

“The Rights of Non-Citizens: American Democracy and Illegal Immigration”

By Dr. David Liu and Dr. Booker T. Ingram

Department of Political Science at Presbyterian College, Clinton, SC

Presented at the Society for Values in Higher Education Annual Conference

Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Illinois

July 27-31, 2011

Abstract

This research will examine the issue of illegal immigration, the public policy debate surrounding the issue and whether the debate and proposed policies reflect the democratic core values respecting the dignity, rights, tolerance and compassion for others that serve as the underpinnings for American democracy and the American promise. An effort will be made to discern during this current period of political debate over illegal immigration (i.e., undocumented workers from Mexico) what rights, as a democratic nation, should America extend to non-citizens. In so doing, attention will be given to the moral and ethical principles that undergird the U.S. Constitution and Declaration of Independence as to ascertain whether the ideals expressed in the documents offer the prospect to aid in the resolution of the policy issue in a just and humane manner that is consistent with America's core democratic values that include tolerance, justice, compassion and equality of opportunity. The paper will give primary focus to equality of opportunity in the areas of employment and education since extending rights to immigrants in these areas are so central to realizing the American Dream or Promise.

Introduction

The issue of human rights for non-citizens has been a recurring issue throughout the history of America since the first immigrants landed on Plymouth Rock in the early 17th century. Many scholars such as Roger Daniels, *Coming to America* and Aristide Zolberg, *A Nation by Design*, have documented this history with rich discussions and analyses of the challenges and obstacles that new immigrants faced in an effort to establish a new life in America.

The scholarship on immigration to America reveals that while for many immigrants the process to move toward acculturation, assimilation and citizenship often times has been uneven and challenging, but that in the final analysis the American political culture has ultimately found ways to accommodate and bestow rights among its new citizens. Historians and social scientists, such as Robert Park and Talcott Parsons, have noted that this was particularly true for the European immigrants in the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries. It could be argued that the acculturation and acceptance of these immigrants was made possible in part due to the economic opportunities that were present in America as well as the common values that were shared by most Americans that were influenced by their political thinking and religious faith.

Many scholars have documented the fact that during America's early colonial period (1600s), and prior to the establishment of governance through political and legal institutions, that the church and its moral teaching played an important role in early community governance. Early community leaders such as John Winthrop, Thomas Hooker, Roger Williams, and William Penn were church leaders as well as community leaders (see Robert Isaak's Anthology, *American Political Thinking*). So, in the development of America's earliest communities, the moral teachings of the church played an important role in the establishment of civil codes that would govern the community and human behavior.

Many of the early religious/community leaders, such as John Winthrop, expressed their political vision of democracy and individual rights in the essays and journals they wrote. Winthrop, in his 1630 essay “A Model of Christian Charity” established the purpose and ends for the community that he founded in Massachusetts. Similarly, religious/community leaders in other colonial communities were aided by the moral teachings of their faith in the development of their political vision for community governance. It should be noted that consideration of secular/civil law was the primary source of governance, but the moral teachings of the church was one of several factors that was considered in writing early community codes.

The noted sociologist, Robert Bellah, in his seminal article “Civil Religion in America” documents the role that moral teachings have played in helping to humanize and temper civil laws. While recognizing the American democratic principle of separation of church and state, Bellah makes the case that America since its origins has evolved a political culture that embraces a form of civil religion that has helped to inform America’s democratic vision and values. He argues that the civil religion evolved in a manner that respects the principle of separation of church and state. As a result, in many of the early communities, to aid group survival, established a communitarian ethic that proclaimed, “Am I my brother’s keeper? Yes! I am.” Such an ethic had its origin in the moral teachings of the church and helped to establish a standard of caring and compassion for one’s neighbors and the new members (immigrants) who joined the community. It was during this period that the treatment of immigrants was first established and it could be argued that the standard would influence how future generations of Americans would treat immigrants. Therefore, this paper seeks to provide perspective of the past and present, while giving an eye to the future concerning the issue of immigration in America and the rights of non-citizens.

Rationale/Justification of the Research

There are several major factors that shaped the decision to pursue this research. One of which pertains to the current debate regarding illegal immigrants and the restrictive laws that have been adopted recently by such states as Arizona, Georgia, and Alabama. A broader discussion of these laws will be provided later in the paper, and consideration will be given to state legislators' probable motives and motivation for passing such laws at this time in American history. Given the nature of the laws, a major concern that emerges is whether these laws are consistent with American democratic values given the significant role immigration has played in America's development and history.

David North of the Center for Immigration Studies has noted that "before the era of rapid communications and transportation, America encouraged relatively open immigration to settle its empty lands."¹ He also observes "from 1900 to 1920, nearly 24 million immigrants arrived during what is known as the Great Wave."² Many of that period's mass immigration were from Europe and the historical record reveals that the European immigrants, relative the more recent Latino immigrants, acculturated and assimilated into American society without too much conflict and were allowed to pursue the American Promise.

Today, however, with the approximately 11.2 million illegal immigrants in this country, there has been much political debate at the federal, state and local level regarding the status and rights of the illegal immigrants/non-citizens. The significant majority of the immigrants are from Mexico. This has caused a great deal of tension and conflict between the immigrants and the citizens of the states that border Mexico, such as California, Texas, and Arizona, where many of the immigrants settle. The Department of Homeland Security, recently, presented data that

¹ www.cis.org

² www.cis.org

revealed that California is home to approximately 2,850,000 illegal immigrants and Texas is home to more than 1,680,000 and some 560,000 call Arizona home (table 1).

Many politicians in these states have taken a more what we will term as a “Restrictionist (anti-immigration),” as opposed to a “Progressive” perspective regarding immigration. This has led to immigration becoming a major issue in presidential, congressional, state and local politics. Recently, there has been anti-immigration legislation passed by a number of the states that do not border Mexico and have relative small illegal immigrant populations. The states such as Georgia, Alabama and South Carolina have recently enacted very restrictive anti-immigration policies, even though, as it the case with South Carolina, the size of the illegal immigrant population does not justify such strong state action.

Thus, another factor that influenced this research is the need to analyze and explain the rationale and justification for the restrictive policies being pursued by “non-border” states, particularly, Deep South states with Republican majorities in the state legislatures and Republican governors. A primary research question that guides this study is to ascertain whether the motivation for these policies is rooted in economic or cultural/ideological reasons. Is there a cultural backlash against increased immigration from the Latin world, or is the backlash a rational response to economic concerns?

While the Restrictionist perspective has gained political ground in recent years in opposition to what many of this perspective perceive as tendencies toward amnesty as being promoted by supporters of the Dream Act, nevertheless, there is an alternative perspective that has a rich history in American politics. The Progressive perspective which advocates equality of opportunity regardless of race ethnicity, creed, gender or social status has consistently argued for greater rights for immigrants as reflected in its support for the 1965 Hart-Cellar Act that

promoted a form of amnesty for immigrants. This perspective maintains unyielding “faith in America’s undimmed ability to metabolize immigrants from around the world, to change them more than they change the U.S.”³

While the case for equality of opportunity became a reality for most Americans after the civil rights and Women’s rights movement (movements that influenced the passage of the Hart-Cellar Act), the value was articulated earlier as a part of the American Promise by former president Herbert Hoover. In his 1922 speech titled “The New American Individualism,” Herbert Hoover argued that “everyone is entitled to have the opportunity to take the position in the community that suits their intelligence, character, ability, and ambition.”⁴

In the speech, Hoover makes the case equality of opportunity as a core American value. He claimed that its ability to provide equality of opportunity for citizens and non-citizens that America could free itself from the socio-economic caste system that existed in many other countries during the early part of the twentieth century. Hoover argued that America’s social, economic, and intellectual progress is almost solely dependent upon the minds of those individuals (native or foreign born) with imaginative and administrative intelligence who create or carry discoveries to widespread application.⁵ Since Hoover believed that progress of the entire nation came through the sum total of the progress of its individuals, it is only natural that he believed that no one race or ethnic group held a monopoly on creativity or brain power.

Therefore, Hoover claimed that obligation of the government is to stimulate and initiate all people, developing the hand and intellect, developing thought and spirituality, and sense of service, thus cultivating the great minds that will contribute to the growth, progress, and success

³ Nathan Thornburgh (June 07, 2007) “Immigration: The Case for Amnesty,” www.time.com, p.3.

⁴ Robert (1994): 523

⁵ Ibid., 531

of the United States. Hoover believed that America could become a great nation if it could continue to expand its talent pool.

The United States was founded on certain democratic values, or as Thomas Jefferson defined them as, “certain inalienable rights.” The rights have come to include the right to life, liberty, justice, tolerance, and equality of opportunity. All of which comprise the core of the American Promise. The Progressive perspective holds that a major issue confronting America in the twentieth first century is how to extend these rights to the new non-European immigrants who have become the primary immigrants to America.

Causes of Recent Backlashes against Unauthorized Immigrants

On Aug. 20, 2010, Gov. Jan Brewer of Arizona signed the nation’s toughest bill on illegal immigration into law. The bill gave broad discretion for law enforcement officers to verify the immigration status of anyone suspected of being in the country illegally and made the failure to carry immigration documents a crime. The bill immediately prompted strong criticism from President Obama, who pointed out that the Arizona law threatened “to undermine basic notions of fairness that we cherish as Americans, as well as the trust between police and our communities that is so crucial to keeping us safe.” Clearly, this law would lead to racial profiling and create a hostile environment for legal Hispanic immigrants. Yet, Brewer claimed that this law represented another tool for her state to use as they worked to solve a crisis they did not create and the federal government refused to fix.

With one of eleven residents in Arizona being unauthorized immigrant⁶, she was right to be concerned, but it is debatable whether this is the right approach to solve this problem. If labor can be regarded a commodity, then it is also governed by the law of demand and supply. Clearly,

⁶ Refer to table 1. Unauthorized immigrants comprised about 8.8% of Arizona’s population, the nation’s highest density.

there are employers eager to hire these migrant workers. Wouldn't it then be easier to target the businesses than the individuals? Shouldn't the allure of better paying jobs be regarded as the original sin and the blames lifted against those who seek it? Why are the furies directed to the helpless foreigners while the roots of the problem are at home? Does the infamous sheriff Joe Arpaio satisfy his ego by bullying the Mexican detainees in his "concentration camps?" Why then were there no Americans incarcerated who partook in the same crime? Are prejudices and racial discrimination really in the past tense?

Since immigration matters are in the purview of the federal government, most of the clauses were blocked by federal judges, and Arizona has tried but to no avail to appeal this decision. So, is this simply a show to rally her political support, much like what cynics thought of Obama's rhetoric of the Dream Act and the broad immigration reform simply as a stratagem to court Latino voters? If one recalls the era of Jacksonian democracy, where both parties rushed to support further enfranchisement, the political system rewarded those who were able to energize the electorate. The immigration question boils down to whether the Latino voters offer similar appeals. It seems that in Arizona, the legal foreign residents are of such a small number (5.9%) that Brewer's policy is rational, whereas Obama's political stance is rational given the presence of 16.3% of Latino or Hispanic origins nationally. This may be a particularly appealing strategy to court Florida, a swing state, where a significant number of Cuban immigrants may come out to vote for Obama out of sympathies for their Mexican comrades in 2012.

The bill in Arizona soon created a ripple effect in other conservative states, including Utah, Indiana, Georgia, Alabama and South Carolina. According to the Pew Hispanic Center,

there were 11.2 million⁷ unauthorized immigrants living in the United States as of March 2010. While the overall volume seems overwhelming, on par with the population of Ohio, the seventh most populous state, percentagewise, its presence becomes more tolerable, at close to 3.6 percent. Given the recent passage of harsh immigration laws in a number of states inspired by Arizona's example, one may be disappointed to find that only Arizona and Georgia made it to the top ten recipient states of unauthorized immigrants and wonder at the rationale for South Carolina and Indiana to make a similar push.

Table 1: Top Ten States of Residence of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population⁸

State of Residence	Estimated population January 2008	% of total unauthorized	% of total state population	% of legal immigrants ⁹	GDP Per capita \$	Unemployment % ¹⁰	Violent Crimes per 100,000 population, 2007 ¹¹
All states	11,600,000	100	N.A.	N.A.	50221	N.A.	N.A.
California	2,850,000	25	7.7	19.1	58931	11.7	523
Texas	1,680,000	14	6.7	9.1	48259	8	511
Florida	840,000	7	4.5	14.2	44736	10.6	723
New York	640,000	6	3.3	18	54659	7.9	414
Arizona	560,000	5	8.8	5.9	48745	9.1	483
Illinois	550,000	5	4.3	9.1	53966	8.9	533
Georgia	460,000	4	4.7	4.4	47590	9.8	493
New Jersey	400,000	3	4.5	15.2	64918	9.4	329
North Carolina	380,000	3	4.0	2.8	43674	9.7	466
Nevada	280,000	2	10.4	8.3	53341	12.1	751
Other states	2,950,000	25	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

It is interesting to note that California, while being the largest recipient state and of the third highest density of unauthorized immigrants, has a more tolerant attitude than Georgia,

⁷ The Department of Homeland Security produced a similar estimate of 11.6 million for 2008. The estimate was based on the residue method, where the estimate of the legal resident foreign born population was subtracted from the estimate of the total foreign-born population.

⁸ The table is adapted from Hoefler et al. (2009), table 4. Five columns of data are added from other sources for this analysis.

⁹ The percentages are calculated by subtracting the percentage of illegal immigrants from the percentage of foreign born persons.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Labor, figures in May 2011: www.bls.gov/lau.

¹¹ Violent crimes include murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. U.S. Census Bureau: http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/law_enforcement_courts_prisons/crimes_and_crime_rates.html.

where both the sheer volume and density of unauthorized immigrants are moderate. The fact that California has 37.6% of its inhabitants of Hispanic origin¹² could be an explanatory factor for the tolerant political atmosphere, whereas 8.8 % Hispanic population in Georgia is unable to carry the same political clout. It is plausible to surmise that the xenophobic sentiment is fueled by the social stratum in direct competition for jobs with the unauthorized immigrants. I attempted to use the percentage below the poverty level as a proxy, but the small difference between 14.2% in California versus 16.6% in Georgia does not seem to justify the public outrage in the latter. On the contrary, the poor segment of the society may well benefit from this influx of labors willing to perform undesirable work and produce goods to sustain the welfare society.

It appears that the attitude towards unauthorized immigrants also correlates with states' acceptance of legal immigrants and per capita income. States such as California, New York, and New Jersey have higher percentages of legal immigrants and are wealthier than Arizona, Georgia, and Texas, and have a more tolerant attitude toward unauthorized immigrants. In South Carolina, the percentage of foreign born persons is 4.4% and that of unauthorized immigrants is 1.2%, yet it was the first state to pass the ban for unauthorized immigrants to attend colleges and universities under Governor Mark Sanford in 2008, and now it has followed Arizona's lead to pass one of the strictest enforcement laws for immigration, under the new governor, Nikki Haley, who herself is a second-generation Indian immigrant. It is also the first state to pay for a brand-new enforcement unit, costing \$1.3 million, whereas the state ranks 42nd in the nation in per capita income and is poised to cut its budget elsewhere, including education. It appears that the reasons for Haley's anti-immigrant legislation are ideological and political, to satisfy her conservative Republican base on the one hand by reinstating "racial profiling" and to maintain the support of working class South Carolinians by exaggerating illegal immigrants' expropriation

¹² U.S. Census Bureau: www.census.gov.

of state resources and job opportunities. The bill's cosponsor, Larry Grooms, even claimed without any substantiation that "they cling together in illegal communities and bring with them drugs, prostitution, violent crime and gang activity." In Georgia, Governor Nathan Deal's program to replace fleeing migrant farm workers with probationers backfired when some of the convicted criminals started to walking off their jobs because field work was too strenuous. As the state's farms expect lose up to \$1 billion if crops continue to go unpicked and rot, Georgia may eventually come to the rude awakening that the undocumented immigrants were an integral part of their farming economy and the issue at hand is not the legal status of the workers but the lack of legal structure to have these workers documented.

This also raises an interesting question whether the state of economy is a driving force behind the passing of stricter immigration laws. While economic recessions reduce the number of job opportunities, thus prompting more protective sentiment toward the limited resources, yet the immigration issue in the United States may not fall in this category, as most of the jobs that illegal immigrants perform may not be substitutable by local citizens. The situation in Georgia provided a good example for this. It is also a fallacy to assume that the total number of jobs is finite. Again in Georgia, the lack of farm labor will lead to the loss of related jobs in transportation, retail, etc. and the state's economy will suffer as a result.

In addition, it might be reasonable to assume that states with higher unemployment rates would be more motivated to pass stricter immigration laws, yet the unemployment rates in California and Florida are both higher than Georgia and Arizona (table 1). So it appears that the state of the economy is not the sole consideration. So, were violent crimes out of control in these states so that stringent immigration laws became paramount concerns? It appears that this may be

more rhetoric than reality, considering the violent crimes rates in Arizona and Georgia in 2007 were lower than all other top ten recipient states except New Jersey (table 1).

So what were the causes for the recent backlash against illegal immigrants? It appears that the economic recession has created an inward-looking sentiment nationally and the blame instead of being directed to the Wall Street bankers who caused the crisis was shifted to the foreigners who bore the burden of menial work of the economy. Ideology also seemed to have played a role in this as all but one of the five states that passed the immigration laws voted Republican in the 2008 presidential election, and Indiana, the exception, only voted Democratic in 1964 and 2008 since 1940, and in 2008 Obama only won by 1% over McCain.

Solutions to the Problem of Illegal Immigration in the United States

It is natural for people to seek better lives, and if their home country cannot provide it, they seek it elsewhere. The per capita income of the United States is more than three times that of Mexico. If the income disparity is taken into consideration, where around 48% of Mexicans were below the poverty line in 2008¹³, the significant influx of unauthorized Mexicans across the long and lightly guarded border is predictable. As a matter of fact, out of all unauthorized immigrants, Mexicans accounted for 61%¹⁴.

With around 11.2 million unauthorized immigrants in the United States, there is no simple solution to this problem. The first option is deportation, which requires a national sweep and tremendous costs to transport back the unauthorized immigrants. This is simply impossible, not only for unthinkable terror this would unleash, but also for it would violate the fourth amendment of the constitution, which guarantees the security from unwarrantable search and seizure. The second option is amnesty. The major concerns are that this weakens the integrity of

¹³ CIA Factbook

¹⁴ Hofer et al. (2009), table 3.

the American legal system; encourages future illegal immigrations by rewarding bad behaviors; discriminates against those who are waiting in line for citizenship legally; creates further drain on the social welfare system as these illegal immigrants are in the lowest rung of the economy. Critics tend to point out that the amnesty of 1986, which provided a path to citizenship for 3 million illegal immigrants, sparked greater waves of illegal immigration. While there is stark economic disparity between the United States and Mexico and border crossing is still possible, which mostly like will be, people desperate for better lives will continue to enter into the United States without permission. Amnesty does have its bright side, which is to incorporate the *de facto* residents into the society so that they could be better regulated. The third option is to encourage the unauthorized immigrants to leave voluntarily and to offer a guest worker program to supply the needs of the American economy. The states that have passed restrictive immigration laws certainly have aimed to provide a hostile environment to discourage the stay of illegal immigrants, yet all have turned a blind eye to the guest worker program. Georgia has been successful in expelling the illegal immigrant workers, yet its economy is clearly suffering. If the economic loss is considered collateral damage, which in Georgia's case is estimated at \$1 billion this year alone, this harsh strategy may well be successful, where the illegal immigrants either pack up and leave the country or migrate to other states with more tolerance. This may also have the potential to spark similar legislations in other states in an effort to stem this inflow of illegal immigrants from the border states. South Carolina may well be motivated by this consideration.

Whatever solution a state or the federal government may adopt, there appears to be no quick fix to the problem and the restrictive laws adopted run counter to the American core values as an immigrant society that uphold the right to life, liberty, justice, tolerance, and equality of

opportunities. One of the resolutions of these restrictive laws denies the children of illegal immigrants the rights to education, who clearly have no fault of their own.

In 1975, Texas adopted a provision that barred the undocumented school age children the free public education. The Supreme Court objection in 1982 shed some light on this issue:

It is difficult to understand precisely what the State hopes to achieve by promoting the creation and perpetuation of a subclass of illiterates within our boundaries, surely adding to the problems and costs of unemployment, welfare, and crime. It is thus clear that whatever savings might be achieved by denying these children an education, they are wholly insubstantial in light of the costs involved to these children, the State, and the Nation.

(Plyler v. Doe 1982: 230)

The question boils down to whether it is possible to expel undocumented immigrants. Without devising a practical solution, the mere denial of their rights to education will increase the burden that this society will come to bear. This *de facto* acceptance of children of undocumented immigrants into the public education system spawned another problem, as some of these children ultimately graduated from high schools and sought college education. The proposed solution is called the DREAM Act, which stands for Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors. This bill was introduced in the Senate in 2000 and reintroduced this year. The purpose of the bill is to provide conditional permanent residency to certain illegal alien students, who graduate from American high schools, arrived as a minor, of good moral character, and have been in the country continuously for at least five years prior to the bill's enactment. The conditions are that they obtain a degree in an institution of higher education or serve in the military with honorable discharge within six years. If the bill is passed, they will also be eligible for in-state tuition.

The rationale of the bill is to provide the illegal alien students with the opportunity to obtain higher education and to become productive members of the society. While the bill is well-

intended, as the bill's critics pointed out, it rewards those who entered the country illegally, uncut the legal immigrants, and strains the resources in higher education through which both citizens and green card holders may be subjected to a disadvantage.

This bill targets the legacy of the slack enforcement of this country's immigration policy. What are expected of the teenagers who came to the U.S. as young children, speak English, and behave in many ways just like the American teenagers? Should they too be deported to a country with only faded memories? Should they be penalized for their parents' actions? If they will remain in the U.S., should they be denied the education as a human right? What reasons exist to condemn them to the underclass without access to education if they have aspirations to learn and potentials to contribute to the society?

Nevertheless, the bill appears to have provisions more generous than necessary. To afford an opportunity to study is one matter, but to grant permanent residency to illegal aliens simply to enable learning is another. Why couldn't they be issued students visas and apply for the permanent residency through the proper legal channels? This bill certainly will be a major disappointment for all those legal immigrants who waited in line patiently.

Conclusion

In this paper, we examined the issue of illegal immigration in this country, analyzed the recent passage of restrictive immigration laws in Arizona, Alabama, Georgia, Indiana and South Carolina, and discussed the solutions to the significant presence of illegal immigrants in the American society, particularly in regard to the matter of education for the children of illegal immigrants.

We maintain the position that the United States was founded upon the ideal of liberty, justice and tolerance, and that the harsh treatment of non-citizens ran counter to the liberal spirit

of this immigrant nation. We proceeded to analyze the recent passage of restrictive immigration laws in Arizona, Alabama, Georgia, Indiana and South Carolina, and examined the possible factors for the enactment of these laws in the aforementioned states versus other states where there are also significant presence of undocumented immigrants. We found that the presence of illegal immigrants, as a percentage of total state population, is not a significant contributing factor to such legislations, nor are the state unemployment and violent crime rates, or the level of income, measured by GDP per capita. However, it appears that the presence of legal immigrants, measured by subtracting the percentage of illegal immigrants from the percentage of foreign born persons of the state population, does seem to make a difference, where the more open the states are in accepting immigrants, the more tolerant they are in their policies towards illegal immigrants. In addition, ideology also seems to matter. While most of these states are bordering Mexico, the non-action in California and the action in Indiana seem to indicate that geography is not as significant a factor as ideology, where all states that enacted the restrictive legislations are conservative and staunch Republican.

We also examined the possible solutions to this debacle, such as deportation, amnesty and voluntary departure. While both deportation and voluntary departure take place as we write this paper, it is neither possible nor beneficial to completely remove all illegal aliens in the United States for two main reasons. First, there are demonstrated needs for Mexican labor in the American economy, where completely cutting off the supply will bring damage to the American economy, as the case in Georgia could illustrate. Instead, a guest worker program needs to be developed to fill this economic need. Second, there are portions of illegal immigrants who have developed roots and been embedded in the American society. If they are to remain, which amounts to *de facto* residents, should efforts be made for the inclusion of this segment of the

society? In particular, what should be done in regard to the education of their children? Should they be penalized for the deeds of their parents by denying them the opportunity to develop into fuller and better persons?

Upon examining the arguments on both sides, we are opposed to blanket amnesty, which rewards bad behaviors and only serves as a temporary fix to the present program, particularly considering that the amnesty of 1986 did not achieve the intended objectives. We argue that the problem of illegal immigration ultimately rests upon the economic imbalance between the United States and Mexico and the loose southern border. Efforts should be made to help cultivate more economic opportunities in Mexico and to improve security along the border, where the latter needs to be subjected to a cost-benefit analysis. In addition, given the needs of the American economy, a guest worker program could both tend to the economic needs and create a legal channel for the inflow of Mexican labor. Furthermore, we are in disagreement with the restrictive immigration legislations in Arizona, Alabama, Georgia, Indiana and South Carolina, and feel that these states have overstepped the boundaries and intruded the matter in federal purview. We are also disappointed that these legislations have the potential to infringe upon civil liberties through possible racial profiling and harassment of legal immigrants. Lastly, we feel that the stalemate on the immigration issue is regrettable and support a comprehensive immigration reform. While the stalemate continues, we also feel that it is necessary and morally imperative to educate the children of these illegal immigrants who are *de facto* residents of this country. We believe that the DREAM Act is well intended and support providing k-12 and post secondary education opportunities for the best and brightest of these children.

Bibliography

- Daniels, Roger. 2002. *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*. 2nd ed. Harper Perennial.
- Hoefler, Michael, Nany Rytina, and Bryan C. Baker. 2009. "Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigration Population Residing in the United States: January 2008." In *Population Estimates, Feb., 2009*. Office of Immigration Statistics, Department of Homeland Security.
- Isaak, Robert. 1994. *American Political Thinking*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace and Company.
- Maloney, Thomas, and Kim Korinek, eds. 2011. *Migration in the 21st century: rights, outcomes, and policy*. Routledge.
- Swain, Carol M., eds. 2007. *Debating Immigration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, Carolyn. 2006. *Lobbying for Inclusion: Rights Politics and the Making of Immigration Policy*. Stanford University Press.
- Zolberg, Aristide R. 2006. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. Harvard University Press.