

## **Adverse Impacts of Massive and Illegal Immigration in the United States**

Jerome Blondell\*

*Health Statistician (retired), U.S. Government*

Information is provided here to show that massive and illegal immigration has adverse effects on economic justice, fairness to immigrants that came legally, and the rule of law. After nearly three million illegal aliens were granted a one-time amnesty in the United States in 1986, a new group, at least four times as large, replaced them in just 20 years. This paper analyzes demographic data from established and reputable sources to present a concise and compelling case for prevention and protection, effective enforcement, and a time-out from current levels of mass immigration.

**Key Words:** Illegal immigration; Economic costs; Health costs; Poverty; Education; Social capital.

### **Costs of Immigration**

Data has long been collected about the costs to American taxpayers from illegal immigration and the presence of low-skill immigrants. A report of the National Research Council (NRC) in 1997 estimated net costs (after subtracting taxes paid by immigrants) at \$15-20 billion in 1994-95 based on immigrants in 9.2 million households (Smith and Edmonston, 1997)<sup>1</sup>. Much more recently, the Heritage Foundation estimated net costs to be \$89 billion in 2004 based on 4.5 million households with low-skill (did not complete high school) households containing 15.9 million immigrants (Rector and Kim, 2007)<sup>2</sup>. An estimated 40 percent of these household residents were illegal. In December 2007, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office acknowledged that “The tax revenues that unauthorized immigrants generate for state and local governments do not offset the total cost of services provided to those immigrants”.

After adjusting for inflation and current population in 2007, the two studies cited above estimate net costs ranging from \$29 billion to \$98 billion (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008)<sup>3</sup>. Distributed among the 105 million non-immigrant households in the United States, that figure equals a cost ranging from \$276 to \$933 per household each year. Similarly, the

---

\* Jerome Blondell, Ph.D., M.P.H., Contact address: jblondell@cox.net

<sup>1</sup> Page 288

<sup>2</sup> Page 15

<sup>3</sup> Tables 2 and 702

Federation of Americans for Immigration Reform (<http://www.fairus.org>) fiscal cost studies for nine states estimate net costs ranging from \$122 to \$1,183 per native household (median \$700), based on expenses for education, emergency medical care, and incarceration. These figures estimate the cost in taxes paid by median income households with a current income of about \$48,000.

A depressing of wages is also to be counted among the costs of the immigration coming into the United States. Alan Tonelson (2006), a research fellow with the U.S. Business and Industry Council Educational Foundation, has used wage data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics for workers in the food services, hotel, construction, and agricultural production industries. Tonelson estimated wage declines between 2000 and 2005 of 1 to 2.2 percent for each of these industries. Harvard economist George J. Borjas, coauthor of the 1997 NRC report, estimated that from 1980 to 2000, immigration reduced wages of native-born workers by \$1,700, or 4 percent (Tella, 2006). For the poorest (lowest 10 percent) workers, the reduction was 7.4 percent. The adverse effects of immigrant labor disproportionately affects other minorities, part-time workers, and earlier immigrants (Krikorian 2008)..

There is reason to question the impression that is common in the United States that migrant labor is essential for picking the country's fruits and vegetables and that these workers' low wages significantly lower the cost of food. Phil Martin Professor of Resource Economics at the University of California-Davis, found that the average household spends just \$357 a year on fruits and vegetables (Martin and Krikorian, 2007). For every dollar spent, just 18 cents go to the farmer and one-third of that cost (or 6 cents) goes to the migrant laborer. Even if costs for farm workers increased 40 percent, the total increase in cost per household would be about \$8 a year. A \$1.80 head of lettuce would increase in price by, at most, 10 cents.

Steven Malanga (coauthor of *The Immigration Solution*, 2007)<sup>4</sup> raises an interesting and important point about the incompatibility of mass immigration and the sort of "welfare state" that has come into being in the United States and elsewhere:

Today, the modern welfare state has turned the self-selection process upside down, offering immigrants from very poor countries incentives to come to America [where they are]... more than twice as likely to use government programs as native-born Americans. As Nobel laureate

---

<sup>4</sup> Page 178

Milton Friedman has said: “It’s just obvious that you can’t have free immigration and a welfare state.”

### **Crime**

Illegal immigrants into a country are by definition breaking the law when they cross the border or overstay their visa. Not as commonly recognized are additional laws that are probably broken by a majority of illegal immigrants. These include working, faking identity, using fake or stolen social security numbers, carrying fraudulent driver licenses or driving without a license and/or insurance, and evading income taxes.

Reports from the 9/11 Commission suggest that the United States system for granting visas and, the as yet unimplemented, plan to track who exits or overstays their visa, is still a significant threat to national security. A big part of the problem is that visa offices and airports and other points of entry are overwhelmed and lack the funding, staff, and technology needed to process the huge volume of foreign visitors. Some estimates suggest that visa overstays constitute 30-40 percent of the illegal alien population now in the United States. Politicians who champion border enforcement only are missing a major portion of the security threat.

### **Health**

According to one estimate a quarter of those without health insurance are immigrants and a significant proportion of immigrants require Medicaid (Krikorian 2008). Krikorian cites a study by Families USA that estimated that each family with private-sector insurance had to pay an additional nine hundred dollars in premiums to cover the mandated health costs for the uninsured.

Between 1993 and 2003, a total of 60 California hospitals closed because they were not paid for half their services (Cosman, 2005). The proportion of uncompensated care caused by illegal aliens is unknown and illegal immigrants are not solely to blame. The Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act of 1985 requires every emergency room to treat every patient coming with an “emergency” (including childbirth) even if unable to pay and even if illegally in the United States. The law is tough; hospitals and doctors are fined up to \$50,000 for refusing to treat. This unfunded federal mandate has caused dozens of hospitals to go bankrupt.

Between 1997 and 2004, wait times in the United States’ emergency departments for emergent illness or injury that should be seen in less than 15 minutes increased, on average, from 10 to 14 minutes (Wilper et

al., 2008). This means that nearly half of the serious cases were not seen within the recommended time. For example, cases diagnosed with acute myocardial infarction (heart attack) experienced increased wait times from 8 to 20 minutes. Crowding as a result of emergency department closures and increased visits, including those by uninsured illegal immigrants, were among the important reasons for longer waits. The median wait time for emergency room cases of all types was 38 minutes in a stratified random sample of 30 California emergency departments around the early part of 2001, which was 52% longer than the 25 minutes reported nationwide at that time (Lambe et al., 2003). Forty-two percent of Californians had to wait an hour or longer before being seen.

### **Illnesses**

Illegal aliens, who—unlike aliens entering the country legally—undergo no screening, are increasingly introducing infectious diseases. Contagious diseases that have largely disappeared in the United States, such as tuberculosis (TB), malaria, Chagas' disease, cysticercosis (from pork tapeworm), Hansen's disease (leprosy), and dengue fever have begun to recur, especially along the southern border and in areas with high immigrant populations (Cosman, 2005).

After the TB epidemic in the United States from 1985 to 1992, the rate of TB among persons born outside the United States declined by a third (CDC, 2007). Nevertheless, the rate of TB among foreign-born persons is 9.5 times higher than among U.S.-born persons. It is noteworthy that 1.2 percent of the 10,662 TB cases in 2005 were multiple-drug resistant forms of TB and 82 percent of these occurred among foreign-born persons. Treating drug-resistant tuberculosis costs around \$250,000 and takes two years.

### **Illegitimacy and Anchor Babies**

An estimated one-third of a million illegal alien mothers come to the United States each year and have a baby (Cosman, 2005). That baby automatically becomes a citizen because of being born on U.S. soil (known as birthright citizenship); an interpretation of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution that has been disputed and a practice no longer followed by any other country. Heather MacDonald tells of this in her article "Hispanic Family Values" in *City Journal*:

Nearly half of the children born to Hispanic mothers in the U.S. are born out of wedlock, a proportion that has been increasing rapidly with no signs of slowing down. Given what psychologists and sociologists now

know about the much higher likelihood of social pathology among those who grow up in single-mother households, the Hispanic baby boom is certain to produce more juvenile delinquents, more school failure, more welfare use, and more teen pregnancy in the future . . . Forty-five percent of all Hispanic births occur outside of marriage, compared with 24 percent of white births and 15 percent of Asian births.

MacDonald reports that Mexican-Americans have the highest teen birth rate of any ethnic or racial subgroup, exceeding that of Asians and white girls by three-fold. High teen birth rates are associated with more juvenile delinquency, higher drop-out rates from schools and more welfare.

As U.S. citizens, these children can stay permanently; their citizenship can prevent a parent's deportation; and—once they are adults—they can sponsor their parents and other relatives for permanent residence.

### **Education and Language**

In 2006, America had 12 million illegal and 26 million legal immigrants (Camarota, 2007). These 38 million immigrants total one-eighth of the population, up from one in 20 in 1970 (Krikorian, 2008)<sup>5</sup>. Over the past two decades the United States (5 percent of the world population) has accepted more legal immigrants than all other nations in the world combined (Easterbrook, 2003)<sup>6</sup>. A third of adult legal immigrants, and 57 percent of adult illegal immigrants, haven't completed high school. Nine percent of American citizens aged 18-64 are without a high school degree. School-age illegal immigrants were 2.8 percent of the total school population in 2007, costing \$14 billion a year. If U.S.-born children of illegals are included, then both groups comprise 6.2 percent of the school age population, costing \$36 billion. (Camarota, 2007; U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). Krikorian (2008)<sup>7</sup> says that in 2005, 10.3 million children of immigrants accounted for 19 percent of the school-age population and that figure alone accounted for all of the recent growth in the school-age population.

Only about half (52 percent) of Hispanic immigrants who have earned U.S. citizenship can speak English well or even somewhat well, a new study has found, even though the citizenship test requires immigrants to demonstrate English proficiency (Hakimzadeh *et al.* and

---

<sup>5</sup> Page 6

<sup>6</sup> Page 10

<sup>7</sup> Pages 175-6

Cohn 2007). Of Hispanics who are not citizens, only 25 percent report being able to speak English “well” or “pretty well.”

Proponents of immigration expect that by the third generation, Mexican-Americans will be on par with native U.S. citizens. Research shows this not to be true. “Proponents of unregulated immigration simply ignore the growing underclass problem among later generations of Hispanics, with its attendant gang involvement and teen pregnancy” (MacDonald et al. *The Immigration Solution*, 2007)<sup>8</sup>. Mexican welfare receipt is twice as high as that of natives. Moreover, welfare use increases between second and third generations to 31 percent. MacDonald noted that “third-generation Mexican-Americans remain three times as likely to drop out of high school as whites and one and a half times as likely to drop out as blacks. They complete college at one-third the rate of whites.”

Further evidence that later generations of Mexicans do not assimilate is reported in the book *Generations of Exclusion* by Edward E. Telles and Vilma Ortiz (2008)<sup>9</sup>. Affiliated with UCLA’s Chicano Studies Research Center, they found 1,576 interviews with Mexican Americans performed in 1965. They performed follow-up interviews on about 700 of the 1965 respondents and their children in 2000. Their statistical models show that the low education levels of Mexican Americans impede other types of assimilation, including income, use of English, and cultural assimilation, even by the fourth generation. In 2000, descendants of the 1965 respondents lived in neighborhoods that were even more Hispanic than the ones their parents and grandparents grew up in. The authors conclude:

Whereas European Americans assimilated on most dimensions by the third generation, Mexican Americans do not. Indeed, there are no signs of complete assimilation on any dimension even by the fourth generation, though loss of Spanish comes closest. Indeed, one can easily point to dis-assimilation, such as the increasing residential isolation from 1965 to 2000, or to the fact that education worsens from the second to the third generation-since-immigration (Telles and Ortiz, 2008)<sup>12</sup>.”

Among the factors responsible for lack of assimilation Telles and Ortiz point primarily to low education. However, they also acknowledge that the “size of the Mexican American population in the American

---

<sup>8</sup> Pages 108-9

<sup>9</sup> Page 16

Southwest and continuing immigration further promote residential isolation and ethnic persistence (Telles and Ortiz, 2008)<sup>12</sup>.” In another words continued massive immigration, both legal and illegal, adversely effect earlier immigrants.

### **Poverty**

Illegal aliens and their U.S.-born children are twice as likely to be below the poverty level as native U.S. citizens (23 percent vs. 11.5 percent), according to the Center for Immigration Studies (Camarota, 2007). In *The Progress Paradox* (2003)<sup>10</sup>, Gregg Easterbrook acknowledged that immigration is “the primary reason poverty persists in the United States,” because poverty among native-born Americans declined from 1979 to 1999. He adds, “Factor out immigration and the rise in American inequality disappears.”

Using government reports, Krikorian (2008) estimated that 75 percent of the increase in poverty from 1989 to 1997 was due to immigrants and their native-born children. Telles and Ortiz (2008) found that overall, home ownership and overall wealth did not increase, for later generations of American-born descendents of Mexican American immigrants who were in the United States in 1965, unlike earlier European immigrants.

### **Environment**

Krikorian (2008)<sup>11</sup> has summarized some of the chief environmental impacts due to increased population that is primarily driven by massive immigration. Interestingly, per capita levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases since 1990 and per capita energy use since 1979 have declined. However, because of population increases, mostly due to immigration, greenhouse gases are up 16 percent and energy use is up almost 25 percent. Similarly, for solid waste, per capita levels stayed about the same from 1990 to 2005, but total levels increased by 20 percent.

### **Balkanization**

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. was a leading liberal democrat, one of the founders of Americans for Democratic Action, a professor of history at Harvard, and Special Assistant to President John F. Kennedy. In 1991 he published *The Disuniting of America* that insists on the importance of assimilation of immigrants. He said:

---

<sup>10</sup> Pages 10-11

<sup>11</sup> Pages 202-6

America increasingly sees itself as composed of groups more or less ineradicable in their ethnic character. The multiethnic dogma abandons historic purposes, replacing assimilation by fragmentation, integration by separatism . . . The militants of ethnicity now contend that a main objective of public education should be the protection, strengthening, celebration, and perpetuation of ethnic origins and identities. Separatism, however, nourishes prejudices, magnifies differences and stirs antagonisms (Schlesinger, 1991)<sup>12</sup>.

But even in the United States, ethnic ideologues have not been without effect. They have set themselves against the old American ideal of assimilation. They call on the republic to think in terms not of individual but of group identity and to move the polity from individual rights to group rights. They have made a certain progress in transforming the United States into a more segregated society. They have done their best to turn a college generation against Europe and the Western tradition. They have imposed ethnocentric, Afrocentric, and bilingual curricula on public schools, well designed to hold minority children out of American society. They have told young people from minority groups that the Western democratic tradition is not for them. They have encouraged minorities to see themselves as victims and to live by alibis rather than claim the opportunities opened for them by the potent combination of black protest and white guilt. They have filled the air with recrimination and rancor and have remarkably advanced the fragmentation of American life. . . . the upsurge of ethnicity is a superficial enthusiasm stirred by romantic ideologues and unscrupulous hucksters whose claim to speak for their minorities is thoughtlessly accepted by the media (Schlesinger, 1991)<sup>13</sup>.

The future of immigration policy depends on the capacity of the assimilation process to continue to do what it has done so well in the past: to lead newcomers to an acceptance of the language, the institutions, and the political ideals that hold the nation together (Schlesinger, 1991)<sup>14</sup>.

Just one example, reported in Tucson, Arizona, in 2008, illustrates the danger that Schlesinger is discussing (Mark Cromer, *The Washington Times*, July 4, 2008):

Ethnic Studies courses used as academic cover to brazenly indoctrinate

---

<sup>12</sup> Pages 16-7

<sup>13</sup> Pages 130-1

<sup>14</sup> Page 121

students with a racially based, anti-American perspective come as no surprise to John Ward, a former history teacher in the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD). Mr. Ward, who is of Latino heritage, was tapped to teach a history course at Tucson High Magnet School. Mr. Ward said he was comfortable that the course featured a Mexican-American perspective, but what he didn't know was that he was expected to only assign grades – a bureaucratic loophole that allowed the students to be lectured by advocates without teaching credentials.

The coursework was steeped in hard-edged anti-American rhetoric. "They declared students were living in an occupied, colonized land," Mr. Ward recalled. A central tenet of the instruction system was that white Americans oppress Latinos, and that the education system is a tool of white oppression. The impact on students, Mr. Ward said, was dramatic.

"By the end of the class, they were very pessimistic and angry about America," he said. "They were convinced that anyone who isn't brown is out to get them, to oppress them." When Mr. Ward challenged the angry, one-dimensional instruction students were receiving through the class, he said his own Latino heritage offered no protection. "They called me a racist, a tool of the oppressor, a 'Vendido', which means 'sellout,'" he said. "They replied that all education is politically-charged and that they must combat the dominant culture's view of history. They believe non-white kids need an anti-white curriculum."

If Mr. Ward was hoping that administrators from TUSD would intervene, he quickly learned otherwise. "They didn't want to pick this battle," Mr. Ward said. "They were white administrators that could see the writing on the wall if they tried to defend me. They'd immediately be tarred as 'racists.'"

Mr. Ward eventually resigned his position and now works for the Arizona state auditor. He said the radicals who lectured his class now have their credentials and are teaching "Raza Studies" at TUSD. The program is set to be expanded throughout the district.

Samuel Huntington is a professor of political science at Harvard who wrote *Who Are We?* to discuss American national identity and the possible cultural threat posed to it by large-scale Latino immigration. The following paragraph, paraphrased from his book, summarizes key aspects of our culture that need to be preserved, if it is to continue to thrive.

America is not a nation of immigrants, but rather of settlers and

immigrants. An Anglo-Protestant settler society came to the new world in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. Settlers leave an existing society as a group in order to establish a new community with a sense of collective purpose. Immigrants do not create a new society but rather join the existing society created by the settlers. Colonists conceived themselves founders, settlers, and planters, not immigrants. Settlers brought Christianity, Protestant values and moralism, a work ethic, English language, British traditions of law, justice, land ownership and limits on government power, and a legacy of European art, literature, philosophy, and music. This original culture persisted 300 years, including especially language, religion, principles of government, manners, and customs. Immigrants became Americans by adopting the Anglo-Protestant culture and political values, which benefited them and the country. Millions of immigrants achieved wealth, power, and status in American society precisely because they assimilated.

The fundamental message from Schlesinger and Huntington is that diverse cultures do enrich us with their art, music, literature, and culinary delights, but there are also core values concerning morality, family, political and social values and the rule of law that the majority of citizens want immigrants to assimilate.

Victor Davis Hanson (Hanson, 2003)<sup>15</sup> echoed this view, saying that “the Mexican immigrant could and should retain a pride in his ethnic heritage—to be expressed in music, dance, art, literature, religion and cuisine *only*—while being mature enough to see that the core political, economic and social values of his abandoned country were to be properly and rapidly forgotten.”

A number of largely unexpected international developments highlight how internal animosities can break nations apart. Very few foresaw the breakup of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, or Yugoslavia, tribal wars in Rwanda, Sudan, and Kenya, and the separatist movement in Quebec. If the United States continues to champion ethnic and racial divisions; concerns for social justice could have the unintended consequence of reinforcing developing hatreds between ethnic, racial, and national groups.

There is some evidence that such balkanization may already be occurring. During the Los Angeles riots of 1992, there were 2,000 injuries, some 53 deaths and about 1,100 buildings destroyed by arson. Subsequent review found that 45 percent of the buildings destroyed

---

<sup>15</sup> Page 82

were Korean-owned and that Blacks had targeted these properties partly in protest to the killing of a Black teenager who fought with a Korean store-owner and was killed. The Sheriff of Los Angeles County, Lee Baca, a Latino raised in east Los Angeles, stated in a recent *Los Angeles Times* editorial (June 12, 2008), “I would . . . suggest that some of L.A.’s so-called gangs are really no more than loose-knit bands of blacks or Latinos roaming the streets looking for people of the other color to shoot. Our gang investigators have learned this through interviews in Compton and elsewhere throughout the county.” He also states there is “a serious interracial violence problem in this county involving blacks and Latinos. . . Latino gang members shoot blacks not because they’re members of a rival gang but because of their skin color. Likewise, black gang members shoot Latinos because they are brown”.

Suzanne Fields (2005) quoted the cultural critic Terry Teachout regarding the loss of assimilation:

Teachout suggests now that the melting pot is battered beyond repair and the metaphor is obsolete. “The common culture of widely shared values and knowledge that once helped unite Americans of all creeds, colors and classes no longer exists,” he laments in *Commentary* magazine. “In its place, we now have a 'balkanized' group of subcultures whose members pursue their separate, unshared interests in an unprecedented variety of ways.”

### **Breakdown of Social Networks and Trust**

Harvard Professor Putnam surveyed 41 selected communities in the United States to determine what factors influence social capital (Putnam, 2007). Social capital is defined as “social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness.” His basic finding is that trust, altruism, and community cooperation is lower in ethnically diverse neighborhoods. Where social capital is higher, children grow up healthier, safer and better educated; people live longer, healthier lives; and democracy and the economy work better. Diversity, on the other hand, can lead to more creativity (for example, more Nobel laureates, National Academy of Science memberships, and academy awards). In support of his findings, Putnam cited a study performed at the county level that found counties with greater ethnic diversity were less socially connected (Rupasingha, 2006).

Putnam’s “Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey,” conducted in 2000, surveyed nearly 30,000 respondents representative of the 41 communities and contained a sample of 3,000 representatives of

the nation as a whole (Putnam, 2007). Los Angeles and San Francisco were among the most ethnically diverse “human habitations in history,” but had interracial trust measures that were relatively low, only half those found in New Hampshire and Montana. People in areas of greater diversity have lower confidence in local government and the news media, vote less often, are less likely to work on community projects, give to charity and volunteer less often, have fewer friends, have less perceived happiness and quality of life, and spend more time watching television. In short, members of diverse communities tend to withdraw more. The educated, well-off homeowners tended to be more trusting and young people, Blacks, and Hispanics, less so. Fundamental to this review, a high level of “immigration seems to have a somewhat more consistent and powerful effect” in terms of the negative influence on social capital than does ethnic diversity even after correcting for confounders.

Putnam found that social capital did not improve in communities that had diverse populations in 1980 and 1990 compared with communities that became diverse more recently in 2000 (Putnam, 2007). He speculated that social capital would increase over long time periods based partly on the immigration experience in the early 1900s. Putnam recommends that communities with high rates of immigration should reconstruct social identities (both immigrants and native-born) by assimilation and hyphenated identities that help ethnic groups see themselves as “members of a shared group with a shared identity.”

In 2007, *New America Media* conducted a telephone poll of 1,105 African-American, Asian-American and Hispanic adults. The poll supported Putnam’s findings. The sample was designed to be representative of the adult population of the three major racial and ethnic minorities in the United States. The poll was conducted in areas of the country that have significant (10 percent or more) African-American, Asian-American and Hispanic populations. The three groups seem more trusting of whites than of each other. The poll found that 61 percent of Hispanics, 54 percent of Asians and 47 percent of African-Americans would rather do business with whites than with members of the other two groups.

In addition, 44 percent of Hispanics and 47 percent of Asians are “generally afraid of African-Americans because they are responsible for most of the crime.” Meanwhile, 46 percent of Hispanics and 52 percent of African-Americans believe “most Asian business owners do not treat them with respect.” And half of African Americans feel threatened by Latin American immigrants because “they are taking jobs, housing and

political power away from the Black community.” The margin of error for the Asian-American sample (400 interviews), the Hispanic sample (355 interviews) and the African-American sample (350 interviews) is approximately 5 percentage points.

### **Polls Show Significant Support, Even Among Hispanics, for Reducing Illegal Immigration**

It is a surprising fact, in light of the impression left by the media, that legal Hispanic immigrants do not uniformly support amnesty or special treatment for illegal immigrants. Polls show majority support among American Hispanics for a variety of conservative immigration reforms, including requiring immigrants to be proficient in English (Bauer, 2007). An August 2005 *Time magazine* poll of Hispanics revealed that 61 percent considered illegal immigration either an “extremely serious” or a “very serious” problem, and 41 percent thought the United States was not doing enough to secure its borders against illegal immigration, while 19 percent felt it was doing “too much”. More recently, a June 2007 Gallup poll found an overwhelming majority of Hispanic-Americans (71 percent) feel immigration should stay at current levels or decrease (Bauer, 2007).

Another 2005 survey of 1,000 likely Hispanic voters conducted by a Democratic advocacy group found that 34 percent think there already are too many immigrants in the U.S. and that new entrants into the country should be reduced or stopped altogether (Lambro, 2005). Significantly, 53 percent of Hispanics said they would support a democratic candidate “who says the current level of immigration threatens American workers and our national security.”

In April 2007, McLaughlin & Associates conducted a national survey of 1,000 likely general election voters. An additional sample of 202 Latino voters was conducted to bring the national sample of Latinos to 300 respondents. The additional responses were then weighted into the overall results in order to ensure a sample representative of national voters. . . . The survey of 1,000 likely general election voters has an accuracy of  $\pm 3.1$  percent at a 95 percent confidence interval, while the subsample of Latino voters has an accuracy of  $\pm 5.6$  percent at a 95 percent confidence interval. Of the total sample, 73 to 82 percent supported requiring a valid photo ID to vote, prohibition of drivers’ licenses for illegals, repeal of local sanctuary laws that protect illegals, and changing U.S. laws granting birthright citizenship to any child whose parents are not U.S. citizens. Interestingly, 53 to 82 percent of all

Latinos surveyed supported these same measures. Latinos' support was the same as all respondents for requiring a valid photo ID to vote (82 percent), less for prohibition of drivers' licenses (59 percent among Latinos vs. 73 percent among all respondents), ten percent less for repeal of sanctuary laws (67 percent among Latinos vs. 77 percent among all respondents), and markedly less, but still a majority, for eliminating birthright citizenship if neither parent is a U.S. citizen (53 percent among Latinos vs. 73 percent among all respondents).

A Zogby-CIDAC poll of 1,010 citizens in the United States and 1,000 Mexicans was conducted in February 2006 (Dinan, 2006). The study revealed that just 36 percent of Mexicans have a favorable view of Americans, compared to 84 percent of Americans who have a favorable view of Mexicans. Approximately half of Mexicans give low ratings to Americans on the characteristics of being "hard working" (48 percent), "tolerant" (49 percent) or "honest" (43 percent). The biggest consensus among Mexicans is that 72 percent rate Americans highly on being racists. When asked why the United States is wealthier than Mexico, 62 percent of Mexicans selected because "it exploits others' wealth" (vs. 12 percent of U.S. citizens). Both surveys carry a margin of error of +/- 3.2 percentage points. An earlier Zogby poll of 801 Mexicans chosen at random throughout Mexico in 2002 found that 58 percent agreed that "the territory of the United States' Southwest rightfully belongs to Mexico". In the same poll, 57 percent said that "Mexicans should have the right to enter the U.S. without U.S. permission" (Krikorian, 2008)<sup>16</sup>.

A recent December 2007 poll by Harris Interactive for the "Bradley Project on America's National Identity" surveyed 2,421 respondents online and then weighted results by age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, income, and propensity to be online (*The Washington Times* editorial, June 8, 2008). The majority of those surveyed, including 80 percent of whites, 86 percent of Blacks and 74 percent of Hispanics fear that America is being balkanized and more divided along ethnic and cultural lines. Nearly 90 percent of all surveyed agreed "learning English and embracing American culture and values is important to successful immigration".

### **Ethical Considerations**

The following discussion of the ethical implications of mass immigration has been developed from the joint article "The Ethics of Immigration: An Exchange" by William W. Chip and Michael A.

---

<sup>16</sup> Page 57

Scaperlanda (*First Things: The Journal of Religion, Culture, and Public Life*, May 2008, pp. 40-46). A number of provocative points are made:

Catholics and many others feel that more prosperous nations have an obligation to help foreigners who come to their shores in search of security and a livelihood. However, this sentiment fails to recognize that Mexico is not Sudan. Unemployment in Mexico is about the same as in the United States, but minimum wages are much lower and opportunities to improve are almost non-existent for most. There is no poverty safety net similar to that in the United States and the divide between the rich and poor in Mexico is far greater.

The moral obligations that Catholics would impose on the prosperous nations is not one they impose on themselves to any significant degree. They do not offer free education in Catholic schools or free treatment in Catholic hospitals, because they cannot afford to. The practical question is whether government agencies in prosperous nations are capable of meeting the needs of mass economic migration without neglecting the responsibilities to their own young people, minorities, and those in poverty. It is arguable that federal, state, and local governments are barely capable of fulfilling promises to underprivileged Americans. From this, it would follow that they therefore cannot be expected to take on tens of millions of poor immigrants.

American workers are poorly protected in labor markets. The claim that Americans won't take jobs that immigrants do not stand up to examination. Native citizens have and are performing garbage collection and agricultural stoop-labor. Wages may not be generous, but they can cover rent, a car, and health insurance. Employers outsource these jobs through private contractors, providing paltry wages and little or no benefits. They then argue that a modest reduction in the wages of working-class Americans is a morally acceptable price to pay for helping immigrants escaping dire poverty. This begs the question of whether employing immigrants is the best way to alleviate global poverty. Data already presented here show that the United States cannot ensure social and economic assimilation of the enormous numbers of immigrants now in the country.

An unintended consequence of mass immigration has been the increasing dependence by families of upper-middle and upper classes on immigrant menials to clean their homes, provide landscaping, rear their children, and, by extension, take advantage of lower prices at hotels, restaurants, and newly constructed housing. In short, the well-off exploit immigrant labor to provide themselves a lifestyle that could not be

sustained without short-changing immigrants on health care, education, welfare, and retirement costs or passing those costs on to taxpayers. The majority of mainstream Americans, both liberal and conservative, broadly share goals of upward mobility for the poor, affordable welfare, and the availability of jobs for all citizens. At the same time, they will not accept third-world encroachments on their neighborhoods that undermine quality-of-life including improper disposal of trash, violation of local noise ordinances, high rates of pedestrian accidents, overcrowded residences, drugs and crime. Today's massive influx of immigrants prevents their getting beyond the low rung of the economic ladder.

Victor Davis Hanson (2003)<sup>17</sup>, who has worked with and taught many Mexican-Americans, documents the tough life of the agricultural immigrants working in California and their unethical treatment:

Roy Beck considers the ethical arguments of globalists, who contend that borders and communities are barriers to a just world and that well-off countries have an obligation to take in immigrants from the impoverished countries (Beck 20). He suggests "there may be incredible need in the rest of the world, but any attempt to meet all that need would mean worthless tiny gestures to each individual. So a person or a country must limit beneficence to a small enough number of people so they can actually benefit." Others argue that resources need to be directed to those already in the country who are ill-fed and unable to secure decent housing. Instead, he says, people need to systematically compare competing claims for immigration slots in terms of which groups have more moral weight than others and how will meeting the needs of one group of people have the effect of denying the needs of another group. Once the effort is made to choose immigrants ethically, it becomes clear that current U.S. immigration policy is a failure, oriented towards rewarding businesses and well-off Americans with cheap labor in a haphazard manner that has little to do with helping those who are most deserving of humanitarian aid.

### **Political Barriers and Solutions**

The Chicago Council on Foreign Relations conducted 2,800 interviews of ordinary Americans and a cross-section of 400 "opinion leaders" in 2002 (Beck and Camarota, 2002). Opinion leaders included journalists, company CEOs, university presidents and faculties, members of Congress, the administration, church leaders, and leaders of major

---

<sup>17</sup> Pages 48-59

interest groups. We are told that “the survey found that 70 percent of the public said that reducing illegal immigration should be a ‘very important’ foreign-policy goal of the United States, compared to only 22 percent of those in the elite” [i.e., the opinion leaders]. Regarding legal immigration, 55 percent of the public want it reduced, and 27 percent said it should stay the same. For elites, only 18 percent want it reduced and 60 percent want no cuts.

In an interview with *Front Page Magazine* (July 18, 2008), Krikorian suggested that “client politics” explains why politicians continue to allow mass immigration and poor enforcement despite “overwhelming opposition from the general public.” So Congress tends to side with groups like produce farmers, real estate developers, and owners of hotel and restaurant chains as well as ethnocentric groups like La Raza who claim to represent illegal immigrants and favor more leniency toward them. “When you have highly organized interests like this, all on the same side of an issue, with only the broader public interest in the other side, you can see how it’s hard to change things.” In the same interview, Krikorian also expressed concern that influential members of the elite (Congress, academics, business, and religious leaders) feel they have moved beyond the narrow, parochial concerns of the general public in favor of global interests. Such individuals have less concern for sovereignty and are less likely to favor employment of black teenagers over newly arrived illegal immigrants from Central America.

Many proponents of unlimited immigration entertain an image of one world where everyone will get along once the prosperous nations help them with their poverty and education. For example, Gregg Easterbrook, a senior editor of *The New Republic*, says “immigration is a social good; immigrants bring vitality to the economy and the culture, and in a troubled world the United States should take in as many as it can. (Easterbrook, 2003)<sup>18</sup>” Taking a contrary view, however, Dr. Victor Davis Hanson (2005) points out that:

Progressives are understandably proud of environmental legislation, zoning laws and the culture of recycling in states like California. But when millions in this country don’t speak English, are impoverished and uneducated, and live outside the law, it is only natural they lack the money to worry about how many families live in a single house, whether cars meet emission standards, or discarded furniture is disposed of in authorized landfills rather than on roadsides.

---

<sup>18</sup> Page 10

Hanson's book *Mexifornia* (Hanson, 2003)<sup>19</sup> summarizes the fundamental difficulty in achieving assimilation. He gained insight growing up on a farm in central San Joaquin Valley, California, and teaching at California State University, Fresno, where he had direct contact with migrants that allowed him to develop a compassionate understanding of their problems. He raises some important questions:

Rarely now do southwesterners express a confidence in our culture or a willingness to defend the larger values of Western civilization. The result is that our public schools are either apathetic about, or outright hostile to the Western paradigm—even as millions from the south are voting with their feet and their lives to enjoy what we so smugly dismiss. Our elites do not understand just how rare consensual government is in the history of civilization. They wrongly think that we can instill confidence by praising the less successful cultures that aliens are escaping, rather than explaining the dynamism and morality of the civilization that our newcomers have pledged to join . . .

How, then, can we recreate civic education to help unite an increasingly fragmented society, and to bring Hispanics and other recent arrivals into the body politic of the United States? It will not be easy—if only because millions of Americans in education, the arts and government have invested a great deal in, and profited handsomely from, a relativist and multicultural society that rejects any unifying core. Their dream is vastly different from the multiracial society in which millions of Americans with a broad spectrum of skin colors speak the same English, share the same commitment to the values of the Constitution, and gradually become indistinguishable through integration, assimilation and intermarriage. Returning to a multiracial society under the aegis of Western culture would put a lot of people in the universities, politics and government bureaucracies quite literally out of business . . .

The really perilous course lies in preserving the status quo and institutionalizing our past failed policies: open borders, unlimited immigration, dependence on cheap and illegal labor, obsequious deference to Mexico City, erosion of legal statutes, multiculturalism in our schools, and a general breakdown in the old assimilationist model. True, the power of popular culture can superficially unite us and prevent the dangerous balkanization of the type we have seen in Eastern Europe, at least for a time.

---

<sup>19</sup> Pages 86, 122, 144-5

Harvard Professor Borgas has focused on the approach of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand:

Canada, Australia and New Zealand have far more proactive approaches to immigration: They have devised systems that are designed to favor people who will contribute economically to the country and who will assimilate quickly . . . Canada, New Zealand and Australia have point systems designed to get them the immigrants that they want . . . All three countries take age, education level and English language proficiency into account, as well as family connection. (Borgas, 2001).

Both Germany and France now have programs to assure that Muslims who immigrate to those two countries assimilate more readily into the culture. In Germany, for example, one state interviews potential Muslim immigrants about the applicants' opinions on equal rights for women, religious freedom, tolerance for homosexuality and honor killings (Bryant, 2006). The German approach was initiated in response to 48 honor killings since 1996 where Muslim men (usually family members) killed women who did not follow through on an arranged marriage or married outside the faith. The purpose of the interview is to assure that future Muslims will accept under oath basic German law. Similarly, though less effectively, France has initiated a civics training program for imams and Muslim chaplains that aims to offer a broad-based understanding of French legal institutions, politics and republican values.

Readers interested in exploring other points related to the issues raised in this review are referred to Krikorian's new book *The New Case Against Immigration: Both Legal and Illegal*. He provides well-documented information about the history of the immigration issue, changes in the approaches to assimilation, effects on government spending, and potential threats to sovereignty and national security and most importantly, a sensible approach to reduce immigration that will alleviate many of the problems now experienced by citizens and legal immigrants.

### **Conclusion**

Projections by the Center for Immigration Studies, based on current immigration policy, estimate that in fifty years (2057) the population of the United States will be 458 million (Krikorian 2008)<sup>20</sup>. That's 100

---

<sup>20</sup> Page 194-5

million more than it would be if there were no immigration during that period. At that point, about 25-30 percent of the population would be immigrants and their children. Such a massive increase cannot help but bring more disruption in all the areas outlined in this brief review, including wages, crime, welfare, environmental concerns, and social trust.

Roy Beck, Executive Director of NumbersUSA, recommends reducing immigration to pre-1965 levels and has commented on the paradox that 70 to 80 percent of Americans want to see immigration markedly reduced, while most have not really spoken out much about legal immigration. In a video, *Immigration by the Numbers* (a compelling, graphic explanation of why immigration cannot significantly help solve world poverty problems, available on the top right-hand side of <http://www.numbersusa.org> homepage), he notes that many feel “we don’t want to talk about things that would hurt the feelings of our immigrant friends. And we would certainly not want to say anything or do anything that would bring hostility toward the foreign-born among us.” In short, he points to the paradox that Americans are pro-legal immigrant, but anti-immigration. He advocates directing resentment and political action “on public officials who have set immigration numbers without regard to their effect on the American people.”

The poll results among immigrants who are already in the United States show a widespread feeling that the current immigration chaos is unfair to the millions who entered the country legally. There are hundreds of thousands each year who are eager to assimilate. There is the sense that fairness to those who have abided by the law requires that they be given priority over those who violate the law. This lends itself to the view that state and local cooperation with federal efforts should be mandatory because the problem of chaotic illegal immigration is harmful to both native and naturalized citizens in so many ways.

This brief review of United States immigration problems suggests that teachers and professors, religious and business leaders, government and media programs who (or which) champion diversity and multiculturalism are having unintended adverse consequences in selected communities. Programs intended to improve the lives of immigrants should carefully pre- and post-test to determine whether the welfare and happiness of immigrants and their surrounding communities improve or deteriorate. More sophisticated multivariate and longitudinal studies of the type by Putnam (2007) and Telles and Ortiz (2008) are needed. Evidence presented here suggests a time-out from

current excessive immigration levels, more selective criteria for admission, eliminating birthright citizenship and chain migration, and assimilation through education are the best hope for helping legal immigrants already here and the communities they have joined. Educators who want to better understand the serious pitfalls of diversity and multiculturalism are advised to read the relatively short (both are about 150 pages long) books by Hanson (2003) and Schlesinger (1991).

## References

- Bauer, G.  
2007 "Lessons from the Immigration Debacle." *Human Events*, July 6, 2007.
- Beck, R.  
2007 "Sorting Through Humanitarian Clashes in Immigration". Available at: <http://www.numbersusa.com/content/files/pdf/sortingthroughhumanitarianclashesinimmigration.pdf> Beck, R. and S. A. Camarota.  
2002 "Elite vs. Public Opinion: An Examination of Divergent Views on Immigration." Washington, D.C.: Center for Immigration Studies, December 2002. <http://www.cis.org/articles/2002/back1402.pdf>
- Borgas, G.  
2001 "Let's be clear about who we want to let in." *Washington Post*. December 23, 2001.
- Bryant, E.  
2006 "Only educated aliens need apply in Europe." *Washington Times*. May 8, 2006
- Camarota, S. A.  
2007 "Backgrounder: Immigrants in the United States, 2007: A Profile of America's Foreign-Born Population." Washington, D.C.: Center for Immigration Studies, November 2007. <http://www.cis.org/articles/2007/back1007.pdf>
- CDC – Centers for Disease Control.  
2007 "Trends in Tuberculosis Incidence – United States, 2006." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 56(11);245-250, March 23, 2007.
- Chip, W. W. and Scaperlanda  
2008 "The Ethics of immigration: an exchange." *First Things: The Journal of Religion, Culture, and Public Life*. May 2008, pp. 40-46.
- Congressional Budget Office.  
2007 "The Impact of Unauthorized Immigrants on the Budget of State and Local Governments, December 2007." <http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/87xx/doc8711/12-6-Immigration.pdf>
- Cosman MP.  
2005 "Illegal aliens and American medicine." *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons* 10(1):6-10.
- Dinan, S.  
2006 "Americans view Mexicans well; reverse not true." *Washington Times* March 21, 2006.
- Easterbrook, G.  
2003 *The Progress Paradox: How Life Gets Better While People Feel Worse*. New York: Random House.

- Fields, S.  
2005 "Second chance for 'Western Civ.'" *Washington Times*, August 4, 2005.
- Hakimzadeh, S. and D. Cohn.  
2007 "English Usage Among Hispanics in the United States." Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center, November 29, 2007.
- Hanson, V. D.  
2005 "A Debate going nowhere." *Washington Times*, June 11, 2005.
- Hanson, V. D.  
2003 *Mexifornia: A State of Becoming*. New York: Encounter Books.
- House, B.  
2005 "Plan Wouldn't Count Non-citizens in Deciding States' representation." *Arizona Republic*, December 6, 2005.
- Huntington, S. P.  
2004 *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Krikorian, M.  
2008 *The New Case Against Immigration: Both Legal and Illegal*. New York: Sentinel.
- Lambe, S., Washington, D. L., Fink, A., et al.  
2003 "Waiting times in California's emergency departments." *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 41:35-44.
- Lambro, D.  
2005 "Poll finds Hispanics split on illegals, immigration." *Washington Times* Aug. 17, 2005
- Mac Donald, H.  
2006 "Hispanic Family Values? Runaway illegitimacy is creating a new U.S. underclass." *City Journal* Autumn 2006.
- Mac Donald, H., Hanson, V. D., and S. Malanga.  
2007 *The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today's*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Malanga, S.  
2006 "The Right Immigration Policy: Not amnesty or guest workers, but newcomers who would strengthen us." *City Journal* Autumn 2006.
- Martin, P. and M. Krikorian.  
2007 "Farm Labor Shortages: How Real? What Response?" Teleconference Transcript: The Center for Immigration Studies. November 2007. <http://www.cis.org/articles/2007/farmtranscript.html>
- McLaughlin, J. and G. Scime.  
2007 "National Survey Summary – Immigration Issue." McLaughlin & Associates, April 26, 2007. [http://www.mclaughlinonline.com/newspoll/np2007/070246\\_immigration.doc](http://www.mclaughlinonline.com/newspoll/np2007/070246_immigration.doc)
- New American Media.  
2007 "Deep Divisions, Shared Destiny – A Poll of African Americans, Hispanic, and Asian Americans on Race Relations." December 12, 2007.
- Passel, J. S.  
2006 "The Size and Characteristics of the Unauthorized Migrant Population in the U.S." Pew Hispanic Center Research Report March 7, 2006.
- Putnam, R. D.  
2007 "*E Pluribus Unum*: Diversity and Community in the twenty-first century: The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30(2):137-174.

- Rector, R. E. and C. Kim.  
 2007 "The Fiscal Cost of Low-Skill Immigrants to the U.S. Taxpayer." Washington, D.C.: Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation. .
- Rupasinha, A., Goetz, S. J., and D. Freshwater.  
 2006 "The production of social capital in US counties." *Journal of Socio-Economics* 35:83-101.
- Schlesinger, A. M. Jr.  
 1991 *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York: Norton.
- Smith, J. P. and B. Edmonston.  
 1997 *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Tella, A.  
 2006 "Immigration Economics." *Washington Times* March 13, 2006.
- Telles, E. E. and V. Ortiz  
 2008 *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tonelson, A.  
 2006 "Immigrants and wages." *Washington Times* May 8, 2006.
- U.S. Census Bureau.  
 2008 *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2008* (127th Edition) Washington, DC, 2008. <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/>
- Wilper, A. P., Woolhandler, S., Lasser, K. E., et al.  
 2008 "Waits to see an emergency department physician: U.S. trends and predictors, 1997-2004." *Health Affairs* 27(2): w84-w95.