

The Huddled Masses: The Case for U.S. Immigration Reform

A Proposal for the 2009-10 National High School Debate Topic

Updated, Summer 2008, by:

Matthew Murrell, McNeil High School, Austin, Texas

Originally Written, Spring & Summer 2007, by:

Matthew Murrell, McNeil High School, Austin, Texas

&

Heather Hayes, Texas State University-San Marcos

Submitted to NFHS, July 22, 2008

“Give me your tired, your poor
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”

-Emma Lazarus, 1883

“In the first place we should insist that if the immigrant who comes here in good faith becomes an American and assimilates himself to us, he shall be treated on an exact equality with everyone else, for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed, or birthplace, or origin. But this is predicated upon the man's becoming in very fact an American, and nothing but an American...There can be no divided allegiance here. Any man who says he is an American, but something else also, isn't an American at all.”

-Teddy Roosevelt

Current Immigration Policy in the United States

Legislative Policy on Immigration – Pre 9/11

As with many politicized issues, immigration policies of the United States can easily be divided into two substantial areas: pre 9/11 legislation and post 9/11 legislation. A notable departure point for this review begins with the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Before the INA, an array of statutes governed immigration law, but were not composed into one substantial document. The INA established clear quotas on admissible immigrants each year and developed country-specific immigration restrictions. The act made history in the immigration debate by defining three clear categories of aliens. These categories included relatives of United States citizens, average immigrants with visa applications, and refugees. In defining these categories, the INA paved the legislative path for unique handling of each group (Graham, 2006).

During the Reagan era, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 passed. Largely motivated by economic factors, the IRCA created two policies. First, the policy criminalized the act of knowingly hiring any illegal immigrant. It created financial and legal penalties for doing so provided the employer maintained more than three employees on their payroll and “did not make a sufficient effort to determine the legal status of the worker” (Mazzoli & Simpson, 2006, p. 1). More significantly, the act granted a one-year amnesty to any illegal alien in the United States who could prove they had been living and working in the country since January 1982. With the passage of the IRCA, over 2.7 million illegal immigrants were legalized in the United States (Graham, 2006).

An extension of these policies was signed into law four years later. The Immigration Act of 1990 provided an increase in the number of legal immigrants allowed into the United States each year. Reports estimate that legal immigration increased from 500,000 aliens per year up to almost 700,000 with the act's passage. At the same time, the act included provisions to strengthen U.S. Border Security, effectively tightening restrictions on illegal immigration. It also

removed AIDS from the list of illnesses declaring a prospective immigrant unable to enter the country.

The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act was enacted on September 30, 1996. It includes increases in criminal penalties for immigration-related offenses, authorization for increases in enforcement personnel, and enhanced enforcement authority over illegal aliens. It mandated a comprehensive tightening of the process of removal for deportable aliens, including a provision for the expedited removal of inadmissible aliens arriving at ports. It broadened the scope of the IRCA of 1986 by requiring three types of employment authorization verification pilot programs. Lastly, it restricted the eligibility of aliens for public benefits and imposed new requirements on sponsors of alien relatives for immigration.

Legislative Policy on Immigration – Post 9/11

The first substantial post 9/11 addition to United States immigration policy came in Title IV of the U.S. PATRIOT Act, entitled “Protecting the Border”. Subtitle A of the section focuses on increased security on the United States’ northern border. While the subtitle creates a number of specific regulations, the thesis is increased monetary aid to Border Security and widened authority for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to investigate the background of visa applicants from Canada. Subtitle B provides a wealth of controversial provisions in America’s terrorism policies. It defines “terrorism” and “terrorist”, while additionally mandatory detention regulations, increasing multilateral cooperation against terrorist influence, and broadening visa security measures for all classifications of incoming aliens. Finally, Subtitle C deals with specific immigrant status for victims of the 9/11 attacks and their families. Overall, the act is best known for creating severe restrictions on visa regulation policies and enhancing border security while notably not addressing the southern United States border.

Additionally, the 109th Congress introduced and passed Senate Bill 2611 in 2006, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act. The act extended beyond the PATRIOT Act in dealing with the United States’ border with Mexico. It introduced a guest worker program in which employers can bring immigrants into the country to work for up to six years, after which the immigrant must return and spend one year in their country of origin. The act includes the Inhofe Amendment, an English-only proposal claiming English as the national language of the United States in order to discourage social service provisions in other languages. Senate Bill 2611 also introduced a provision through which illegal immigrants living in the United States for more than five years can become citizens by paying fines and a series of back taxes.

Finally, Congress passed the Secure Fence Act of 2006. The act very simply provides for 700 miles of fencing to be erected between the United States/Mexican borders in order to combat illegal immigration. However, the bill enjoyed no funding in the final draft and Congress is still debating what amount will actually be allocated to the fence project, which will actually determine how much of the fence will be built.

Current Executive Initiatives in Immigration

The chief executive initiative in immigration policy under President George W. Bush consists of a modified guest worker program. The program shares its origin with Senate Bill 2611, but modifies the guest worker provisions. Guest workers in Bush’s plan would be allowed to stay in the United States for up to three years, after which they could reapply to stay for an

additional three (Bush, 2004). The proposal differs dramatically than Senate Bill 2611 in the burdens and penalties placed on employers who hire guest workers. Bush contends that in order to approve the guest workers, employers must demonstrate a search for American workers to fill the position and even then, the burden of reporting immigration status to the government periodically falls squarely on the employer.

While advocating for guest workers, the Bush administration still stands vehemently opposed to any type of amnesty program for illegal aliens living in the United States, but does support an increase in the number of green cards being granted each year in the legal immigration process.

The Case for Immigration Liberalization in the United States

Obstacles Against Liberalization

In the status quo, the chief obstacle to immigration liberalization lies in United States terrorism policy. Legislation like the PATRIOT Act has made the visa approval process much more complicated, while not significantly increasing bureaucratic means to review visa applications. This slows the application process in some cases to as much as an eight-year endeavor (Center for Immigration Studies, 2006).

Additionally, a key component in the War on Terror included the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, an agency under which all immigration issues now fall. By many accounts, Homeland Security struggles to fulfill the breadth of tasks to which it has been assigned, leaving immigration issues to sometimes be overlooked. By some accounts, the Department of Homeland Security is said to have blocked more than fifty initiatives to liberalize immigration reform in the past five years (Mareitta, 2006).

Finally, public opinion in the post-9/11 world prohibits many liberalization policies from becoming popular. As of June 2004, when asked the question, "In your view should immigration be kept at its current level, increased, or decreased?" 49% of Americans say it should be decreased, 14% say it should be increased, while 33% advocate no change in immigration standards (Bolin, 2005). Directly after September 11, 2001, over 58% of Americans argued for decreased immigration in the United States, with over half of those polled citing terrorism as their prime concern (Bolin, 2005).

Harms To Current Restrictive Policies

Current restrictive immigration policies create a number of harms throughout society. First, restrictive policies negatively impact issues of human rights and cultural diversity. In creating refugee status through the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the United States government recognized that certain countries around the world oppressed their citizens on the basis of race, religion, gender, or other classifications. The United Nations estimates that throughout the world today tragedies are occurring that have displaced over 20 million people from their home countries. These displacements come at huge costs to neighboring nations, and frequently borders are sealed to prevent the open flow of refugees between nations. This in effect seals a death sentence for many political and religious refugees, particularly throughout Africa and the Middle East. Restrictive policies in the United States can effect international refugee relief efforts and increase the likelihood that other first world nations enact stricter

immigration policies. These acts can prove catastrophic to the international human rights effort.

Restrictive policies also decrease cultural diversity in the United States. Emma Lazarus's infamous statement, "Give me your tired, your poor/ Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free," reflects the American desire to not only provide the "American dream" to immigrants, but also to broaden American cultural knowledge and history through the integration of immigrants into the United States social fabric. Through immigration, the United States was able to start its first foreign exchange programs, foreign language assessments, and broaden its social stratosphere and economic markets. As more immigrants come to the United States, cultures meld together to create the "melting pot" for which America is known.

Secondly, restrictive immigration policies affect United States' relationships with key nations around the world. In an effort to maintain a form of soft hegemony and leadership through diplomacy, the United States has created a series of liberalized immigration policies throughout its history. Historic acts such as the Burlingame Treaty of 1868 employed immigration provisions in order to build strong relationships with other nations. Burlingame specifically solidified U.S. cooperation with China as a result of the Gold Rush of the 1860s, providing "the rights of man to change his home and allegiance" (Bolin, 2005, p. 3). Without similar treaties and acts, the United States would historically have found cooperation from nations like the United Kingdom, France, and Russia more difficult to manage. Restricting immigration policies now could mean an even more significant hurdle to increased cooperation in the War on Terror and other key American policy issues.

Finally, and most significantly, restrictive immigration policies adversely affect the United States economy. It is widely accepted that immigrants work in labor positions that many American workers currently are unable to sustain. Even the most restrictive legislative and executive policy proposals argue that maintaining a partial immigrant workforce can be vital to American economic progress (Borjas, 1999). This happens in a number of key industries, particularly agriculture, construction, and social maintenance services.

By some estimates, more than 40% of the agricultural industry's workforce is comprised of illegal aliens, while a vast majority (almost 70%) is comprised of both illegal and legal immigrants (Borjas, 1999). As Borjas argues, the figures are staggering and create an overwhelming argument for liberalized immigration policies, particularly with regard to industries that are immigrant dependent. With more restrictive policies that cut this part of the workforce, American economic stability in those industries is at best uncertain.

Mechanisms To Liberalize Immigration

There are a number of mechanisms through which to liberalize United States immigration policy. First, the United States Congress could repeal a number of PATRIOT Act and Secure Fence Act provisions. If unfunded or repealed, the Secure Fence Act would not amount to an actual fence between the United States and Mexico, a liberalized policy change that would create a number of diplomatic and economic benefits for the United States. In repealing the stricter visa provisions of the PATRIOT Act or in redefining "terrorist", the Act would go far in liberalizing immigration policy in an effective and swift manner. These provisions, if repealed, could increase the number of refugees the United States is able to allow in its borders and could increase the number of guest workers the United States is able to certify.

Secondly, executive initiatives could be enacted to liberalize immigration. Bush's policy to provide an updated guest worker program with increased responsibility placed on the employer as a means to determine legal status could, by some estimates, legalize up to 2 million illegal workers in the United States (Graham, 2006). These workers would remain in underrepresented segments of the workforce, such as social maintenance and agriculture, ensuring those industries remain economically viable and profitable.

Third, full amnesty programs could be created. Some leading Democrats in the years before September 11 had already begun writing legislation that could legalize immigrants in a few different ways. Initially, Congress could pass another law much like the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act. The policy would need to choose a departure date, after which all immigrants who were residing and/or working in the United States would be legalized, with limited restriction. Like the 1986 act, this action would not only create a number of diplomatic benefits for United States relationships around the world, but would dramatically lighten the burden on the Department of Homeland Security in tracking current illegal immigrants. This means the bulk of border security efforts could focus on keeping additional illegal aliens out of the country and on revising visa application procedures in order to increase legal immigration numbers.

Fourth, the United States could create new provisions to increase the number of student and high-skilled visas that are granted each year. Since September 11, 2001, there has been over a 20% drop in the number of student visas granted to visiting foreign students seeking to extend their field of study in the United States (Graham, 2006). This decrease has extended to a reduction in the number of visiting scientists and professors allowed into the United States each year. The impact of this reduction is seen in "brain drain", a process through which talented and able professors and scientists leave the United States or seek visas in other nations to complete their academic work. This leaves the United States unrepresented in a great many scientific, mathematic, and medical advancements.

The Case for Immigration Restriction in the United States

Obstacles Against Restriction

As the voices for immigration liberalization grow stronger from the right and left, so too do the voices for restriction. Surprisingly, the restriction debate affirms the idea that politics makes for strange bedfellows. Critics of President Bush's worker policy include mainstays of the left like Senator Diane Feinstein of California and hardened members of the right like Patrick Buchanan. In his 2006 bestseller State of Emergency, Buchanan explains the barriers blocking those that want to restrict immigration:

Consider the forces against reform. Corporate America wants an endless supply of cheap labor and the freedom to hire foreign workers and bring them to the United States. The major media, the unions, the churches favor amnesty. The Democratic Party sees in mass immigration the future voters who can end Republican hegemony. The GOP is terrified of offending 43 million Hispanics and of a cutoff in campaign cash if it imposes sanctions on corporate scofflaws who regularly hire illegal aliens. (Buchanan, 2006, p. 247)

Additionally, staunch resistance exists at the state and local level. Motivated by a number of factors including the fear of political backlash from fellow politicians and voters, these

governments pass laws and statutes that give sanctuary to illegal aliens. The primary statute-of-choice for these “sanctuary cities” is to establish policy that prohibits local law enforcement agencies from enforcing federal immigration policy. Though it is a felony to reenter the United States illegally once an alien has been deported, these policies outlaw local law enforcement personnel from arresting those in violation of the law if they are not committing other acts of crime. Some go further, disallowing local law enforcement personnel to aid federal authorities in any way when federal immigration policy is being enforced. Punctuated in 1989 by Mayor Ed Koch of New York City, these policies have been adopted over the last twenty years by major cities across the United States (Buchanan, 2006). Already a sanctuary city, both the mayor and city council of Oakland recently adopted statutes condemning federal immigration raids in that city and reifying the ban on assistance to federal agencies by local law enforcement (Zamora 2007).

Harms To Current Liberalized Policies

Advocates of immigration restriction point to a number of areas where unchecked immigration has created problems. The first area, and one on which literature abounds, is crime. The U.S./Mexico Border Counties Coalition, an organization comprised of the 24 counties in the United States that border Mexico, released a two-year study in 2006. The study shows that if “those twenty-four counties were the fifty-first state, that state would be number one in federal crimes” (Buchanan, 2006, p. 45). The study illuminates an alarming fact about U.S. border immigration policy, namely, that federal authorities have little control over those that sneak into the U.S. In a 2005 speech in Arizona, President Bush admitted that 4.5 million illegal aliens had been caught attempting to enter the United States, over 350,000 of which had felonious criminal records (Bush, 2005). The nature of those trying to sneak into the United States is changing as well. Writing on the evolution of attitude of illegal immigrants, Glynn Custred, a professor of anthropology at California State University, Hayward, stated:

They became more aggressive, more brazen, more dangerous. In some cases, instead of asking for food or water, they would kick down doors to get it. Meanwhile, dogs are poisoned or their throats cut; property is damaged and goods are stolen, cars are hijacked and residents threatened. (Custred, 2005, p. 28)

This erosion of civility in illegal immigrants has caused an explosion in violent crime that is so overwhelming some law enforcement agencies feel as if they have nowhere else to turn. This is best exemplified by the MS-13 gang. Originally started in Los Angeles in the 1980s by a group of El Salvador expatriates, MS-13, short for Mara Salvatrucha, has become one of the largest and deadliest gangs in the United States. In Los Angeles, MS-13 is the single largest gang, and graffiti can be seen calling for traditional rival gangs like the Bloods and the Crips to join forces against MS-13 (Buchanan, 2006).

The second area where unchecked immigration worries a great number of individuals on both sides of the political divide is terrorism. As the previous section on the history of immigration law in the United States proves, 9/11 changed everything about immigration policy. In 2005, President Bush admitted that over 130,000 non-Mexican immigrants caught sneaking over the southern border of the United States were unaccounted for. Buchanan is flabbergasted by this fact:

Is this not an astonishing admission? President Bush has conceded that, in the third year following 9/11, 160,000 border crashers from nations all over the world were turned

loose into our society, and only one in five turned up in court. Some 130,000 vanished into our midst. How can the president say our homeland is secure? (Buchanan, 2006, p.14-5)

Buchanan is not alone in his condemnation of status quo policy. Democratic Senator Diane Feinstein aggressively questioned John Negroponte about the holes in border security during Senate hearings in 2006 (Buchanan, 2006).

A third problem caused by unchecked immigration is the spread of disease. The 2006 study by U.S./Mexico Border Counties Coalition, again comprised of the 24 counties bordering Mexico, also examines how disease affects these counties, finding if “those twenty-four counties were the fifty-first state, that state would be... number two in tuberculosis and number three in the incidence of hepatitis” (Buchanan, 2006, p.29). Buchanan digs deeper, enumerating the negative impact that some immigrants are causing:

High among these is the appearance among us of diseases that never before afflicted us and the sudden reappearance of contagious disease that researchers and doctors eradicated long ago. Malaria, polio, hepatitis, tuberculosis, and such rarities of the Third World as dengue fever, Chagas’ disease, and leprosy are surfacing here. (Buchanan, 2006, p.29)

A fourth problem created by unfettered immigration is the economic burden placed upon both society and individuals. High on the list of costs incurred by communities that house pockets of illegal immigrants is the expense of social services. In discussing this cost placed upon society, Buchanan lists “the benefits America provides her poor: free medical care at clinics and emergency rooms, education for their children, subsidized rents and food, welfare cash and earned income tax credits” (Buchanan, 2006, p.13). In addition, illegal immigrants that enter the United States for employment can inadvertently wreak havoc on an economy. Though companies that hire illegal workers can pass that savings on to consumers, often that money is pocketed instead of used in a way that helps out impoverished residents of the United States. Since these companies can hire illegal workers at a reduced wage, wages in surrounding areas and in similar industries are driven down, meaning that labor provided by illegal workers can deflate wages and hurt other poor residents of the United States, in some cases to the tune of 7.4 percent (Buchanan, 2006). Buchanan concludes:

[T]he mass migration from Mexico is an attack on America’s poor. ... [W]ere it not for immigration from Mexico, U.S. high school dropouts would be earning 8 percent more in wages. To allow mass migration of Third World poor is thus to betray black, Hispanic, and working-class white Americans without high school diplomas. “That’s why it’s intellectually dishonest to say... that immigrants ‘do jobs Americans will not do.’ ” (Buchanan, 2006, p.34)

A final area that is frequently mentioned as a harm created by unchecked immigration is the impact on the American education system and education in general. In comparing test scores of American students against those of international students, Buchanan examines the work of Edwin Rubenstein, a researcher at ESR Research Economic Consultants. Looking at Rubenstein’s study about literacy, Buchanan notes:

[I]mmigrants are dragging down average U.S. test scores in worldwide competitions. If only native-born Americans were taking these tests, there would be no crisis. The test scores for literacy of native-born Americans run 35 percent higher than the test scores of immigrants. (Buchanan, 2006, p.38)

Mechanisms to Restrict Immigration

Much like the proponents of liberalization, those advocating the restriction of immigration offer varied approaches to stem the ills of increased immigration. Perhaps the most sweeping proposal of this nature is the call for a moratorium on all immigration for a set period of time. Citing the period in American history from the 1920s to the 1960s, Buchanan makes the argument that a moratorium allows immigrants that are here time to assimilate into American culture (Buchanan, 2006). At the same time, a moratorium would immediately stem the cause of many of the harms of increased immigration.

The next area of restrictive immigration policy would best fit into the general category of tighter border security. One of the most ambitious proposals under tighter border security would be the construction of a border fence between the southern states and Mexico. Logistics on various fences differ, but the advocates of this idea seem to agree that, while upsetting Mexico, a fence would immediately stem the flow of drugs, diseases, criminals, and possible terrorists over the southern border of the United States (Buchanan, 2006). In addition to the fence proposal, state governors and legislatures are calling for more border patrol agents, and some have even resorted to using National Guard troops to patrol their border with Mexico. Proposals in this category extend beyond land to the sea and air as well. Maritime proposals include calling for tighter shipping and dock regulations, increased enforcement by organizations like the Coast Guard, and tighter inspection of incoming freight, in the case that it is used to smuggle illegal aliens. Proposals regulating the air travel industry include tighter airport security and stricter regulations by CIS and TSA officials.

The third set of potential solutions to the immigration problem fits best into the category of banning current policy. As the history section at the beginning of the paper proves, United States immigration policy is a piecemeal effort that has been put together by hundreds of people with different views over a long period of time. In some cases, this makes it easier to point to a specific policy or a particular section of an immigration policy and simply get rid of it. Examples of this type would include banning dual citizenship, ending chain migration where one family cannot start an immigration chain whereby an entire village can come to the United States, or ending specific categories of visas. Additionally, this category would also include ending the ability of immigrant children to become American citizens the instant they are born inside the geographic United States. Buchanan makes the argument that automatic citizenship at birth is a large reason why immigrants illegally enter the country, and cites the Center for Immigration Studies in showing that nearly 25% of all births in California are children of mothers who are in the country illegally.

A fourth area of solutions would be to change the structure of economic incentives that entice immigrants to enter the United States. Labeled “magnets” by proponents of this policy shift, the thinking is that once illegal immigrants no longer receive these benefits, they will go home. Buchanan made his case by arguing, “[i]nstead of providing social welfare to illegal aliens, including free education from preschool through high school, state and federal governments should provide only emergency services” (Buchanan, 2006, p. 265).

An additional proposal is to increase the punishment on businesses that hire illegal aliens. If businesses do not get caught, then they are rewarded for hiring illegal workers because it drives their cost of production down. Buchanan again made the case for this proposal by stating, “[i]nstead of being rewarded, businesspeople who break the law by hiring illegal aliens for lower wages than U.S. citizens should be punished severely.” (Buchanan, 2006, p.265)

Reworking refugee laws is a sixth area of potential fixes to the immigration problem. Because billions of people are economic, political, or religious refugees, it is impossible for the United States to take all of them. At the same time, it is still the duty of America to be a beacon of hope and freedom for the world to see. Proponents of changing refugee policy argue that the United States, while offering asylum to some, should empower other nations to accept those fleeing persecution. Other proponents argue that certain categories of asylum should be removed altogether, based in some instances on geographic criteria and in others on the basis of the asylum, like religious or political criteria.

A seventh group of solutions fits into the category of increased enforcement of current laws. This group would include increasing the size of the U.S. Border Patrol, CIS, or the Department of Homeland Security. Proposals might also aid local and state law enforcement agencies in their ability to arrest, detain, and deport illegal immigrants, and punish those cities that hinder local law enforcement from aiding in the enforcement of U.S. law.

Immigration Policy & The 2008 Presidential Election

Immigration as an Election Policy Issue

Immigration has proven itself as a major issue throughout the Democratic and Republican primaries, and is now developing as a major issue in the Presidential race proper. Ironically, both primaries have produced candidates that are not the first choice of voters that are either pro-immigration or immigrants themselves. In the Democratic primary, Senator Barack Obama performed poorly among Hispanic voters throughout the South and Florida, proving those demographics much preferred Hillary Clinton. On the Republican side, Senator John McCain finds himself in two worlds, belonging to a party whose stance on immigration stands opposed to the stance that McCain needs to court the demographic that many pundits say is critical for McCain to win swing states like Florida, Colorado, and New Mexico (Adler, 2008). The Politico's team of political writers elucidates just how hard each candidate is working to gain the good graces of pro-immigration voters, when they write:

Recognizing the growing political power of the nation's largest minority, John McCain and Barack Obama both sought to woo Latinos in back-to-back speeches on Saturday — and it's clear each candidate has some work to do to earn their favor. McCain must reassure Hispanic voters that he remains committed to an immigration reform package that includes a pathway to citizenship for illegal immigrants. After politically suffering in 2007 for his support of legislation that critics derided as “amnesty,” McCain reversed course during the GOP primary and said it was imperative to secure the borders first. At a debate in January, McCain said he would even oppose his own legislation if it were to be voted on again. Obama must overcome a deep chasm in his own party. In the Democratic primary Hispanics overwhelmingly favored Hillary Rodham Clinton. Obama remains largely unknown in a community that plainly would have preferred his rival. (Adler, 2008)

Senator McCain's Stance on Immigration

Senator John McCain, the presumptive nominee of the Republican Party as of this writing, holds a stance on immigration that is more nuanced than his Party's stance. This nuance creates a balancing act for Senator McCain. On one hand, he belongs to a party that advocates strict regulation of the borders and has historically supported severe restrictions on immigration. On the other hand, McCain represents Arizona, a border state with Mexico, where his political views, like many of his Republican colleagues from southern states, must be more flexible than the party line to allow for both the realities of immigration upon the local culture and economy and the political survivability that a more softened stance on immigration provides.

His voting record and policy history reflects this precarious balance. In early 2007, McCain authored an immigration bill that provided amnesty to workers while tightening border security. More conservative members of the Republican Party scoffed at McCain's amnesty proposals, however, and he later backed away from the legislation, taking a more conservative tone on immigration by indicating that tighter border security was his primary goal (Martinez, 2008). The senator's position during the Republican primary and after gaining presumptive nominee status further reflects both sides of McCain's immigration stance.

Under the "Issues" section of his website, for example, McCain does not choose the word "Immigration" as one of the twelve major policy areas, instead using the more right-centric language of "Border Security". In his policy stance, McCain quickly establishes the view that Washington has failed to enforce current laws, firmly saying, "As President, I will secure the border." (McCain, 2008) He goes further to argue that a secure border entails the regulation of not only people crossing the border, but also cargo and goods crossing the border. This representation walks the party line.

His stance becomes more nuanced, however, when he argues that the United States must more effectively deal with immigration by strengthening relations with Mexico and Latin America, enhancing the ability of businesses to pay good wages to all workers, making the American labor market more flexible, allowing the education system to create a generation of educated workers, assimilating the current immigrant population into American society, and by realizing that the United States is a beacon of hope and freedom to which immigrants will always be drawn (McCain, 2008).

This balancing act of sorts potentially creates problems for Senator McCain. Journalist Dena Bunis argues that McCain's stance could backfire, causing more conservative voters to stay at home while not attracting more liberal voters for fear that his views are created out of political expediency more than his true desire to defend the rights of immigrants, legal or otherwise (Bunis, 2008). Cecilia Munoz, vice president of the National Council of La Raza, uses more harsh language to make McCain's conundrum clear:

I don't think [McCain] can appease the hard-core xenophobes and convince the Latinos he is standing up for them at the same time. I think he has to pick a side and make it clear. Is he going after the votes of the xenophobes? (Martinez, 2008)

Senator Obama's Stance on Immigration

Senator Barack Obama, the presumptive Democratic nominee as of this writing, faces the same problem with pro-immigration voters that he faces with voters concerned with other issues; namely, voters remain unsure about who Senator Obama truly is and where he stands on many

issues. Like other issues, this position is exacerbated by Obama's shallow voting record on immigration (Adler, 2008). Since the Hispanic populations in southern states preferred Senator Clinton to Obama, he is attempting to gain the trust of those communities and groups. His limited voting record, however, does show that he supports increased rights for immigrants, including social services, and a comprehensive immigration policy that includes a guest worker program and amnesty. In a speech to the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials in June, Senator Obama argued, "[Y]ou can trust me when I say that... I will be your champion when I am in the White House," (Adler, 2008). Pundits argue that many pro-immigration and pro-Hispanic voters may ultimately settle for Obama. In the words of Arizona Democratic Representative Raul M. Grijalva, "Barack Obama is the only choice we have available" (Adler 2008).

Conclusion

The immigration debate is an incredibly rich one. The advocates on both sides of the debate are very passionate about what they write, and a lot of middle ground certainly exists. At the end of State of Emergency, Pat Buchanan makes the urgency of the situation clear by arguing:

It needs to be said again: If we do not solve our civilizational crisis – a disintegrating culture, dying populations, and invasions unresisted—the children born in 2006 will witness in their lifetimes the death of the West. In our hearts we know what must be done. We must stop the invasion. (Buchanan, 2006, p.270)

Whether Buchanan's prediction is true remains to be seen. However, a cursory look at the literature on both sides suggests that students would have an incredibly diverse, educational debate season trying to discover if it actually would.

Proposed Resolutions

The 2008-09 Ballot Wording:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially decrease its restriction of immigration to the United States.

Liberalization Wordings:

1. Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially decreasing restriction of immigration to the United States.
2. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially decrease restriction of immigration to the United States.
3. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially decrease one or more of its restrictions of immigration to the United States.
4. Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially increasing immigration to the United States.
5. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase immigration to the United States.

Restriction Wordings:

1. Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially restricting immigration to the United States.
2. Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially increasing restriction on immigration to the United States.
3. Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially increasing one or more restrictions on immigration to the United States.
4. Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially decreasing immigration to the United States.
5. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially decrease immigration to the United States.

The 1994-95 Wording:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially strengthen regulation of immigration to the United States.

Definitions/Glossary

“Decrease”

decrease – *tr.v.* to make less; cause to diminish
Dictionary.com Unabridged (v1.1)

decrease – *v.* To grow or cause to grow gradually less or smaller, as in number, amount, or intensity.
American Heritage Dictionary

decrease – *v.* 1. decrease in size, extent, or range; "The amount of homework decreased towards the end of the semester"; "The cabin pressure fell dramatically"; "her weight fell to under a hundred pounds"; "his voice fell to a whisper" [ant: increase] 2. make smaller; "He decreased his staff" [ant: increase]
WORDNET 3.0

decrease – *v.* to make or become less
Kernerman English Multilingual Dictionary

“Emigration”

emigrate – *intr.v.* To leave one country or region to settle in another.
American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition

emigration – 1649, from L.L. *emigrationem* (nom. *emigratio*) "removal from a place," from L. *emigrare* "move away, depart from a place," from *ex-* "out" + *migrare* "to move" (see migration).
Online Etymology Dictionary

emigration – *noun.* migration from a place (especially migration from your native country in order to settle in another)
Wordnet 3.0

emigrate – *intr.v.* to leave one's place of residence or country to live elsewhere
<http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/emigration>

“Establish”

establish – 1. a. To set up; found. b. To bring about; generate: *establish goodwill in the neighborhood.* 2. a. To place or settle in a secure position or condition; install: *They established me in my own business.* b. To make firm or secure. 3. To cause to be recognized and accepted: a discovery that established his reputation. 4. To introduce and put (a law, for example) into force.
American Heritage Dictionary, 2000

establish – to institute (as a law) permanently by enactment or agreement
Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law, 1996

establish – institute, enact, or establish; "make laws"
WordNet 2.0, 2003

“Immigration”

immigrate – *v. intr.* To enter and settle in a country or region to which one is not native.
The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition

immigration – *noun.* 1. migration into a place (especially migration to a country of which you are not a native in order to settle there)
WORDNET 3.0

immigration – *noun.* the act of entering a country in order to settle there
Kernerman English Multilingual Dictionary

immigration – *noun.* 1. the act of immigrating. 2. a group or number of immigrants.
dictionary.com unabridged v 1.1

immigrate – *v. intr.* 1. to come to a country of which one is not a native, usually for permanent residence.
dictionary.com unabridged v 1.1

immigration <Although human migration has existed throughout human history, immigration in the modern sense refers to movement of people from one nation-state to another. Immigration implies long-term permanent residence (and often eventual citizenship) by the immigrants: tourists and short-term visitors are not considered immigrants (see expatriates). However, seasonal labour migration (typically for periods of less than a year) is often treated as a form of immigration.>
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immigration>

“Increase”

increase – *tr.v.* to make greater, as in number, size, strength, or quality; augment; add to: to increase taxes.
Dictionary.com Unabridged (v1.1)

increase – *tr.v.* To make greater or larger.
American Heritage Dictionary

increase – *verb* 1. become bigger or greater in amount; "The amount of work increased" [ant: decrease] 2. make bigger or more; "The boss finally increased her salary"; "The university increased the number of students it admitted" [ant: decrease]
WORDNET 3.0

increase – *verb.* to (cause to) grow in size, number etc
Kernerman English Multilingual Dictionary

“Policy”

policy – A plan or course of action, as of a government, political party, or business, intended to influence and determine decisions, actions, and other matters: American foreign policy; the company's personnel policy.
American Heritage Dictionary, 2000

policy – an overall plan, principle, or guideline; especially : one formulated outside of the judiciary <obligated to consider legislative policy on the matter in their decision>
Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law, 1996

policy – 2 a : a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions b : a high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures especially of a governmental body
Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2006

“Restrict”

restrict – *tr.v.* 1 : to confine within bounds : RESTRAIN 2 : to place under restrictions as to use or distribution; synonym see LIMIT
<http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/restrict>

restrict – *tr.v.* to confine or keep within limits, as of space, action, choice, intensity, or quantity.
Dictionary.com Unabridged (v1.1)

restrict – *tr.v.* To keep or confine within limits.
American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition

restrict – *verb.* 1. place restrictions on; "curtail drinking in school" 2. place under restrictions; limit access to; "This substance is controlled" [ant: derestrict] 3. place limits on (extent or access); "restrict the use of this parking lot"; "limit the time you can spend with your friends" 4. make more specific; "qualify these remarks" [syn: qualify]
Wordnet 3.0

restrict – *tr.v.* 1 : to subject to bounds or limits <restrict the height of buildings> <restrict visitation rights> 2 : to place under restrictions as to use or distribution <restricted the land to recreational use>
Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law

restriction – *noun.* 1. something that restricts; a restrictive condition or regulation; limitation.
Dictionary.com Unabridged (v1.1)

restriction – *noun*. 1. a principle that limits the extent of something; "I am willing to accept certain restrictions on my movements" 2. an act of limiting or restricting (as by regulation) [syn: limitation] 3. the act of keeping something within specified bounds (by force if necessary); "the restriction of the infection to a focal area"
Wordnet 3.0

restriction – *noun*. a rule etc that limits or controls
Kernerman English Multilingual Dictionary

restriction – *noun*. a regulation that restricts or restrains [restrictions on hunters]
<http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/restriction>

Affirmative Positions, Page One

If Increasing/Liberalizing Immigration is the Affirmative Ground:

1. Blanket Amnesty – Grant amnesty to any person living in the United States based on a set of criteria, most often based upon the immigrant’s date of entry.
2. Worker Amnesty – Proposal to grant amnesty to workers in jobs that Americans don’t want.
3. Relational/Family Amnesty Or Chain Immigration – If you have a primary relative (mother, father, son, daughter, brother, or sister) that is a legal resident of the United States, then you can get amnesty.
4. Asylum for Geographic Refugees – Based on geographic region where the justification is an equitable support for the residents of nations regardless of the governing country.
5. Asylum for Economic Refugees – This takes refugees from areas that are severely impoverished based on a specific factor including a despotic government, a natural disaster, an economic crash, or climate change.
6. Asylum for Political Refugees – Asylum would be granted based on persecution by an authoritarian government over political differences.
7. Asylum for Religious Refugees – Asylum would be granted based on persecution by an authoritarian government over religious differences.
8. Guest Worker Program – The main example is President Bush’s proposal under which workers are granted a two-year work visa based on a set of criteria including the immigrant proving that they have employment in the United States and the business proving that it tried unsuccessfully to fill the job with an American citizen.
9. Student Visas – Visas can be granted to particular subgroups seeking education in the United States. These groups of visas offer over twenty potential case areas including: high school education, undergraduate education especially in areas like math and science, post-graduate education especially in areas of physics (for military applications) and the bio-sciences (for disease research).
10. High-Skilled Visas – Visas can be granted to highly educated or skilled individuals that fulfill a specific need in a specialized field. These include: professors at universities/academia, engineering especially in the industrial/military sector, areas of privately-funded science research like stem cell study and disease.

Affirmative Positions, Page Two

If Decreasing/Restricting Immigration is the Affirmative Ground:

1. Moratorium – End immigration altogether for a specified amount of time or for a specific group of immigrants.
2. Border Fence – Construct a fence along the border between the United States and Mexico, either comprehensively or in specified urban areas to decrease illegal immigration access.
3. Increased airport security – Increased worker screening, background checks for passengers, or decreased access to transatlantic flights can be included here.
4. Increased port security – Closing some ports or restricting access based on national affiliation or cargo specifics.
5. Reduce the amount of asylum granted – Decrease amount of refugees allowed in the United States by nation or political/religious claims.
6. End chain migration – Disallow children or relatives of immigrants currently within the United States to gain access to citizenship.
7. End automatic citizenship for those born on American soil.
8. End social programs for immigrants – From education to health care to basic police and fire protections, affirmative can end specific services or groups of services.
9. Punish businesses that hire immigrants – Create monetary or jail time penalties for executives of businesses that hire, train, or pay illegal immigrants.
10. Enforce current laws – Increase enforcement mechanisms for current policies that govern immigration issues, including manpower, agencies, or money.
11. Increase federal law enforcement – Extend current agencies that govern federal immigration laws or create new agencies.

Negative Positions

If Increasing/Liberalizing Immigration is the Affirmative Ground:

Disadvantages: Terrorism, Crime, Spending, Politics, Economy, Social Fragmentation, Disease, Drugs, Population Growth, Social Services Restrictions, Cultural Dilution, Refugee Status/Political Rights, Hegemony

Counterplans: Ban Immigration, Restrict Immigration

Kritiks: Xenophobia, Borders, Otherization/Cultural Delineation, Empire, Feminism, Capitalism, Marxism, Heidegger, Biopower

If Decreasing/Restricting Immigration is the Affirmative Ground:

Disadvantages: Economy, Globalization, Agriculture & Other Immigrant-Intensive Industries, Multiculturalism, Population, Human Rights, Soft Power, Diplomacy, Refugees/Political Rights, Cultural/Generational Development, Politics, Hegemony, Federalism, Spending, International Relations, Trade

Counterplans: States, Countries, NGOs, International Organizations, Asylum, Amnesty, Refugees, Visas, Anything to Increase or Liberalize Immigration

Kritiks: Xenophobia, Borders, Otherization/Cultural Delineation, Empire, Feminism, Capitalism, Marxism, Heidegger, Biopower

Immigration As A Debate Topic, Page One

Timeliness

The yearlong bipartisan battle in the Senate proves that immigration as a political issue in the forefront of the American mind is not fading. Creating political alliances that reach across party lines, even uniting traditional foes like Ted Kennedy and President Bush, the immigration issue is one that is politically and socially important.

As awareness about immigration continues to rise, it will continue to be a topic that is heavily covered by the media and discussed in high school classrooms. In addition, much of the literature indicates that now is the critical time to act. In the words of Pat Buchanan, "If the border is not secured before we reach the tipping point, the border will never be secure. And that will be the end of the America we knew and loved."

The 2008 Presidential Election has proven that an immigration-based debate topic would provide an incredibly relevant area for students to debate. Immigration is already registering as a key issue among voters, and potential candidates are addressing it in their speeches. Immigration issues are never far from the headlines, making this a highly accessible topic to all students, no matter their resources.

Research & Access

The literature that exists on immigration abounds. A Google search of immigration shows over 113 million hits, Amazon.com has over 115,000 books on immigration, and the USCIS is afforded near Cabinet-level recognition, as its director is an under-secretary to the Department of Homeland Security.

Immigration is also a unique topic in its regional variance. Every part of the United States is affected by immigration; as a debate topic, it could afford students the opportunity to examine the impacts of immigration on their local communities. It would allow students to tailor arguments to their personal interests depending upon their geographic interest.

Immigration As A Debate Topic, Page Two

Google Hits (As of July 22, 2008):

“immigration” – 113,000,000
“emigration” – 10,900,000
“immigration policy” – 2,240,000
“immigration” + “legislation” – 2,260,000
“immigration” + “restriction” – 380,000
“immigration” + “liberalization” – 426,000
“border security” – 2,690,000
“border fence” – 1,690,000
“immigration” + “terrorism” – 10,600,000
“immigration” + “crime” – 3,430,000
“immigration” + “economy” – 28,000,000
“immigration” + “labor” – 22,700,000
“immigration” + “jobs” – 3,450,000
“immigration” + “culture” – 33,000,000
“immigration” + “assimilation” – 1,680,000
“illegal immigration” – 6,830,000
“immigration” + “impacts” – 1,860,000
“immigration” + “education” – 14,100,000
“immigration” + “social services” – 3,160,000
“immigration” + “disease” – 10,100,000
“immigration” + “agriculture” – 14,400,000
“immigration” + “Mexico” – 1,280,000
“immigrant rights” – 734,000
“Citizenship and Immigration Services” – 431,000
“Immigration and Naturalization Service” – 2,220,000
“immigration” + “asylum” – 418,000
“asylum seekers” – 3,150,000
“refugees” – 24,400,000
“refugees” + “children” – 10,200,000
“refugees” + “United States” – 8,820,000

Useful Online Resources:

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services Website – <http://www.uscis.gov>
US Department of Justice Immigration Page – <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/immigration/>
US Census Bureau – <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/immigration.html>
National Immigration Law Center – <http://www.nilc.org/>
Center for Immigration Studies – <http://www.cis.org>
National Immigration Forum – <http://www.immigrationforum.org>
Findlaw’s Immigration News Page – <http://news.findlaw.com/legalnews/us/im/>
Library.org Immigration Thinkquest – <http://library.thinkquest.org/20619/>
CATO’s Immigration Page – <http://www.freetrade.org/issues/immigration.html>

The Huddled Masses: The Case for U.S. Immigration Reform

The Two-Page Summary, Page One

Top Three Resolutions:

1. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially decrease its restriction of immigration to the United States. (*This is the official wording from the 08-09 ballot*).
2. Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially decreasing restriction of immigration to the United States.
3. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially decrease restriction of immigration to the United States.

Affirmative Case Areas (if liberalization is given to the affirmative):

1. Blanket Amnesty – Grant amnesty to any person living in the United States based on a set of criteria, most often based upon the immigrant’s date of entry.
2. Worker Amnesty – Proposal to grant amnesty to workers in jobs that Americans don’t want.
3. Relational/Family Amnesty – Granting those with primary relatives (mother, father, son, daughter, brother, or sister) who are legal residents of the United States amnesty.
4. Asylum for Geographic Refugees – Based on geographic region where the justification is an equitable support for the residents of nations regardless of the governing country.
5. Asylum for Economic Refugees – Accepting refugees from severely impoverished areas based on factors including politics, natural disasters, economic crashes, or climate change.
6. Asylum for Political Refugees – Asylum would be granted based on persecution by an authoritarian government over political differences.
7. Asylum for Religious Refugees – Asylum would be granted based on persecution by an authoritarian government over religious differences.
8. Guest Worker Program – The main example is President Bush’s proposal under which workers are granted a two-year work visa based on a set of criteria.
9. Student Visas – Visas can be granted to particular groups seeking education in the U.S. This area offers over twenty potential case areas including: high school education, undergraduate education especially in areas like math and science, post-graduate education especially in areas of physics (military applications) and the bio-sciences (for disease research).
10. High-Skilled Visas – Visas can be granted to highly educated or skilled individuals. These include: professors, engineers, industrial/military sector workers, scientists, and doctors.

Negative Positions (if liberalization is given to the affirmative):

1. Disadvantages: Terrorism, Crime, Spending, Politics, Economy, Social Fragmentation, Disease, Drugs, Population Growth, Social Services Restrictions, Cultural Dilution, Refugee Status/Political Rights, Hegemony
2. Counterplans: Ban Immigration, Restrict Immigration (via one of the methods on the “Restrict Immigration” affirmative case list, Exclude a Specific Group of People or Demographic
3. Kritiks: Xenophobia, Borders, Otherization/Cultural Delineation, Empire, Feminism, Capitalism, Marxism, Heidegger, Biopower

The Huddled Masses: The Case for U.S. Immigration Reform The Two-Page Summary, Page Two

Topic Balance:

The best way to balance the topic between the affirmative and negative is to avoid a bi-directional topic and give either immigration restriction or immigration liberalization to the affirmative. In the opinion of the authors, a bidirectional topic (like the one that existed in 1994-95) would make the job of the negative incredibly difficult. As an example, there are an entire group of disadvantages that the negative would run against restriction affirmatives that cannot be adapted for liberalization affirmatives. With no solid generic ground, the topic becomes hard for the negative. In addition, it would mean that teams could potentially run a large number of their affirmative arguments on the negative, decreasing overall topic education. Whether it's giving restriction or liberalization to the affirmative, the authors of this paper firmly believe that the best division is a clear, unidirectional topic.

Per the discussion at the 2007 Topic Meeting in San Diego, the topic authors fully support the idea of giving liberalization to the affirmative and restriction to the negative. Forcing affirmatives to restrict immigration would not only be incredibly difficult for teams in some areas of the country to debate, but it would also make the topic much less viable politically among various coaches and voting representatives.

Additionally, the authors feel it is important to word the topic in a way that avoids restricting the affirmative to "immigration policy". Because 9/11 changed the face of how policymakers view immigration, a discussion of immigration would be incomplete if an affirmative were not able to use mechanisms outside of normal "immigration policy", like altering part of the PATRIOT Act dealing with immigration or addressing shipping laws.

Ballot Summary (as it appeared on the 08-09 ballot):

In a myriad of post-9/11 political issues, none has been at the forefront of more controversy than United States immigration policy. In the wake of the major defeat of President Bush's immigration proposal, we stand at a crossroads in determining the future of foreign citizens who wish to immigrate to the United States. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services estimates over 35.2 million immigrants are currently living in the United States with another 2.9 million citizenship applications submitted per year. Affirmatives would be able to alter existing policies including the PATRIOT Act and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, create new policies or organizations to process immigration related issues, grant amnesty, increase asylum in one or more areas, and increase approved visa applications, among others. Disadvantages would include terrorism, crime, politics, economy, disease, drugs, social fragmentation, social services, cultural dilution, and hegemony, among others. The negative could also argue that the states or other nations are better suited to address immigration issues. International organizations like the UN or Amnesty International could be better suited to address global issues like refugee crises. Never far from the headlines, immigration offers an incredibly rich area for discussion.

Annotated Bibliography

Adler, B., Martinez, G., & Smith, B. (2008, June 28). McCain and Obama court Latino voters. *The Politico*. Retrieved July 22, 2008 from <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0608/11418.html>

Aleinikoff, T. A., Martin, D. A., & Motomura, H. (2005). *Immigration and nationality laws of the United States: Selected statutes, regulations, and forms*, 2005 ed. Rochester: West.

Overriding LONG casebook considered to be the volume authority on immigration law.

Bolin, T. (2005). *Public Opinion on Immigration in America*. Merage Foundation for the American Dream: New York.

Booth, D. (2006). Federalism on ice: State and local enforcement of federal immigration law. *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 29, 1063-83.

This article discusses exactly what the title suggests. It examines how local governments can increase the effectiveness of federal immigration law, including an analysis of the benefits of that enforcement.

Borjas, G. J. (1999). *Heaven's door: Immigration policy and the American economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

PRE 9/11 look at immigration policy and how it affects the US economy. Chapters include "Skills of Immigrants", "The Labor Market Impact of Immigration", "The Economic Benefits from Immigration", "Social Mobility across Generations", and "The Goal for Immigration Policy". Mixed view of immigration but argues immigration definitely has a negative impact on America's poorest citizens.

Buchanan, P. (2006). *State of emergency: The third world invasion and conquest of America*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

Focuses on Mexican illegal immigration into the United States. Argues that unless we stop illegal immigration now, America will become a "polyglot boardinghouse" for the world. Uses one chapter to lay out a new immigration security plan for America's future.

Bunis, D. (2008, July 21). McCain can't win for losing on immigration. *Orange County Register*. Retrieved July 22, 2008 from <http://www.ocregister.com/articles/mccain-immigration-issue-2098473-vote-gilbert>

Bush, G. W. (2005, November 28). President discusses border security and immigration reform in America. *Office of the Press Secretary*. Retrieved April 27, 2007 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/20051128-7.html>

Center for Immigration Studies. (2006). The public's view of immigration: A comprehensive survey and analysis. *Backgrounders*, 06. Retrieved January 22, 2007 from <http://www.cis.org/articles/2006/back906.html>

This article features a study funded by a group favoring decreased immigration while increasing the quality of life for immigrants that are admitted into the United States. The study reflects public opinion being strongly anti-immigration.

Clark, W. A. V. (2003). *Immigrants and the American dream: Remaking the middle class*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Discusses how immigrants are integrated into America's class structure.

Custred, G. (2005, November). Friends and Elites, Chickens and Coyotes. *American Spectator*, 38(9), 28-32.

Garland, E. (2007). Latinos in America's cultural laboratory. *Futurist*, 41(1), 18-19.

This article explores the reasons why Latinos immigrate to the United States. It highlights immigrants who come to the United States for a short period of time to earn high-paying wages to send back home, and the political ramifications on other immigrants and policymakers.

Graham, Jr., O. L. (2006). *Unguarded gates: A history of America's immigration crisis*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Post 9/11 historical view of immigration policy in US; argues that failure to control immigration has led to security risks, labor competition issues, and population issues leading to social fragmentation.

Harris, N. (2002). *Thinking the unthinkable: The immigration myth exposed*. Great Britain: I. B. Tauris.

Examines the effect of immigration on economic conditions (employment, wealth, growth, etc.) Appears to dispel the myth that immigration will destroy a nation's economy.

Harvard Law Review, 119. (2006). Immigration law – Administrative adjudication – third and seventh circuits condemn pattern of error in immigration courts. 2596-2603.

This article condemns inconsistencies in immigration courts and explores ways those courts should handle immigration policy.

Hines, B. (2006). An overview of U.S. immigration law and policy since 9/11. *Texas Hispanic Journal of Law & Policy*, 12, 9-28.

This article criticizes immigration policy since 9/11 and specifically addresses how policies like the Patriot Act have destroyed immigrant rights.

Jacobson, D. (1997). *Rights across borders: Immigration and the decline of citizenship*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Argues that transnational migration has affected and devalued ideas of citizenship. Also argues that traditional international rights law is overshadowing national sovereignty in this area.

Jacoby, T. (2006). Immigration nation. *Foreign Affairs*, 85(6), 50-65.

This article lists and explains the benefits of increased immigration, especially as it pertains to the economy, including benefits to overall economic health, the service industry, and labor.

Johnson, K. R. (2003). *The huddled masses myth: Immigration and civil rights*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Argues that immigration in the United States, although touted as open to anyone, is actually restricted based on race and ethnicity. Argues that immigration policy is inextricably linked to civil rights policies. Case studies include how those fleeing Cuba and those fleeing Haiti from persecution are treated differently based on political bias. Post 9/11 commentary on Arab immigration included.

Joppke, C. (1999). *Immigration and the nation-state: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pre 9/11 book that argues that nation-states prove extremely resilient when it comes to increased immigration. Looks at immigration from two perspectives: a) the effect of immigration on state sovereignty and b) immigration's effect on citizenship and how to integrate immigrants into society. Focuses on USA, Germany, and Great Britain as case studies.

Lee, S. (2005). Citizen standing and immigration reform: Commentary and criticisms. *California Law Review*, 93, 1479-1508.

This article provides an analysis of post-9/11 immigration policy and the ways in which it has been enforced and used to fight the War on Terror. It also examines inconsistencies within the court system in regards to immigration policy.

Mareitta, M. (2006). Undocumented immigrants should receive social services. *International Social Science Review*, 81, 61-66.

This article is the second in a three part series (all three parts are included in this bibliography). It advocates the dissemination of social services to illegal immigrants.

Martinez, G. (2008, June 20). McCain's immigration zigzag. *The Politico*. Retrieved July 22, 2008 from <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0608/11240.html>

Mazzoli, R. and Simpson, A. (2006). Enacting Immigration Reform, Again. *Washingtonpost.com*, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/14/AR2006091401179.html>.

Authors of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act analyze immigration policy 20 years later.

McCain, J. (2008). Border security and immigration reform. *John McCain For President*, <http://www.johnmccain.com/Informing/Issues/68db8157-d301-4e22-baf7-a70dd8416efa.htm>.

A summary of the Senator's position on border security and immigration reform authored by the Senator himself.

Mills, N., (Ed.). (1994). *Arguing immigration: The controversy and crisis over the future of immigration in America*. New York: Touchstone.

A series of essays by various authors divided into five categories about immigration policy including "To Open or Close the Door", "Costs and Benefits", "Race and Ethnicity", "A Shared Culture?", and "Asylum".

Money, Jeannette. (1999). *Fences and neighbors: The political geography of immigration control*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

While focusing largely on Great Britain, France, and Australia (with a short section on the US), Money argues that immigration policy and its politics start at the local level, and often depends on how the immigrants affect economic conditions and their access to the resources of the welfare state.

Muaddi, J. B. (2006). The alienable elements of citizenship: Can market reasoning help solve America's immigration puzzle? *Emory Law Journal*, 56, 229-274.

This article explores a possible solution to immigration issues in selling green cards. It looks at the political ramifications and benefits of such a proposal.

Pantoja, A. (2006). Against the tide? Core American values and attitudes toward U.S. immigration policy in the mid-1990s. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, 32, 515-531.

This article delves into the opinion of immigration held by Americans in the mid-90s and the underlying values that support those opinions. Certain values had a strong correlation with certain opinions while not shaping opinions on other issues at all.

Pivec, M. E. (2006). Comprehensive immigration reform: Congress offers employers the stick and lots of red tape. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 32(2), 15-42.

This article analyzes the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006 and its potential impacts on employers.

Porter, L. (2006). Illegal immigrants should not receive social services. *International Social Science Review*, 81, 66-72.

This article is the third in a three part series (all three parts are included in this bibliography). It opposes the dissemination of social services to illegal immigrants.

Qin-Hillard, D. B., Hertzog, M. E., & Suarez-Orozco, M.(Eds.). 2004. The new immigration. Oxford: Routledge.

An anthology of the dominant work on new immigration policy from the perspectives of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and demography.

Sanders, R. M. (2006). Policy point-counterpoint: Should illegal immigrants and their children receive federal and state social services. *International Social Science Review*, 81, 58-60.

This article is the first in a three part series (all three parts are included in this bibliography) that is an introduction to the debate between those advocating the dissemination of social services to illegal immigrants, and those opposing that view.

Shapiro, M. J. (1997). Violent cartographies: Mapping cultures of war. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

A critical view of how nation states are formed. Focuses on the violence of colonial encounters through which states are formed.

Sriskandarajah, D. (2006). Migration madness: Five policy dilemmas. *Studies in Christian Ethics*, 19(1), 21-37.

This article lists five issues that policymakers must address when establishing immigration policy: admission, entitlements, integration, overseas impact, and undocumented migrants.

Van Hook, J. (2006). For love or money? Welfare reform and immigrant naturalization. *Social Forces*, 85, 643-666.

This article focuses on a study that examined whether linking welfare benefits to naturalization via the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 causes immigrants to pursue citizenship more quickly. It also examines how immigrants are incorporated into a society and examines the effects of policies on their social and economic wellbeing.

Weinberg, M., Cannell, R., & Moore, J. (2005). Migration, law, and the public's health. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 33(4), 109-110.

This article documents a panel discussion that explores the health risks that immigrants can pose to the U.S.

Zamora, J. H. (2007, April 26). Measures to oppose U.S. raids. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved April 27, 2007 from <http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/articles.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/04/26/BAGF0PFM3E1/DTL>