

Inquiring Minds for March 23, 2018

Topic.. IMMIGRATION and SPECIFICS

Moderator.. Al Kaplan

Immigration has been an issue on this earth for all of time. Today it is a major issue in most areas and countries of this world, including, for example, all of Europe, Africa, Israel, and these United States.

Let us spend some thought today on some specifics in these United States..

1. Should a Bracero like program be reconsidered. This was effective during the pre- Reagan era in bringing Mexican agricultural workers to the US on temporary visas, and effectively worked in Agriculture and reduced prices while increasing productivity.

2. Should family considerations, relations to already Citizen persons be a major factor in legalizing immigration.

3. Should working potential, necessary talents, be a major consideration. Consider the H-2 programs. Should they be time limited.

4. Should birth in this country continue to be the factor in permitting Legalization of citizenry.

5. Should growing up in this country, regardless of how a person came here, or birth, be a consideration in legalizing citizenry.

6. Should escaping from a hostile environment be a sufficient rational for permitting entry.

**7. Should Immigration from certain areas... countries...
Be encouraged or prohibited??**

8. Should Immigration for education purposes be encouraged??

Immigration has been a talking point for Americans for years, going back, back before the day of Trump. Prior to the first laws as such, at the end of the 19th century, your Immigration to this country was basically the product of your being able to get here, and the decision of the person running The Immigration Center, be it Ellis Island, Castle garden or Angel Island on the west coast.

- <https://www.wsj.com/articles/family-based-migration-stirs-debate-1516219888>

Kinship Emerges as Immigration Flashpoint

President's administration tries to link terrorist attacks to foreign born, complicating the public discussion - [Greg Ip](#), Jan. 17, 2018,

A foreigner who immigrates to the U.S. doesn't just get a shot at a better life. That person also in effect gets a voucher with which to share the prospect of a future in the U.S. with relatives.

Chain migration, as critics refer to successive rounds of family-based admissions, tilts the immigrant pool away from young, skilled workers best equipped to prosper and assimilate. It is a key reason so many reformers envy Australia and Canada, two countries that accept more than twice as many migrants per capita as the U.S. while allocating a smaller share of those slots to family members.

Lately, the case against family-based migration has taken a strident turn. Immigration restrictionists, including President Donald Trump, portray it as a conduit for terrorism and crime. It is a charge built on flimsy evidence that evokes the xenophobia of a century ago.

In 1924, Congress imposed quotas on immigrants according to national origin to halt the influx of southern and eastern Europeans that nativists considered racially inferior, a threat to native-born workers and riddled with communist sympathizers. By virtually slamming the door shut on newcomers, lawmakers aimed to maintain western and northern Europeans' ethnic majority.

By the 1960s the national origins system had become a source of shame. Determined to extend the cause of civil rights to immigration, then-President Lyndon Johnson declared in 1964, "A nation that was built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: 'What can you do for our country?' But we should not be asking: 'In what country were you born?'"

The Immigration Act of 1965 replaced national origin with criteria based on skill and family ties. The definition of family was expanded, from spouses and small children to include adult children, siblings and parents.

This was actually a concession to nativists. Most of the foreign born at the time came from Europe and they were expected to sponsor the most family members. But most European-born people were too old to have many relatives to sponsor. Instead, as Marta Tienda, a demographer at Princeton University, [has documented](#), the provision's effect was first felt when Asian workers who came under employment visas

then sponsored their parents. The pattern was later repeated by Latin American workers, including illegal workers legalized in 1986.

Ms. Tienda found that sponsorship of parents tended to raise the average age of these immigrants. A report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development notes family-based immigrants were on average less educated, less fluent in English and less likely to be employed than employment-based immigrants, though employment rose with time.

The U.S. has long admitted immigrants for noneconomic reasons, for instance to give shelter to victims of persecution and war and to reunite divided families. The policy is driven in part by a simple belief that immigrants—no matter the reason for moving—possess a fierce determination to improve their lives, which makes all of the country stronger.

In a legal sense, family migrants don't displace skilled migrants or refugees since all are subject to different caps. Since 2007, family-based admissions have fluctuated around 800,000 a year and employment-based around 150,000. But in a political sense, family migrants do displace skilled migrants. Every country has a finite appetite for immigrants and the more that inflow is filled by family migrants, the less the appetite for refugees or skilled workers.

This leads to the elements of a compromise: narrow the criteria for family migration, as restrictionists want, while expanding the number of skilled migrants as liberalizers have urged. While the total pool could remain around 1 million, the nation's aging native-born workforce easily justifies a far larger intake. Extended family could still come, but under stricter criteria.

Above a quota, Australia charges sponsors a hefty fee for elderly parents to defray the cost of social services. Aspiring immigrants to Canada get credit under its point system if they already have relatives there.

Yet many restrictionists want to end chain migration to reduce, not maintain or expand, overall immigration. It is a key factor holding up a deal to legalize 690,000 illegal immigrants, known as Dreamers, who arrived as children, even though most wouldn't or couldn't sponsor relatives other than spouses.

Mr. Trump has already signaled that his opposition to chain migration isn't about economics. This week his administration [released a report](#) that attributed 73% of 549 terrorist acts convicted in U.S. courts between the Sept. 11, 2001, attack at the World Trade Center and 2016, to the foreign born, many family migrants.

The methodology seems crafted to accentuate the threat: it excluded domestic acts of terrorism (such as by white supremacists) and included acts carried out on foreign soil. Many of the convicted were planning or supporting terrorism; they didn't kill or injure anyone. The actual number of deaths in the U.S. attributable to foreign-born terrorists since the start of 2002 is 34,

Our Immigration Debate Is Older Than America Herself - [WSJ](#) · February 6, 2018

The times may change but the immigration debate endures, with each wave of new arrivals smashing into variations of the same old arguments.

In the 1750s, Benjamin Franklin was already complaining about the use of bilingual signposts in Pennsylvania to accommodate the swarthy hordes of German migrants. “Why should Pennsylvania, founded by the English, become a Colony of Aliens,” wrote Franklin, “who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of us Anglifying them, and will never adopt our Language and Customs, any more than they can acquire our Complexion?”

In the antebellum period, Samuel Morse, the inventor of the telegraph and a leader of the Know Nothing movement, called for banning Irish Catholics, whom he accused of subverting America’s values and ideals. Talk of the “Yellow Peril” came next. In a famous political cartoon from 1881, Lady Liberty is depicted as a Chinese coolie gripping an opium pipe. Italians, Jews, Poles and others shortly thereafter would experience similar treatment.

In recent decades, the boisterous conversation surrounding immigrants from Latin America has addressed similar themes. Are they stealing jobs and depressing wages? Are they driving up crime rates and stretching our social services? Are they assimilating? How much unskilled foreign labor can our modern economy absorb?

Those questions are complicated by the fact that there is no typical immigrant. They aren’t all gang members, and they aren’t all microbiologists. Most are economic migrants in search of an opportunity to make a better life for themselves and their loved ones. Most are simply looking for a higher return on their human capital.

Open immigration entails costs as well as benefits. A border policy that acknowledges this isn't racist, it's realistic. The goal is to find the right balance of immigrants to meet the country's economic needs. Yes, humanitarianism ought to inform this debate, but ultimately U.S. immigration policy should prioritize the needs of the people already here, not the people trying to come.

Franklin wasn't being paranoid. Germans in colonial America had a reputation for sticking to themselves in German-speaking communities. During the Civil War, there were all-German units in the Union Army with commands given in German. Germans have left giant cultural footprints on the country as well; they introduced America to kindergarten and marching bands and Christmas trees. And German immigrants ultimately did overtake the English in numbers. Today, Americans of German ancestry outnumber any other ethnic group.

Of course, the major difference between yesteryear's emigrating Europeans and Asians and today's Latinos is that so many of the latter are here illegally. Some sneaked across the border. Some are "overstayers" who entered with visas and never left. Others—the so-called Dreamers—were brought in unlawfully as children. The George W. Bush and Barack Obama presidencies featured endless debates about how to address the growing undocumented population. Both administrations attempted large-scale comprehensive immigration reform but came up empty.

Mr. Trump has followed his predecessors with a grand gambit of his own. The immigration outline the White House sent to Congress last month provides additional funding for a border wall and creates a path to citizenship for around 1.8 million Dreamers. But some Democrats balked at the plan because it also called for scrapping the diversity visa program and tightening family migration, both of which could result in lower levels of legal immigration. The reforms, they argue, would change too much at once.

If Mr. Trump still wants a deal, he should go smaller. On Monday Republican Sen. John McCain and Democratic Sen. Chris Coons unveiled legislation that offers a path to citizenship for the Dreamers and a path to funding for a wall. A companion bill in the House has 54 cosponsors, split evenly between Democrats and Republicans. The president initially criticized the Senate measure because it does not immediately authorize funding for the border wall. But there's room for negotiation, and Mr. McCain likes to cut deals, too.

The president should not underestimate the willingness of Democrats to move his way on border security if he addresses their priorities. As Democratic congressman Luis Gutierrez told CNN last month, "I think it would be a monumental waste of taxpayer money to build a monument to stupidity, but if that is what it is going to take to get 800,000 young men and women and give them a chance to live freely and openly in America, then I'll roll up my sleeves, I'll go down there with bricks and mortar and begin the wall."

Incremental progress is better than none at all, and a smaller deal wouldn't preclude further reforms at a later date. Neither side would get everything it wants this time around, but both sides would get something significant. In this environment, take what you can get.

WSJ · February 6, 2018, [according to Alex Nowrasteh of the Cato Institute](#), . . . you were 1,641 times more likely to be killed in a garden-variety homicide.

When an entire class of the foreign born is vilified on such dubious grounds, it severs the debate from hard-nosed economic and public policy considerations, and puts reasoned agreement even further out of reach.

For further reading, please download:

www.shellpoint.info/InquiringMinds/20180323_Immigration_and_Specifics_-_supplement