temporary revisions to immigration policy to allow people left homeless by World War II to come to the United States. In , Congress passed the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act, which formally repealed any remaining restrictions based on ethnicity, and opened immigration to people from any nation. Reflecting recent political developments, the government began to restrict immigration based on political ideology: In , Congress abandoned the quota system and based immigration acceptance on the relative "need" of each applicant. Under the new system, a certain number of people were allowed entrance for labor, family unification and political asylum. The new system greatly restricted immigration from Mexico and Central and South America, and led to an increase in illegal immigration. During the s, illegal immigration and border security became the chief issues in the immigration debate. In , Congress granted additional powers to law enforcement agencies to allow for the punishment of persons who aided or facilitated illegal immigration. In , Congress made it illegal for the U. At the same time, Congress voted to allow a 40 percent increase in the number of immigrants lawfully permitted per year. In , Congress addressed illegal immigration from Latin America with laws that doubled the number of border control agencies, added fences in areas with heavy traffic and increased penalties for harboring or aiding illegal immigrants.

From Ireland to Germany to Italy to Mexico: Where Each State's Largest Immigrant Group Was Born, to The United States has long been—and continues to be—a key destination for the world's immigrants.

Society Mixed Fifty years after passage of the landmark law that rewrote U. Looking ahead, new Pew Research Center U. These are some key findings of a new Pew Research analysis of U. Census Bureau data and new Pew Research U. In addition, this report uses newly released Pew Research survey data to examine U. Post Immigration Drives U. This fast-growing immigrant population also has driven the share of the U. The combined population share of immigrants and their U. The Immigration and Nationality Act made significant changes to U. At the time, relatively few anticipated the size or demographic impact of the post immigration flow Gjelten, In absolute numbers, the roughly 59 million immigrants who arrived in the U. Between and , By comparison, both of the U. Meanwhile, the Hispanic share of the U. Non-Hispanic whites are projected to become less than half of the U. No racial or ethnic group will constitute a majority of the U. From Ireland to Germany to Italy to Mexico: Over the decades, immigrants from different parts of the world arrived in the U. This led to the rise of immigrant communities in many parts of the U. In , the Irish were the largest immigrant group nationally and in most East Coast and Southern states. At the same time, changes to U. As a result, other immigrant groups rose to become the largest in those states. By the early 20th century, a new wave of immigration was underway, with a majority coming from Southern Europe and Eastern Europe. By the s, Italians were the largest immigrant group in the nation and in nine states, including New York, Louisiana, New Jersey and Nevada. The composition of immigrants changed again in the post immigration era. But other immigrant groups are represented as well. Chinese immigrants are the largest immigrant group in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. Indians are the largest immigrant group in New Jersey. Filipinos are the largest immigrant group in Alaska and Hawaii. For more, explore our decade-by-decade interactive map feature. Society Are Mixed For its part, the American public has mixed views on the impact immigrants have had on American society, according to a newly released Pew Research Center public opinion survey. The same survey finds that half of Americans want to see immigration to the U. Views are most negative about the economy and crime: On other aspects of U. Meanwhile, half of Americans say the impact of immigrants from Africa has been neither positive nor negative. However, Americans are more likely to hold negative views about the impact of immigrants from Latin America and the Middle East. Many Americans say that immigrants to the U. Two-thirds of adults say immigrants in the U. The survey has a margin of error of plus or minus 2. As a result, newly arrived immigrants in those who had been in the U. Overall, the number of newly arrived immigrants peaked in the early s: Some 8 million residents of other countries came to the U. The number of recent arrivals declined after that, to about 6 million for the years to , according to a Pew Research Center analysis of federal government data. Perhaps the most striking change in the profile of newly arrived immigrants is their source region. Asia currently is the largest source region among recently arrived immigrants and has been since Back in , Europe was the largest region of origin among newly arrived immigrants. One result of slower Mexican immigration is that the share of new arrivals who are Hispanic is at its lowest level in 50 years. Compared with their counterparts in , newly arrived immigrants in were better educated but also more likely to be poor. Yet on several other measures, the characteristics of the newly arrived today are returning to those of the newly arrived in In terms of geographic dispersion, half of new arrivals in lived in one of four states: California, Florida, New York or Texas. Nearly two-thirds of new arrivals lived in those four states in , up from a third in However, the numbers for each status group are not broken out separately except where stated. That estimate is essentially unchanged since , as the number of new U. According to Pew Research estimates going back to , this population rose rapidly during the s and peaked in The number of unauthorized immigrants declined during the recession of before stabilizing. Illegal immigration from Mexico has been the main factor in these changes in the U. For more Pew Research analysis of unauthorized immigration, see [http:](http://) Chapter 4 explores the U. Appendix B contains a U. Appendix C includes to population tables, and Appendix D contains the survey topline. Unless otherwise noted, recent

arrivals include all the newly arrived regardless of their legal status, that is, both legal immigrants and unauthorized immigrants. Unless otherwise noted, recent arrivals include all the newly arrived regardless of their legal status, that is, both legal and unauthorized immigrants. This definition reflects standard and customary usage by the U. Department of Homeland Security and academic researchers. Immigrant generations living in the U. References to specific racial groups, such as Asians, blacks and whites, include only single-race individuals. Asians do not include Pacific Islanders, unless otherwise noted. Hispanics are of any race. Prior to it refers to those who have completed at least four years of college. Those completing any college at all, including less than one year, are designated as finishing some college. Prior to it refers to those who have completed at least four years of high school. Data Sources in Appendix A. These and other estimates and projections in this report may differ from census data in Chapters 3 and 5; see the methodology in Appendix A. In , about 1. On the basis of those arriving in the past year, Asia immigrants supplanted those from Central and South America in

Chapter 4 : History of Illegal Immigrants and Current Immigration Laws in the U.S.

Illegal Immigration: A Modest Proposal. We have seen much hyperventilation of late about uncontrollable waves of less than fully white, non-English speaking immigrants inundating our southern.

Thousands of immigrants found work on the trans-continental railroad, settling in towns along the way. Word of the California Gold Rush had spread around the world, drawing immigrants from both Asia and Europe. As one immigrant recalled, "I saw the crop. I smelt the fearful stench—the death sign of each field of potatoes—the luxuriant stalks soon withered, the leaves decayed—" The Great Hunger would leave 1. Rapid population growth, changes in land distribution, and industrialization had stripped many European peasants and artisans of their livelihoods. As in the past, the immigrants of this period were welcome neighbors while the economy was strong. During the Civil War, both the Union and Confederate armies relied on their strength. But during hard times, the immigrants were cast out and accused of stealing jobs from American workers. But it was the pro-immigrant voices of this era that would be most influential. The Republican platform of stated, "Foreign immigration which in the past has added so much to the wealth, resources, and increase of power to the nation—should be fostered and encouraged. Immigrants poured in from around the world: The door was wide open for Europeans. After , nearly all immigrants came in through the newly opened Ellis Island. One immigrant recalled arriving at Ellis Island: Ah, that day must have been about five to six thousand people. Jammed, I remember it was August. Some of these then sent for their wives, children, and siblings; others returned to their families in Europe with their saved wages. The experience for Asian immigrants in this period was quite different. Since earlier laws made it difficult for those Chinese immigrants who were already here to bring over their wives and families, most Chinese communities remained "bachelor societies. For Mexicans victimized by the Revolution, Jews fleeing the pogroms in Eastern Europe and Russia, and Armenians escaping the massacres in Turkey, America provided refuge. And for millions of immigrants, New York provided opportunity. In Lower New York, one could find the whole world in a single neighborhood. But after the outbreak of World War I in , American attitudes toward immigration began to shift. Through the early s, a series of laws were passed to limit the flow of immigrants. Many recent immigrants returned to their native lands, including hundreds of thousands of Mexicans, many against their will. The restrictive immigration policies of the s persisted. In the late s, with World War II accelerating in Europe, a new kind of immigrant began to challenge the quota system and the American conscience. A small number of refugees fleeing Nazi persecution arrived under the quota system, but most were turned away. Once the US declared war against the Axis Powers, German and Italian resident aliens were detained; but for the Japanese, the policies were more extreme: Congress would officially apologize for the Japanese Internment in . After the war, the refugee crisis continued. But millions more were left to seek refuge elsewhere. Between and , the US admitted 38, Hungarians, refugees from a failed uprising against the Soviets. These were among the first of the Cold War refugees. In this era, for the first time in US history, more women than men entered the country. They were reuniting with their families, joining their GI husbands, taking part in the post war economic boom. By the early s, calls for immigration reform were growing louder. Gone was the quota system favoring Western Europe, replaced by one offering hope to immigrants from all the continents. The face of America was truly about to change. Within five years, Asian immigration would more than quadruple. This trend was magnified even further by the surge in refugees from the war in Southeast Asia. On the other side of the world, Cuban refugees told a similar story: My father was in a nervous state. Throughout this period, in a policy that continues to this day, the government has given preferences to professionals like doctors, nurses, scientists, and hi-tech specialists, creating what is often called the "Brain Drain. Their influence is felt from the Imperial Valley to Silicon Valley. Immigrants can enter the country by air, by sea, and by land routes through Canada and Mexico, making it easier than ever to enter the country illegally. Through the 80s and 90s, illegal immigration was a constant topic of political debate. In , the government gave amnesty to more than 3 million aliens through the Immigration Reform Act, but during the recession years of the early 90s, there was a resurgence of anti-immigrant feeling. Does America have a duty to keep its doors open to the

world? Can immigrants keep their own culture and language, and still be called Americans? Is continued economic growth in America dependent upon a liberal immigration policy? The debates will certainly continue, as new immigrants arrive on our shores daily, bringing with them their own histories, traditions, and ideas, all of which broaden and enrich our sense of what it means to be an American. Donate now to help preserve the islands for future generations. Create a free account to search for family arrival records and learn more about Lady Liberty and Ellis Island. Be a part of history!

Chapter 5 : Modern immigration to the United Kingdom - Wikipedia

Undocumented immigrants are often part of the same family as documented immigrants. million people were in "mixed-status" families—those with at least one undocumented immigrant—in

The rule would have numerous troubling effects. It would sow more fear in immigrant communities and almost certainly lead many immigrants who are in the United States legally to forgo health coverage, nutrition assistance, and housing assistance that their families are eligible for and need. It would harm children and likely lead to more family separation. It would hurt many workers in our communities who perform important but low-paid jobs, often under difficult conditions. The rule would essentially put a price tag on obtaining legal U. Specifically, the rule would drastically change longstanding federal policy and erect a harsh new standard for immigration officials to apply when deciding: Under the proposed rule, immigration officials could turn away legal immigrants seeking to remain here — or to come to the country in the first place — if they have received, or are judged likely to receive in the future, any of an array of benefits tied to need that are available only to immigrants lawfully in the United States. Immigration authorities consider receipt of those benefits, along with other factors, when making a public charge determination. The proposed regulation that DHS has released, however, would radically alter this policy and greatly broaden the scope of benefits considered. For the first time, the public charge determination process would consider whether an individual has received or is likely to receive in the future any of an array of non-cash benefits that provide food, health coverage, and housing assistance — including Medicaid, Medicare Part D subsidies that make prescription medications affordable for low-income beneficiaries, rental assistance, and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program SNAP, formerly known as the Food Stamp Program. Second, it would enable the Trump Administration to keep out of the country individuals who are working, or would work, in low-paid jobs because they would likely qualify for one or more of the targeted benefits in the future. This may reflect a deeply mistaken White House view that such immigrants do not contribute to the U. The rule would be certain to foster confusion and widespread fear in immigrant communities. There is persuasive evidence this will occur. In the late s, when immigration and welfare legislation modified immigration eligibility for public benefit programs, an atmosphere of confusion and fear emerged in many immigrant communities regarding whether the use of benefits like Medicaid and SNAP could place people at risk of negative immigration actions. This led many eligible people in need to refrain from applying for these benefits. Partly as a result, in , only 40 percent of eligible citizen children living in households with immigrants participated in SNAP, compared to 70 percent of all eligible children. To allay this fear and confusion, the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations clarified the public charge rules and undertook outreach in immigrant communities, and program participation rates subsequently rose back for eligible children in immigrant families. To say the least, comparable efforts by the current Administration seem very unlikely. And just the leak of earlier versions of this rule itself created significant apprehension in immigrant communities and appears already to have led many immigrants to withdraw from benefit programs. Pregnant women fearful of immigration repercussions could forgo health coverage, increasing the risk of maternal and child mortality and other adverse birth outcomes. Families could choose not to enroll in SNAP when their earnings fall and be left without sufficient food. In some cases, such as if people forgo needed vaccinations or treatment for contagious illnesses like the flu or pneumonia, this also could put public health at risk. Undocumented immigrants already are ineligible for these assistance programs, and immigrants whose primary income source is cash assistance rather than earnings already can be designated a public charge. Thus, many of the immigrants who could be affected by the new rule — either directly or through the chill effect — are people who work hard at jobs that pay low wages, provide few if any benefits, and have difficult working conditions, such as nursing home or home health aides, office custodial staff, dishwashers, and the like. They rely on their earnings, but may qualify for assistance now or in the future that supplements their low pay and poor or non-existent benefits. After all, a large share of native-born U. Given this and the broad discretion that immigration officials would have under the rule, there is serious risk that many hard-working immigrants or prospective immigrants who

work in jobs the economy needs but earn modest pay would be denied the ability to stay here or denied entry into the country. Many low-wage workers have earnings below this level. Coming on top of other executive orders and actions that have placed various immigrants at risk, the draft rule is another severe and unjustified measure that would harm immigrant families and ill-serve our country. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization and policy institute that conducts research and analysis on a range of government policies and programs. It is supported primarily by foundation grants.

Chapter 6 : Immigration Timeline - The Statue of Liberty & Ellis Island

Finally, facing the modest flux of immigration Europe and the US are facing-indeed modest if we consider that other countries are dealing with much larger numbers in proportion to their capacity.

For information and statistics on the resident foreign-born population of the UK, see Foreign-born population of the United Kingdom. It is not to be confused with Welsh emigration. The number of people immigrating to the UK increased between and by 28,, whereas the number emigrating fell by 7, An estimated , people left, including , British citizens and 83, other EU citizens. The top countries represented in terms of arrivals were: This figure fell from around , in , which was the highest figure recorded since , when records began. Between , the average number of people granted British citizenship per year was , The main countries of previous nationality of those naturalised in were: Grants of settlement are made on the basis of various factors, including employment, family formation and reunification, and asylum including to deal with backlogs of asylum cases. Definitions According to the House of Commons Library , several definitions for a migrant exist in United Kingdom so that a migrant can be: Someone whose country of birth is different to their country of residence. Someone whose nationality is different to their country of residence. Someone who changes their country of usual residence for a period of at least a year, so that the country of destination effectively becomes the country of usual residence. Both during this time, and following the granting of independence to most colonies after the Second World War , the vast majority of immigrants to the UK were from either current or former colonies, most notably those in the Indian subcontinent , South East Asia , Oceania and the Caribbean. Many people were specifically brought to the UK on ships; notably the Empire Windrush in The justification for the control which is included in this Bill, which I shall describe in more detail in a few moments, is that a sizeable part of the entire population of the Earth is at present legally entitled to come and stay in this already densely populated country. It amounts altogether to one-quarter of the population of the globe and at present there are no factors visible which might lead us to expect a reversal or even a modification of the immigration trend. In , to combat the perceived injustice in the case where the wives of British subjects could not obtain British nationality, the British Nationality Act was adopted. Shortly afterwards, refugees from Kenya and Uganda , fearing discrimination from their own national governments, began to arrive in Britain; as they had retained their British nationality granted by the Act, they were not subject to the later controls. The Conservative MP Enoch Powell campaigned for tighter controls on immigration which resulted in the passing of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act in Those who did not could only obtain British nationality at the discretion of the national authorities. The total number of Commonwealth immigrants since is estimated at around 2,, German migration to the United Kingdom In the lead-up to World War II , many people from Germany , particularly those belonging to minorities which were persecuted under Nazi rule, such as Jews , sought to emigrate to the United Kingdom, and it is estimated that as many as 50, may have been successful. There were immigration caps on the number who could enter and, subsequently, some applicants were turned away. When the UK declared war on Germany , however, migration between the countries ceased. The UK recruited displaced people as so-called European Volunteer Workers in order to provide labour to industries that were required in order to aid economic recovery after the war. More than 60, arrived before , many of whom drove buses, or worked in foundries or textile factories. Later arrivals opened corner shops or ran post offices. Around 30, Ugandan Asians emigrated to the UK. Many Pakistanis came to Britain following the turmoil during the partition of India and the subsequent independence of Pakistan; among them were those who migrated to Pakistan upon displacement from India, and then emigrated to the UK, thus becoming secondary migrants. As Commonwealth citizens, they were eligible for most British civic rights. They found employment in the textile industries of Lancashire and Yorkshire , manufacturing in the West Midlands , and car production and food processing industries of Luton and Slough. It was common for Pakistani employees to work nightshifts and at other less-desirable hours. There was also an influx of refugees from Hungary , following the crushing of the Hungarian revolution , numbering 20, people. Enoch Powell gave the famous " Rivers of Blood " speech on 20 April in which he warned his audience of what he believed would be the

consequences of continued unchecked immigration from the Commonwealth to Britain. Conservative Party leader Edward Heath sacked Powell from his Shadow Cabinet the day after the speech, and he never held another senior political post. By 1968, only holders of work permits, or people with parents or grandparents born in the UK could gain entry – significantly reducing primary immigration from Commonwealth countries. It also made a distinction between nationality by descent and nationality other than by descent. Citizens by descent cannot automatically pass on British nationality to a child born outside the United Kingdom or its Overseas Territories though in some situations the child can be registered as a citizen. In the late 1950s, most of these early migrants were granted asylum, while those arriving later in the 1960s more often obtained temporary status. The main driving forces behind this secondary migration included a desire to reunite with family and friends and for better employment opportunities. The former government adviser Andrew Neather in the *Evening Standard* stated that the deliberate policy of ministers from late 1950s until early 1960s was to open up the UK to mass migration. Instead, restrictions were put in place to limit migration to students, the self-employed, highly skilled migrants and food and agricultural workers. Data from Office for National Statistics. Many of the immigrants who arrive under these schemes bring skills which are in short supply in the UK. Applications are made at UK embassies or consulates or directly to UK Visas and Immigration, depending upon the type of visa or permit required. In April 2010, changes to the managed migration system were proposed that would create one points-based immigration system for the UK in place of all other schemes. Tier 1 in the new system – which replaced the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme – gives points for age, education, earning, previous UK experience but not for work experience. The points-based system was phased in over the course of 2010, replacing previous managed migration schemes such as the work permit system and the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme. Tier 1 – for highly skilled individuals, who can contribute to growth and productivity; Tier 2 – for skilled workers with a job offer, to fill gaps in the United Kingdom workforce; Tier 3 – for limited numbers of low-skilled workers needed to fill temporary labour shortages; Tier 4 – for students; Tier 5 – for temporary workers and young people covered by the Youth Mobility Scheme, who are allowed to work in the United Kingdom for a limited time to satisfy primarily non-economic objectives. In June 2010, The newly elected Coalition government brought in a temporary cap on immigration of those entering the UK from outside the EU, with the limit set as 24,000, in order to stop an expected rush of applications before a permanent cap was imposed in April 2011. Though immigration is a matter that is reserved to the UK Government under the legislation that established devolution for Scotland in 1999, the Scottish Government was able to get an agreement from the Home Office for their Fresh Talent Initiative which was designed to encourage foreign graduates of Scottish universities to stay in Scotland to look for employment. Cuts to legal aid prevent asylum seekers getting good advice or arguing their case effectively. This can mean refugees being returned to a country where they face certain death. Both the Labour Party and the Conservatives have suggested policies perceived as being "tough on asylum" [69] although the Conservatives have dropped a previous pledge to limit the number of people who could claim asylum in the UK, which would likely have breached the UN Refugee Convention [70] and the tabloid media frequently print headlines about an "immigration crisis". Concern is also raised about the treatment of those held in detention and the practice of dawn raiding families, and holding young children in immigration detention centres for long periods of time. EU courts have upheld this policy. David Blunkett, then the Home Secretary, called the promise an objective rather than a target. This target was met early in 2010. The UK hosts one of the largest populations of Iraqi refugees outside the Gulf region. Immigrants with the right to stay in the UK are denied housing and cannot be released. In other cases vulnerable asylum seekers are released onto the streets with nowhere to live. In January 2011 the government repealed a law that previously allowed homeless detainees to apply for housing while in detention if they had nowhere to live when released. Charities maintain around 2,000 detainees who before this applied for support each year can no longer do so.

Chapter 7 : Modern Immigration Wave Brings 59 Million to U.S.

Immigrating to The United States in the Modern Era. The United States is a country founded on immigration. The Pilgrims who came from Great Britain to America on the Mayflower, were among the country's first immigrants.

Camarota is the director of research at the Center for Immigration Studies. The findings of this analysis show that the average cost of a deportation is much smaller than the net fiscal drain created by the average illegal immigrant. Of course, simply because deportation is much less costly than allowing illegal immigrants to stay does not settle the policy questions surrounding illegal immigration as there are many factors to consider. Partly due to policies adopted in the second term of the Obama administration, ICE removed nearly , fewer aliens in than in , even though it actually spent 8 percent more in in inflation-adjusted dollars. If the average cost of a deportation was what it had been in FY , then the larger enforcement budget in FY would have allowed for , more removals without spending additional money. Costs of illegal immigrants: Researchers agree that illegal immigrants overwhelmingly have modest levels of education – most have not completed high school or have only a high school education. There is also agreement that immigrants with this level of education are a significant net fiscal drain, creating more in costs for government than they pay in taxes. The NAS estimated the lifetime fiscal impact taxes paid minus services used of immigrants based on their educational attainment. Important caveats about these estimates: The NAS projects future fiscal impacts. A significant share of the current illegal population are not recent arrivals, so some of the net burden they create has already been incurred. The above cost estimates are only for the original illegal immigrant, and exclude descendants. To create its long-term fiscal estimates, the NAS uses the concept of "net present value" NPV , which is commonly used by economists. This approach has the effect of reducing the size of the net fiscal drain that unskilled immigrants create because costs or benefits years from now are valued less relative to more immediate costs. Introduction One argument made by opponents of immigration enforcement is that it would be prohibitively expensive to deport all illegal immigrants, so we have to amnesty them. Rather, actually enforcing immigration laws would cause many illegal immigrants to return to their home countries on their own. Nonetheless, the cost of deportations vs. To answer that question, this analysis takes the cost that Immigration and Custom Enforcement ICE estimates for the average deportation and compares it to the lifetime fiscal impact of the average illegal immigrant. To calculate the net fiscal impact of the average illegal immigrant, we take their likely education levels and apply fiscal estimates taxes paid minus costs developed by the NAS for immigrants by education level. Our findings show that deportation is much less costly than allowing illegal immigrants to stay. Of course, fiscal impacts are not the only consideration when weighting the various policy options. Determining how much it costs to deport, or more accurately formally remove, a non-citizen from the United States is not as straightforward a question as it might seem because ICE has multiple missions and legal responsibilities. Much of what ICE does has nothing to do with immigration, such as countering the smuggling of drugs and contraband across the border; stopping the illegal export of sensitive technology; stopping weapons trafficking; preventing the production and sale of child pornography via the internet; and intercepting stolen art and antiques. In short, the budget of ICE is not a budget solely for immigration enforcement. This figure includes "all costs necessary to identify, apprehend, detain, process through immigration court, and remove an alien. These two entities comprise the overwhelming share of spending on removals. One complicating factor when considering enforcement costs is the number of removals. Yet they removed about Declining Number of Removals. It is certainly possible to remove significantly more people with the current budget. The government actually did so in If enforcement was stepped up it seems almost certain that the lower cost per removal would continue, provided that policies continue to encourage enforcement operations rather than discourage them. During the second term of the Obama administration, policies prohibiting agents from arresting aliens became increasingly stringent. A recent GAO report found that the backlog of pending cases that are carried over from the prior year in immigration court more than doubled between and Arthur explains that several factors have caused the pace of deportations to slow. One of the biggest reasons for the recent slowdown in removals is the priorities of the

Obama administration, including the decision to admit so many unaccompanied minors at the border and the burden on the courts resulting from the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals DACA program. The Trump administration has curtailed some of these policies. It remains to be seen if the number of removals returns to the same level as . However, if the costs of deportation were what they had been in then the somewhat larger enforcement budget in would have allowed for the removal of at least , more aliens with the same budget. There is a good deal of agreement among researchers that the education level of immigrants is a key factor in determining their net fiscal impact. As a recent study by the NAS states, the education level of arriving immigrants is one of the "important determinants" of their fiscal impact. Those with modest levels of education tend to earn low wages in the modern American economy, and as a result tend to make low tax payments and often qualify for means-tested programs. The less-educated are a net fiscal drain, on average, regardless of legal status or if they were born in the United States or a foreign country. Education Levels of Illegal Immigrants. In terms of the educational attainment of illegal immigrants, there is a good deal of evidence that they have modest levels of education, much lower than native-born Americans or legal immigrants. The Heritage Foundation study cited above estimated that, on average, illegal immigrants have 10 years of schooling. In an earlier analysis by the Center for Immigration Studies of illegal immigrants based on Census Bureau data, we found that 54 percent of adults have not completed high school, 25 percent have only a high school degree, and 21 percent have education beyond high school. We find that adult illegal immigrants have become somewhat more educated since , but the vast majority still have very modest levels of education. It is also worth noting that illegal immigrants overall are significantly more educated than we reported in an earlier analysis, which focused only on illegal border-crossers. Even though illegal immigrants overall are more educated than illegal border-crossers and illegal immigrants have become more educated over time, as a group they remain much less educated than the native-born or legal immigrants. Fiscal Impact by Education Level. The NAS study mentioned above projected the lifetime fiscal impact taxes paid minus services used of immigrants by education. These estimates are expressed as a net present value NPV. This is a concept used in fiscal studies, and in other contexts, to express the sum total of costs or benefits over long periods of time – in this case a lifetime. NPV represents the fiscal balance taxes paid minus costs if we had to spend the money today. Costs or benefits in the future are discounted or reduced based on how long from now they occur. Later in this report, we discuss in more detail the concept of net present value, both its usefulness and its shortcomings. The NAS study does not report separate estimates for illegal and legal immigrants. Rather, it simply estimates tax payments and expenditures on immigrants as they appear in Census Bureau data, primarily the Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement. As a result, the estimates from the NAS are for both legal and illegal immigrants by education. The NAS fiscal projections include eight different scenarios, each with different assumptions about future spending, tax rates, and the future flow of immigrants. It is not entirely clear what set of fiscal assumptions are best, and the NAS study itself does not identify the one best scenario. In Table 1 we simply take all 8 scenarios and average them together by education level. It should be pointed out that in every scenario from the NAS, as shown in Table 1, immigrants without a high school education are a significant net fiscal drain during their lifetimes. That is, they pay less in taxes than they use in services. Those with only a high school education are a net fiscal drain in seven of the eight scenarios. This is very important because the vast majority of adult illegal immigrants in the country lack a high school diploma or have only a high school education. Calculating the Fiscal Impact of Illegal Immigrants. The first column of Table 2 reports the average fiscal effect of immigrants by education level, taken directly from the bottom of Table 1. Column 2 shows the education level of illegal immigrants in the country as discussed above. Column 3 multiplies the average cost by the share of illegal immigrants who fall into that educational category and the bottom of column 3 adds up the costs to give a weighted average. However, for reasons discussed below we think this figure overstates the net fiscal costs. As already mentioned, the NAS fiscal analysis is for immigrants overall – both legal and illegal. Although illegal immigrants do access some welfare programs and create other significant costs, it should still be the case that less-educated illegal immigrants create smaller net fiscal costs than less-educated legal immigrants. Unfortunately, the NAS study has very little discussion of how legal and illegal immigrants differ in their

fiscal impact. The study does state on page that, "unauthorized immigrants as a group may have a more positive fiscal impact than authorized immigrants. We agree with their tentative conclusion and so we adjust downward the fiscal drain created by less-educated illegal immigrants relative to illegal immigrants. To estimate the adjustment factor, we use the Heritage Foundation study mentioned above. That study has estimates for immigrants by education and legal status. There is also the issue of inflation. The NAS fiscal estimates are reported in dollars. If we assume there are The NAS fiscal estimates are for newly arrived immigrants during their lifetimes projected forward. Since this analysis is concerned with the existing population of illegal immigrants, some share of the net fiscal costs they create has already been incurred. Based on the age of the illegal population and their time already in the United States, we estimate that one-fifth of their costs have already been incurred. The concept of net present value employed by the NAS study reduces or "discounts" costs or benefits in the future based on how long in the future they take place. Page of the NAS study states that they used a 3 percent annual discount rate, which is common in this kind of analysis. So, for example, the fiscal balance whether a net drain or benefit an immigrant creates two years after arrival is reduced by about 6 percent. After 10 years, the amount is reduced by about 26 percent and at 20 years the discount is 45 percent. This means events that occur further in the future have a smaller impact on the total cost or benefit. Comparing the net present value fiscal costs illegal immigrants create to the costs of removal can be seen as reasonable because a removal has to be paid for up front while the fiscal drain accrues over time. By using a NPV it makes the costs of removal comparable to the lifetime costs illegal immigrants create. The primary disadvantage of using NPV for fiscal estimates is that it masks the actual size of future outlays created by less-educated illegal immigrants. Without discounting, the actual outlays associated with illegal immigrants are much larger. Making Different Assumptions Including Descendants. There are four key variables in the above calculations that potentially impact the results. The first is whether to include the children of illegal immigrants. Many of the descendants of less-educated immigrants struggle, often earning low wages themselves and making use of welfare programs and other public services.

Chapter 8 : How U.S. immigration laws and rules have changed through history | Pew Research Center

*Originally published by the Americas Program of the Center for International Policy Posted on: 14/01/ by David Bacon
By David Bacon Editor's Note: This is the third and final installment of a three-part series on migrant rights by journalist and immigration activist David Bacon.*

Definitions[edit] According to the House of Commons Library , several definitions for a migrant exist in United Kingdom so that a migrant can be: Someone whose country of birth is different to their country of residence. Someone whose nationality is different to their country of residence. Someone who changes their country of usual residence for a period of at least a year, so that the country of destination effectively becomes the country of usual residence. Both during this time, and following the granting of independence to most colonies after the Second World War , the vast majority of immigrants to the UK were from either current or former colonies, most notably those in the Indian subcontinent , South East Asia , Oceania and the Caribbean. Many people were specifically brought to the UK on ships; notably the Empire Windrush in 1948. The justification for the control which is included in this Bill, which I shall describe in more detail in a few moments, is that a sizeable part of the entire population of the Earth is at present legally entitled to come and stay in this already densely populated country. It amounts altogether to one-quarter of the population of the globe and at present there are no factors visible which might lead us to expect a reversal or even a modification of the immigration trend. In 1948, to combat the perceived injustice in the case where the wives of British subjects could not obtain British nationality, the British Nationality Act was adopted. Shortly afterwards, refugees from Kenya and Uganda , fearing discrimination from their own national governments, began to arrive in Britain; as they had retained their British nationality granted by the Act, they were not subject to the later controls. The Conservative MP Enoch Powell campaigned for tighter controls on immigration which resulted in the passing of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act in 1962. Those who did not could only obtain British nationality at the discretion of the national authorities. The total number of Commonwealth immigrants since is estimated at around 2.5 million. German migration to the United Kingdom In the lead-up to World War II , many people from Germany , particularly those belonging to minorities which were persecuted under Nazi rule, such as Jews , sought to emigrate to the United Kingdom, and it is estimated that as many as 50,000 may have been successful. There were immigration caps on the number who could enter and, subsequently, some applicants were turned away. When the UK declared war on Germany , however, migration between the countries ceased. The UK recruited displaced people as so-called European Volunteer Workers in order to provide labour to industries that were required in order to aid economic recovery after the war. More than 60,000 arrived before 1945, many of whom drove buses, or worked in foundries or textile factories. Later arrivals opened corner shops or ran post offices. Around 30,000 Ugandan Asians emigrated to the UK. Many Pakistanis came to Britain following the turmoil during the partition of India and the subsequent independence of Pakistan; among them were those who migrated to Pakistan upon displacement from India, and then emigrated to the UK, thus becoming secondary migrants. As Commonwealth citizens, they were eligible for most British civic rights. They found employment in the textile industries of Lancashire and Yorkshire , manufacturing in the West Midlands , and car production and food processing industries of Luton and Slough. It was common for Pakistani employees to work nightshifts and at other less-desirable hours. There was also an influx of refugees from Hungary , following the crushing of the Hungarian revolution , numbering 20,000 people. Enoch Powell gave the famous " Rivers of Blood " speech on 20 April in which he warned his audience of what he believed would be the consequences of continued unchecked immigration from the Commonwealth to Britain. Conservative Party leader Edward Heath sacked Powell from his Shadow Cabinet the day after the speech, and he never held another senior political post. By 1962, only holders of work permits , or people with parents or grandparents born in the UK could gain entry " significantly reducing primary immigration from Commonwealth countries. It also made a distinction between nationality by descent and nationality other than by descent. Citizens by descent cannot automatically pass on British nationality to a child born outside the United Kingdom or its Overseas Territories though in some situations the child can be registered as a citizen. In the late 1960s, most of

these early migrants were granted asylum, while those arriving later in the s more often obtained temporary status. The main driving forces behind this secondary migration included a desire to reunite with family and friends and for better employment opportunities. The former government adviser Andrew Neather in the Evening Standard stated that the deliberate policy of ministers from late until early was to open up the UK to mass migration. Instead, restrictions were put in place to limit migration to students, the self-employed, highly skilled migrants and food and agricultural workers. Data from Office for National Statistics. Many of the immigrants who arrive under these schemes bring skills which are in short supply in the UK. Applications are made at UK embassies or consulates or directly to UK Visas and Immigration, depending upon the type of visa or permit required. In April , changes to the managed migration system were proposed that would create one points-based immigration system for the UK in place of all other schemes. Tier 1 in the new system " gives points for age, education, earning, previous UK experience but not for work experience. The points-based system was phased in over the course of , replacing previous managed migration schemes such as the work permit system and the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme. Tier 1 " for highly skilled individuals, who can contribute to growth and productivity; Tier 2 " for skilled workers with a job offer, to fill gaps in the United Kingdom workforce; Tier 3 " for limited numbers of low-skilled workers needed to fill temporary labour shortages; Tier 4 " for students; Tier 5 " for temporary workers and young people covered by the Youth Mobility Scheme, who are allowed to work in the United Kingdom for a limited time to satisfy primarily non-economic objectives. In June , The newly elected Coalition government brought in a temporary cap on immigration of those entering the UK from outside the EU, with the limit set as 24,, in order to stop an expected rush of applications before a permanent cap was imposed in April . Though immigration is a matter that is reserved to the UK Government under the legislation that established devolution for Scotland in , the Scottish Government was able to get an agreement from the Home Office for their Fresh Talent Initiative which was designed to encourage foreign graduates of Scottish universities to stay in Scotland to look for employment. Cuts to legal aid prevent asylum seekers getting good advice or arguing their case effectively. This can mean refugees being returned to a country where they face certain death. Both the Labour Party and the Conservatives have suggested policies perceived as being "tough on asylum" [69] although the Conservatives have dropped a previous pledge to limit the number of people who could claim asylum in the UK, which would likely have breached the UN Refugee Convention [70] and the tabloid media frequently print headlines about an "immigration crisis". Concern is also raised about the treatment of those held in detention and the practice of dawn raiding families, and holding young children in immigration detention centres for long periods of time. EU courts have upheld this policy. David Blunkett , then the Home Secretary , called the promise an objective rather than a target. This target was met early in . The UK hosts one of the largest populations of Iraqi refugees outside the Gulf region. Immigrants with the right to stay in the UK are denied housing and cannot be released. In other cases vulnerable asylum seekers are released onto the streets with nowhere to live. In January the government repealed a law that previously allowed homeless detainees to apply for housing while in detention if they had nowhere to live when released. Charities maintain around 2, detainees who before this applied for support each year can no longer do so. Please update this article to reflect recent events or newly available information.

Chapter 9 : Modern immigration to the United Kingdom - The Reader Wiki, Reader View of Wikipedia

Since , immigration to the United Kingdom under British nationality law has been significant, in particular from the Republic of Ireland and from the former British Empire especially India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, the Caribbean, South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya and Hong Kong.

This is the third and final installment of a three-part series on migrant rights by journalist and immigration activist David Bacon. The Americas Program is proud to publish this series in collaboration with the author. Development of the Immigrant Rights Movement to Before the cold war, the defense of the rights of immigrants in the U. At the time when the left came under attack and was partly destroyed in the cold war, immigrant rights leaders were also targeted for deportation. In the s, at the height of the cold war, the combination of enforcement and contract labor reached a peak. In 1., Mexicans were deported from the U. And from to , between , and , Mexicans were brought into the U. The program, begun during World War Two, in , was finally abolished in The civil rights movement ended the bracero program, and created an alternative to the deportation regime. Farm workers went on strike the year after in Delano, California, and the United Farm Workers was born. They also helped to convince Congress in to pass immigration legislation that established new pathways for legal immigration – the family preference system. People could reunite their families in the U. Migrants received permanent residency visas, allowing them to live normal lives, and enjoy basic human and labor rights. Then, under pressure from employers in the late s, Congress began to debate the bills that eventually resulted in the Immigration Reform and Control Act. That debate set in place the basic dividing line in the modern immigrant rights movement. IRCA contained three elements. It reinstated a bracero-like guest worker program, by setting up the H2-A visa category. And it set up an amnesty process for undocumented workers in the country before The main trade union federation to which most U. The Catholic Church and other Washington DC liberal advocates supported amnesty and were willing to agree to guest workers and enforcement as a tradeoff. Employers wanted guest worker programs. That effort, together with earlier, mostly left-led campaigns to organize undocumented workers, built the base for the later upsurge of immigrants that changed the politics and labor movement of the city. Elsewhere, local immigrant advocates set up coalitions to look for ways to defend undocumented workers against the impact of employer sanctions. Grass roots coalitions then began helping workers set up centers for day laborers, garment workers, domestic workers, and other groups of immigrants generally ignored by established unions. On one side are well-financed advocacy organizations in Washington DC, with links to the Democratic Party and large corporations. They formulate and negotiate over immigration reform proposals that combine labor supply programs and increased enforcement against the undocumented. On the other side are organizations based in immigrant communities, and among labor and political activists, who defend undocumented migrants, and who resist proposals for greater enforcement and labor programs with diminished rights. Many community-based coalitions withdrew from the Washington lobbying efforts, refusing to cast the undocumented to the wolves. The strategy failed, in any case, and the eventual law includes severe provisions directed at legal, as well as undocumented immigrants. At the AFL-CIO convention in Los Angeles, the federation called for the repeal of employer sanctions, for a new amnesty, and for defending the labor rights of all workers. The federation was already opposed to guest worker programs. At their heart are the guest worker programs proposed by employers. Except for the vacillating and divided position of unions, this is the same political coalition that passed IRCA in Some local immigrant rights coalitions have also supported the bills, although most have been unwilling to agree to guest worker programs and more enforcement. Supporters of the comprehensive bills have organized a succession of high-profile lobbying efforts, which received extensive foundation support. The structure of the bills has been basically the same from the beginning – the same three-part structure of IRCA – guest workers, enforcement and some degree of legalization. Over the last decade, however, a loose, unorganized network of groups has grown that has generally opposed most CIR bills and their provisions, and that have also organized the movements on the ground that have opposed increased enforcement and repression directed against immigrant communities. Outside the Washington

beltway, community coalitions, labor and immigrant rights groups are advocating alternatives. Some of them are large-scale counters to the entire CIR framework. Others seek to win legal status for a part of the undocumented population, as a step towards larger change. First introduced in , the bill would allow undocumented students graduating from a U. Estimates are that it would enable over , young people to gain legal status, and eventual citizenship. Three were arrested when they sat-in at the office of Arizona Senator John McCain, demanding that he support the bill, while defying immigration authorities to come get them. They learned to stop deportations in an era when more people have been deported than ever since the days of the Cold War. However, when the bill was introduced, the Pentagon pressured to substitute military for community service. Many young activists were torn by this provision, and ultimately, the bill did not pass Congress, even with that change. Supporting the Dream Act and other partial protections for the undocumented are the worker centers around the country. This movement is based on organizing centers for contingent workers, who are mostly undocumented. Some of the centers have anchored the protests against repression in Arizona, or fought to pass laws in California, New York and elsewhere prohibiting police from turning over people to immigration agents. The National Domestic Worker Alliance was organized last year, in part using the experience of day labor organizing, to win rights for domestic workers, almost all of whom are women. It won passage of a bill of rights in New York, and is working on passing it in California. On a broader scale, what would be a law that would liberate people- not turn them into modern day slaves- today? Many progressive immigrant rights organizations have sought to formulate an answer to this question, especially in response to the CIR proposals in Washington that they oppose. Advocating New Policies- Progressive Proposals The Frente Indigena de Organizaciones Binacionales Binational Front of Indigenous Organizations “ FIOB conducted a series of organized discussions among its California chapters to formulate a very progressive position on immigration reform, with the unique perspective of an organization of migrants and migrant-sending communities. We have to change the debate from one in which immigration is presented as a problem to a debate over rights. The real problem is exploitation. The FIOB proposal on immigration reform is similar to that advanced by the Dignity Campaign, a loose coalition of organizations around the country that have proposed an alternative to the comprehensive labor supply plus enforcement bills. The constituent organizations have participated in other earlier coalitions opposing employer sanctions and guest worker programs. The Dignity Campaign brings together immigrant rights and fair trade organizations, to encourage each to see the global connections between trade policy, displacement and migration. It also brings together unions and immigrant rights organizations to spur the growth of a fight back against immigration enforcement against workers, highlighting the need to oppose the criminalization of work. Several other efforts were also made earlier by the National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights to define an alternative program and bring together groups around the country to support it. Vulnerability makes it harder for people to defend their rights, organize unions and raise wages. That keeps the price of immigrant labor low. This will not stop people from coming to the U. Last year over , people went through privately-run prisons for undocumented immigrants. At the same time, the Washington DC-based CIR proposals all expand guest worker programs, in which workers would have few rights, and no leverage to organize for better conditions. Finally, the CIR legalization measures would impose barriers making ineligible many of the 12 million people who need legal status. It makes no sense to promote more free trade agreements, and then condemn the migration of the people they displace. Instead, Congress must end the use of the free trade system as a mechanism for producing displaced workers. That also means delinking immigration status and employment. If employers are allowed to recruit contract labor abroad, and those workers can only stay if they are continuously employed, then they will never have enforceable rights. A coalition for reform should fight for the right of people to choose when and how to migrate. Freedom of movement is a human right. Even in a more just world, migration will continue, because families and communities are now connected over thousands of miles and many borders. Immigration policy should therefore make movement easier. At the same time, workers need basic rights, regardless of immigration status. It would be better to devote more resources to enforcing labor standards for all workers, instead of penalizing undocumented workers for working, and employers for hiring them. Permanent legal status makes it easier to organize. Guest worker

programs, employer sanctions, enforcement and raids make organizing much more difficult. Today the section of workers with no benefits and the lowest wages is expanding the fastest. Proposals to deny people rights or benefits because of immigration status make this process move even faster. A popular coalition should push back in the other direction, toward more equal status, which will help unite diverse communities. Building a political coalition for a more pro-worker and pro-immigrant reform has to start by seeking mutual interest among workers. That common ground is a struggle for jobs and rights for everyone. Black unemployment, for instance, is at catastrophic levels. Very little unemployment is a result of displacement by immigrants, and is caused mostly by the decline in manufacturing and cuts in public employment. In the recession, out of 2,, Black factory workers lost their jobs. But in the growing service and high tech industries, displaced African American and Chicano workers are anathema. To end job competition, for instance, workers need Congress to adopt a full-employment policy. To gain organizing rights for immigrants, all workers need the Employee Free Choice Act and labor law reform. Winning those demands requires an alliance between workers — immigrants and native-born, Latinos, African Americans, Asian Americans and whites. An alliance with employers, giving them new guest worker programs, will increase job competition, push wages down, and make affirmative action impossible. The Dignity Campaign proposal, therefore, is not just an alternative program for changing laws and policies, but an implicit strategy of alliances among those communities and constituencies based on their mutual interest. The basic elements of such an alternative include: To resolve the dilemmas of migration and globalization, the U. Corporations and those who benefit from current priorities might not support this alternative, but millions of people will. A human rights reform will be a product of the social movements of this country, especially of people on the bottom outside the beltway. A social movement made possible advances in that were called unrealistic and politically impossible a decade earlier. The Dignity Campaign proposal may not be a viable one in a Congress dominated by Tea Party nativists and corporations seeking guest worker programs.