

## Chapter 1 : Shifting Public Views on Legal Immigration Into the U.S. | Pew Research Center

*Towards A More Just Immigration Policy Law enforcement must improve their relationship with immigrant communities. By The Crimson Editorial Board May 5, Since the election and inauguration of.*

During his campaign, Donald Trump used the issue of illegal immigration as a nativist dog whistle. According to Trump, Mexico was sending criminals over the border. He called for deporting the 12 million undocumented immigrants in the United States. After the election, Trump accused undocumented immigrants of surreptitiously voting for Hillary Clinton in the general election. He and his attorney general have stepped up deportations, even for traffic offenses. After agreeing to work with Democratic congressional leaders on a bill extending DACA, he reneged by attaching conditions, including funding for a border wall, that he knew Democrats would reject. In fact, Trump has not come close to deporting the 12 million. According to reports last September, he has deported fewer undocumented immigrants than the Obama administration did in a comparable period. But his rhetoric, and his rejection of DACA, have sown fear among immigrants. And they have reasserted the need to find an eventual path to citizenship for the 12 million. They have consistently downplayed or denied that there is any urgent need to stanch the flow of unauthorized immigration. They have also denied that the massive influx of unskilled labor over the last five decades has held down wages, increased social costs, or undermined unionization in some sectors, including construction, agriculture, and meatpacking. Cotton and Perdue had originally introduced their plan in February to little fanfare, but in August Trump endorsed the plan, making it his own. Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by former Democratic Representative Barbara Jordan, a leading liberal of her day. Democrats believe, of course, that in downplaying illegal immigration and insisting that immigration benefits everyone, they are standing up for their own constituents. They think that working-class Americans who backed Trump on this issue failed to understand their own interests. But Democrats are wrong in this case. While many American businesses and the well-to-do have clearly benefited from the massive influx of unskilled immigrants, many middle- and working-class Americans, including such key Democratic constituents as African Americans, have not. The act was adopted on civil rights and humanitarian grounds. It was not expected to increase immigration dramatically. Indeed, this measure provides for an increase of only a small fraction in permissible immigration. In , Congress passed another bill—this time enthusiastically backed by business—that increased still further the total quotas on immigrants. The immigrant population exploded. In , the foreign-born accounted for 4. During the same period, illegal immigration across the border also grew, the result in part of the repeal in of the bracero guest-worker program, but also of a huge increase in Latin American population that was not matched by growing prosperity. There are now an estimated In , Congress and the Reagan administration tried to stem illegal immigration by making it illegal for employers to knowingly hire workers without citizenship papers, but employers did not have to check whether the papers were authentic. Attempts to create a more rigorous computerized system of checking have been resisted by business lobbies. Employer fines were few in the Clinton years—in “but virtually ceased under George W. Bush, who levied three fines in That has put the emphasis on border control, even though half or less of undocumented immigrants actually come across the border. Most just overstay tourist or other visas. About one-third to one-half of the immigrants coming legally into the United States are unskilled or lower-skilled. About half lack proficiency in the English language. Those percentages are considerably higher among undocumented immigrants. About 70 percent lack proficiency in English. As a result, the greatest percentages of immigrants find unskilled work in agriculture, construction, health care as aides , maids and housekeeping, and food service. Many of the studies of the effects of immigration are financed by business groups and lobbying organizations that have a stake in the outcome. But there are a number of studies that show that while immigration has resulted in a rise in overall wealth, it has been a significant, though not the only, factor in the decline of wages among the low-skilled workers who had to compete with the influx of new immigrants. In , the same year the Jordan Commission issued its findings, the National Academy of Sciences published a report on immigration. These findings would accord with the simple law of supply and demand. A rapid

increase in supply either holds down increases in wages or results in reduced wages. Harvard economist George Borjas, who participated in the NAS study, estimates that within a particular skill group, a 10 percent increase in supply results in at least a 3 percent reduction in wages. As the NAS study notes, the two groups in the labor force most immediately affected are prior immigrants and high school dropouts. Many of the first-generation immigrants are Hispanic, and many of the high school dropouts, or those with only a high school degree, are African American. And there are studies showing that workers from these two groups have been hit hard by competition from immigrants. On building crews, for instance, immigrants and non-immigrants work side by side; most construction laborers are native-born. In other sectors, however, as businesses use legal and illegal immigrant labor to drive out unions and drive down wages and working conditions, native-born workers do begin to shun certain jobs. A good example is the transformation of the meatpacking industry. In , The New York Times described what had happened to the industry over the preceding 20 years: Today, the processing and packing plants are largely staffed by low-paid non-union workers from places like Mexico and Guatemala. The companies brought in immigrants, including undocumented immigrants, to undermine the unions and depress wages. Something similar has happened in construction and low-skilled services, where documented and undocumented immigrants were brought in to undermine unionization. The labor movement lobbied for the restrictions on immigration that Congress adopted in and . The leaders of organized labor believed at the time that the huge inflow of immigrants was making it impossible to organize workers to better their conditions. During the prior decades, employers had used immigrants as strike-breakers. The legislation itself was tainted with nativism and anti-Semitism and contributed to the tragic denial of asylum in the s to Jews fleeing Central Europe, but the restrictions imposed on the numbers of low-skilled immigrants were a factor in union successes from the s through the s and in wage increases during that period. The temporary cessation of mass immigration also, as Borjas argues in his new book *We Wanted Workers*, facilitated the assimilation of the millions of immigrants who had entered the United States before . They were able to work their way up through the new industrial economy that employed them and that, thanks to the growth of unionism, paid middle-class wages in the decades following World War II. But many of the low-skilled and unskilled immigrants who have come into the United States since and are employed in the lower rungs of a service economy may not find it as easy to attain middle-class incomes and living standards. Well through the s, Democrats and the labor movement worried that this massive immigration was undermining unionization and holding down wages. That was reflected in the findings of the Jordan Commission in and in union support for the enforcement of the law prohibiting employers from hiring undocumented immigrants. But that understanding has disappeared. But for Democrats, uncritical backing for immigration was also the result of a political calculation that may turn out to be wrong. And there is, or has been, some truth in that. When Republicans have accompanied arguments against illegal immigration with naked xenophobic appeals, as California Republicans did in promoting Proposition in , they have alienated Hispanic voters. That dynamic is still with us. They look with disfavor on the massive immigration of unskilled workers. The poll found significant support among Hispanics for some of its provisions. In other words, Hispanic voters were favorably inclined toward a proposal that aimed to change the priorities in our immigration policy. Hispanic preferences were roughly the same as those of all registered voters. A plurality of the other income groups thought there are too many low-skilled immigrants coming into the country. In sum, the Democratic stance on these issues is not only unpopular with most voters, but with many Hispanics as well. There is one more political dimension to the argument about immigration that is voiced by leading Democrats and Republicans. It is that continuing large-scale immigration of unskilled workers will help the Democrats politically and hurt the Republicans. That calculation lies at the bottom of Democratic hopes and Republican fears of immigration. It encourages Democrats to ignore the downside of mass and illegal immigration and Republicans to seek to cut immigration and to do whatever they can do to discourage immigrants already here from voting. Democrats, after all, have historically been the party of immigrants. Outside California, there are indications that may be the case. Republican candidates for governor in Texas and the Senate in North Carolina have almost broken even among Hispanic voters. And Trump, perhaps because he appeared to promise jobs, actually did better with Hispanic voters than candidate Mitt Romney.

Secondly, the continual surge of low-skilled immigrants into the United States will contribute to an impoverished underclass that holds down wages and creates welfare costs for small towns and states. The existence of that underclass has helped fuel bitter cultural-economic conflicts that have riven America over the last 30 years. It undercuts any promise of an American social democracy or extension of New Deal liberalism, which must be based on a common sense of community. It is already threatening the social solidarity that sustained European social democracy. So in the long run, even if some Democrats benefit at the ballot box, an uncritical stance toward immigration is bad news for the country. What, then, can the Democratic Party do? On the one hand, it is reasonable to push for a path to citizenship, and especially to prevent the cruel deportation of immigrants who were brought here illegally as children and often literally have no home country to return to. But Democrats make both a policy mistake and a political one when they become cheerleaders for illegal immigration and for expanded immigration in general, while denying the plain fact that in many cases immigrants do indeed lower the wages of local workers. Building a wall is bad policy, but so is ignoring the plain realities. You may also like.

## Chapter 2 : Immigration - Wikipedia

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

Many live and work in the country after receiving lawful permanent residence also known as a green card , while others receive temporary visas available to students and workers. In addition, roughly 1 million unauthorized immigrants have temporary permission to live and work in the U. Want to know more about immigration to the U. Take your understanding to the next level with our short email mini-course. These proposals have received renewed attention under the Trump administration. Here are key details about existing U. Family-based immigration In fiscal , , people received family-based U. This program allows someone to receive a green card if they already have a spouse, child, sibling or parent living in the country with U. President Donald Trump has proposed restricting family-based green cards to only spouses and minor children. For other family members, a Senate bill would make a limited number of green cards available under a skills-based point system. Refugee admissions The U. This decline reflects a lower admissions cap. For fiscal , refugee admissions have been capped at 45, , the lowest since Congress created the modern refugee program in for those fleeing persecution in their home countries. In January , refugee admissions resumed for all countries. Employment-based green cards In fiscal , , employment-based green cards were awarded to foreign workers and their families. A Senate bill would replace the existing eligibility criteria with a point system similar to that proposed for family-based green cards. The new system would eliminate a green card for immigrant investors who put money into commercial U. This path to a green card, the EB-5 program, has drawn criticism from some lawmakers. Diversity visas Each year, about 50, people receive green cards through the U. Since the program began in , more than 1 million immigrants have received green cards through the lottery. Trump has said he wants to eliminate the program , which seeks to diversify the U. Citizens of countries with the most legal immigrant arrivals in recent years “ such as Mexico, Canada, China and India “ are not eligible to apply. H-1B visas In fiscal , , high-skilled foreign workers received H-1B visas. In all, more than 1. Under the Trump administration, the number of H-1B applications challenged by the federal government has increased. In addition, the administration has considered restricting the number of years foreign workers can hold H-1B visas. In Congress, long-standing efforts to expand the H-1B visa program continue. Temporary permissions A relatively small number of unauthorized immigrants who came to the U. One key distinction for this group of immigrants is that, despite having received permission to live in the U. The following two programs are examples of this: The program has been central to negotiations as Congress debates changes to U. Trump ended the program in September As a result, DACA enrollees whose benefits expire March 5 would be the first to be dropped from the program. Temporary Protected Status More than , immigrants from 10 nations have permission to live and work in the U. Many are expected to lose their benefits in and The first group expected to lose their benefits will be roughly 1, Sudanese whose benefits expire Nov. Benefits for the largest group, about , people from El Salvador, are scheduled to expire on Sept. About 7, Syrians with TPS recently had their benefits renewed. Under the Trump administration, only those from Syria and South Sudan have received TPS extensions with the possibility of future renewals. It was updated on March 19, , to credit the U.

**Chapter 3 : Mexico's Immigration Law: Let's Try It Here at Home | Human Events**

*Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.*

Immigration is a deeply polarized and often polarizing topic. Often, as my conversation partner Robert McFarland has noted in his first piece on this topic, public conversations on this topic seem to be mired in rhetoric and prone to talking past one another. So this forum, bringing together voices who share a commitment to Christ even if we may disagree on how our faith should inform our views on immigration policy, is valuable. What I was left wanting, though and might find with the next post was more specificity: We can both acknowledge that policy responses to the challenges of U.S. But questions of immigration policy are also far more than theoretical: He begins by discussing the challenges of rhetoric in the immigration debates. I absolutely agree that rhetoric has proven problematic in the U.S. Advocates of one view or another tend to sniff out the terminology used by others and immediately lump them into one of two opposite poles, but the reality is that the only politically realistic policy proposals are more moderate, far from either pole. But most Christians and most Americans actually have nuanced views on this topic: They want those who are a public safety threat deported, but would like long-time residents who have except for their violation of immigration law stayed out of trouble to be given a chance to make amends and stay lawfully, especially in cases when their deportation would likely divide family units. Most Americans value the contributions of immigrants to the country economically and culturally, both throughout our history and at present, but they are troubled by the erosion of the rule of law that results when our federal government seems to look the other way when individuals enter, overstay a visa, or work illegally. There are, of course, advocates of open borders and amnesty, who believe immigration restrictions of any sort are illegitimate but actually very few. And there are xenophobes who simply dislike anyone born in another country who want to restrict immigration altogether, who want not secure borders but closed borders but they are actually a very small share of the population as well. As Robert rightly notes, the national debate over immigration is too often characterized by lazy rhetoric devoid of complexity and nuance. In reality, though, not only do most Americans and most Christians reject the most extreme positions on either side, so do most politicians. There are very few conservative Republicans in Congress who advocate mass deportation and very few liberal Democrats who have ever proposed a mass amnesty that does not include serious fines, a decade-plus process toward permanent legal status, and significant expenditures on border security. I also agree with Robert that we need to define terms before we can really dialogue. And I suspect I erred there in my first post, because I presumed a lot: And even within federal immigration policy, there were many questions I did not address, mostly for lack of space. Robert spent much more time carefully defining terms, whereas I jumped right in to my views. I can readily agree with Robert and with Mark Amstutz, whose recent book *Just Immigration* he cited on several occasions that since immigration policy is so complex, we need to carefully consider various specific questions, among them how to best secure our borders presuming we agree we should have secure borders, which I believe Robert and I do, what the level of legal immigration ought to be presuming we agree there should be any limits, which I believe we both do, and what should the policy be toward those who have either entered the country unlawfully or violated the terms of a temporary visa. Amstutz always introduces me with great kindness, even while noting we do not necessarily always share the same perspectives. But my biggest disagreement or perhaps a better word might be dissatisfaction with Dr. What specific policy changes do either believe would make our immigration system more just? Would it be wise to build a wall across the parts of the U.S. Or to employ more border patrol agents? To fully enforce existing law in such a way that Immigration and Customs Enforcement would be appropriated the financial resources necessarily to deport all 11 million immigrants who are present unlawfully? To instead allow most of those immigrants those without serious criminal issues and who meet other qualifications the opportunity to make amends and earn the chance to stay lawfully? Immigration is a complex issue, and there are not perfect policy solutions. Our elected officials have to make yes or no votes on proposals that do not

address the full range of issues and on bills which they believe would present a marginal improvement in the situation but also include provisions they find problematic. But these decisions of policy are not just theoretical: Immigration is Personal and Urgent The house my wife and I own was built more than a century ago, but divided into two apartment units at some point in the past, such that we rent out our upper unit to tenants. Back in , I brought her to a local church that, with help from my colleagues at World Relief, provided a workshop to assist her and other eligible individuals in completing the formal legal request form for DACA. Years later, as the result of the announced termination of the DACA program, this young woman is now poised sooner or later, with the timing now uncertain due to court challenges to lose her ability to work, which will mean losing her job, because of the termination of the DACA program. She teaches my son and daughter in Sunday School. But she does not know what will happen in the coming year if and when here DACA-based work authorization expires. A colleague with whom I share an office faces the same urgent challenge: As her employer, I have to face the difficult reality that, under the law, we will be required to lay her off if and when her work authorization obtained through DACA expires. At present, her status expires in the fall, but she recently was able to submit a renewal request because of a federal court decision; we hope but cannot be certain that the renewal will give her an additional two years of work authorization before a higher court eliminates that possibility or the Department of Homeland Security re-terminates the DACA program in a way in which the courts could not find fault. I feel a moral obligation to leverage the influence I have so that theyâ€”and many others in a similar situationâ€”can flourish. That is particularly true, I believe, because I am not persuaded that there would be any significant negative impacts on anyone else if these three young women are allowed to stay in the country and continue to hold their jobs, nor that my commitment to the rule of law necessitates that I hold them responsible for being brought to the country as children. Because these are politicalâ€”not just policyâ€”decisions, my concern for these friends has necessitated facing some political calculations. I believe that would have meant, on the net, a more just situation for them and for the country. Similarly, a friend and former neighbor of mineâ€”an Iranian religious minorityâ€”is deeply worried about what will happen to his extended family members who are currently in Vienna, Austria, invited by the U. State Department to travel there to apply for refugee status more than a year ago, but now denied without being given a specific reason, which seems to be part of a larger trend of dramatically restrict refugee resettlement to the U. So I helped draft a letter to the President and to Members of Congress urging them to reconsider recent policy changes that have dramatically cut the number of refugees admitted to the U. My point is that, given the impact of these policies on human lives, I think it is vital that we move from the theoretical and utopian to the concrete. One last point of disagreement, or at least concern: Perhaps Robert agrees with me on some of these views, perhaps he does not: I believe Christians can charitably disagree.

## Chapter 4 : How Trump is quietly rewriting US immigration policy - CNNPolitics

*fair and generous immigration policies.1 Social with others in seeking compassionate, just, and wise immigration reform through this directed primarily toward.*

You can help by adding to it. October Further information: History of human migration Sign Immigration near the border between Mali and Mauritania; sponsored by EU The term immigration was coined in the 17th century, referring to non-warlike population movements between the emerging nation states. When people cross national borders during their migration, they are called migrants or immigrants from Latin: From the perspective of the country which they leave, they are called emigrant or outmigrant. Germany and Russia host 12 million migrants each, taking the second and third place in countries with the most migrants worldwide. Saudi Arabia hosts 10 million migrants, followed by the United Kingdom 9 million and the United Arab Emirates 8 million. Europe added the second largest with about 20 million. In most parts of the world, migration occurs between countries that are located within the same major area. India has the largest diaspora in the world 16 million people , followed by Mexico 12 million and Russia 11 million. The other top desired destination countries those where an estimated 69 million or more adults would like to go were Canada , France , Saudi Arabia , Australia , Germany and Spain. In , there were about 70, Vietnamese in the Czech Republic. In the case of economic migration usually labor migration , differentials in wage rates are common. As transportation technology improved, travel time and costs decreased dramatically between the 18th and early 20th century. Travel across the Atlantic used to take up to 5 weeks in the 18th century, but around the time of the 20th century it took a mere 8 days. Natural disasters can amplify poverty-driven migration flows. Research shows that for middle-income countries, higher temperatures increase emigration rates to urban areas and to other countries. For low-income countries, higher temperatures reduce emigration. They are often referred to as " expatriates ", and their conditions of employment are typically equal to or better than those applying in the host country for similar work. Recent research has found gender, age, and cross-cultural differences in the ownership of the idea to immigrate. Evasion of criminal justice e. This type of emigration and immigration is not normally legal, if a crime is internationally recognized, although criminals may disguise their identities or find other loopholes to evade detection. For example, there have been reports of war criminals disguising themselves as victims of war or conflict and then pursuing asylum in a different country. Immigrants when leaving their country also leave everything familiar: They also need to liquidate their assets, and they incur the expense of moving. When they arrive in a new country, this is often with many uncertainties including finding work, [43] where to live, new laws, new cultural norms, language or accent issues, possible racism , and other exclusionary behavior towards them and their family. Those with security concerns cite the French riots and point to the Jyllands-Posten Muhammad cartoons controversy as examples of the value conflicts arising from immigration of Muslims in Western Europe. Because of all these associations, immigration has become an emotional political issue in many European nations. A European study suggested that "employers are more likely to be pro-immigration than employees, provided that immigrants are thought to compete with employees who are already in the country. Or else, when immigrants are thought to compete with employers rather than employees, employers are more likely to be anti-immigration than employees. Commuters , tourists and other short-term stays in a destination country do not fall under the definition of immigration or migration, seasonal labour immigration is sometimes included. Economic migrant Further information: Economic migrant The Indo-Bangladeshi barrier in India is building a separation barrier along the 4, kilometer border with Bangladesh to prevent illegal immigration. The term economic migrant refers to someone who has travelled from one region to another region for the purposes of seeking employment and an improvement in quality of life and access to resources. An economic migrant is distinct from someone who is a refugee fleeing persecution. Many countries have immigration and visa restrictions that prohibit a person entering the country for the purposes of gaining work without a valid work visa. Treatment of migrants in host countries, both by governments, employers, and original population, is a topic of continual debate and criticism, and the violation of migrant human rights is an ongoing crisis. Major

migrant-receiving countries and regions – including Western Europe, North America, Pacific Asia, Australia, and the Gulf States – have not ratified the Convention, even though they are host to the majority of international migrant workers. As of [update] , family reunification accounted for approximately two-thirds of legal immigration to the US every year. Less privileged individuals, including the mass of poor people in low-income countries, cannot avail themselves of the legal and protected immigration opportunities offered by wealthy states. This inequality has also been criticized as conflicting with the principle of equal opportunities. The fact that the door is closed for the unskilled, while at the same time many developed countries have a huge demand for unskilled labor, is a major factor in illegal immigration. The contradictory nature of this policy – which specifically disadvantages the unskilled immigrants while exploiting their labor – has also been criticized on ethical grounds. They can also mean net loss for a poor donor country through the loss of the educated minority – a " brain drain ". This can exacerbate the global inequality in standards of living that provided the motivation for the individual to migrate in the first place. One example of competition for skilled labour is active recruitment of health workers from developing countries by developed countries. The size of these effects increases with the ethnic diversity of the local population, the geographic distance to the origin country, and the ethno-linguistic fractionalization of the origin country. For instance, a study of Germans in West-Germany who had been displaced from Eastern Europe during and after World War II showed that the forced German migrants did far worse economically than their native West-German counterparts decades later. Refugees that enter as older teenagers have lower attainment with much of the difference attributable to language barriers and because many in this group are not accompanied by a parent to the U. Legalization, instead, decreases the unemployment rate of low-skilled natives and increases income per native. The data indicate that acquiring EU status raises earnings for the workers by giving them the right to freely change jobs. At a minimum, our results indicate that no negative impact on economic freedom is associated with more immigration. Other possible explanations include theories regarding in-group and out-group effects and reciprocal altruism. This means that successful cases of assimilation will be underestimated. Research shows that ethnic attrition is sizable in Hispanic and Asian immigrant groups in the United States.

**Chapter 5 : Key facts about U.S. immigration policies and proposed changes**

*The U.S. Immigration Policy Program analyzes U.S. policies and their impacts, as well as the complex demographic, economic, political, foreign policy, and other forces that shape immigration to the United States.*

By Roberto Suro I. Overview Although an overwhelming majority of Hispanics expresses positive attitudes toward immigrants, relatively few Hispanics favor increasing the flow of legal immigration from Latin America and a significant minority, concentrated among native-born Latinos, is concerned that unauthorized migrants are hurting the economy. The willingness to migrate, even illegally, is evident in all sectors of Mexican society including the middle class and the well-educated as well as those who are poor and who only completed low-levels of schooling. Several major immigration reform bills were introduced in Congress earlier this summer, and President George W. Bush has said recently that he expects to see action on the topic when he and the Congress return to Washington in September. The various proposals under consideration generally aim to deal with two broad sets of policy challenges: Determining the status of the estimated 11 million persons, most of them Latinos, who currently live in the country without authorization. And, managing future migration flows. Latino public opinion overall looks favorably on immigrants. For example, clear majorities of U. Hispanics in several PHC surveys have said that unauthorized migrants help the economy by providing low cost labor. But these views are neither unanimous nor monolithic. At least a third of the native born consistently complain that the unauthorized hurt the economy by driving down wages. Attitudes among Latinos toward options in immigration policy reflect a variety of views on immigrants and their impact on the country as well as assessments of the specific pros and cons of individual measures. In terms of future migration flows, the PHC Mexico Survey shows that a large share of the Mexican population would consider participating in a temporary work program. However, the policy challenges may still grow given that the inclination to migrate is evident across a broad swath of the Mexican population. The Center has conducted extensive and repeated surveys of the U. Hispanic population for more than three years and has probed attitudes toward immigrants, immigration and immigration policy options in a variety of ways. A review of those findings, which can be found in Appendix A of this report, shows substantial consistency in these views. When asked to prioritize public policy issues, Latinos do not rank immigration as highly as education, health care or jobs. On the flow of legal immigrants from Latin America, more Hispanics want to see the numbers either kept as they are or reduced than favor an increased flow. On this question and others, nativeborn Latinos are less enthusiastic about immigration than the foreign born. Roughly speaking, between a fifth and a third of native-born Hispanics offer negative responses to various questions about immigrants, particularly the undocumented, or on policies that would help the unauthorized acquire legal status. These sentiments are generally strongest among the middleaged and the middle class in the native-born Latino population. Latinos, June was conducted by telephone among a nationally representative sample of 1, Latino respondents from June 14 to June The survey has a margin of error of 3. In order to probe the views of potential migrants in Mexico, the nation that is by far the largest single source of new arrivals to the United States, the Center conducted surveys of nationally representative samples of the Mexican population in February and May of this year. Identical questions on migration were asked in both surveys and produced similar results. The propensity to migrate is evident in all sectors of Mexican society although it is somewhat higher among males, young adults and people with relatives already in the United States. It is by no means restricted to either the poor or the less educated. Its mission is to improve understanding of the U. The Center does not advocate for or take positions on policy issues. The terms Hispanic and Latino are used interchangeably throughout this report.

**Chapter 6 : Immigration | National Skills Coalition**

*Towards a Just Immigration Policy Paperback - Dec by Ann Dummett (Editor) Be the first to review this item. See all formats and editions Hide other formats.*

Visit Website Did you know? She had made the nearly two-week journey across the Atlantic Ocean in steerage with her two younger brothers. In 1620, a group of roughly 100 people later known as the Pilgrims fled religious persecution in Europe and arrived at present-day Plymouth, Massachusetts, where they established a colony. They were soon followed by a larger group seeking religious freedom, the Puritans, who established the Massachusetts Bay Colony. By some estimates, 20,000 Puritans migrated to the region between 1620 and 1640. Visit Website A larger share of immigrants came to America seeking economic opportunities. However, because the price of passage was steep, an estimated one-half or more of the white Europeans who made the voyage did so by becoming indentured servants. Although some people voluntarily indentured themselves, others were kidnapped in European cities and forced into servitude in America. Additionally, thousands of English convicts were shipped across the Atlantic as indentured servants. Another group of immigrants who arrived against their will during the colonial period were black slaves from West Africa. The earliest records of slavery in America include a group of approximately 20 Africans who were forced into indentured servitude in Jamestown, Virginia, in 1619. By 1700, there were some 70,000 African slaves in the American colonies, a number that ballooned to 1 million by 1800, according to some estimates. Congress outlawed the importation of slaves to the United States as of 1808, but the practice continued. Civil War resulted in the emancipation of approximately 4 million slaves. Although the exact numbers will never be known, it is believed that 12 million Africans were brought to America and sold into slavery between the 17th and 19th centuries. Immigration in the Midth Century Another major wave of immigration occurred from around 1840 to 1860. The majority of these newcomers hailed from Northern and Western Europe. Approximately one-third came from Ireland, which experienced a massive famine in the midth century. Typically impoverished, these Irish immigrants settled near their point of arrival in cities along the East Coast. Between 1840 and 1860, some 4 million Irish immigrants arrived in America. Also in the 19th century, the United States received some 5 million German immigrants. Many of them journeyed to the present-day Midwest to buy farms or congregated in such cities as Milwaukee, St. Louis, and Chicago. In the national census of 1850, more Americans claimed German ancestry than any other group. During the mid-1800s, a significant number of Asian immigrants settled in the United States. Lured by news of the California gold rush, some 25,000 Chinese had migrated there by the early 1850s. The new arrivals were often seen as unwanted competition for jobs, while many Catholics—especially the Irish—experienced discrimination for their religious beliefs. In the 1850s, the anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic American Party also called the Know-Nothings tried to severely curb immigration, and even ran a candidate, former U.S. President Millard Fillmore. Following the Civil War, the United States experienced a depression in the 1870s that contributed to a slowdown in immigration. Ellis Island and Federal Immigration Regulation One of the first significant pieces of federal legislation aimed at restricting immigration was the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which banned Chinese laborers from coming to America. Californians had agitated for the new law, blaming the Chinese, who were willing to work for less, for a decline in wages. For much of the 19th century, the federal government had left immigration policy to individual states. However, by the final decade of the century, the government decided it needed to step in to handle the ever-increasing influx of newcomers. More than 12 million immigrants entered the United States through Ellis Island during its years of operation from 1892 to 1954. Beginning in the 1880s, the majority of arrivals were from Central, Eastern and Southern Europe. In that decade alone, some 1 million Italians migrated to America, and by 1900 more than 4 million had entered the United States. Jews from Eastern Europe fleeing religious persecution also arrived in large numbers; over 2 million entered the United States between 1880 and 1920. The peak year for admission of new immigrants was 1907, when approximately 1.2 million arrived. Within a decade, the outbreak of World War I caused a decline in immigration. In 1924, Congress enacted legislation requiring immigrants over 16 to pass a literacy test, and in the early 1930s immigration quotas were established. The Immigration Act of 1924 created a quota system that restricted entry to 2 percent of the total number of people of each nationality in America as of the national census—a system that favored immigrants from Western Europe—and prohibited immigrants from Asia. After the war,

Congress passed special legislation enabling refugees from Europe and the Soviet Union to enter the United States. Following the communist revolution in Cuba in , hundreds of thousands of refugees from that island nation also gained admittance to the United States. In , Congress passed the Immigration and Nationality Act, which did away with quotas based on nationality and allowed Americans to sponsor relatives from their countries of origin. As a result of this act and subsequent legislation, the nation experienced a shift in immigration patterns. Today, the majority of U.

**Chapter 7 : U.S. Immigration Before - HISTORY**

*Immigration raids and terminating workers listed in no-match letters are attacks on our unions and all workers, not just on immigrants. They create a climate of fear and intimidation in our workplaces and our communities and are often used to settle workers' attempts to improve their working conditions.*

Many unaware that most immigrants in the U. Support for increasing the level of legal immigration has risen, while the share saying legal immigration should decrease has fallen. Since , the share of Americans who favor increased legal immigration into the U. The shift is mostly driven by changing views among Democrats. The share of Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents who say legal immigration into the U. The new survey, which was largely conducted before the crisis at the U. Fewer than half of Americans know that most immigrants in the U. In , the most recent year for which data are available, lawful immigrants accounted for about three-quarters of the foreign-born population in the United States. Most feel sympathy toward unauthorized immigrants in the U. That view has changed little since , when a surge of unaccompanied children from Central America attempted to enter the U. Since , the share saying that providing legal status for those in the U. Americans also broadly support granting legal status to immigrants brought to the U. Most Americans do not think undocumented immigrants are more likely to commit serious crimes. Large majorities of Americans say that undocumented immigrants living in the U. These opinions, which also are divided along partisan lines, are virtually unchanged since . Many overestimate the share of the immigrant population that is in the U. Somewhat more give incorrect answers: There is a stark education gap in views of the legal status of most immigrants in the U. Younger people also are more likely to say that most immigrants living in the U. Perceptions of the relative number of immigrants who are in the U. Within both parties, those with four-year college degrees are more likely than those without a college degree to believe that most immigrants living in the U. Still, college-educated Democrats are 21 points more likely than college-educated Republicans to say most immigrants living in the U. Most Americans do not think undocumented immigrants take jobs U. Opinions on both measures are little changed since . Across nearly all demographic groups, majorities say that undocumented immigrants do not have negative effects on job availability for U. S citizens and serious crime in the country. Republicans are divided over whether undocumented immigrants are more likely than U. There is a relationship between knowledge about the legal status of most immigrants in the country and attitudes about whether undocumented immigrants are more likely than American citizens to commit serious crimes. Among those who know that most immigrants in the U. This relationship is seen within both parties. Among Republicans and Republican leaners, most of those who believe the majority of immigrants are in the U. The share of Americans who express sympathy for immigrants in the U. While majorities across nearly all demographic groups have at least some sympathy for unauthorized immigrants, young people are more likely than older adults to express sympathy for them. And blacks and Hispanics are more likely than whites to have sympathy for people in the U. Views of legal immigration into the U. Over the past decade, opinions about levels of legal immigration into the United States have changed among members of both parties, especially among Democrats. Opinions have changed more modestly among Republicans: Democrats are internally divided about legal immigration. Liberal Democrats are 19 percentage points more likely than moderate and conservative Democrats to support increasing legal immigration into the U. Among Republicans as well, there are age differences in views of legal immigration. In contrast with Democrats, however, there are no significant ideological differences among Republicans in these opinions. There also are educational differences in both parties in views of legal immigration. Among Republicans, those who do not have a college degree are somewhat more likely than those who do to favor cutting legal immigration into the U. Like other attitudes about immigrants and immigration, views on the willingness of immigrants to assimilate have grown more positive over the past decade, with the biggest change occurring among Democrats.

**Chapter 8 : The Two Sides of Immigration Policy**

*A permanent solution is needed to repair our long-broken immigration system, and the KBI continues to advocate for comprehensive, just and compassionate policies that recognize the dignity of the human person, offer safety to those in danger, and keep families together.*

Under Mexican law, it is a felony to be an illegal alien in Mexico. Mexico has a single, streamlined law that ensures that foreign visitors and immigrants are: The law also ensures that: Who could disagree with such a law? It makes perfect sense. The Mexican constitution strictly defines the rights of citizens and the denial of many fundamental rights to non-citizens, illegal and illegal. It is an interesting law and one that should cause us all to ask, Why is our great southern neighbor pushing us to water down our own immigration laws and policies, when its own immigration restrictions are the toughest on the continent? If a felony is a crime punishable by more than one year in prison, then Mexican law makes it a felony to be an illegal alien in Mexico. If the United States adopted such statutes, Mexico no doubt would denounce it as a manifestation of American racism and bigotry. We looked at the immigration provisions of the Mexican constitution. Mexico welcomes only foreigners who will be useful to Mexican society: Federal, local and municipal police must cooperate with federal immigration authorities upon request, i. Articles 85 and 86 A national Catalog of Foreigners tracks foreign tourists and immigrants Article 87 , and assigns each individual with a unique tracking number Article Foreigners with fake papers, or who enter the country under false pretenses, may be imprisoned: Foreigners with fake immigration papers may be fined or imprisoned. Foreigners who fail to obey a deportation order are to be punished. Article Foreigners who are deported from Mexico and attempt to re-enter the country without authorization can be imprisoned for up to 10 years. Article Foreigners who violate the terms of their visa may be sentenced to up to six years in prison Articles , and Foreigners who misrepresent the terms of their visa while in Mexico such as working with out a permit can also be imprisoned. Under Mexican law, illegal immigration is a felony. Article Mexicans who help illegal aliens enter the country are themselves considered criminals under the law: A Mexican who marries a foreigner with the sole objective of helping the foreigner live in the country is subject to up to five years in prison. Article Shipping and airline companies that bring undocumented foreigners into Mexico will be fined. Article All of the above runs contrary to what Mexican leaders are demanding of the United States. This article was first posted at CenterforSecurityPolicy.

**Chapter 9 : U.S. immigration policy toward the People's Republic of China - Wikipedia**

*U.S. immigration law is very complex, and there is much confusion as to how it works. The Immigration and Naturalization Act (INA), the body of law governing current immigration policy, provides for an annual worldwide limit of , permanent immigrants, with certain exceptions for close family members.*

The Communists led by Mao Zedong had forced the Guomindang who had originally ruled China under the Republic of China to retreat to the island of Taiwan, which in effect created two separate "Chinas". The first of its dealings was with the Soviets. Earlier in the year, Mao had proclaimed his policy of "leaning to one side" as a commitment to the socialist bloc. The debate which took place in the United States as a result of the removal of the Kuomintang and Chiang Kai-shek to the island of Taiwan centered on Republican charges that the Democrats "lost" China. The Republic of China in Taiwan was to be the legitimate China until However, Hong Kong was given a separate quota because it was still under British jurisdiction. In , Chinese exclusion laws were repealed and small quotas established for Chinese immigration, allowing many families to reunite and for the first time admitting significant numbers of Chinese women to the United States. At the conclusion of his trip, the U. The Taiwan Relations Act made the necessary changes in U. Signed into law by President Johnson, the Act eliminated national origins quotas and established an annual limitation of 20, visas per country Taiwan and Mainland China were considered as one origin in this law. Priority was given to those with skills and family in United States. In , there were an estimated 3. Of the , places, were allotted to Chinese. This resulted in a massive surge of Chinese immigrants from mainland China due to the renewal of relations of mainland China and the United States. The act provides that for most practical purposes of the U. The Act does not recognize the terminology of "Republic of China" after Jan. It defines the term "Taiwan" to include, as the context may require, the islands of Taiwan the main Island and Penghu , which form the Taiwan Province and Taipei and Kaohsiung cities. The Act further stipulates that the United States will "consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes , a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States". This Act also requires the United States "to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character", and "to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan. The Taiwan Relations Act does not require the U. Separate quotas for Taiwan, Mainland China, and Hong Kong allowed for Chinese immigrants to enter the country from more diverse regions. Public attitudes at home[ edit ] The "Yellow Peril"[ edit ] editorial cartoon with caption: Feelings, many thought had died out with the exclusion period in the late 19th century. Many Americans distrusted newly arriving Chinese immigrants and suspected them of having communist sympathies or simply being communists. With more progressive immigration reforms towards Chinese immigrants a resurfacing of xenophobic feelings soon followed. Just as the United States began to loosen many laws regarding Chinese immigration, anti-communist xenophobia and hysteria brought about a resurgence of the idea of a "yellow peril". That the massive influx of Chinese immigrants who at the time came mostly from non-communist regions such as Hong Kong, Taiwan, Cambodia, and Laos would somehow pose a threat to the security of the American people. In the name of investigating Communist subversive activities, the U. The investigation further divided the Chinese American community when the Justice Department began the Chinese Confession Program in , in which Chinese-Americans were encouraged to turn on each other. The release of The Manchurian Candidate in with the brainwashing Dr. Yen Lo as one of its main antagonists is one example of the media facilitating those fears even further. His character, though fictional represented many fears held by the American people that the incoming Chinese immigrants who had Communist ties would one jeopardize the security of the country.