

Debating Immigration

Debating Immigration presents 20 original and updated essays, written by some of the world's leading experts and preeminent scholars, that explore the nuances of contemporary immigration in the United States and Europe. This volume is organized around the following themes: economics, demographics and race, law and policy, philosophy and religion, and European politics. Its topics include comprehensive immigration reform, the limits of executive power, illegal immigration, human smuggling, civil rights and employment discrimination, economic growth and unemployment, and social justice and religion. A timely second edition, *Debating Immigration* is an effort to bring together divergent voices to discuss various aspects of immigration often neglected or buried in discussions.

Carol M. Swain is an award-winning political scientist and member of the James Madison Society at Princeton University. She is the author or editor of eight books. Her highly acclaimed *Black Faces, Black Interests: The Representation of African Americans in Congress* won three national prizes, including the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award for the best book published in the U.S. on government, politics, or international affairs. Dr. Swain has been cited by the U.S. Supreme Court and profiled in major publications and documentaries. She regularly makes guest appearances on numerous national and international radio and TV shows. Her opinion pieces have been published in major national and international newspapers.

“Carol M. Swain has a knack for identifying important issues of social welfare policy before other analysts. From her background and research, she sees issues, trends, and perspectives in an important way. Hers is a voice that needs to be part of any conversation on immigration.”

*James F. Blumstein, University Professor of Constitutional Law
and Health Law and Policy, Vanderbilt Law School
and Medical School*

“This collection of reasoned and informed articles is a welcome intervention in the politically toxic and shrill debate on immigration. It should contribute to a balancing of conflicting interests for the common good.”

*Herman Daly, Emeritus Professor, School of Public Policy,
University of Maryland*

“Some Americans favor immigration, some oppose it, and most academics are all-too-united in defending it. Carol M. Swain and her contributors treat the divisions clearly and fairly. She achieved that in the first edition of *Debating Immigration*, and now she has done it again. This book is engrossing and disturbing, because the subject is. America’s future is on the anvil.”

Lawrence M. Mead, New York University

“The timely publication of this second, updated, edition of *Debating Immigration* is a welcome event. In this volume, editor Carol M. Swain has gathered an impressively knowledgeable and ideologically diverse set of contributors, who comprehensively address the immigration issue in all of its moral, legal, economic, and political complexity. As an added bonus, Professor Swain provides her own trenchant and, to this reader, persuasive critical assessment of how the interests of rank-and-file black Americans are ill-served by the positions taken on this issue by liberal elites.”

*Glenn C. Loury, Merton P. Stoltz Professor of the Social Sciences,
Brown University, Rhode Island*

“Thoughtful. Challenging. Wide-ranging. The updated edition of *Debating Immigration* offers new and dynamic perspectives on one of our nation’s most important issues. Readers from across the political spectrum will see their most cherished ideas effectively elucidated and constructively interrogated. Professor Swain has assembled a magnificent group of thinkers whose efforts combine deep philosophical debates with powerful calls to action. A critical and highly valuable contribution.”

*Arthur Lupia, Hal R. Varian Collegiate Professor of Political
Science, University of Michigan*

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47046-9 — Debating Immigration
Edited by Carol M. Swain
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

Debating Immigration

Edited by

CAROL M. SWAIN

James Madison Scholar, Princeton University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47046-9 — Debating Immigration
Edited by Carol M. Swain
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India
79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108470469
DOI: 10.1017/9781108556606

© Cambridge University Press 2018

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2018

Printed in the United States of America by Sheridan Books, Inc.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-108-47046-9 Hardback
ISBN 978-1-108-45467-4 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> viii
<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xi
<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i>	xiii
<i>Preface to the First Edition</i>	xv
<i>Foreword</i>	xvii
<i>Nathan Glazer</i>	
<i>Acknowledgments: First and Second Editions</i>	xxvi
<i>Introduction: Déjà Vu</i>	i
<i>Carol M. Swain</i>	
PART I: ECONOMICS, DEMOGRAPHICS, AND RACE	19
1 Race, Immigration and Civil Rights Law in the Low-Skilled Workplace	21
<i>John D. Skrentny</i>	
2 Comprehensive Immigration Confusion	39
<i>Peter Skerry</i>	
3 Who Got the Jobs?: Two-Thirds of Long-Term Employment Gains Have Gone to Immigrants, 2000–2017	61
<i>Steven A. Camarota and Karen Zeigler</i>	
4 The Congressional Black Caucus and Immigration Reform	86
<i>Carol M. Swain</i>	
5 Will Hispanic and Asian Immigrants Save America?	101
<i>Amitai Etzioni</i>	

vi	<i>Contents</i>
PART II: LAW AND POLICY	119
6 The Progressive Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States <i>Philip Cafaro</i>	121
7 What Should Comprehensive Immigration Reform Encompass? <i>Carol M. Swain</i>	140
8 Unintended Consequences and Path Dependencies: Explaining the Post-1965 Surge in Latin American Immigration <i>Douglas S. Massey and Karen A. Pren</i>	147
9 Alien Rights, Citizen Rights, and the Politics of Restriction <i>Rogers M. Smith</i>	179
10 Good Neighbors and Good Citizens: Beyond the Legal–Illegal Immigration Debate <i>Noah Pickus and Peter Skerry</i>	194
11 Federalism and the Politics of Immigration Reform <i>Carol M. Swain and Virginia M. Yetter</i>	217
12 Barack Obama: Testing the Constitutional Limits on the Executive <i>Carol M. Swain</i>	243
PART III: PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION	259
13 Biblical Prudence and American Immigration <i>James R. Edwards, Jr.</i>	261
14 The Moral Dilemma of U.S. Immigration Policy Revisited: Open Borders vs. Social Justice? <i>Stephen Macedo</i>	286
15 Carved from the Inside Out: Immigration and America’s Public Philosophy on Citizenship <i>Elizabeth F. Cohen</i>	311
PART IV: COSMOPOLITANISM: HOW EUROPEAN NATIONS DEAL WITH IMMIGRATION	327
16 The Politics of Citizenship and Belonging in Europe <i>Marc Morjé Howard and Sara Wallace Goodman</i>	329
17 Globalization, Migration and Governance <i>Susan F. Martin</i>	347
18 The Free Economy and the Jacobin State, or How Europe Can Cope with Large-Scale Immigration <i>Randall Hansen</i>	364

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47046-9 — Debating Immigration
Edited by Carol M. Swain
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

<i>Contents</i>	vii
19 Human Smuggling and Trafficking into Europe <i>Louise Shelley and Camilo Pardo</i>	381
PART V: CONCLUSION	403
20 Concluding Thoughts <i>Carol M. Swain</i>	405
<i>Index</i>	413

Figures

0.1	Legal immigration and Congressional reform efforts	<i>page</i> 10
3.1	Natives accounted for nearly two-thirds of the increase in the working-age population (16 to 65), but only one-third of the increase in employment gains, 2000 to 2017	64
3.2	Employment growth for natives has not kept pace with population growth among the working-age (16 to 65) 2000–2017	64
3.3	Natural population growth and new immigration have greatly exceeded employment growth, 2000–2017	67
3.4	The employment rate of natives (16 to 65) never fully recovered from the 2001 recession; and the rate remains below the 2007 level	72
3.5	Despite some improvement in recent years, labor force participation among natives (ages 16 to 65) has looked dismal over the last 17 years	72
3.6	The decline in the labor force participation rate since 2000 of working-age natives has impacted both genders, whites, blacks, and Hispanics	73
3.7	The decline in native labor force participation since 2000 has impacted every education level	80
4.1	Unemployment rate by race	90
4.2	Poverty statistics by race	92
6.1	Changes in annual family incomes in the U.S., 1970–2005, by quintile	128
6.2	Distribution of total wealth in the U.S. in 2010, by quintile	129
6.3	State sprawl rates, 1982–1997	132
6.4	City sprawl rates, 1970–1990	132

<i>List of Figures</i>	ix
6.5 U.S. population projections to 2100 under three scenarios	136
6.6 U.S. population projections to 2200 under three immigration scenarios	137
8.1 Mexican immigration to the United States in three categories	150
8.2 Frequency of pairing of the terms flood, crisis, or invasion with immigration in five leading newspapers (three-year moving average)	152
8.3 Annual number of apprehensions and illegal migrants, 1955–1995 (three-year moving average)	156
8.4 Feedback loop between apprehensions and border enforcement, 1965–1995	157
8.5 Intensity of border enforcement, 1965–1995	158
8.6 Deportations from the United States, 1965–2009	160
8.7 Feedback loop between deportations and internal enforcement, 1965–2009	160
8.8 Percentage of Mexicans admitted outside country quotas as relatives of U.S. citizens	165
16.1 Changes in the citizenship policy index between 1980, 2008, and 2016	337
18.1 Net migration to the European Union, in thousands	368

Tables

3.1	Labor force status of natives and immigrants 2000–2017	<i>page</i> 65
3.2	Immigrant and native employment by occupational category	69
3.3	Labor force participation rates of natives and immigrants by age, 2000–2017	75
6.1	Immigrants’ occupational share by economic sector in the United States, 2004	127
8.A1	Restrictive immigration legislation enacted by Congress toward Latin Americans, 1965–2010	170
8.A2	Restrictive enforcement operations launched by the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Department of Homeland Security, 1990–2010	171
8.A3	Legal and illegal U.S. migration from Mexico and political policy indicators, 1955–2009	173
16.1	Citizenship policy index in 2016	336
17.1	National, regional and international initiatives to foster international cooperation on migration	353
18.1	Relative unemployment as a percentage of the labor force by origin, 2012	370

Contributors

Philip Cafaro, Professor of Philosophy, Colorado State University, affiliated faculty member of CSU's School of Global Environmental Sustainability and President of the International Society for Environmental Ethics.

Steven A. Camarota, Ph.D., Research Director for the Center for Immigration Studies.

Elizabeth Cohen, Associate Professor, Syracuse University.

James R. Edwards, Jr., Fellow at the Center for Immigration Studies, Washington, DC.

Amitai Etzioni, University Professor and Director of the Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies at The George Washington University.

Nathan Glazer, Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Education at Harvard University.

Sara Wallace Goodman, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California at Irvine.

Randall Hansen, Professor of Political Science and Canada Research Chair in Global Migration at University of Toronto.

Marc Morjé Howard, Professor of Government and Law at Georgetown University.

Stephen Macedo, Laurence S. Rockefeller Professor of Politics and Director of the Center for Human Values at Princeton University.

Susan F. Martin, Donald G. Herzberg Professor of International Migration at Georgetown University.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47046-9 — Debating Immigration
Edited by Carol M. Swain
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)

xii

List of Contributors

Douglas S. Massey, Henry G. Bryant Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University.

Camilo Pardo, Graduate Research Assistant, Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center of the Schar School of Policy and Government at George Mason University.

Noah Pickus, Associate Director of the Kenan Institute for Ethics and Adjunct Associate Professor of Public Policy at the Sanford Institute of Public Policy at Duke University.

Karen A. Pren, Project Manager, Office of Population Research, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University.

Louise Shelley, Omer L. and Nancy Hirst Endowed Chair as well as a University Professor in the School of Policy, Government and International Affairs and the founder and Director of the Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center (TraCCC) at George Mason University.

Peter Skerry, Professor of Political Science at Boston College.

John Skrentny, Professor of Sociology, and Director of the Yankelovich Center for Social Science Research, University of California, San Diego.

Rogers M. Smith, Christopher H. Browne Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania.

Carol M. Swain, James Madison Scholar, The James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, Princeton University.

Virginia Yetter, Associate Attorney, Bass, Berry, and Sims, Nashville, TN.

Karen Zeigler, Demographer, Center for Immigration Studies, Washington, DC.

Preface to the Second Edition

Carol M. Swain

More than a decade ago, we published the first edition of *Debating Immigration*. It received much attention and was used in classrooms around the world. Readers praised the stature of the contributors, the diversity of perspectives, and the book's readability for non-experts.

In this revised edition, we strive to maintain the same high standards of the first book. Readers will encounter some new voices as well as updates of recurring chapters and new chapters written or co-authored by me.

Many major developments occurring since 2007 have affected migration worldwide, especially in the United States. It has been more than thirty-five years since Congress has passed major legislation affecting immigration. American presidents, most notably Barack Obama, used executive powers to make changes at the margins. President Obama's efforts, however, have encountered opposition and in some cases reversal since the election of Donald J. Trump, an outsider candidate who campaigned in 2016 as a restrictionist. In the year since his election, President Trump has taken actions consistent with many of his campaign promises and has begun to use executive action and agencies to make some substantive changes.

Significant events that have helped shape immigration laws and practices include:

- Donald Trump's 2016 election as president and his efforts to implement a travel ban affecting nations suspected of sponsoring terrorism.
- The expansion and restriction of immigration federalism. Such involvement dictates what state and local governments can and can't do to assist the federal government in undertaking its role to enforce immigration laws.
- The unprecedented use of executive actions and prosecutorial discretion to bypass Congress and enact policies that have slowed deportation of illegal immigrants and expanded immigrant rights.

- A surge in border crossings of illegal aliens from Central American asylum seekers.
- The rise in unaccompanied youth crossing the border.
- An increase of refugees from majority-Muslim states.
- A steep decline in the percentage of working-age Americans in the labor force, either employed or unemployed, which was at a thirty-six-year low (62.4 percent) in September 2015, but had risen to 63.1 percent by September 2017.¹ In this edition of *Debating Immigration*, we cover most, if not all, of these issues. We also expand the section on European migration to examine globalization, human trafficking, citizenship for immigrants, and the reality of terrorism.

NOTE

1. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007–2017, <https://goo.gl/p44od7>; “United States Labor Force Participation, 1950–2017,” *Trading Economics* <https://tradingeconomics.com/united-states/labor-force-participation-rate>, accessed February 12, 2018.

Preface to the First Edition

The origins of this volume lie in a conference I organized at Princeton University in January 2005 on the theme: “Contemporary Politics of Immigration in the United States.” With the sponsorship of the James Madison Program and the close assistance of program manager Reggie Feiner, we convened a diverse group of well-known activists, scholars, and journalists, most of whom had taken highly visible public positions on various aspects of immigration policy. Conference participants included Tamar Jacoby of the Manhattan Institute; Peter Brimelow of VDARE; Amitai Etzioni of George Washington University; Stephen Camarota of the Center for Immigration Studies, Washington, DC; Stephen Macedo of Princeton University; Philip Kasinitz of City University of New York; Jane Junn of Rutgers University; Ken Masugi of Claremont University; Rogers Smith of University of Pennsylvania; Linda Bosniak of Rutgers University Law School; Elizabeth Cohen of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University; Lina Newton of Hunter College, Noah Pickus of Duke University; Peter Skerry of Boston College; and Charles Westoff of Princeton University.

Our group spent two days together, grappling with some of the more troubling aspects of the current immigration situation in America. At the top of the list was the issue of the nation’s estimated 11–14 million illegal aliens. Other topics treated included the history of American attitudes toward newcomers, and the impact of large-scale immigration on current United States citizens, especially poor minorities. A major goal of the conference was to bring together people who rarely converse with each other and create a place where they could have a vigorous conversation that might allow them to find common ground on certain aspects of these issues. To their credit, the participants were cordial and civil to one another, even though they often had quite divergent viewpoints. What emerged from that conference forms the core of the following anthology, which examines from a variety of ideological perspectives the current realities and projections about immigration in the U.S.

Some of our participants were unable to contribute chapters to the volume. In order to achieve balance and to ensure coverage of a number of issues not specifically addressed by the conference, including the biblical perspective on immigration, and immigration's impact on certain historically disenfranchised groups, we invited Nathan Glazer of Harvard University; Randall Hansen of the University of Toronto; Marc M. Howard of Georgetown University; Peter Schuck of Yale University; James R. Edwards, Jr. of the Hudson Institute; and Jonathan Tilove of Newhouse News Service to contribute additional chapters. One of my own chapters also appears here. The resulting volume is a timely, multifaceted interrogation of a highly visible and pertinent issue in contemporary America and one that includes the viewpoints of some of the most distinguished thinkers and activists in the world.

Foreword

Nathan Glazer

I write as someone who has studied problems of immigration for seventy years or more, but also as the child of immigrants, as so many Americans are, raised in East Harlem and the South Bronx during the 1920s and 1930s, when these areas were parts of the poorest Congressional districts in the nation. For over a century and a half now, we have grappled with problems of immigration and immigration policy. In 1984, in a book I edited titled *Clamor at the Gates*, I described America as a “permanently unfinished country,” founded by settlers and pioneers long before the establishment of an independent nation, and long before we began to call newcomers “immigrants” or had any need to think of immigration laws and debates about whom to admit and whom to exclude. We still deal with these issues, and how to develop a workable immigration policy that balances the values and needs of the nation with the pleas of the many seeking to enter.

The second edition of *Debating Immigration* is being published at a time very different from ten years ago. Then, we were still in a stage in which immigration was celebrated for the most part as a distinctive contribution to making the United States a great nation, and it had been so celebrated by every president since John F. Kennedy. Today, a new president is in office, who has promised in his campaign the most radical changes in immigration policy since 1965 and a return to the most restrictive policies on immigration since the early 1920s. This has already transformed our consideration of what has been considered the most important and difficult problem in immigration policy: how to handle the large number of undocumented or illegal immigrants, ten million or more, integrated into American life and the economy, and related to American citizens by birth or marriage. In this second edition, some new contributors appear and older ones offer fresh insight from their updated chapters. We find excellent research, particularly on the economic effects of recent immigration – not that we all agree or can be expected to agree on the conclusions of this research, especially its impact on the most vulnerable Americans: blacks, poor whites, and Hispanics. There is also a good deal of

research, by its nature more difficult to conduct, on the various dimensions of the assimilation and integration of immigrants into American society, and the conclusions of this research are also disputed. We have had extended debate and a good deal of legislation with respect to illegal or undocumented immigration, universally considered the most serious issue in current immigration, but it has not seriously curtailed illegal entry or presence in the United States. Scholars like Doug Massey and Karen Pren would argue we have made things worse through our restrictive legislation.

As we struggle with this issue in the first decades of the twenty-first century – just as we struggled with it in the 1980s and 1990s of the last century – it is clear we have come to no generally accepted and politically realizable conclusions as to what, if anything, can and should be done. Or, are we to consider the tossed-off remarks during a political campaign of a historically unique candidate, who lost the majority of the popular vote, but gained a victory in the Electoral College, such a generally acceptable and realizable policy? He certainly thinks so, but the judicial and legislative branches of the government may not agree. Yet we know it is a problem crying out for a solution. Fears of terrorism and growing pressure to admit refugees from Third World nations, some known to breed terrorism, further complicate the dilemma we face.

This edition tells us some familiar things about current immigration and brings to our attention some of the recent research, particularly on economic effects, but its true value is to raise some new questions. In view of how difficult it has been to resolve disputes over immigration in the past thirty plus years, some new thoughts and ideas may well be just what we need. While every chapter has something to tell us that is helpful, I would point to two issues from the previous edition that are brought to our attention in these chapters with a degree of forcefulness that has not characterized these themes in the past.

The first of what I consider as these new thoughts is the focus of two of the chapters on the ethical and moral bases that should guide our immigration policy. One point of view that is particularly significant for American politics today is that of evangelical Christians, which generally enters political discussion in the form of demands from one side and denunciations on the other and almost never appears in reasoned policy discussion. But here it warrants an interesting and important inspection. What is the biblical point of view, insofar as it can be drawn from the Hebrew and Christian Bibles? This perspective is developed in the essay by James R. Edwards. It is supplemented by a sophisticated piece by Stephen Macedo in which recent thinking in moral philosophy, in particular the influential work of John Rawls and Michael Walzer, is brought to bear on the immigration issue. I will develop below my reasons for thinking moral and ethical issues are beginning to, and will continue to, play an increasingly important role in discussions of immigration, even though such considerations will be in abeyance as long as the period initiated by the victory of Donald Trump prevails.

The second of these new thoughts, to my mind, is developed in the chapter by Noah Pickus and Peter Skerry. It attacks what has politically become the central issue in the immigration debate: the distinction between legal and illegal immigration. They ask, “Is this really the problem? Do not many of the consequences that concern us when we consider immigration, consequences affecting the economic interests of various groups, for example, result from legal immigration, which is, after all, by far the greater part of immigration, as well as from illegal immigration? Is not much that we applaud and approve among immigrants evident among illegal immigrants, too?” It is time to rethink the distinction, and explore what light this may throw on immigration issues. Likewise, Philip Cafaro makes an enlightened case for reducing immigration by pointing to the impact of large-scale immigration on progressive goals to achieve a more economically just and ecologically sustainable society.

Clearly the moral issues raised by Edwards and Macedo are relevant here, too. We find, I believe, that the ideas of natural justice, and moral and ethical concerns more generally, play an increasingly relevant role in political thinking and, until very recently, in international affairs. Such a development has to throw some doubt on the significance of the difference between legal and illegal immigrants. Both come for the same reasons, escaping the same countries and attracted similarly to the realm of free countries with greater opportunities. Can we be so absolute in erecting a wall between them, with rights for those on one side and no rights at all for those on the other?

Furthermore, this book pays a significant amount of attention to the changes in race and ethnicity of immigrants in recent decades, devoting an entire section to it and placing particular emphasis on the question of how the issue of immigration interacts with the place and fate of black Americans. Of particular interest is a chapter by John Skrentny that shows the continuing effect of race and racism in employer decisions about whom to hire and what types of jobs they should be assigned to. His study of factories shows how low-skilled whites and blacks frequently lose out to employer-preferred Latino and Asian immigrants. This occurs despite the Civil Rights Act of the 1960s that makes such ethnic preferences illegal.

Another issue to which I would point is spelled out by Rogers Smith. Smith, more than most of the others, suggests to us that a look back at the history of immigration in the United States may be helpful. It reminds us that there are possibilities in immigration policy that are not evident on the horizon today. We do not see much reference to the past in these chapters, and it may well be argued that so much has changed in the United States in the past fifty years that there is no point to looking at the history of immigration policy, much of which is disreputable. But history reminds us of one important lesson: The mantra that this is, has always been, and always will be an immigration society is as much ideology – the ideology of the past half-century in particular – as a proper evaluation of the actual role of immigration in American society.

We should recall that in large stretches of American history – and indeed in some of its most formative periods – immigration was low and not much considered a central and shaping element in American society. I would point to two such periods in particular. Consider the sixty years from the time of the American Revolution to the 1840s. Revolution and war played a major role in keeping immigration low during much of this period. The Napoleonic Wars did not end until 1815 and even after the return to peace, immigration remained low. During this entire period, and for a few decades thereafter, there was no national legislation on immigration; as Elizabeth Cohen reminds us, it was a matter then for the states, and few bothered to exercise their rights on the subject. Tocqueville, traveling through the United States in the 1830s, did not think of the United States as a country being shaped by immigration. To him, it was a country of Anglo-Americans, and he didn't expect that to change. He was happy to make contact with French immigrants, but they were few. The problematic minorities – to use current terminology – in the American population were Indians and blacks, not immigrants.

Consider another lengthy period, from the 1920s to the 1960s, forty years covering the growth of the twenties, the Great Depression, the four terms of FDR, World War II, and postwar prosperity. During that entire period, immigration was kept low by the Depression and war and by law if these did not suffice. National sentiment, as expressed in Congress, was strongly anti-immigration. Even efforts to bring in threatened Jewish children or concentration camp survivors who could find no home in Europe met fierce political resistance. Indeed, when immigration law was finally changed in 1965, it was only because no one expected that immigration would rise much. A degree of family reunification for some Europeans was expected and made possible, and a bow to the anti-racism which we had formally espoused in the war against Hitler twenty years before permitted the elimination of the ban on Asians. But not many of them were expected.

America has changed since, and one of the chief ways in which it has changed is in our acknowledgment of responsibilities and duties, to some degree, to the entire world – another example of the role of the ethical and moral concerns to which I earlier alluded. Such an acknowledgment has to raise the question of what kind of claim people in poor or war-ravaged countries, or in countries brutalized by dictators, have to the assistance of richer and more fortunate countries in escaping from terrible conditions. We have seen the emergence of an international ethic according to which it has become an obligation of rich countries to provide aid to poor countries, even to those for whose poverty they bear no particular responsibility. The idea of aid to poor countries as an obligation of the richer countries was certainly no part of international thinking before World War II; the idea may have arisen with decolonization after World War II, but it has since become a general obligation. For various poor countries, there is a club of donors, most of whom have no previous colonial relation to the country in question. The United States is a willing

participant in these clubs, or has been until now. Things may change under President Trump.

The United States, despite its prickly insistence on untrammelled sovereignty, does accept obligations set by international organizations, such as the right to asylum, under which many immigrants come. Initially, this was sharply circumscribed: we accepted asylees insofar as they furthered our Cold War with Russia or our conflict with Cuba, or insofar as their desperate condition owed something to American policies, such as the failure of American foreign and military policy in Vietnam. But, as mentioned before, the obligation has become more general over time.

Yet another oddity of our immigration policy illustrates the increasing hold of the idea of international obligation on this proud and independent country. Consider the “diversity” provision in immigration law. We know why it came into effect; the immigration law of 1965, which favored relatives of citizens, also disfavored immigration from countries from which immigrants had come a long time ago and for whom close family relations had frayed, and this affected Ireland particularly. The “diversity” provision, which permits persons in countries that provided few immigrants to apply for visas in an international lottery, was designed to make it possible for more Irish to come. Its effect over time, however, has been to make it possible for more Bangladeshis, Nigerians, and other Africans and Asians to come. This was no part of its intention, but the law has not been changed or abandoned as a result. It becomes an exemplification of the idea that all peoples have a claim on entering the United States and becoming part of the country, a claim which cannot be limited by differences of religion or race or by lack of connection to the ethnic and religious groups that have played a central role in the making of the United States.

These disparate policies and changes bear the common characteristic that we increasingly accept the idea that we have an obligation to the poorest of the globe and that we are bound by an emerging moral and ethical code in dealing with the peoples of the world. How this actually works itself out in policy would take us far afield, and many find the expression of this commitment to universal ethical and moral standards and international human rights hypocritical, but the fact remains that the words expressing such a responsibility were pronounced until recently by the most authoritative voices representing America, our Presidents. This had to reflect itself in our immigration policy, and thus we, and other democratic and free countries of the developed world, increasingly abandoned the right to choose immigrants for the purpose of molding or controlling the racial and ethnic character of the country. This is a surprising development indeed.

The increasing weight of a regime of international human rights, raised for all people whatever their legal status or citizenship, must also affect our thinking about the difference between legal and illegal immigrants, the issue raised in the chapter by Pickus and Skerry. Our two chapters on the moral and ethical

aspects of immigration both agree that a limited political community with its own defined rules, and a fundamental obligation to its own members, is a morally and ethically legitimate social form, not simply a means of selfishly excluding others outside it. But as the Pickus–Skerry chapter indicates, it is hard to consider the overwhelming majority of illegal immigrants – who come to seek work in industries and areas eager to employ them, to provide sustenance to families back home, and to escape difficult economic and political conditions, and so many of whom establish families and in effect become good citizens, even without the status of citizenship – as simply criminals and lawbreakers, and even those specifically employed to enforce the law and control the borders do not often so consider them.

Contemplate another change which both bears on the issue of the steady expansion of moral and ethical concerns and which may also affect our thinking about illegal immigrants. We have seen in the last few decades a surprising change in our conception of and the legal status of citizenship. We think properly of American citizenship as a treasured and exclusive status. The oath of citizenship specifically gives up all previous allegiances, yet we increasingly recognize the status of dual citizenship, not only the dual citizenship that is the result of being born in the United States to immigrant parents whose native countries grant citizenship to the children of their nationals born abroad, but also the dual citizenship of mature individuals who have maintained their citizenship in their native country. Many nations allow their citizens to maintain citizenship even when they become citizens of the United States.

In effect, we recognize today not only the sentimental and familial ties that inevitably bind immigrants to their native countries, but we also recognize – if their native countries permit it – the legal status of citizenship in a foreign country, even when that person has become a citizen of the United States. Depending on the country, such citizenship may permit voting in its elections, even though that dual citizen also votes in elections in the United States, and may include running for and taking office in the native country.

This development is often a subject of outrage by those following it, and indeed were these possibilities of dual citizenship embodied in legislation it is hard to believe Congress would accept them. The expansion of the status of dual citizenship and the ability without danger to American naturalization to take up duties of citizenship in a foreign nation (serving it in elected or appointed positions, serving in its armed forces, voting in its elections, etc.) is the result of Supreme Court decisions which have rejected the harsher and more exclusive version of American citizenship – decisions which Congress has not seen it necessary to overrule, as it probably could.

I mention this development and its possible bearing on our thinking about the difference between legal and illegal immigrants because it reflects, to my mind, the ascendancy of more complex ideas of citizenship and how people might relate to their mixed allegiances than we often find in the stark contrast of legal versus illegal immigration. Among illegal immigrants, there is certainly

criminality aside from the specific fact of breaking the laws on entry or remaining, and that should and does concern us (whether there is more or less than among legal immigrants is not a question I have seen addressed). But many illegal immigrants we know are visitors who have overstayed the legal period of their stay, students who are not in the specific status of studenthood that makes them legal, and persons caught in the complexities of immigration law. Many of those who apply for the immigration diversity lottery are in residence in the United States in some status short of legal residency, and apply for the lottery in the distant chance that they may win and legalize their status. (If they are so lucky, I believe the previous condition of illegality does not affect them as winners entitled to legal residency.)

Of course, the major impact in our thinking about illegality comes from the disappointment of the hopes of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act. We thought that granting amnesty to the existing illegal immigrants, only three million or so at the time, and imposing restrictions on the employment of illegal immigrants would dry up the supply and bring the problem to an end. It turned out that our amnesty was successful, with 2.7 million foreigners put on the path to U.S. citizenship, but our constraints on the employment of illegal immigrants were full of holes. Employers benefiting from the labor power of illegal immigrants had enough influence to prevent really effective restrictions on their employment. And did the rest of us – the American people – really want such controls? Did we not benefit from them as gardeners, painters, roofers, handymen, nannies, and the like? Is it not clear that the only solution to the illegal immigrant problem, if there is any, is in effect to legalize the illegal? I believe our more tolerant society will not deport 10 million illegals, or any substantial part of them, many of whom are the parents and husbands and wives of American citizens. Despite President Trump, I believe we will not accept the costs, in the form of a huge increase in numbers of border police, and in a huge increase in inconvenience for the millions of citizens, immigrants, and visitors crossing the borders daily, or in the costs of building a two-thousand-mile wall, that a really serious effort to effectively seal the borders would require. We once did deport hundreds of thousands, but our sense of the proper and legitimate behavior of government has changed, and I believe we will not accept, as a people, the inevitable cruelty and heartlessness that the physical removal of illegal immigrants would cause or the economic losses and inconvenience that such a radical reduction in the labor force working the fields and hotels and restaurants and homes and factories would cause.

What do Americans really want in immigration? The ideology – see the inscription on the *Statue of Liberty* – which welcomes the unfortunate and the striving – says “more.” The pragmatic judgment as to personal self-interest generally says, for many of us, “more.” But there are strong motivations to say “less” when we consider the impact of immigrants on any neighborhood and the inevitable conflict between the known, the stable, the expected, and the changes that immigration brings. This leaves aside the still-powerful, if minority

(and somewhat underground), point of view that America should remain a white man's country and that its ethnic and racial composition should not undergo radical change.

The conflict is, in strictly comprehensible political science terms, between those with a strong interest in more immigrants, for economic reasons or for reasons of familial sentiment or group attachment, and a more diffuse general feeling that the United States has enough immigrants, and less would be better. In such a situation, the specific and powerfully motivated interests overwhelm the diffuse opposition. But this balance may change. One reason it may change – and indeed is already changing to some degree – is the sharp rise in fears of terrorist attack following 9/11 and the subsequent attacks on American soil in Chattanooga, San Bernardino, Orlando, and other U.S. cities. The impact of this quantum jump in security concerns is not discussed in these chapters, but it has already affected the number of students coming from abroad to study in the United States, an important source of immigrants that has shown the first substantial drop since World War II as a result of the greater difficulty in getting visas to study here. It has also undoubtedly reduced the number of visitors – some part of whom overstay and become illegal immigrants and some part of whom become legal immigrants in the end – because of the increased difficulty in getting visas. Muslims coming from many countries are under specific suspicion, but less understandably our immigration authorities are not very good at making distinctions, and a turbaned Sikh or a distinguished Parsee Indian author responding to an invitation to lecture in an American university, and indeed almost anyone seeking to enter the United States today, is likely to find as much difficulty as a potential Egyptian student.

The balance between pro- and anti-immigration forces is delicate and shifting. In the 1990s, we saw some legislation affecting the public benefits immigrants could receive. Many thought that this signaled a new anti-immigration phase, but it did not: Neither legal nor illegal immigration dropped, and benefits were restored for many immigrants. I believe the changes I have referred to above, in the form of the greater power in international affairs of concern for the poor and the abused, and the greater tolerance and reduction of racist attitudes within the United States, are permanent changes, with a permanent impact on our immigration policies. But they do not mean the ebb and flow of attitudes affecting immigration policy has ceased, as we have seen in the election of President Trump. These will respond to large events, such as an increase in terrorism and an awareness of the dangers of extremism among some part of immigrants, or to large changes in the economy. We see this conflict in attitudes not only between different groups and interests, but in the same people: The homeowner who is happy to find immigrant workers who will paint his house for less will also be annoyed at the group of day laborers in the center of town waiting for those who would employ them for the day. The American who says, “Deport illegal immigrants” will also say, “Not the one who comes to take care of my

Foreword

xxv

children.” This matter will play itself out, and will be influenced by changes in our sense of security and in our economy, but I think we will continue to be affected by a long change in attitudes which is reducing the boundaries between “us” and “them,” those within the polity and those outside it, those deserving rights to decent human treatment and those to whom we owe no obligation.

Acknowledgments: First and Second Editions

SECOND EDITION

I am deeply grateful for the many people who encouraged me to produce a second edition of *Debating Immigration*. Since I edited the 2007 volume, a number of changes have occurred, including the retirement of my long-term Cambridge University Press editor, Lewis Bateman, who skillfully guided me through three earlier projects. The second edition could not have been published without the support of people like Nathan Glazer, who at age 94, wrote the Foreword. I am indebted to the collaborators and the secretaries and research assistants who worked on various aspects of the project. These include Renee Hawkins, Julie Gillespie, Ingrid Laubach, and Lori Ungurait at Vanderbilt University Law School. In addition, the following former Vanderbilt University Law students co-authored or rendered considerable research support: Gwendolyn Hauck and Virginia Yetter. Mike Towle, Dr. Mary Poplin, and Dr. Jeanie Roberson offered feedback on some of the chapters. Lastly, Jaymee Cole Westover, a *summa cum laude* graduate of Vanderbilt University's class of 2017, worked tirelessly during the final stages of this book. Ms. Westover, a political science and Spanish major, who plans to pursue graduate education at a major research university, provided research and editorial assistance.

FIRST EDITION

Carol M. Swain

This book is a collaborative enterprise made possible through the support of several organizations and a number of good people. Foremost amongst those to whom I am especially grateful is Lew Bateman, my friend and editor at Cambridge University Press. Lew's unflagging support and his wise and steady guidance saw this project through to completion. Equally indispensable to the completion of this project has been the generous support

Acknowledgments: First and Second Editions

xxvii

of Robert P. George, Director of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions at Princeton University. I want to thank Vanderbilt University students and faculty assistants who helped with the project. Lastly, I want to express my deep gratitude to the authors of the essays who produced work of the highest quality and substance.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47046-9 — Debating Immigration
Edited by Carol M. Swain
Frontmatter
[More Information](#)
