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America is a nation composed almost entirely of immigrants. Immigrants began arriving in the Americas since at least 1492 and in what is today the United States since the early 1500s, immigrants continue to arrive five hundred and fifteen years later. After a process of genocide, displacement, pacification and relative assimilation of indigenous peoples, Anglos, Dutch, French and Spanish immigrants began formulating and instituting public and government policies that would sanction the importation and exploitation of other minorities whose labor would develop the vast resources of America, generate incredible wealth, build its infrastructure and establish cities, towns and industries that would be administered by the dominant Anglo-groups. Immigrant groups have been exploited for their labor while often being used politically as a scapegoat by politicians to avoid addressing the need for reform in the political, economic and social institutions of America and maintain the subordinate positions of minority groups.

While conducting this preliminary research it becomes evident that in addition to illuminating the many fallacies of anti-immigrant arguments that exist it is at the same time necessary to reveal the assumptions of anti-immigrant arguments of which include an explicitly racial component and intertwined the belief or practice deeming some groups as outsiders undeserving and with no rights in integrating into the United States and others who belong, apparently, by virtue of them absent in anti-immigrant arguments and in the presence of much of the studies and statistics available. For example, an explicitly racial component today include Mexican and Latino immigrants who are targeted with anti-immigrant arguments and harassed by the legal and policing institutions of America while the other two thirds of the majority immigrating groups, English and Asian, who are virtually absent from the arguments or claims. Furthermore, the studies available seem limited to unskilled, semi-skilled and low wage industrial labor and do little to address the impact of immigration on technical and professional labor. Traditional anti-immigrant arguments within the United States include the detrimental impact of immigrants on social services, educational systems and labor force. These anti-immigrant arguments have historically been nativist or racist in that they ignore simple statistical analysis of population characteristics and the overwhelming contributions of immigrant labor to
the wealth and productivity of America, the tax base and welfare programs and the educational system.

Traditional anti-immigrant arguments in reference to labor are reductionist and nativist contending that immigrants displace or steal jobs away from Americans.\(^1\) They assume first that the number of jobs available in America are fixed and immutable and secondly, continue to claim that the resources of America are to be owned, controlled and enjoyed by certain groups of people, harking back to the days of manifest destiny and the divine Anglo-Saxon duty to subordinate and dominate all resources and all non-Anglo peoples.\(^2\) These arguments are not based on fact and often successfully ignore the many benefits of immigration to America’s labor force and economy. Benefits of new immigration to the American economy include the augmentation of an aging workforce with a young, skilled, highly productive and flexible labor source, job creation, a decrease in unemployment rates, and large profit for sectors of the economy.

The participation of new immigrants in the American workforce is particularly beneficial when taking into consideration today’s rapidly aging “native” or rather, old and established immigrant population. Throughout American history various immigrant groups have arrived in their prime working years, skilled and educated, capable of filling a variety of jobs, and highly productive.\(^3\) Statistically immigrants arrive in the United States while in their twenties and thirties contributing their most productive years to the building and development of American resources and economy by providing their labor, and services. Hispanics as a labor source have the largest and youngest population averaging 26.5 years with 46.3% of the population falling within the 20-39 age group in contrast to the average 38.1 years for the white population of

---


which only 32.5% of that population falls within the same age range.\textsuperscript{4} Studies did not reveal the characteristics of other immigrant groups, including the United Kingdom or Asian countries. Immigrant populations benefit the American economy by contributing a young and productive worker as well as a skilled and relatively educated worker.

In spite of popular belief that immigrants are uneducated and unskilled, immigrants “possess extensive educations, and professional capabilities in greater proportions than the native labor force hence they are not poor in the important sense of having high earning potential.”\textsuperscript{5} New immigrants are skilled and educated at a higher rate than the old immigrant and predominantly European population of America. In 1980, “16% of employed natives were professional and technical workers compared to 26% of immigrants.”\textsuperscript{6} Together with the skill, education and youth of immigrant labor they represent a work force that is flexible in job location and therefore “help the economy adjust to changing conditions.”\textsuperscript{7} In addition to the immediate benefits of immigration, the labor source is necessary for our future well being as a Nation.

The impact of this young new immigrant labor force on our economy is necessary for America’s economic well being in the years to come, a “short term a large influx of immigrants may forestall a sever labor shortage in future decades” and “with the drop in the fertility rate, as the baby boomers reach retirement, fewer workers will have to support an increasingly large number of people drawing social security.”\textsuperscript{8} While 3.25 workers support each social security retiree today the ratio will drop 2 to 1.” Americans need immigrant labor to help support the


aging population. Immigrants are coming in during their most productive years and are having more children therefore contributing to the work force in the future and if allowed to become citizens also contributing to the support of retirees in the future. The American population is rapidly aging, with 11.3% of the total sixty-five years of age or older. This generation “tends to be economically dependent because they consume rather than produce,” while only 2.9% of immigrants are 65 or older, 61.6% of immigrants admitted for occupational purposes are between the ages of 20-39. Historically immigration has been the key to Americas relative success providing the productive labor needed to develop, diversify and strengthen its economy.

Labor intensive industries have a long history of gaining wealth from the labor of immigrants, Corporate America is dependent on an exploitable labor force. Businesses that benefit from population growth such as real estate and construction immediately benefit from immigrant labor. Republicans whose constituents are big business and the religious corporations have historically supported pro-immigration policies, especially temporary work programs. Temporary worker programs, such as the Bracero program and Reagan and George W. Bush “immigration reform” policies are “elite driven – supposed to produce the allocational benefits of migration while avoiding the distributional costs.” Temporary work programs are an efficient way to exploit labor without greatly benefiting or including new immigrants into the American system, and avoid further ethnic and racial diversification of the documented or authorized population. Historically temporary work programs allow immigrants to contribute their labor long enough to benefit corporate profit and consumer savings but send those workers

---


back to avoid integrating them into Americas social, political and economic system.\textsuperscript{16} By forcing immigrants to return home after their labor has been exploited also maintains the white majority population in America, especially when taking into consideration that there has never been a social or political movement controlling, limiting, or agitating for the return of Canadian, or European whites to their original countries. Corporations benefit from immigrant labor often paying immigrants one-tenth the wages they would an American. Immigrant labor is readily available, replaceable, cheap, exploitable, and highly productive.\textsuperscript{17} It is through the exploitation of immigrant labor that the resources of the continent have been exploited and the wealth of the country amassed, beginning in the 1600’s whether by African’s in the tobacco, indigo, rice and cotton plantations, the Irish in the industrial sweat and manufacturing shops in the north east, the Chinese, Irish, indigenous, and Mexicans building the rail roads or in the corporate agricultural fields of the southwest.\textsuperscript{18} While legalized slavery has been abolished, businesses are seldom punished for hiring undocumented workers and they apparently lack a viable system to verify new hire work eligibility.\textsuperscript{19} A viable system is undesirable for businesses who exploit workers not under the protection of the government and who lack agency within its system. If borders were truly open and free, immigrants would be able to stand with American workers to demand better wages and conditions and contribute to labor movements.\textsuperscript{20} Instead, businesses prefer unauthorized labor, they benefit by making larger profits not required to pay a minimum wage, provide medical, benefits or retirement. Unauthorized immigrants live with in the shadows of industrial and corporate America scraping a livelihood while being the political scapegoat for social and economic problems.

Throughout United States history with every economic slump or crisis it is the newest and most ethnically different or non-white immigrant group who are scapegoats for the economic struggles and increasing unemployment rate that is characteristic of an industrial capitalistic

\textsuperscript{17} Center for Immigration Studies “Illegal Immigration,” (2006) \url{http://www.cis.org/topics/illegalimmigration.html}.
\textsuperscript{20} Center for Immigration Studies “Illegal Immigration,” (2006) \url{http://www.cis.org/topics/illegalimmigration.html}.


In spite of the fallacies surrounding the arguments that immigrants steal jobs or monopolize jobs Americans would otherwise have, they persist in common belief and are perpetuated politically. Anti-immigration arguments continue to be fueled/persuaded by Malthusian logic that if there is increased population, the resources available will become scarce, including jobs. Malthusian logic is also akin to social Darwinism, a social science that has been used to justify the subordination and exploitation of lower economic castes and racial and ethnic minorities. Employment opportunities however are not fixed, just as population growth
historically has not decreased the standard of living, but resulted in a higher standard of living.\textsuperscript{26} There is a general misconception that the number of jobs is fixed, and that more people implies more unemployment.

Another contention of nativists or anti-immigrationists are that while immigrants take jobs they also contribute to an increasing unemployment rate, again blamed for another structural flaw not immigration. Stephen Moores’ study examined how the rates of immigration into a large number of cities in the America from 1960-76 related to changes in unemployment rates and found that the effect was either very small or nonexistent.\textsuperscript{27} “A study by Thomas Muller of the Urban Institute found no evidence of increased unemployment in California due to Mexican labor.”\textsuperscript{28} Studies have found that there is negligible damage to citizens’ ability to “acquire jobs where immigrants concentrate such as the hotel and restaurant industries usually because natives have better paying alternatives, including welfare programs.”\textsuperscript{29} In addition, unemployment is lower where there are concentrated immigrant populations, not higher unemployment.\textsuperscript{30} According to research immigrants have considerable awareness of labor market conditions here and tend not to come if their skills are in small demand.\textsuperscript{31} Immigrants come to the United States to work and for few other main reasons, if there was no work available, they would not spend the time, money and resources immigrating in addition to the political and financial harassment they must endure from local, state and federal government. In addition, while Workers in a particular industry may be displaced temporarily, no more so that by new technology or innovations, and

sooner than later those displaced workers readjust and are integrated back into the system reaching the same equilibrium of employment and unemployment as previously established. According to limited studies, in the economy as a whole, immigrants not only take jobs, they make jobs. Their income adds to total demand, creating new jobs and they open businesses that employ natives as well as other immigrants and themselves.\textsuperscript{32} 

The studies and statistics generated seem to address immigrants impact on unskilled and semiskilled sectors, the impact on professional positions such as Academia is unknown. Regardless, population increase, whether by immigrants or otherwise, expands aggregate demand, creates more business opportunities, makes it more attractive to invest in expansion and new ventures by reducing risk.\textsuperscript{33} The income immigrants earn increases the demand for goods and for workers to produce them across a range of occupations which in turn produces more income and more new jobs. Eventually, new immigrants “create as many jobs as they themselves occupy.” “This continues until the economy approaches a new equilibrium with the same rate of unemployment as before.”\textsuperscript{34} In addition, “the mobility that process creates also results in a more efficient allocation of resources.” \textsuperscript{35} Immigrants create more jobs through the businesses they start and statistically start businesses at a higher rate than Americans. While 11\% of Americans are entrepreneurial, over 14\% of immigrants begin businesses.\textsuperscript{36} In California, the state


receiving the largest portion of immigration into America, this is more than evident, visit any neighborhood throughout southern California and walk into the locally owned businesses and you will be greeted by immigrants from a variety of origins including Mexico, Peru, Korea, China, Vietnam, Iran, Lebanon and Italy to name a few, all providing goods and service to Americans in addition to jobs.

The argument that immigrants take jobs is furthered by the assumption that with “some displacements some reduction in wages must occur when potential workers are added to an occupation, whether laboring or doctoring.” In industrial and labor intensive work the blame for decreased wages is traditionally placed on immigrants, usually an immigrant minority group who collectively lack agency and power rather than the corporations who are in the place of power to decide how much profit they will share with their workers through wages. In 1999, Julian R. Betts in his report to the United States House judiciary subcommittee on Immigration and Claims found that the question of whether immigration causes wage depression is not definitive and that there are several studies that argue that immigration both decreases wages, or has no impact.

The studies that include evidence of decrease wages for the uneducated and unskilled American workers due to immigrant labor are relevant to about ten million, predominately African American workers of a population of 300 million. Anti-immigration arguments mask or scapegoat issues that are characteristic of an industrial capitalistic system that institutionalized and legalized a race based caste system beginning in the 1630s. The social, political and economic position of African Americans has been determined by law and institutionalized racism for all of American history, therefore blaming new immigrants for a condition that has been characteristic of America for 377 years is another smoke screen for addressing those conditions of racism that persist. Furthermore, for those studies that exhibit a decrease in wages the impact is negligible relative to the .33% of the population impacted, regardless again it is the


corporations who decide the wages and profit to be made off of labor, as well as who they prefer to hire, not the laborers themselves. While this may be the case for lower skilled and labor intensive jobs, little research is available on the impact of immigration on professional jobs.

Overall, “in the long run legal immigrants arrive with considerable education and skills and enter a wide variety of occupations hurting no occupation or income level much, even in the short run.” A report by Center for Immigration Studies contends that 8 million immigrants create job competition for 10 million uneducated and unskilled Americans and result in the decrease in wages by 5%. Although the report is not specific concerning which industries wages are impacted. It makes sense that there would be a decrease in wages for the lowest paid segment in society, more specifically labor intensive, low skill industries in which corporation prefer illegal immigrant labor because they can decrease the wages paid, in this case it is corporate practices that should be taken to task and not the workers.

Studies that specifically calculate the benefit of immigrant and unauthorized labor to industry and corporate profits and compare those profits to the wages paid and the benefits, medical and retirement not provided is very much needed. In spite of the absence of these studies it is logical to assume that corporations benefit greatly by paying lower wages and not providing benefits, retirement or medical, just as planters of the antebellum south benefited greatly from the work of Africans and Native Americans, and the Rail Roads Barons from the work of Chinese, Mexicans and Irish. Today, labor organizations support immigration and the facilitation of citizenship, they understand that immigration is about supply and demand and that if labor is able to unite they are more capable of taking corporations to task and bargaining collectively for better wages and conditions. Overall, the evidence and statistics provided in all the given studies used here, in spite of some their analysis of the evidence, suggest the arguments against immigrations negative impacts on labor and wages are false. Another “charge against
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immigration is that immigrants become public charges draining welfare money from American tax payers, solid evidence gives the lie to this charge.”  

A report by the National Academy of Science estimated that the government spends 500 Billion annually of social services and that 1.5% of Americans use public assistance while 1.8% of immigrants use public assistance. Given that the population of America is 300 million, that is roughly 4.5 million Americans using public assistance. Given the population of immigrants is roughly 35 million, that that is roughly 600,000 immigrants using public assistance. The burden of immigrants on public assistance is miniscule compared to Americans. The Academy also provided statistics for American versus immigrant use of any one or more of the following programs: Supplemental Food Stamps, Public or subsidized housing, Medicaid, and WIC. They found that 15.8% of 300 million Americans use any one of the above programs or more compared to 28.6% of 35 Million immigrants. In numbers that computes to 47.4 million Americans using welfare programs compared to 10 million immigrants. A study by Borjas found that between 1970 and 1990 11.5-13.2% of Americans used public assistance compared to 10.7 – 11.6% of immigrants, bringing the number of people using public assistance down both in the American and immigrant populations and furthermore, his statistics would argue even further in favor of immigrants arguing that only 3.5 – 4 million or so immigrants use public assistance while 34.5- 39.6 million Americans use public assistance.

Although the Center for Immigration Studies found similar conclusions statistically to the National Academy of Science, the argument or analysis put forth is that immigrants have “overwhelming” positive impacts on American economy, social services and education. In further support of pro-immigrant arguments, when programs for the elderly are included in the use of public funds, given the youth of immigrant populations, “immigrant families use fare less

public funds than do [Americans] natives.” And while immigrant families may use public services initially, when immigrants retire, “their children contribute to their support thus placing no burden or delaying burdens upon the tax system.” Overall, immigrants pay more into social services than they utilize. “Most employed immigrants pay federal income and social security taxes and do not use disproportionate amounts of those services funded by the federal government.”

The estimates given for the use of government services by unauthorized immigrants are small, many do not apply for fear that they will be revealed as unauthorized when they apply. The estimates of use of services include the following in reference to an unauthorized population that estimates put in a range of 3 million to 11 million. An estimated 5% use free medical, 4% use unemployment insurance and food stamps and 1% use welfare or public education. Practically none receive social security but 77% pay social security taxes and 73% have federal taxes withheld. Unauthorized immigrants contribute far more to the system of welfare and social services than they themselves utilize, in fact, they are contributing to the services that benefit Americans.

“A nationwide survey of natives and immigrants done by the census Bureau shows that immigrant families pay more in taxes than do native families, on average, and use less in welfare

The average American family in 1975 paid $3008 taxes in 1975 in comparison to immigrant that paid $3359 and $3592. Each year natives are enriched by an average of $1343 through the public coffers for each additional immigrant family. In 1981 the value of an immigrant family discounted at 3% inflation adjusted was $20,600 in 1975 dollars... at 6% inflation the value is $15,800 and at 9% inflation the value of an immigrant family is $12,400 per year.  A “reasonable” estimate of tax accounting provided by Borjas shows that immigrants received $23.8 billion in government entitlement and paid $85.4 billion in taxes. “In sum immigrants benefit natives through public coffers by using less than their share of services and paying more than their share of taxes. They cover the additional public capital needed on their account through the debt service on past investments.”

Immigrants will also assist Americans in supporting retirees and helping to ease the social security burden on the younger American populations. “According to demographers, while 3.25 workers support each social security retiree today,” without immigration, “in the next century the ration will drop 2 to 1.” Immigrants will contribute to the future workforce and the amount of Americans paying into social security. Even the small numbers of immigrants who are

elderly are not eligible for social security and the children of retired immigrants support them with their taxes as well as immediate caretaking.\textsuperscript{60} Essentially, in years to come, the children of immigrants will be supporting their parents as well as the parents of Americans as they are reaching retirement age. The fallacies concerning the impact of immigration on American society, economy and educational institutions continue to be perpetuated, and without facts to prove those arguments.

Nativists argue that immigrants lower educational quality for Americans, are a financial burden on the educational system, and that educating immigrants does not benefit the Nation. These arguments are not substantiated through research based theoretical analysis. In addition, the public education system was approved and perpetuated in effort to assimilate foreigners into the American mainstream or to Anglocize them into the body politic.

Anti-immigrationists contend that immigrants lower the educational quality of America's schooling institutions. This argument is not based on any studies or facts and so continues to be a controversial issue. “Despite the growing presence of immigrant students in the nation’s largest cities and states, research about their schooling experience is limited.”\textsuperscript{61} The failure to research both the educational experiences of natives and immigrants and analyze the quality of education provided to either results in a mute argument. A preliminary analysis of school enrollment statistics was conducted to augment the lack of studies. According to the census bureau, approximately 75 million students are enrolled in the Nation’s educational institutions.\textsuperscript{62} Of these students approximately 7.5\% or 7 million of 75 million students are immigrants. This suggests that claims that immigrants lower the educational quality received by natives is false due to their statistical insignificance.\textsuperscript{63} However, blaming a relatively small population for the flaws of the educational system, in a country that spends the majority of its budget on military endeavors is another example of minority population being used as a scapegoat for larger issues.


In addition, America has a long history of denying access to education and equal education to minorities, this history and the impact of institutionalized racism for the most of American history is more likely to be the culprit of poorer standards of education in minority communities rather than due to those minority themselves. This argument perpetuates a “blame the victim” mentality that the clients or students of the institution are failing the institution rather than the reality that the institutions are failing the people who they are argued to serve.

The argument that immigrants are a financial burden to the educational system is nonsensical, biased, and ill informed. According to testimony delivered to the U.S. House Judiciary Committee evidence regarding the precise effect of immigration on the Nation’s educational institutions is non-existent. This is contributed to the fact that reliable data is not collected for this student population. “Although the census data are the most comprehensive, they represent a count of all youth, including those too young to be enrolled in school. The only national count of immigrant students is collected as part of a small federal categorical program targeted to students who have been in the United States for three years or less.” In addition, educating the Nation’s population is important to introduce educated and skilled labors into the workforce. While there may be costs of education, they are not a burden and in the long run only a benefit contributing to the nations economic and intellectual stability. Furthermore, it is an obligation of the American system to educate its youth, regardless of what generation of immigrant they may represent.

This obligation has been established through litigious actions such as Plyler v. Doe. “The first, Plyler v. Doe (102 S. Ct. 2382), is the case most directly relevant to immigrant children. In Plyler, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1982 that the states had a responsibility to educate the children of undocumented immigrants and held for the first time that the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment extends to anyone, “whether citizens or strangers,” who resides within the boundaries of a state, regardless of immigration status (Hull, 1983).” Those who argue about the burdens that immigrants placed on the Nation’s infrastructure fail to recognize

---

the contributions of this population. “Immigration is a policy area where the economic and social benefits generated by newcomers are diffuse and long term.”

Betts argued that immigrants make up ¼ of the growth of the national labor force population and for this reason it is important to determine if this population is receiving an adequate education. According to the conclusion of a study presented to the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, policy change is necessary to meet the needs of immigrants. It is necessary for policies to favor the educational attainment of immigrants because they are large portion of the growth of the labor force “and hence are of increasing importance to the nation’s economic future.” In addition, “A few respondents in each state, however, saw the problems facing immigrant students in a broader context. For example, a number of respondents in California mentioned that there was a need to provide more and better training for adult immigrants. In their view, that training includes the opportunity to gain what has been called “an employability level of English proficiency.” Therefore, it would be fiscally irresponsible not to invest in the Nation’s future.

The adoption of legislation, programs, teaching methods and progressive institutions will make a mere dent in our xenophobic society. As stated by Forbes, “The attack on bilingual education and on American languages is not based on rationality but is another example of race-hate and xenophobic ethnocentrism”. It is apparent that our education system has both made great strides but has also had many downfalls. It is yet to early to speculate on its precarious future. While immigrants are often blamed for degrading the educational system, so too are they often targeted for abusing Social Services programs.

Nativists continue to argue that immigrants benefit from programs without contributing to them significantly overextending the programs and costs to the average American. According
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to the statistics gathered by the same institutions that make these arguments immigrant populations continue to be used to scapegoat real need for economic and social reform in America and that the actual numbers of immigrants that use these services are relatively miniscule compared to the Americans who continue to use them. Poverty continues to be an institutional problem, not a minority problem.

Anti-immigrationists continue to argue that immigration is at an all time high and that continued immigration will negatively impact the American economy and way of life. This argument has been made for decades and at least for the last 100 years or so is incorrect. One measurement of the affects of Immigration on population demographically is “directly, thorough the contribution of new members to the population,” or net immigration, the number of immigrants minus the number of emigrants. 72 Limited statistical studies and analysis are available on the impact of immigration on population growth, and though the statistical conclusions differ from study to study, not so much that they challenge the arguments made here, so a percentage range is given that reflects the differences of the studies available. Between 1990-2000 immigration accounted for 8% of the American population, and this included all immigrants who entered the United States since 1970. In America generally, there has been no increase in the rate of immigration since before 1930. “In some ways the effect of the “new” immigrants have been very minor up to this moment” and “the relative flow of immigrants to the US has been small compared to the size of the United States population and has been concentrated in several states and in major metropolitan areas,” such as Los Angeles, Chicago, New York and Miami. 73

The highest rate of immigration since 1870 occurred between 1860-1920 when the number of immigrants who entered the United States every decade fluctuated between 12-17 million and accounted for 11.6-14.7 percent of the population. Immigration peaked in the decades 1901-1910 with 14.7% of the population being foreign born in contrast to 1.6% of the population being foreign born in the 1960s and fluctuating between 4.7 and 8.8% for the past

The peak year in legal immigration was 1907 when immigration added more than 3% to the labor force in that year alone; Contemporary immigration has only about one-tenth the impact as 1907.75

Between 1790-1870 the highest rate of immigration accounted for 9.7% of the population, of course studies on immigration have failed to take into account the violent demographic flip beginning in 1600’s when European immigrants began their colonizing process of which included genocide replacing the original 10 million or so native inhabitants with thousands of Europeans.76 In California, the demographic flip took place with the beginning of the American Gold Rush in 1849. What began as a Californio, Native American, Mexican gold rush in 1848, turned into a terrorized era when Anglos flooded the region killing and enslaving the native peoples. By 1865 the “white” or largely Anglo population increased from being less than one percent of the population to 98-99% of the population. By 1865 Anglo expansion and colonization created a white majority and resulted in the continental completion of manifest destiny and California statehood.77 While European immigration to America did have devastating impacts on the economy, culture and way of life already established, immigration since that initial demographic flip has had an impact that is obviously beneficial and negligibly negative, if any.

The Growth of immigrant population is, 1.1 million per year, this does not include deaths and out-migration.78 Taking into consideration that 280,000 immigrants return home each year and 500,000 new immigrants arrive each year, only 250,000 new immigrants increase the population each year.79 The net immigration, immigration – emigration and mortality is roughly 250,000 per year. The rate of immigration, or immigration relative to population size, has not

---

increased compared to any time in United States history since at least 1900. In fact, Immigration relative to population size is about half the levels of the early 20th century. Net Immigration has decreased since 1900.

The second measure used to examine the impact of immigration on population demographically is the theoretical future reproduction of the population. First, when you consider that the white or European immigrants have consistently accounted for 85-89% of the population and continues to account for the majority of population growth, it is European immigration that has had the largest and will continue to have the largest impact on population growth. The impact of new and relatively more racially diverse immigration on population growth of old and established immigrants may be higher than in the past for two reasons. First, racist immigration legislation established in 1790 and active until 1952 was relaxed with the Immigration Act of 1965 allowing for a more racially diverse immigrant population and the second, the age and fertility of the American population.

Between 1990-1999 immigration accounted for a population increase of 7.5 million while natural increase in population growth after births-deaths accounted for an increase of 16 million people. Natural increase of the American population continues to be at least twice as great as new immigration contributions to the population. Immigration now provides a somewhat greater proportion of population growth than early in the century even though it is now at a much lower rate than at the turn of the century. This is due to the lower fertility rates of the American population that have produced lower levels of natural increase. In the current situation immigration plays a greater role in affecting overall population growth. Even considering these factors, 80% of annual population growth results from natural increase – the amount by which births exceed deaths. 20% is due to net immigration estimated at 200,000 -

In 2006, the population of America reached 300 million, 277 million people are categorized as white. The five million or so Europeans that continue to be admitted, even the 4.4 million Asians that continue to be admitted are not targeted as contributing to societies ills while the 5 million or so Mexicans and Latinos are continuously targeted and harassed.

Another fallacy that is constantly replayed in America in the news, politically and privately includes the argument that unauthorized Mexican immigrants are flooding our borders and will cause irrevocable harm if not stopped. While the Native Americans and Californio population of Mexican California can successfully make that argument about Europeans beginning in the 1600’s and onward, the Majority of Americans today who are European and their descendants can only argue that America instead has a long history of integrating its new immigrants successfully into its racial caste system resulting in a higher standard of living. European immigration throughout the 1600-1800’s resulted in the industrial revolution and contributed the America emerging as the world power by the end of World War One. “Historical situations where the flow was large relative to the residential population” such as from “west Germany and Japan after WWII” and “Israel in the 1950s, with massive immigration from Arab countries” “were all successful economically according to almost every stud.” Not to mention the 277 million white immigrants over the past four hundred years.

For the past several decades it has been predominately the Mexican immigrants, especially those who arrive undocumented whom sound the nativist alarm. Statistically however, if there are indeed negative impacts, they are certainly negligible when considering their impact on the population. An estimated 8 million Mexican immigrants of a total American population of 300 million are blamed for every structural flaw in the American system from economic downturns to lowered educational standards. An estimated 200,000 - 400,000 Mexican immigrants legally and illegally enter the United States bringing the unauthorized Mexican population to roughly 3.5-11 million out of a total immigrant population of 27-35 million.

Some Statisticians and demographers argue that the estimate of unauthorized immigration is closer to 0 and there has been no increase in net illegal immigration since 1977 with a steady population of 2-4 million unauthorized immigrants.\textsuperscript{89} Unauthorized immigrants account for a maximum of \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the foreign born population, this is the stock immigrant population, so it includes all new immigrants since 1970.\textsuperscript{90} There is also a fallacy perpetuated that all illegal immigrants are seasonal agricultural workers, even if this is the case their population is negligible.

Between 2003 and 2005, 28-32 million immigrants have been admitted into the United States, only 117,000-129,000 of those were seasonal workers and only 4.8 million were from Mexico while the majority came from the United Kingdom of which contributed 5 million immigrants to the American population while Japan contributed 4.4 million immigrants.\textsuperscript{91} Throughout the 70s, 80s, and 1990s unauthorized immigration into the United States has been estimated at 200,000 to 300,000 people per year.\textsuperscript{92} Reports guess that 43 percent of unauthorized immigrants live in California, and in 1999 was home, at least temporarily, to a foreign born population that that has been estimated to amount to 21.7-30 percent of the


\textsuperscript{90} Jeffrey S. Passel and Barry Edmonston, “Immigration and Race in the United States: The 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} Centuries,” \textit{Program for Research on Immigration} Policy (1992): 15.


Ironically, Nativists make the argument that Mexican’s are taking over, considered from a historical perspective it has taken over one hundred and fifty seven years for that population to recover its former place as a majority ethnic or racial group in this territory. Even more interesting is that it is likely that many Mexicans would choose not to stay in the United States, but rather return home if allowed free access across the border. Many come to make a living that is not available in Mexico due to its subordinate economic and political position in the global market and to the United States. So while it is historically obvious that the rate of immigration has not increased since the last great waves of European immigration, the political panic is due to racial issues not questions of immigration or population growth.

While the rate of immigration has not increased or decreased substantially since 1930, the racial and ethnic composition as changed significantly since 1965 and perhaps even since 1609. “The racial and ethnic characteristics of the new immigrants are distinctive, the age, sex and educational characteristics, however, are not markedly different from those immigrants who previously came from Europe and Canada.” On March 26, 1790 Congress passed an act that restricted naturalization or citizenship to white persons establishing a racial prerequisite that would remain law until 1952. The changing ethnic and racial composition of new immigrants since 1965 is due to revisions in the United States Immigrant admission policies instituted in Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965.

---

European immigration has accounted for the highest rate of immigration consistently beginning in the early 1600s until 1965 as reflected in a racial majority since at least 1900 when it reached 87%. Before 1965 the US immigration policy restricted annual immigration with a system of country quotas that reflected the ethnic and racial composition of 19th century America, predominately white European. Until the 1950s virtually all immigration was from Europe and Canada. Throughout the 1950s Europeans continued to contribute 66% of immigrants to the United States population. The remaining one-third were from Asia (6%), Mexico (12%), and other countries so Latin America (14%).

White European immigration has had by far the largest impact in American history. The white population grew from 66 million in 1900 to 187 million in 1990, three quarters of the 1990 white population is attributable to the original 1900 population. The majority of 20th immigration of whites occurred in the first three decades of the century. The relative impact of this early immigration wave on the 1990 population is very apparent. 36 million or 19% of the 1990 white population is contributed to European immigration during the 1900-1930. For whites the 1900-1930 wave has more than 3 times the impact of all post 1930 immigrants.

The revised rules of 1965 opened the door for immigration from many different countries by eliminating the restrictive and racist national quotas. The 1965 law also raised the overall numerical ceiling for annual immigration to 270,000, although no more than 20,000 could come from any one country assuring no overwhelming population of specific ethnic or racial enclaves.

As the number of legal immigrants increased during each of the past four decades, from 2.5 million in the 1950s to 6 million in the 1980s the racial composition as reflected in the regions of

---

origin have also changed. In the 1980’s 40% of legal immigrants came from Mexico and Latin America, 37.3 – 44 % came from Asia and 10.4%– 14% from Europe and Canada. Mexico continues to be the largest single source of legal immigrants accounting for 12-14% of the flow during each of the past four decades. Considering the location of Mexico, this shouldn’t be surprising, statistics are needed addressing the amount of unauthorized immigration from the predominately white European country to the North that has consistently contribute new immigrants to the United States. Asian Immigration expanded from 6% of legal immigration in the 1950s to 44% in the 1980s. Immigration from Latin America expanded steadily accounting for 40% or 2.4 million legal immigrants in the 1980s.

Mexico continues to account for about 12-14% of immigration into the United States but has never reached the levels of European immigration, as reflective of a population that has maintained an 80 percentile of white immigrants and their descendents since 1609. Between 1990-1999 the resident population was 273 million, 196 million of that population was white while 77 million were non-white. In 1999, The fastest growing non white populations Include Asian and Pacific Islander, 45% growth, 4% of the population, 11 million residents; 2. Hispanic all races, 40% growth, 9 – 11.5% of the population, 31 million residents; 3. Black, 14% increase, 12.3 to 12.8% of the population, 35 million residents; 4. Native American, 16% increase, 1% of the population, 2 million residents. In 1990, only 8% of the population, or about 20.3 million out of a population of 249 million can be attributed to immigrants who entered the United States since 1970 and their off spring.

---

For the last 400 years White Europeans have been the largest immigrant population and maintained a white majority in the United States, having by far the largest and most devastating impact on American culture, economy and ethnic and racial characteristics. The United States “has been a biracial society, a white majority, black minority, and small American Indian population.” Prior to massive European migration and enslavement America was characterized as a multi-ethnic, extremely diverse continent and is now again becoming a multi-ethnic society as well as multi-racial. The white-European portion of the population however continues to maintain its majority status while the African-American, Asian, Latin and Native American populations continue to grow. Over the last one hundred years, or since 1900, the white population has dropped from 87% to a little more than 85%. This change is especially significant because it provokes fear for many in the white majority that the ethnic composition in the distant future may again reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of America before massive European immigration. Multi racial immigration also greatly challenges the great bulwarks American government has built over the past 377 years to avoid a non-white majority and maintain subordination of minority groups.

According to nativists immigrants take jobs, overburden social services, are detrimental to educational institutions, and harm the economic stability of the nation. These contentious statements serve as fodder to the hypersensitive nature of the American populace. It is through this propaganda that nativists are able to endorse anti-immigrant militia groups, such as the Minutemen; in the states of California, Nevada, and Texas. These groups further the anti-immigrationist agenda and push for legislation that would strip natural born citizens with undocumented parents of their citizenship birthright.

The most salient cliché in the global society is “American as apple pie,” which simultaneously stands for economic/social stability. In an attempt to explain the nuances of American citizenship obtainment, it was necessary for the utilization of an understandable

analogy. The primary idea that has been purported to the global society is that the American dream (which for immigrants is citizenship) is analogous to apple pie. The obtainment of citizenship in America can be compared to a sweet, tart, rich, decadently melting piece of apple pie in your mouth on a cold winters day. However, it is ironic that the invention of apple pie, which has long stood as an icon of Americana, is not a homeland invention. This long-standing symbol of American pride and patriotism is a British invention that migrated to the United States with the original colonists. As such the infamous apple pie now stands as an example of others who also migrated to America in search of happiness, liberty, and citizenship. Perhaps it is not so ironic since the inception of this stable and prosperous nation is and has been largely dependant on the colonization and subjugation of people of color. Such was the case regarding the infamous apple pie; the outcome was not limited to the dessert but also to thousands of groups searching for the dream. The reason that this analogy works so well is that an apple pie, is served by the slice to an individual, in this case a Euro-American. As such this visual conjures up an individual who has painstakingly worked to pay for this slice of the pie, perhaps through manifest destiny. In so doing, it ignores the immigrant groups who toiled to build our infrastructure, agribusiness, couture; and become our farm workers, harvesters, packers, grocery store clerks, bakers, flour millers, egg farmers, dairy workers and the list could continue ad infinitum. These immigrant groups become trapped into these jobs through institutional racism, the vehicle through which the apple pie is constructed, packed, and sold by the slice.

The challenge that we currently face as a Nation is to recognize that we are not mere individuals. We need to unify and propose policy that would rebuild our institutions in a spirit of equitability for all inhabitants.
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